

1. The Chuvash

Research history overview

The literature on Chuvash beliefs can be divided into five major periods. The first consists of descriptions by 18th-century travellers, which are historically important, but the data presented in them are sometimes difficult to interpret and are not detailed. The second major period includes the data recorded up to the 1880s, which are more detailed and are based on several local collections. The third period, during which a great deal of data was collected and processed, lasted until the second decade of the 20th century. This body of material has provided the core research material up to the present day. During this period, both collection and processing met scientific standards, yet were still based on living traditions. During the compulsory atheism of the Soviet era, fewer works were published, and after the 1990s, “New-Age paganism” appeared in Chuvashia, too. It is characterised by using earlier traditions in a haphazard and incoherent way, closely accompanied by pseudo-scientific literature. In addition, of course, the scientific literature has also been developing with some comprehensive major studies and many text editions.

What may be regarded as the first record of Chuvash beliefs is perhaps a description by Germogen, who served in Kazan as an exarch between 1589 and 1606. His report to the Tsar reveals how the newly baptised Chuvash (as well as Tatars, Cheremis, and Votyaks) did not comply with religious regulations. He notes that the Chuvash “do not go to church, do not wear a cross, do not keep icons (divine representations) and crosses in their houses and do not call priests to their homes” (quoted by Ivanov 1907, 4). The next record, which is also the first description of the Chuvash language, dates from the first half of the 18th century and is connected to the name of Swedish military officer Strahlenberg (Strahlenberg 1730). He only writes briefly about the religion of the Chuvash that they are Zoroastrian believers and worship celestial bodies and all kinds of trees.

A much more detailed and data-based description is given by Müller, who set out from St. Petersburg in 1733 as the leader of an academic expedition to conduct a complete cultural mapping of Siberia. During his stay in Kazan (1733), he collected data from Chuvash data providers and met Putsev-Grigorovich, who later compiled the first Chuvash grammar. According to Müller's description, although the Chuvash believe in one God and link the existence of all good things to him as well as expect him to avert evil, they also believe in the devil who dwells in water and is detrimental to humans through his evil deeds. Müller was the first to write in some detail about smaller local deities and holy places (the *kiremets*), and he also discovered their hierarchical order. Müller published the Chuvash translation of The Lord's Prayer¹, which is the first continuous printed text in the Chuvash language. It includes the word *soytan*, which is also important to our topic.

In the 18th century, two multilingual dictionaries were also compiled, which aimed to record a five-hundred-word vocabulary based on a questionnaire pre-prepared in 1737-38. The Russian-Tatar-Chuvash-Mordvin and Russian-Chuvash-Cheremis-Mordvin vocabularies contain numerous data that are important to us, but they do not contain any local notions that are specific to the given place or region (such as *kiremet*), as the glossary was compiled from Russian words.²

In 1740, as a participant in an astronomical expedition, Königsfeld travelled across Chuvash lands and he wrote in his diary that the Chuvash were non-Christian, that is, they would not adopt Christianity because it was so vastly different from their customs. He also wrote about places that were dedicated to idols (Königsfeld 1779;³

¹ In 1803, The Lord's Prayer was re-translated and was subsequently followed by translations of further prayers and parts of the Bible for educational purposes, which are briefly reviewed by Munk. 29-35.

² The Russian-Chuvash sections of the two dictionaries were published with commentaries by Dmitriev in 1960.

³ Königsfeld's diary, written in German in 1740, was published in French translation in 1779.

I cite it from Enderov: End. 21). A brief reference to Chuvash beliefs is also included in Rychkov's book published in 1762: he writes that they sacrifice horses, cows and sheep to God (Rychkov 1762, 188).

In 1768, the Russian Academy started a six-year expedition-series, the leadership of which was entrusted to Peter Simon Pallas. Pallas published his scientific observations in two volumes; first in Russian (1799, 1809), then some parts of his work also appeared in German, English, French and Italian translations. Pallas devoted a few pages to Chuvash beliefs; he wrote about the *yěřĕx* and the *kiremet* in a relatively detailed way. He presented an interesting aspect of the *kiremet*, which tended to reappear in later data, too. According to this, the phrase *kiremet's father* is one of God's names. Furthermore, he recorded the names of eight lesser deities, a short, three-line prayer and an animal sacrifice ceremony.

Another member of the same expedition was the German-born doctor, Johann Gottlieb Georgi, whose material collected during the expedition was first published in German in Saint-Petersburg between 1776 and 1780; then his work also appeared in French, as well as in Russian, in four volumes between 1776 and 1799. Besides God, the *kiremet*s and *irās*, Georgi recorded the names of four lesser deities and also mentioned Satan living in the water and the forest spirit. He was the first one to divide the Chuvash supernatural beings into good and bad ones, listing Satan and the forest spirit among the latter. He also briefly described an animal sacrifice ceremony and quoted a prayer text.

Also within the frame of the great academic expedition, the so-called Second Orenburg Expedition was led by Lepekhin, who had studied in Strasbourg and also held a medical degree. He collected a large amount of material from the Volga region in 1768-69, which was published in St. Petersburg in 1771. In his description of Chuvash beliefs, he paid special attention to ceremonies, gave a long description of the *kiremet* as a place of sacrifice and also recorded a pagan prayer.

In 1782, Chulkov published a dictionary of Russian superstitions, which in fact not only featured Russian superstitions and mythical

beings but also those from the territory of Russia, including some Chuvash data.

Of the 18th-century descriptions, the most complete and most detailed was an article published in the *Северный архив* (*Northern Archive*) in 1827, the author of which was yet unknown to the scientific public, so he was referred to as “the author of the Northern Archive” for quite some time. The study dated 1783 was written by Kapiton Mil’kovich, and for later researchers it became such an important and key description that Magnitskiy republished it in 1888 and Nikols’ky in 1906.⁴ Mil’kovich sought to give a complete picture of the world of Chuvash deities and spirits as well as many sacrificial rites. In his description, he listed 33 good deities and attempted to outline the hierarchy of *kiremets*. He recorded five great, four medium and three small *kiremets* by name, wrote about *kiremets* found at the edges of villages and worshipped locally, as well as about two types of *yěřěχ*.

In 1804, the University of Kazan was opened in Kazan, which played a huge part in the development of local intelligentsia in the Volga region. In addition, the exploration of the ethnography of the peoples living in the area became regular and systematic. Over the next century or so, hundreds of writings on ethnographic topics and text publications appeared in periodicals published by the University.

In the first half of the 19th century, Protopope Aleksandr wrote a short note on Chuvash beliefs, in which he recorded the name of two evil spirits besides God and the notions of *kiremet* and *yěřěχ*. A much more detailed picture was painted by Alexandra Fuks who, in her letters from Chuvashia to her husband Karl Fuks, a teacher of the University of Kazan, gave a detailed account of the local beliefs. She mentioned the names of 16 Chuvash deities and spirits, gave a detailed description of the *yěřěχ* and also recorded a Chuvash prayer. Two years later, Prosper Thomas⁵ (the French teacher of Leo Tolstoy’s children) made some notes about the Chuvash during his

⁴ Furthermore, it was published yet again between 2004-2007 in the collective volumes of Nikol’skiy’s work.

⁵ His person was recently clarified by G. R. Rafikova (Rafikova 2018).

trip to Kazan (about which he published a small volume in French in 1844). The description of the Chuvash, which includes the names of thirteen mythical beings, was published in Russian by V. A. Anderson in 1906.

In 1846, in the journal of the University of Kazan, *Казанские губернские ведомости* (*Kazan Provincial Gazette*), a long article was published by Vishnevskiy, who had been born in a priest's family in Chuvashia and spoke Chuvash at a native-speaker level. On the basis of his own collections, he presumed that the Chuvash basically believed in a good and a bad supernatural being: in a good God, who created the world and in its evil counterpart, the *kiremet*. In Vishnevskiy, we can find several names that appear as names of independent deities in some of the later literature. Vishnevskiy described some of these as the various names of God, and another part of them as God's helpers. He presumed a similar hierarchy of *kiremet*s, too: there is a great, earth-dwelling being connected with bad things and diseases as God's counterpart, who also has assistants and subjects. Furthermore, he also mentioned the lesser *kiremet*s, which are found at the edge of every village, who attack humans and their animals with various diseases. Vishnevskiy recorded two prayers: one to God and the other to the great *kiremet*. About the sacrifice offered to them, Vishnevskiy says that animals and cereal foods were offered to God, and animals and money to the *kiremet*s. There are four further names in his work, which are unanimously regarded as mythical beings by the later literature, but Vishnevskiy listed them as names of diseases (*χitām*, *Esrel*, *yěřχ*, *vileške*).

The next major work was published in 1856 by Vasily Afanasevich Sboev. Born near Cheboksary in a Russian priestly family, Sboev spent his childhood partly in a Chuvash environment, so he was fluent in Chuvash and was well acquainted with the culture of the Chuvash living in the area. He pursued his university studies in Kazan and St. Petersburg and then became a professor at the University of Kazan, where he taught subjects related to history and ethnography. His volume dedicated to the Chuvash (1856) is the first monographic description of this people. Several chapters of his book deal with the sacrificial rites and beliefs of the Chuvash.

Sboev basically classified the mythical beings into three groups. He first listed the celestial good gods, mentioning thirty-three gods and deities. With regard to these beings, he remarked that once a single celestial good God had been known to the Chuvash, and these beings actually only displayed some quality or characteristic of this one God. He classified the earthly good deities in the second larger group, mentioning eight such beings, such as the gods of the forest, the roads, the house and the field. Sboev's theory was that the Chuvash imagined the supernatural world to be basically bipolar, one pole being the good, creative God and the other Satan. Besides, Sboev devoted an entire chapter to describing the *kiremets* and also published memorats on their nature and powers.

In 1866, Artem'ev, editor-in-chief of the journal of the University of Kazan, published a small study of the Chuvash, in which he shared the view, which was almost unquestionable by this time, that Chuvash beliefs were dualistic, relating God to goodness and light and, as the opposite pole, presuming the existence of Satan, which was related to evil and darkness. Artem'ev, however, recorded a mythical story in which the *kiremet* had originally lived as the son of God, whose destruction was caused by humans.

In 1875, Nikolay Ivanovich Zolotnitskiy compiled a Chuvash-Russian dictionary (*Корневой чувашско-русский словарь*), which gave a new momentum to scholars who were not native speakers of Chuvash. In addition to the glossary, the book also presented ethnographic and mythical data in several chapters, as well as publishing short mythical texts (mainly incantations).

In 1878, the University of Kazan launched the journal *Известия общества археологии, истории и этнографии* (*News of the Society of Archaeology, History and Ethnography*), which existed until 1916, and during these four decades it provided space for more than 900 articles and text publications related to the Chuvash people.

The numerous writings of the Chuvash school inspector, Vasily Magnitskiy, constituted a milestone in the research of Chuvash beliefs, especially his great summary work, *Материалы к объяснению старой чувашской веры* (*Materials for the Explanation of the Old Chuvash Faith*), which was published in 1881 in

Kazan. Magnitskiy's Chuvash text recordings are rather inaccurate and his transliterations are inconsistent, with later authors often expressing doubts about Magnitskiy's data. However, this author recorded a huge quantity of data, and his descriptions of mythical beings, which would be questioned now and then, often reappear in other records, thereby proving their existence.

Magnitskiy, breaking away from previous assumptions, thought that the Chuvash specifically believed in many gods and spirits and regularly held a variety of ceremonies for them. In the *Materials*, he basically described the ceremonies in great detail, collected and recorded many prayer texts, attached a glossary featuring Chuvash words that were missing from Zolotnitskiy's dictionary but which he deemed important, and also attached Smelov's study of Chuvash beliefs. During this period, many smaller articles and studies were being published, some them descriptions of a mythical being, and others about the beliefs of a smaller area or district. Magnitskiy himself published several of these. Among the smaller publications of the time, Aleksey Vasil'evich Rekeev's four-part series of articles is worth mentioning, not only because he sought to provide a detailed and comprehensive picture, but because Rekeev himself partly grew up in a pagan Chuvash environment, which makes his information, at least, from a certain point of view, more reliable.

The most significant work of the first decade of the twentieth century is Gyula Mészáros's book, *A csuvas ősvallás emlékei (Memories of the Chuvash Ancient Religion)*, based on his local collection and partly processing the previous literature. For the Chuvash, this book is still one of the most significant research sources into their beliefs – which is why it was also published in Russian almost a century later, in 2000. Mészáros described many sacrificial ceremonies and customs in detail and also presented many texts. Perhaps because of his respect and compassion for the Chuvash people, he insisted to the very end on the theory that the pagan Chuvash were also monotheistic.

Primarily using Sboev's work, Nikolay Vasil'evich Nikol'skiy wrote a larger study, which is more of a summary nature, while his other studies, such as his work on the Orthodox missionizing of the

Chuvash, are of paramount importance. After Magnitskiy, he also published Mil'kovich's 18th-century description, with many critical remarks.

The most dominant prominent Chuvash scholar of the first few decades of the twentieth century was Nikolay Ivanovich Ashmarin. His main work is the 17-volume dictionary of the Chuvash language, which contains a great number of Chuvash texts, including folklore texts and excerpts. The dictionary is not of a completely uniform standard. In the first volume, Ashmarin provided both Russian and Latin translations of the Chuvash words and translated all of the texts. Subsequent volumes only contain a Russian translation of words at the beginning of the entry, and the texts are only presented in Chuvash. The publication of the grandiose work spanned 22 years and Ashmarin died in the meantime, so the dictionary was completed by others, using his notes. Perhaps this is partly the reason why the references are often chaotic and why there are many abbreviations in the dictionary that are not explained in the last volume. Nevertheless, this dictionary is one of the foundational works not only of Chuvash linguistics but, also of Chuvash ethnography.

Ashmarin, although primarily a linguist, also gave university lectures on Chuvash folklore and on the beliefs of the pagan Chuvash. The texts of his university lectures were only published in 1982. In addition, some of Ashmarin's works contain remarks that are important to our topic, perhaps the most important of which is his article analysing the names of some hard-to-decipher mythical beings. This article and his earlier book, *Болгары и чувашы* (*The Bulgars and the Chuvash*), clearly reflect his theory that the present Chuvash were the direct descendants of the former Volga Bulgaria. Ashmarin also published two manuscript excerpts important for the study of beliefs. One of them is entitled *Жертвенная тетрадь* (*Notebook of Sacrifices*), recorded in 1883-1884 by Nikifor Pavlovich, a teacher in Simbirsk, and the other is the *Авалхи чăваш йăлусем* (*Old Chuvash Ceremonies*) written by M. V. Shevle in 1907.

In addition to Ashmarin's works, a significant summary was written by Pyotr Vladimirovich Denisov in the Soviet era. He reviewed

the system of mythical beings in the first chapter of his book, then examined their Volga Bulgarian origins, reviewed the customs and rites and devoted several chapters to the history of Orthodox missionary activities. His work was mostly a reworking of Ashmarin, Nikol'skiy and Mészáros; the only novelty he provided was his analyses along the lines of ideology appropriate to the period. Besides this, as was the case with other Turkic-language peoples living in the Soviet Union, series of folklore texts, legends, folk songs and tales were published.

In the last two to two and a half decades, the Chuvash Institute of Humanities has republished many previous works. In addition to Ashmarin's 17-volume dictionary, some older studies were republished in several anthologies, along with new anthologies, which contain texts that had already been published in smaller or larger journals (and can be very difficult to obtain), or were selected from a large number of manuscripts related to folklore.

Among present-day researchers, Salmin's work is the most extensive. He has written several books and papers on the pagan Chuvash religion; his most significant summary work, *Система религии чувашей* (*The System of the Chuvash Religion*), was published in St. Petersburg in 2007. Salmin is undoubtedly a highly knowledgeable scholar, yet he does not make much use of the results or even data of previous research in his work, and also, his efforts to reconstruct a coherent, unified system by all means override his respect for data.

In recent years, some articles that are important to our topic have been published by Vyacheslav Enderov and Olesya Vovina.

Transcription table

(modified) Cyrillic	Trans- literation	English sound value	Notes
а	a	(as in <i>sun</i>)	open back vowel
ă	ă		reduced <i>a</i> (only in Chuvash)
б	b	b	only appears in Russian words
ц	ts	(as in <i>fits</i>)	only appears in Russian words
ч	č	ch (as in <i>child</i>)	
д	d	d	only appears in Russian words
е	e	e (as in <i>end</i>)	
э	e	e (as in <i>end</i>)	
ě	ě		reduced <i>e</i>
ə	ă	(as in <i>man</i>)	near-open front vowel
ф	f	f	only appears in Russian words
г	g	g (as in <i>go</i>)	only appears in Russian words
х	χ		voiceless velar fricative
и	i	i (as in <i>in</i>)	
ы	ĩ		velar <i>i</i>
й	y	y (as in <i>yard</i>)	
к	k	k	
л	l	l	
м	m	m	
н	n	n	
о	o	o	
п	p	p	
р	r	r	
ш	š	sh (as in <i>shed</i>)	
с	s	s	
ç	ś		palatalised <i>s</i> sound
т	t	t	
у	u	u (as in <i>put</i>)	
ў	ü		front rounding close vowel (as German ü)
в	v	v	
з	z	z	only appears in Russian words
ж	ž	(as in <i>genre</i>)	only appears in Russian words

Chuvash mythical beings

The transcription of Chuvash terms denoting mythical beings are not uniform. In the first, smaller-font paragraph of each entry, I only transliterated the data of 20th-century Russian and Chuvash authors, and in all other cases, I retained the Cyrillic notation of Chuvash words used in the given source. The contemporary form of the words are not faithfully reflected either by the immature Chuvash orthography (as was at the time), or by the haphazard ways of transcribing the data; therefore, their scientific transcription seems superfluous. However, it is not feasible, either, to transliterate these forms into modern literary Chuvash, as they can sometimes reflect dialectal differences. In the second, descriptive (larger font-size) part of each entry, I basically use the present-day Chuvash form of the given mythical being and its transliteration to Latin script.

From the Russian-language volumes, I have always translated the Russian meaning of Chuvash words into English.

The works of the 18th-century authors were usually published in two editions, in parallel or with a few years apart, in German and Russian. The German editions have been used by western scholarship and the Russian editions by Russian-speaking (Russian, Chuvash, Tatar, Bashkir) scholars. I myself also used the Russian-language editions.

As for referencing within the entries, I use the abbreviations of the most frequently cited authors, and in other cases I follow the usual method of citation. However, for four works, I had to introduce a third way of citation. Kapiton Mil'kovich's series of articles, originally published anonymously in a now hard-to-access journal in the first third of the 19th century, was republished by two other authors in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Chuvash scholars use Nikol'skiy's republishing from 1906 and I did the same. Its text, however, is not identical with the original. Nikol'skiy was not only familiar with the published study, but also with the original manuscript, so his additions and amendments are probably correct, but I had no way of verifying this. Therefore, I cite Mil'kovich in two ways: (1) referring to his original article in the usual way, with the

abbreviation of his name and the page number, and (2) the parts I found in Nikol'skiy, in a more complex form: Mil.: Nik. I + the page number. Furthermore, I included in the next subchapter of my book a tabular overview in which the differences between mythical beings relevant to my topic can be traced in the two texts.

In two other cases, I refer to two works by Ashmarin by including two additional references. In the appendix to one of his articles, Ashmarin published a manuscript compiled in 1883-1884 by a teacher, Nikifor Pavlovich, entitled *Notebook of Sacrifices*. I cite the latter in the form “Pav.: Ashmarin 1921, (+ page number)”. On the other hand, since the texts in the anthology are simply indicated by the abbreviation Pav., followed by the page number according to Ashmarin's article, in this chapter, in section **IV**. of the introduction to the entries (where I refer to the anthology) I consistently use the same form. I did the same when referring to Mikhail Shevle's manuscript, which Ashmarin published by inserting it into the third volume of his 17-volume dictionary. This is cited as follows: “Shevle: Ashm. III (+ page number)”. I follow the same method when citing the few small excerpts about the Chuvash from a book entitled *Souvenirs de Russie*, published by Prosper Thomas in 1844, which Anderson republished in 1906: “Thomas: Anderson 1906, 10”.

Akšă-makšă

I. ‘forest elf, evil spirit’ (Shevle: Ashm. I, 103-104); *akšă-makšă* (dial.) *akšă-makšă* ‘evil spirit, forest spirit’ (Ser. 67). **II.** ‘1. very much, extraordinarily, extremely 2. strangely, clumsily stupidly; 3. beautifully, gorgeously’, as well as *akšă-makšă šin* ‘1. a rare good man; 2. good-for-nothing man’ (Ser. 67); in Buin county, a phrase used for cursing (Ashm. I, 103). **III.** Sergeev tries to give two etymologies of the compound word, both of which can be discarded (Ser. 67-69). Equally unconvincing is his origination of the second part of the Chuvash compound from the Iranian word *māgus*.

Shevle knows several meanings of *akšă-makšă*. Some of his data providers claim that it is a forest elf or spirit that came from a frozen drunk man, and others claim that it is an impure spirit, which does not come from a human. However, it is true for both types that they are dangerous to humans and even cause their death. Shevle regards

it as a similar form to the spirits → *Ar-pir*, *lăp-lap*, *im-yom*, while Ashmarin to → *Ar-šuri*⁶ (all of the listed data: Ashm. I, 103-104).

Alăk ušan

I. *Алык озянь* ‘one who opens wide the door of the divine abode’ (Vish. 232); ‘door-man, gate-keeper’ (Skv. 245); *Алык озян (озязан) тора* ‘guardian of the heavenly gate’ (Zol. 21. > Ashm. I, 143). **II.** *alăk* ‘door, gate’ (Ashm. I, 139); *uś-* ‘open, (up), open wide’ (Ashm. III, 306).

The literal meaning of *Alăk ušan* is ‘door opener’ (as well as the form in Zolotnitskiy: *Alăk ušan tură* ‘door-opening God’). Skvortsov classifies it as one of the lowest deities in the divine hierarchy, along with the *alăk xuppan*,⁷ the *čělpěr tītan*,⁸ the *xum kěrekeši*,⁹ as well as with those names that include the word *šūreken* (‘going’) (Skv. 244).¹⁰

Vishnevskiy notes that this mythical being and some others¹¹ do not appear in prayers (Vish. 232). Already Skvortsov pointed out that on the basis of the great many prayer texts that have been discovered since then, this assumption cannot be proven. Furthermore, there are two of the listed deities and spirits (*Xěrlě-šir* and *Xārpan*) to which separate prayers were said (Skv. 246-247). We can add

⁶ Ashmarin only mentions this in the Latin summary of his entry.

⁷ The meaning of this is also ‘door opener’.

⁸ The meaning of this is ‘holder on a leash’. This mythical being appears in two of Magnitskiy’s beer sacrifice lists (Maslovoy list XII. round 6; Bishev list, deity 41). The parallel might be far-fetched yet worth mentioning that in one of the shamanic rituals of the yellow Uyghurs, a “whip-holding” deity is mentioned (cf. Malov 1912, 68).

⁹ This name appears in Magnitskiy’s Maslovoy God-list, meaning ‘waver of grain’. Skvortsov provides the Russian meaning ‘кравчий’ – in the Russian Tsar’s court, this official was responsible for the feeding of the ruler and the supervision of meals.

¹⁰ Although Skvortsov himself did not list such beings, it can be found in our material in various compounds, such as: *Xěrlě-šir uměnce šūreken Pülěxšě* (→ *Pülěxšě*); *Kepe uměnce šūreken Pülěxšě* (→ *Kepe*; → *Pülěxšě*); *šiv turri uměnce šūreken iră* (→ *Šiv*); *Tură uměnce šūreken Īr* (→ *Īră*). What is common in these forms is that they include two mythical creatures in the form Y going before X.

¹¹ Vishnevskiy also includes the beings *šūren iră*, *Xěrlě-šir* and *Xārpan* among them (Vish. 232).

that the form *alāk ušan* also appears as a spirit or deity invoked in prayers, for example in such a compound form as *kělě alāk ušakan* (see → *Kělě*).

Alpas

I. ‘1. evil spirit’, like → *Alpastā* and *ulāp pusni*¹² (Ashm. I, 164); *albassam* is an old, obscure word, not even in use, except in this invocation [on the occasion of the beer sacrifice] (Mész. 167); *Албассам* ‘layman [not a priest]’ (Zol. 220). **II.** ‘2. disease, 3. funny name/title’ (Ashm. I, 164); **III.** Zolotnitskiy offers two etymological possibilities. According to the first one, it is related to the Altai word *albasti* ‘population, people’, and according to the other, it is related to the Altai word *el-basčir* and the Kyrgyz word *el-basči* ‘leader of the people’ (Zol. 220). Both assumptions can be discarded, due to serious phonetic and no less serious semantic considerations. Ashmarin considers the Chuvash form *alpas* to be a compound, from the common Turkic *alīb* ‘giant’ and *basti* ‘he pushed’, where the last syllable was lost (Ashm. I, 164; cited with further data by: Fed. I, 35-36). Further etymological possibilities will be given briefly about the origin of the word (which is very common in Turkic languages) at the entry → *Alpastā*.

Ashmarin provides three meanings for it: 1. ‘female evil spirit, which is said to often go around with unkempt hair’ 2. (Buguruslan distr.) name of a disease (‘the *alpas* grabbed him/her’) 3. (without specifying a location) at the beer sacrifice (*čūkleme*) as an invocation (I, 164-165). *Alpas* used as an invocation is not without problems, as several data and several attempts at deciphering are known. At the beer sacrifice, when the barrel is opened, family members and guests sit separately at specific places, according to gender and age. The prayer-reciter and the host offer a piece of bread and a spoonful of beer to everyone present, being addressed by different names. The young people, sitting by the door, are called *albassam*, and the women, sitting opposite the oven at the front of the house, are called *χurān sur kassisem*. Zolotnitskiy (220, 260) translates *albassam* as ‘layman’ and *χurān sur kassisem* as ‘from a birch forest’ (Zol. 220, 260). Ashmarin (I, 164-165.) and Mészáros (166-167)

¹² Chuv. *ulāp* ‘giant’ (Ashm. III, 213-214); *pus-* ‘push’ (Ashm. IX, 313).

regard both forms of address as funny titles.¹³ However, this does not make their meaning any clearer and besides, the sacrifice does not have any other humorous element.

Alpastă

I. ‘evil spirits we can meet in incantations’ (Ashm. I. 166-167); *albastă* ‘spirit of an evil man, wizard, suicide victim or a drunkard, which brings diseases and nightmares’ (Paas. 140). **II.** Modern dictionary meanings: ‘1. (myth.) evil spirit; 2. (metaph.) messy, sloppy, dirty person; 3. (metaph.) spoilt child; naughty, mischievous; ~ *kurăkă* ‘cow wheat’ (Sirotkin 1961, 29); ‘1. filthy, sloppy (person) (noun and adj.)’ *ku ača căn-căn* ~ this boy is a real mess, 2. naughty, mischievous, scamp (noun and adj.) 3. prankster, buzzer, chatty, gossiping person, 4. (myth.) name of an evil spirit, (botan.) ~ *kurăkă* cow wheat’ (Skvor. 31). **III.** This word can be found in the majority of Turkic languages.¹⁴ Its etymology is not yet entirely clear, although a number of solutions have been attempted. The word *albasti* is interpreted as a compound by the majority of Turkologists, as the meaning of its second part, *bas-ti* ‘push-ed’ can easily be understood from Turkic languages, and the meaning of the word shows a clear semantic match with the night hag function of the being. As for the first part of the compound, five explanations have been published so far. Some of these claim that the first part (*al*, *āl*) also has a Turkic etymon, but another assumes a word of Iranian origin. Based on its Turkic etymology, *āl* can mean ‘scarlet red’, which word already existed in Old Turkic with the same meaning (cf. Cl. 120-121). This etymology was elaborated by Räsänen, trying to support his theory with the fact that some Turkic peoples also have a parallel mythical being: *qara basti* (‘black pushed’) (Räs. 14). Yet another idea starts from the word *al* ‘front’; thus the name of the mythical being would be a compound meaning ‘pushed at the front’ (e.g. Ost. 12-13; Mak. 27; Nas. 251; Kobl. 436). We can certainly discard the suggestion that the Turkic word *el* meaning ‘hand’ is hidden in the first part (pl. Nas. 251; Kobl. 436), as it poses serious phonological problems. The possibility of the original form *alp+basti* has also been raised (e.g. in Ashmarin; see → *Alpas*), where the first part

¹³ On the basis of the Tatar phrase *kayın sar* ‘cemetery’, Ashmarin believes that the women coming back from the cemetery are mentioned here in a funny way. (We must add that in the Tatar dictionary, *kayın sar* means ‘birch forest, birch grove, name of a mushroom’, and does not have a ‘cemetery’ meaning – TRS 206; nor does it have a ‘cemetery’ meaning in the dictionary of 19th-century Ostroumov; Ost. 105). Mézáros thinks that “birch-villagers” is a funny name for women, referring to their white shirts.

¹⁴ But also in several Iranian and Caucasian languages (see e.g. Takazov 2008; Litvinsky 1981).

had two early, Old Turkic meanings: ‘brave, heroic’, when referring to people, and ‘heavy, hard, danger(ous)’, when referring to inanimate objects or concepts (for the Old Turkic data, see: Cl. 127-128). As *āl* is also an Iranian mythical concept (it can be found in several Iranian languages, and is similar to the Turkic *albastī* in its function, too), several scholars consider the first part *al-* to be of Iranian origin (Andreev 76-79; Benveniste 1960, 1953, 65-74; Akhm. 17; also mentioned as a possibility by: Mak. 27; Kobl. 436; Nas. 251). Some Iranologists suggest a completely different starting point. They start from the form *almasty*, which exists in several languages, and is not regarded as a compound word. They trace the form *almasty* all the way back to the ancient Babylonian form *lamaštu*, which is supposed to have got into Turkic languages by the mediation of Iranian languages (Klimov - Edel'man 1979, 60-63; Rastorgueva - Edel'man 2000, 309). Other summaries of a broad context, providing several data are, e.g. Doer. II, 109-110; Ser. 69-75; but there are numerous further etymological concepts in the literature listed in our entry, which can hardly be supported. The concept *albastī* has given rise to a lot of ethnographical descriptions and several studies, of which perhaps the three most important ones are (with plenty of additional literature): Dyrenkova 2012b; Johansen 1959; Basilov 1994. **IV.** incantation: Ashm. I, 166.

As it mainly appears in incantations, the data providers could not easily define what *alpastā* meant. Ashmarin provides three interpretations (the first two from Buin and the third from Buguruslan counties): (1) *alpastā* is an evil (*usal*) and *aštakkā* (→ *Aštaḡa*), which clings to humans. (2) It shows itself as a maiden to young men and as a young man to maidens, and says “Don’t tell anyone” as it leaves, and beats the person. (3) If somebody has a splitting pain in their bones or if (s)he is “pushed” at night then (s)he fell ill from the evil spirit (*usal*), for which the *alpastā* incantation¹⁵ must be applied (Ashm. I, 166).

Ama

I. *Аму* ‘female’ (Soc. 24; Zol. 4); *Ama* ‘the oldest mother’ (Magn. 62); *Ama* ‘female deity, who is regarded as the mother of the whole world’ (Ashm I, 186). **II.** ‘1. female, 2. mother, 3. queen bee, 4. deity, 5. a part of the plough’ (Ashm. I, 185-186); *ама* ‘female’¹⁶, *ама съору* ‘stepmother (*съору* = half)’ (Zol. 4); *ама* ‘female, mother’ (Paa. 3-4). **III.** According to Räsänen, the Chuvash word *ама* is

¹⁵ I cite it under Ashm. I, 166.

¹⁶ The word *ami* was first recorded as meaning ‘female’ in 1769: Soc. 25.

only related to Kyrgyz *emä* ‘old woman’ of the Turkic languages. The Yakut data (*ämägät* ‘guardian spirit of the shaman’; *ämäḡ-sin*, *imäḡsin* ‘old woman’) are loans from Mongolian (Räs. 42; with a broader interpretation: Egor. 25; Fed. I, 38-39); originated from OT. *ana*: GTJ 298. **IV.** prayer: Magn. 58, 59-60, 84-87.

It appears in two of Magnitskiy’s lists in connection with the beer sacrifice: in the Maslovoy and the Bishev lists. Ashmarin presents a short text¹⁷ which suggests that *Ama* is the creator of the world, but we have no other data for such a meaning. Skvortsov provides forms such as *śut tēncene śuratna Aslā Ama* (‘bright-world-birthing Great Mother’) and *Śerti-śültipe śut tēncene tītan Ama* (‘Earthly-upper bright-world-holding Mother’),¹⁸ which he regards as identical partly with → *Kepe* and partly with → *Śēr-śiv*, → *Xērlē śir* and *Turā amāšē* (Skv. 166-167).

It often appears in compounds, for example: *ivāl-ḡēr śuratakan ama* ‘name of deity’¹⁹ (Ashm. III, 48); *ivāl-ḡēr śuratakan amēš* ‘deity belonging to the second round’ (Shevle: Ashm. III, 48);²⁰ *ama pūren* ‘one who gives a mother (queen bee) to the bees’ (Magn. 86). Besides these, there are several compound deities whose second part is the word *amāšē* (‘its mother’).²¹

¹⁷ *Ey pētēm tēncene śuratnā ama! Sanran pulni purte usāllā, purte avan śavānpa sana epir yalanax tivēšlīpe čükletpēr* ‘Oh, whole universe-creating (-birthing) ama! Everything that comes from you is useful and good, therefore we always offer sacrifices to you as is becoming.’ (Ashm. I, 186)

¹⁸ Unfortunately, he does not provide the source for these.

¹⁹ The name of the deity means: ‘son-daughter-creating mother’.

²⁰ The deities *ivāl-ḡēr śuratakan turā* ‘son-daughter-creating God’ and *ivāl-ḡēr śuratakan pūlēḡši* ‘son-daughter-creating *Pūlēḡši*’ also appear in the same round (Shevle: Ashm. III, 48).

²¹ In the material processed by us, the following such compound names appear: *čeček aššē-amāšē* (MagnMa. 18); *čun pūren Pūlēḡšē amāšē* (→ *Pūlēḡšē*); *čun śuratakan Pūlēḡšē amāšē* (→ *Pūlēḡšē*); *čun śuratakan turā amāšē* (→ *Turā*); *ḡért śurt amāšē* (→ *Xért śurt*); *ḡayar amāšē* (→ *Xayar*); *ḡārpan amāšē* (→ *Xārpan*); *Xērlē-śir amāšē* (→ *Xērlē-śir*); *ḡēvel amāšē* (→ *Xēvel*); *yulavšā amāšē* (→ *Yulavšā*); *kepe amāšē* (→ *Kepe*); *mān kiremet amāšē* (→ *Kiremet*); *mān kiremet pūlēḡšē amāšē* (→ *Kiremet*); *mān kiremet pūlēḡšē amāšē* (→ *Kiremet*); *Pereket amāšē* (→ *Pereket*); *Pūlēḡšē amāšē* (→ *Pūlēḡšē*); *śiv amāšē* (→ *Śiv*); *śiv ḡayar amāšē* (→ *Śiv*); *śiv Pūlēḡšē amāšē* (→ *Śiv*); *śiv turri amāšē* (→ *Śiv*); *śēlen amāšē* (→ *Śēlen*); *śēr amāšē* (→ *Śēr*); *śēr ḡayar amāšē* (→ *Xayar*); *śēr*

Georgi already tried to interpret the form *Turā amāšē* not as ‘god’s mother’ but as ‘the highest God’s wife’ (Geor. 176), and others, too, suggested such interpretation of the compounds later. We do not accept this possibility for two reasons. Firstly, the explanation that the word meaning ‘[its] mother’ can appear here in the meaning of ‘wife’ because in colloquial language, married couples sometimes call each other ‘father, [their, i.e., the children’s] father’ and ‘mother, [their, i.e., the children’s] mother’, is expressly forced here. Secondly, there are several deity names where a given being has both a father and a mother.²²

The compound deity names that have the word *amāšē* (‘[its] mother’) in them are far more common than those with the word *aššē* (‘[its] father’) in them. It is worth mentioning that the majority of the latter are related to some natural force or phenomenon (Sun, water, wind, earth, snake, flower).

Amak

I. ‘some kind of disease; in phrases, a swearword (an obsolete word whose original meaning is not known)’ (Ashm. I, 193-195); ‘2. evil spirit; 3. devil – in swearing (such as ‘the devil knows; what the devil?!’)’ (Skvor. 32). **II.** ‘(obs.) disease’ (Egor. 25). *Амак* – *хаяр амак*, *тыдан (тыдаган) амак* (from a prayer) ‘pushing disease’ (Zol. 4); ‘1. disease, diseased state’; in compounds: *ačamak*, *ača amakē* ‘puerperal fever’ [lit. ‘child *amak*’ or ‘child’s *amak*’], *tītamak* ‘epilepsy’, *kāsamak* ‘measles’, *saramak* ‘jaundice’ (Skvor. 32); *Amak* – *tīban amak* ‘some disease, falling sickness, spasm’ (Paa. 4); *χēvel amak* ‘sun-stroke’ (Ashm. XVII, 9); *šul amakē* ‘name of a disease’ (Ashm. XII, 217); *χāntāramak* ‘strong belly cramps’, as well as swearword

χārpan amāšē (→ *Χārpan*); *šēr yiš amāšē* (→ *Šēr*); *šēr Pülēχšē amāšē* (→ *Šēr*); *šēr turāš amāšē* (→ *Šēr*); *šēr-šiv amāšē* (→ *Šēr*); *šēr-šiv tītan amāšē* (→ *Šēr*); *šēr-šiv tīta(ka)n irā amāšē* (→ *Šēr*); *šēr-šiv tītan pülēχšē amāšē* (→ *Šēr*); *šil amāšē* (→ *Šil*); *tāvašši amāšē* (→ *Etem turā*); *tupavšā amāšē* (→ *Yulavšā*); *turā amāšē* (→ *Turā*); *turā χayar amāšē* (→ *Xayar*); *Valem χuša amāšē* (→ *Valēm χuša*); *vāršālā χayar amāšē* (→ *Xayar*); *vupkān amāšē* (→ *Vupkān*).

²² The word *aššē* (‘[his] father’) appears in the following compounds: *čeček aššē-amāšē*, *Xērlē-šir aššē* (→ *Xērlē-šir*); *χērt šurt aššē* (→ *Xērt šurt*); *χēvel aššē* (→ *Xēvel*); *kiremet aššē* (→ *Kiremet*); *Pereket aššē* (→ *Pereket*); *šiv aššē* (→ *Šiv*); *šēlen aššē* (→ *Šēlen*); *šēr aššē* (→ *Šēr*); *šēr-šiv aššē* (→ *Šēr*); *šil aššē* (→ *Šil*); *vupkān aššē* (→ *Vupkān*).

(Egor. 25). **III.** Old Turkic *āmgāk* means ‘pain, agony’ (*āmgā-* ‘suffer, pain’), as well as any event involving tormentation, such as the birth of a child (Cl. 159). In Turkic languages, the word has survived in two different meanings. The first one is ‘crawling (of a child)’, e.g. Osm; Tkm; Khak; Koyb; Kyrg; Bash; and the second is ‘fatigue, work, difficulty’, e.g. Kaz; Tat; Uyg. (cf. Räs. 42; Egor 70; Fed. I, 39-40). In Chuvash, OT. *āmgāk* exists in two separate forms, one is *amak* and the other is → *Inkek*, borrowed from Tatar (Egor. 25-26; Räs. 42).

Ashmarin lists a great many data for the interpretation of *amak*. Based on these, it primarily means ‘ailment’ in general and, according to folk belief, an abdominal disease that is caused by an evil spirit, the → *Vupkän*. Ashmarin also has a piece of data: *χēvel amak* (‘sun-stroke’, literally ‘sun-disease’) (Ashm. XVII, 9). In the case of animals, it is the name of a tumorous disease affecting cows and sheep, as well as a disease of sheep involving spasms. In colloquial language, though, it was often used as a swearword (Ashm. I, 194-195).

According to some records, *amak* was also the name of a supernatural being. Ashmarin quotes from one of his manuscripts (marked *Arś*) what his data providers answered to what exactly *amak* meant: “What is *amak*? It is also *Ar-śori*, Satan (*šoyttan*), *ir-osal*, thief-robber (*vār-χoraχ*²³), as well as a road-sign (*śol may-ak*)²⁴” (Ashm. I, 194).²⁵ Another piece of data suggests that *amak* was not only a disease or disease-demon. *Xayar amak* is the name of angry, evil spirits which, after the father’s death, torment and torture the children or the whole household in the image of the dead father, if he died without keeping the promise he had made to his own spirits (Magn. 112 > Ashm. I, 195). The name *χayar amak* also

²³ This compound also appears in prayers in this way: “Guard us from the thief-robber!”; e.g. Mész. 161-162; Mész. 163; Paa. 51.

²⁴ Ashmarin translates it as ‘road sign’ (I, 194), which is an accurate translation but it is hard to interpret in the given context. The phrase *śula mayan* (in the given dialect, *śol mayan*) means ‘by the roadside’ (Ashm. XII, 217), and as the road is associated with several beliefs and mythical beings, it can be a misspelling of that.

²⁵ I discuss some of the names appearing here in detail: *ar-śori*, see → *Ar-śuri*; Satan, see → *Šuyt(t)an*; *ir-osal*, see → *İră*; → *Usal*.

appears among the invoked deities and spirits at the ceremony of the goose sacrifice, where nine geese were sacrificed to nine harmful supernatural beings. This sacrifice was held in order to alleviate a disease affecting several members of the family or tormenting one member of the family for a long time (Magn. 112).

Amin tură

I. ‘some deity’ (Ashm. I, 200). **II.** *amin* ‘amen’ (Ashm. I, 199-200), *амынъ, амыль* ‘amen – a word frequently appearing at the end of pagan Chuvash prayers’ (Zol. 4); *tură* ‘God, deity’ (see → *Tură*). **III.** The word *amin* is considered an Arabic loan word by Zolotnitskiy, which had got into Chuvash through Tatar mediation (Zol. 4; on the Arabic original, see also: Mész. 6). The etymology of *amin* is not discussed either by Egorov or Fedotov.²⁶ **IV.** prayer: Mész. 15, 144/1-2, 146.

Although Ashmarin thinks that the compound *amin tură* is the name of a god, this is not proven by the example given by him (*amin tură, sirlax* ‘amen God, have mercy!’). The word ‘amen’ was sometimes placed at the beginning²⁷ and sometimes at the end²⁸ of pagan prayers as the exact meaning of the word was not known. However, it was not used as the name of a god but as a sacred element belonging to the prayer. Mészáros voices a similar opinion: he thought that the Chuvash interpreted the word *amin* as a kind of attribute, meaning something like “eternal God” (Mész. 280).

Ana iyi

I. ‘evil spirit living at the margin between fields’ (Ashm. I, 235). **II.** *ana* ‘paddock, part of a pasture’ (Zol. 5.); *ana* ‘field’ (Gomb. 3; Paa. 4); *ana* ‘paddock, part of a pasture, plot, a strip of ploughed land’ (Ashm. I, 231-323). On the second part of the compound, see → *Iye*.

²⁶ Although Fedotov has an entry *amin* (Fed. I, 41), only a few data from Ashmarin appear there and not the etymology of the word.

²⁷ Such prayers were also recorded by Mészáros, one of which I cite under Mész. 15.

²⁸ Zolotnitskiy writes about this: “countless prayers, which are recited on the occasion of various ceremonies, are ended with the form *amin sirlax* ‘amen, have mercy’, or simply with *amin*” (Zol. 4).

According to Ashmarin's only piece of data (from Buin County), if a child was laid down in the margin between two pieces of land, there it was bitten by the *ana iyi* (Ashm. I, 235).²⁹ The sick child would then cry and scream and sometimes even its arms and legs became bent and its back hunched. (The → *Iye* itself is a similar being, which especially causes sickness in a child who is put on the ground).

Ashmarin has a few more records of beliefs in connection with the marginal furrow between two fields (*ana yāran*): if a person lies down on the margin, he will be knocked down to the ground by an evil being (→ *Usal*); if a person falls asleep on the margin, he will be tormented with nightmares by an evil being (*usal*) (Ashm. I, 236). In addition, there is another, slightly different and unparalleled data: "As he was walking along, a blue-headed being came out of a margin" (Ashmarin I, 236).

Ana turri

I. 'god of the (field) plot' (Ashm. I, 240); *Ана Турры, Ой турры* 'god or spirit of the field or plot' (Kam. 11). II. For *ana*, see → *Ana iyi* and for *turri* ('[his] god'), see → *Turǎ*. IV. prayer: Mész. 67, 68.

According to Kamensky's description from the end of the 19th century, *ana turri* takes care of the growing grain, ridding it of weeds and pests, but only if the farmer keeps a watchful eye on it and acknowledges and gives thanks for its work. Greater prayers and ceremonies are only offered to it every ten or fifteen years, when the healer asks for its kindness and for the harvest to be good in the years to come. Smaller prayers are offered to it every spring at the beginning of the sowing, when fried (hen's) eggs are brought to the field (Kam. 11).

Ashmarin presents a single piece of data in his dictionary (from the Ishley district), without any context (Ashm. I, 240). However,

²⁹ Diseases do not usually collocate with this verb, but rather with verbs meaning 'grab, catch, (take) hold (of)'. The meaning of *tula-* are: 'bite, gnaw, maul' (Paa. 172); tear (apart), maul' (Ashm. XIV, 119); 'bite, tear apart, maul' (Sir. 491).

he believes that the *ana* (of whom strength,³⁰ a sharp sickle and food was asked), appears personified and as a deity in a prayer collected by Mészáros (Mész. 67),³¹ which he refers to in his university lectures. Thus, this data would also belong to the *ana turri* (Ashmarin 1982, 7).³² It is important to mention that the text recorded by Mészáros is probably not the same as the one referred to by Kamensky, as the former was recited at the time of the harvest.

Ankěl

I. *Ankěl*, *ankāl* ‘angel’ (Ashm. I, 252). III. Late Russian borrowing: Rus. *ангел* ‘angel’.

Ashmarin presents a single data from Yakeikino: “in my dream I saw three angels” (Ashm. I, 252). Mészáros notes that at the time of his collection (at the very beginning of the 20th century), angels were sometimes pleaded with in prayers to Mother Mary, due to Russian influence (Mész. 15).³³ He writes a little longer about the notion of angel at another place. In the imagination of the northern Chuvash (who, according to Mészáros, had already been converted to Christianity by that time), a person’s soul stays on earth after death, where an angel shows it the good and bad deeds (s)he had done during his/her life (Mész. 19, 250; more about this: → *Pirěšti*).

In the Cheshlam list, Magnitskiy gives the translation of → *Pülěχśě* as ‘archangel, angel’, following his data provider Mikhail Orlov, who had read in one of the Chuvash-language Orthodox publications, which were few and far between at the time, that the angel was the Chuvash *Pülěχśě* (Magn. 87-88).

³⁰ A prayer asking the land for strength after the harvest also exists among the Tatars (Tat. → *Džir iyäse*).

³¹ Mészáros presents the other version of the prayer on the next page (Mész 68). I cite both prayers in the anthology: Mész. 67-68.

³² Perhaps it is worth mentioning here that Mészáros did not regard *ana* as a mythical being.

³³ This process did not continue, as the word is altogether absent from later dictionaries (Skvortsov, Egorov, Fedotov).

In the material processed by me, some data appear from time to time that undoubtedly suggest Russian Orthodox influence (besides *ankěl*, for example: *kušpučě, pěr těrli; Ilya praluk*). Nevertheless, it is worth mentioning that these did not become wide-spread. However, this claim basically only applies to linguistically tangible data; general or even structural changes that bring about a shift in the meaning of a notion in some direction (perhaps the best example for this is the → *Kiremet*), cannot be examined on this basis.

Arăš-pirěš

I. ‘evil spirits’ (Ashm. II, 230). **II.** Meanings of *arăš-pirěš*: ‘1. wrongly, 2. in all directions, 3. incoherently, in a chaotic way, 4. chattering, gossiping (person), 5. irregularly, 6. evil spirits’ (Ashm. II, 230).

According to Ashmarin’s only piece of data,³⁴ the *arăš-pirěš* lives in the forest and the person who meets him will fall sick with terror and die. The connection of the being with → *Ar-pir* and → *Asar-piser* requires further research.

Ar-pir

I. ‘impure spirit(s)’ (Ashm. I, 318). **III.** Ashmarin originates it from Tatar, referring to the form *är-bir* ‘thing, something’ in the language of the Chuvash living in the Tsivilsky district (then Tatarstan), which is present in Kazan Tatar as *är-bır* ‘all, every one of them’, which in turn is a compound of Persian هر (*här*) ‘all’ and common Turkic *bır* ‘one’. He adds that the Tatar language also has the phrase *ärbir öröngan* ‘something unclean strikes or stabs someone’ (Ashm. I, 318). Scherner proved with phonetic arguments that the compound *ar-pir* in this form cannot go back to the Tatar *är-bir*, while he raised another possibility that the first part would be Chuvash *ar* (common Turkic *är*) ‘man’, and the second one (*pir*) a word of obscure meaning, which is known in other compounds, too: *pir-yivăšši* ‘poplar tree’ (‘tree of *pir*’), *pir-širli* ‘rosehip’ (‘berry of *pir*’), *pir šapnă* ‘paralysis’ (‘*pir* struck him/her’) (Scher. 120). One meaning of *pir* is ‘flax’, which is independent of the *pir* part of these compounds, according to both Scherner and Ashmarin (IX, 219). Scherner’s idea is

³⁴ Ashmarin refers to it with the abbreviation ‘G. T. Timof.’, which is not explained in the list of abbreviations of volume XVII. In all probability, he means Timofeev’s monograph, written between 1896 and 1903 and published in 2002 in Cheboksary (Timofeev 2002).

not to be discarded, even less so because the *poplar tree* is regarded as a cursed tree in Chuvash folk belief (Mészáros 1909), whereas the rosehip supposedly has the power to oust impure forces (Ashmarin V, 128).³⁵ Paasonen quotes *pir* as an independent word (not only occurring in compounds), meaning ‘stroke’. On the basis of his example sentence, the meaning is rather ‘the cause of stroke’; he thinks that the word might correspond with the Bashkir word *bire* ‘devil’ (Paa. 102).

Ashmarin quotes from two different sources. According to one of them, *ar-pir* means all kinds of impurities, even occurring in a prayer in this sense: “*Yey Tură! Těrlě arpirten ħătar pire, sirse yar pirěn patran!*” ‘God! Deliver us from all kinds of impurity, take it away from us!’ (Ashm. I, 318). The other source suggests that *ar-pir* means some kind of disease: *Vărmanta ar-pir-měn lekrě pulě*. ‘He probably contracted (some kind of) *ar-pir* in the forest’. Ashmarin suggests that the latter case is about a disease contracted from evil spirits, and *ar-pir* might mean evil spirit(s) in the first case, too. The reason for this difference may be that, when the Chuvash data provider had to clarify what exactly *ar-pir* was, they used the Russian word *нечистота* ‘dirt, uncleanness’, but actually meant *нечисть* ‘evil spirit (in folk belief)’ (ibid.). Thus, the meaning of the above prayer line becomes “God! Deliver us from all kinds of evil spirits, take them away from us!”. Ashmarin relates *ar-pir* to the being *lăp-lap*³⁶ (Ashm. I, 318).

Ar-śuri

I. ‘name of forest spirit’ (Ashm. I, 308); *ap-цюпу* ‘forest spirit, which inflicts diseases upon people and numbs their body parts’ (Sbo. 95. > Nik. II, 134); *ap-сьору* ‘forest spirit (half-man)’ (Zol. 5); monkey-like creature living in the forest, who takes out people’s teeth and swallows them (Rekeev > Ashm. I, 308-309); *ap-сьору*

³⁵ Being damned and having the power to expel unclean spirits are not necessarily opposing meanings, as the poplar tree itself is, in Mészáros’s description, regarded as a cursed tree, not suitable for building a church or any of its furnishings, yet a stick made of poplar wood is the only instrument suitable for killing haunting witches by stabbing them in the heart and burying them together with it (Mész. 110).

³⁶ This compound is only discussed by Ashmarin; his data refer to some disease in a more general sense (cf. Ashm. VIII, 112).

‘half-man, forest spirit’ (Magn. 112); *ar-šurri* ‘female forest elf (of a huge size; she throws her gigantic breasts over her shoulders, where two boy children suck them); woman behaving like a man’ (Paa. 5); ‘forest monster’ (Mész. 51, 53, 109); ‘forest god, which inflicts various diseases on people (one of Satan’s helpers)’ (Inf. 19); ‘a seventh-line deity’ (Shevle: Ashm. I, 313); ‘spirit, elf, the master of forests’ (ME I, 106; II, 316); ‘harmful, ill-willed creature living in the forest’ (Sal. 477-479). Other forms: *ar-šori*, *ar-šurri*, *ar-šüri* (Ashm. I, 308); *ar-čuri* (End. 29). **III.** As regards the origin of the compound, there are five suggestions. 1. *ar* ‘man’ + *šüre* ‘go, going’, the meaning of the compound is: ‘going, walking man’ (Sbo. 95); 2. *ar* ‘man’ + *šurā* ‘half’ – thus the compound means ‘half of a man, half-man’ (e.g. Zol. 5, accepted by: Magn. 112, Mész. 51; mentioned as a possibility by End. 29; Sal. 478); 3. *ar* ‘man’ + *šurā* ‘child’ – meaning of the compound: ‘man’s child’ (mentioned as a possibility by Den. 42; End. 29; Sal. 478); 4. The old meaning of *ar* ‘Udmurt’ (which may originally have meant ‘people living in the forest’) + *šurā* ‘somebody’s children’ (mentioned as a possibility by Den. 42-43; End. 29). 5. Basilov supposes an old deity name, which is related to the Slavic *Ильп* (ME I, 106). Sboev’s origin cannot be upheld either phonetically or semantically; the suggestions in points three and four are hard to interpret and also inaccurate, because *šurā* means ‘an animal’s young’ (Ashm. XII, 268). Basilov’s idea is unelaborated and it can be discarded in this form. About the interpretation ‘half of a man’, it is worth mentioning that in Chuvash, there are several compounds whose second part is *šuri*: *ama-šuri* ‘step-mother’, literally ‘half of a mother, half-mother’, *aša-šuri* ‘stepfather’; there is also *šin-šurri* which literally means ‘half of a man’, whereas its meaning is ‘middle-aged man’ (Ashm. I, 272); besides, the phrase *mukka*³⁷ *šuri* is interesting, used to tease cumbersome, clumsy boys, literally meaning ‘half of a bogeyman’ or ‘little bogeyman’. In addition to the latter meaning: *kuyan* ‘rabbit’, *kuyan šuri* ‘little rabbit, bunny’ (Ashm. VI, 254). In addition to the compounds meaning ‘half-man’, also see: Akhm. 48-50. Furthermore, we must add that in Bashkir, there is also a mythical being whose name is derived from the word meaning ‘half of something’ → *Yarımtıq*; and in Turkish, there is a mythical being called *yarım adam* ‘half-man’ (cf. Mész. 26-27). Besides the above, there is another compound in Chuvash: *Esrel šuri*! ‘devil-bred, son of the devil’ (Skvor. 1982, 637). **IV.** mythical story: Ashm. I, 308-309, 310, 311, 314; Mész. 50, 50-51.

On the basis of most descriptions, the *ar-šuri* is a creature living in the forest and harmful to humans. As far as its appearance is concerned, several different descriptions are known. According

³⁷ The meanings of *mukka*: ‘1. little dog, puppy (caretaker speech) 2. bogeyman’ (Ashm. VIII, 258). Mészáros also mentions it among child scarers (*muka*, *mokkā*), remarking that its meaning has become obscure (Mész. 54).

to some, it has a black face, long hair, four eyes: two in the front and two in the back, three arms and three legs (Ashm. I, 310, Den. 41); others say that it is a huge, human-like creature with tiny eyes (Ashm. I, 309; End. 31-32); or monkey-like (Ashm. I, 308); in other sources it is a huge-breasted female being (Paa. 109; Mész 51; Ashm. I, 314); or a man wearing a red shirt (Magn. 247); but it can also take the form of various animals, and sometimes it appears as a haystack (Ashm. I, 309, Mész. 52, Sal. 479). Mészáros attributes its female and male forms to geographical differences: he assumes that it was imagined as a woman by the southern Chuvash and as a man by the northern (Mész 51). Mészáros's description differs from others in quite a few points; actually, the creature mentioned by him as *upatě* is the same as the mythical being called *ar-šuri* in other sources.³⁸

The origin of an *ar-šuri* is explained in two different ways. In several records, *ar-šuris* come from people who die unnatural deaths. The most common idea is that it comes from the soul of new-born infants taken to the forest by their mothers right after birth and left there unburied (e.g. Magn. 194; Ashm. I, 310). The souls of people murdered in the forest or on the road, of suicide-victims, of those frozen in the forest and of those who died without a funeral or a funeral feast would also become *ar-šuris* (Mész. 52; Ashm. I, 310-315, Den. 42). If a man killed an *ar-šuri*, every drop of its blood turned into yet another *ar-šuri* (Sal. 478). Completely different from these is the explanation which says that the *ar-šuri* used to live in heaven and serve God but, because of its disobedience, it was sent to earth together with several other beings,³⁹ where the forest became its abode.

In the forest, the *ar-šuri* tries to make people stray from their paths in order to tickle them or take out and swallow their teeth. It shouts loudly or lures people by calling their names. In Rekeev's description, if a person stops to talk to the *ar-šuri*, (s)he can only

³⁸ The mythical stories quoted under Mész. 50 and Mész. 50-51 also refer to this.

³⁹ There are similar mythical stories about → *Šuyttan*, → *Usal* and → *Kiremet*.

escape in one way: if, when asked the question whether they are going downstream or upstream, they answer downstream. It is because the *ar-šuri*, afraid of water, cannot go around the estuary, but it can go around the source and thus, running fast, it can get in front of the man (Ashm. I, 308-309). According to yet another record, one can escape the *ar-šuri* by throwing bread to it (Ashm. I, 312), and Mészáros says that it is afraid of Russian prayer (Mész. 52). The *ar-šuri* likes horses, which it rides and completely exhausts by an unbridled gallop. However, it is afraid of dogs and does not dare approach people walking in the forest with a dog.

According to some records, meeting an *ar-šuri* makes people sick (Sbo. 95; Ashm. I, 313). Magnitskiy's description of the Maslovoy goose-sacrifice⁴⁰ is related to this function, where nine geese are sacrificed to nine harmful supernatural beings including the *ar-šuri*.⁴¹

In addition to the above, there is also a rather different notion of *ar-šuri*, which seems to be the result of contamination with the god of the forest (*vārman turri*). Some mythical stories mention that, during a conflagration, the *ar-šuri* drives the animals out of the forest, prevents logging in the forest and revives the animals it had eaten from their bones (End. 30-31).

Aša kašar

I. *Ажа-казяр, ажа-казярыр* 'going over, putting over, forgive (metaph. condescendingly or mercifully forgive)' (Zol. 175); *ажа-казяр* 'tolerantly forgive' (Magn. 83), *aša kašar* 'forgive (me)' (Ashm. II, 210). II. *aš-* 'wade through (water, snow, mud ...)' (Ashm. II, 208 (3rd meaning), Fed. I, 75); *Aša tură* 'deity' (Sal. 447); *kašar* 'take over, bring over, put over' (Ashm. VI, 137). III. OT. *āš-* 'to cross

⁴⁰ It differs from the description of the goose sacrifice recorded by Mészáros in several aspects. In Magnitskiy, this sacrifice is held specifically in order to cure a disease affecting several family members or one family member for a long time, whereas in Mészáros, it is a sacrificial ceremony held every two or three years for the *kiremet*, although it is also intended for the alleviation of diseases.

⁴¹ Magnitskiy presents two different lists: one from Maslovoy and one from Bishev, which are rather different. The Maslovoy one features 9 deities and demons, all of which are harmful, whereas the Bishev one features 24, of which the first five cannot be considered harmful to humans.

(a mountain)’ (Cl. 255), equivalents of the word exist in several Turkic languages (cf. e.g. Räs. 30, Fed. I, 75), *aš-* got into Chuvash from a Turkic language; as to the equivalents of *aša*, derived from a verb, meaning ‘across, through, over, more than (etc.)’, which cannot be found on its own in Modern Chuvash: Räs. 30. Chuv. *kaś-* ‘go over’ < OT. *kāč-* ‘to pass away, elapse; to pass through, to cross over’ (Cl. 693-694), can be found in several Turkic languages; its Modern Turkic forms: Räs 245; Egor 93-94, Fed. I, 237. IV. prayer: Elle 52-54 (prayers 1, 3); Magn. 58, 187-188.

In Magnitskiy’s Maslovoy list, *aša kaśar* appears as the name of the 87th, or last, deity or spirit invoked during the beer sacrifice. However, even though Magnitskiy listed it among the names of deities and spirits and gave it a number, as it is immediately followed by the word *Амынь* ‘Amen’, it is actually not a name but the ending of this part of the prayer. There are other data for this compound as a prayer ending form.⁴²

With regard to the first part of the compound, two other attempted solutions have been published. Salmin discusses at length a being called *Aša* or *Aša turā* (‘*Aša* God’), which he nevertheless cannot match with a single reference to such a deity, so there probably are no such data. Salmin derives the word *aša* by back-formation from *aša kaśar* and → *Ašapatman*, which he relates to the god *Aša* of the *Zend Avesta*. His assumption is based on neither linguistics nor cultural history. Fedotov also identifies the first part of *aša kaśar* with that of the name *Ašapatman*, believing that *Aša kaśar* actually means ‘*aiša*, forgive!’, based on *Aša* < Ar. *aiša* (Fedotov 1963, 98. /cited from Scherner: Scher. 124/). Although, from a linguistic aspect, this claim is at least not to be discarded at once, neither can it be supported on the grounds of religious and cultural history.⁴³

⁴² Ashmarin cites several examples where *aša kaśar* functions as the closing formula of a prayer, instead of the word *širlax* ‘have mercy!’ (Ashm. II, 210). In two prayers quoted by Magnitskiy, it appears next to the word *širlax* ‘have mercy!’ (I include one of them in the anthology under Magn. 50). *Kaśar* can stand on its own in prayers: *Xěrlě-šir! Kaśar pire!* (PK 63), meaning ‘*Xěrlě-šir*, forgive us!’. Besides, it also appears on its own and in compound forms in prayers used in fire-water sacrifices, which I cite under Elle 52-54.

⁴³ Fedotov himself may have deemed his assumption doubtful, as he does not mention it in his later etymological dictionary (Fed. I-II).

Ašapatman

I. *ажа батман карчыге* ‘witch (Rus. *баба яга*)’ (Magn. 151); ‘1. the forms *Ašapatman*, as well as *Ašapatman karčäk* (or *karčäkë*) [*Ašapatman* old woman (or *Ašapatman*’s old woman)] appear in incantations (Ashm. II, 212); its further versions: *ašamatman* (Ashm. II, 211), *asapatman* (Ashm. II, 99); *ešepatman* (Ashm. II, 43); *laša patman* (Ashm. VIII, 67); *šapatan* (Ashm. XVII, 126); *Awanatman karčake* ‘patron spirit’ (ME II, 538) **II.** ‘2. referring to very large things, together with the particle *pekeχ* (‘like, as if, similarly’) (Ashm. II, 211). **III.** Already Zolotnitskiy tried to find the etymology of the word: *aš-* ‘go over/across’ + *putman* ‘does not sink’ (Zol. 172); later Mészáros partly corrected it with the help of Tatar data; the etymology offered by him is the following: Ar. عیشه (sic!) (woman’s name) + Per. باتمان ‘one eighth of a grain measure (which was presumably stuck to the former as a mock-name)’ (Mész. 340); finally, Ashmarin cleared up its origin as the compound of Ar. عائشة (‘*ā’iṣa*) + فاطمة (*Fāṭima*), the names of one of Mohammed’s wives and his daughter (Ashm. II, 211); accepted by: Egor. 38; Fed. I, 76; ME II, 538) and Scherner with the no less important amendment that it had got into Chuvash by Tatar mediation (Scher. 123-124). **IV.** incantation: Magn. 151; Mész. 341; Elle 29-30.

This mythical creature, originating from the compound of the names of Mohammed’s favourite wife and his daughter, is widespread among the Volga Turkic peoples⁴⁴ and primarily appears in incantations. Among the Chuvash, it is mainly featured in incantations to avert the evil eye (Ashm. II, 211; Mész. 337-340). Gammer *Ašapatman* comes from a far-away or mythical land, for example “on the wild field is a dense forest; in the middle of the dense forest is a round lake; in the round lake lives Gammer *Ašapatman*” (Ashm. II, 99). As for her appearance, she has one hair on her buttocks and one tooth or, in other descriptions, she has a golden head with silver teeth. The texts of the incantations say that the healing is not

⁴⁴ See Tatar → *Gayšä Fatıyma*, Bashkir → *Ġäyšä-Fatıma*. Although Scherner claims that in the case of the other Turkic peoples of Islamic faith, there are no data for such a merging of two names, we can in fact find some such data, for example in Uzbek incantations (Snesarev 1969, 242), as the name of a holy place in Astrakhan (Syzranov 2006: 140), and in a Turkmen incantation (Samoylovich 1912: 120) is. At several places in folk Islam, however, Fatima has paramount importance in curing the effects of the evil eye (Kriss-Heinrich 1960-1962, I, 23-38).

performed by the person incanting but by Gammer *Ašapatman*: “she heals, she cures” (Mész. 341), “she blows, she spits” (Ashm. II, 99).

Mészáros thought that *Ašapatman* could once have been a real person, an important healer (Mész. 340-341), but this incorrect assumption of his was based on faulty etymology.

Aštaṣa, Aštaṣa šēlen

I. ‘dragon, dragon-snake’ (Ashm. II, 216). III. For the etymology of the word, see → *Aštaṣa*.

The word in this form only appears in Ashmarin (II, 216), and only recorded at one place: the Belebeyev district. Ashmarin does not mention that it is related to the word *aštaṣa* (the form *aštaṣa* does not feature in Chuvash etymological dictionaries; it only appears in Scherner). Although the two words are clearly related, I discuss them in separate entries, partly because these forms entered the Chuvash language at different times and partly because the two notions are very different.

Based on its only description, *aštaṣa* appears to be a thunderstorm demon. Here, we can also see the belief shared by Tatars and Bashkirs that a dragon who lives for a long time turns into a *yuxa* (Chuv. *yuxxa*)⁴⁵ (Ashm. II, 216).

Asar-piser

I. ‘impure power’ (Ashmarin 1898, 115⁴⁶ > Paa. 7; Ashm. II, 99); ‘1. demonic, impure power; frightening being’ (Egor. 34). II. ‘2. thunderstorm’ (Ashmarin 1898, 115); *azar-pizer šil kilet* ‘a gale is blowing’, *azar-pizer alḫazat* ‘make too much noise’ (Paa. 9); ‘2. Strong, frightful, horrible (of a thunderstorm)’ (Egor. 34). III. Egorov relates the first part of the compound to several Finno-Ugric linguistic data in the vicinity (Ezra Mord.: *azor* ‘master, host’, *azars* ‘mad, rabied’, Moksha: *azīr* ‘lord’, Udm. *uzīr* ‘lord, God’). He eventually traces all of them back to the Vedic Sanskrit word *Asura* ‘ruler, prince’, which later, in classic Sanskrit, adopted the meaning ‘demon’, cf. OT.

⁴⁵ This being occurs in tales (cf. Ashm. V, 24).

⁴⁶ In the morphological part of this early work, Ashmarin collected some compound words typical in the Chuvash language, including *asar-piser*. Its possible connection with the forms *ar-pir*, *arāš-pirēš* requires further study.

*asura*⁴⁷ ‘demon’ (Egor. 34). This is adopted without criticism and further developed by Akhm. 13-14. More defensible than this is Egorov’s other assumption that the compound word might be related to data in some other Turkic languages: Kyrg; Kkp. *azar-bezer* ‘restless, disturbed’,⁴⁸ Az. *azar-bezar* ‘all kinds of disease’ (Egor. 34). *Azar* as a Persian loan word exists in several Oguz and Kipchak Turkic languages, meaning ‘offence, vexation, sorrow, suffering’ as well as ‘restlessness, some kind of disease’; about these in more detail: Rad. I, 304; Sev. I, 108; Räs. 33; Egor. 34.

Ashmarin and Egorov’s data basically outline two different meanings: 1. An impure power filling a traveller with fear – at this time, the person may fall ill or lose their mind due to the fear; 2. (as an attribute) terrible, abominable – it generally describes some event related to wind and storm, for example ‘an abominable storm’; during a draught: ‘dust storm’ (Ashm. II, 99-100; Paa. 7; Egor. 34).

Aslati

I. *Аслади* ‘god of thunder’ and *аслади созимбе* ‘god of lightning’ (Fuks 1840, 92); *asladi* ‘god of thunder’, *Asladi-Sozimbe* ‘god of lightning’ (Thomas: Anderson 1906, 11); *azamme*, *асламме*, *асладу* ‘the personification of thunder (as an old man)’ (Zol. 200; adopted by: Den. 18); *Асла-аѡѡу-Топа* ‘god of thunder and lightning (lit. grandfather-God)’ (Sbo. 80); *aslā-ati* ‘great father, spirit, which controls thunder’ (Rek. 420); *aslati*, *aslavti*, *aslatte*, *aslati* ‘2. god of thunder, *aslati-amašē* ‘deity, mother of the god of thunder’, *aslati turri* ‘god of thunder’ (Ashm. II, 102-105); *аслā амме мурā* ‘god of thunder and lightning’ (Nik. II, 132); *Асламу* ‘god of thunder’ (ME II, 538). **II.** *асладу* ‘thunder’ (Zol. 7); *aslā* ‘big’ + *ati* ‘my father’ (Ashm. II, 137); *aslati* ‘1. my grandfather; 3. threat, danger’ (Ashm. II, 103-104). **III.** The Turkic background of the Chuv. word *aslā* is seen by Räsänen and Fedotov as follows: Middle Turkic *ās-ki* ‘old’, Chagatai. *ās-li* ‘big, strong’ (with further, Modern Turkic data: Räs. 50; Fed. I, 53-54); not accepted by Egorov; he thinks that the word comes from Persian and the Persian word goes back to the adjectival form of Arabic أصل (*aṣl*) ‘root, origin, beginning’ (Egor. 35). For Chuv. *atte*, *ati* < OT. *atā* ‘father’ (for the Old Turkic data: Cl. 40); for the other Turkic data: Egor 36-37; Fed. I, 70. **IV.** incantation: Elle 29-30; Mész. 341; prayer: Pav. 28-29.

⁴⁷ The Old Turkic form is *asuri* (DTS 61); however, it is worth noting that its only occurrence is in the translation of a Buddhist text.

⁴⁸ In Yudakhin’s dictionary, *azar* means ‘torment, suffering; oppression’ (Yud. I, 25), also appearing in compounds such as *azar-bezer* ‘restlessness’ (Yud. I, 123) and *azar-kazar* ‘chaos, mess, panic’ (Yud. I, 317).

In the early records of Fuks (and Thomas), it appears as a deity (Fuks 1840, 92; Thomas: Anderson 1906, 11). However, a few decades later Zolotnitskiy writes that although, on the basis of his name (great father or chief father), he must once have been imagined as a great and independent god, but on the basis of available data, he only appears to be a natural force identified as an old man, against which the Chuvash ask God for help: “God, save us from thunder and lightning!” (Zol. 200). The later literature dealing with Chuvash beliefs is also divided about this question: some authors regard it as a deity and some do not.⁴⁹

Sboev lists *Aslati* as the fourth of the nineteen good deities living in the sky, noting that he has no acceptable explanation as to why this not-so-important deity is called grandfather-God by the Chuvash. Nikol’skiy mentions it among the secondary deities (Nik. II, 132). In Ashmarin’s dictionary, he appears as the god of thunder and thunder-and-lightning,⁵⁰ who was prayed to during a sacrifice made for rain.⁵¹ His idea is supported by the phrase *aslati tură* (‘*aslati* God’), present in several records. In his university lectures, Ashmarin argued with Mészáros’s statement that both thunder and lightning originate from God (*Tură*),⁵² as the phrase meaning ‘thunder’ (*aslati avădat* ‘*aslati* speaks’) features not *Tură* but *aslati* (Ashmarin 1984, 27).

Denisov, though unreferenced, adopts Rekeev’s opinion that *aslati*’s former functions had largely been taken over by *Il’i prorok* (Prophet Elijah, getting from Russian into Chuvash folk belief) who, as the protector of agriculture, is also lord of thunder and lightning (Rek. 420; Den. 20). Ashmarin also gives an interesting example

⁴⁹ It does not feature, for example, in Vishnevskiy or Magnitskiy; nor is it regarded as a deity or spirit by Mészáros or Salmin.

⁵⁰ Zolotnitskiy discusses the forms *asladi* and *ása* together (Zol. 199), while Ashmarin discusses them separately. What is more, in his university lectures, he calls *ása* the god of lightning, not thunder (Ashmarin 1986). In his dictionary, too, the examples given of *ása* are more closely related to lightning (Ashm. II, 117-118).

⁵¹ Such a prayer text can also be read in PK, from collections in 1886 and 1932 (e.g. PK 121, 122, 128).

⁵² For this opinion of Mészáros, see: Mész. 85-86.

about the connection between Elijah and *aslati*.⁵³ Furthermore, in the Chuvash anthology entitled *Blessings and Prayers*, in some prayers offered during sacrifices for rain, *Ilya praluk* (Prophet Elijah) also features among the deities invoked (PK 125, Prayer 345⁵⁴).

In Chuvash folk belief, thunder and lightning are also attributed some purifying and healing functions;⁵⁵ of which, see also → *Šišem* ('lightning').

Aśa

I. *мун-азба* 'personification of thunder (as an old man)' (Zol. 200); *aśa* 'god of thunder' (Ashm. II, 117-118); *aśi* 'god of lightning' (Ashm. II, 127); *aśa* 'god of lightning' (Ashmarin 1984, 27). **II.** Primary meaning of *aśa*: 'male', further meanings: 'father; god of thunder' (Ashm. II, 116-118). Because of the etymology of the word, Egorov lists the meanings in reverse order, noting that nowadays it is only used in the meaning of 'father' in the genitive case, e.g. *aśšē* 'somebody's father' (Egor. 35-36). **III.** The word had already existed in Old Turkic, OT. *ečī* 'older (but younger than the father) close male relative' (cf. Cl. 20) or 'elder brother' (DTS 162); today, it can be found in several Turkic languages, usually to refer to an elder male relative, e.g. Osm. *ači, iči* 'older relative, elder brother', Alt; Tuv. *ača, ada* 'father', Khak. *ača* 'elder brother, paternal grandfather'. See the Turkic data in detail: Räs. 35; Egor. 35-36; Fed. I, 65.

Ashmarin regards *aśa* as a deity, but this is not supported by his examples. According to his data, God wants to destroy the devil with lightning (*aśa*); therefore, care must be taken that the devil may not snuggle up to man.⁵⁶ For this reason, one must not hurry in the rain, lest the devil stick to him, nor must one cross himself with his cap taken off, because the devil may hide under the cap (Ashm. II, 116-118; 127). Based on this, lightning is an instrument of God and not some deity or mythical being.

⁵³ According to this, *Aslati* had originally been a man named Elijah, transported by God to heaven on a chariot of fire (Ashm. II, 10).

⁵⁴ This is a prayer asking for rain, recorded in 1912.

⁵⁵ I cite one such incantation under Mész. 341.

⁵⁶ The Bashkirs also have a similar notion, see Bash. → *Šaytan*.

Astaḡa

I. ‘nightly light phenomenon; evil spirit’ (Mész. 46); *aštaḡa*, *aštakkā*, *aštak* ‘dragon; evil spirit’ (Ashm. II, 128). **III.** Equivalents of the word exist in several Turkic languages (e.g. Osm; Tkm; Az; Kar; Tat; Bash; Kyrg; Uzb; Nog.), the etymology of which had already been clarified by Budagov: the word is of Persian origin (Bud. I, 38), cf. ModPer. اژدها, اژدرها (*aždahā*, *aždarhā*) ‘dragon, giant snake’ (Gaf. I, 24); in Turkic languages, it means ‘dragon, dragon-snake, evil spirit’ (cf. Räs. 53; Egor. 36; Fed. I, 66); for more accurate meaning and mythical background of the various Turkic data: ME I, 50. It probably got into Chuvash with Tatar mediation; about this and phonetic problems: Scher. 122. **IV.** mythical story: Mész. 46.

Mészáros knows two meanings of this word. One of them is a nightly light phenomenon and the other is a mythical being that looks like a man from the front and sleeps with women at night in the shape of their husbands, which finally causes the women to wither away or die. It is only visible from the back that it is not a real man, with its back looking like the intestines of a sheep. In some areas, the same being is known by the name of → *Věri šēlen* or *vutlā šēlen* ‘fiery snake’ (Mész. 46). Ashmarin’s data agree with this only in part, some of which (Buin district, Simbirsk) describe this being as an evil spirit (→ *Usal*). If it sticks to a person, (s)he will become ill and unable to walk and will dwindle away like a candle, in vain does (s)he eat and drink. Ashmarin also has some records which describe it as a snake swallowing up people and domestic animals, also occurring in tales (Ashm. II, 128).

Avān kētūs

I. *Авын кўтнеси* ‘guardian grain-drying barn’⁵⁷ (Magn. 43); *Авын ктўсь вали*⁵⁸ (in Cheshlam village) ‘unthreshed sheaf of grain hung in the barn for protection’ (Magn. 45); *Авын ктюз* ‘guardian of the grain-drying barn’ (Magn. 45); *Avān kētūs* ‘guardian of the grain-drying barn’ (Ashm. I. 46. < Magn. 45). **III.** *Avān* ‘grain-drying (barn)’ (Ashm. I, 44; Gomb. 4; Egor. 19; Fed. I, 26; Skvor. 20); ‘platform erected of poles for the drying of grain’ (Paa. 9); Russian loan word: Rus. *овин* ‘sheaf grain-drier; drying barn’ (OMSZ II, 1036); cf. Paa. 9; Gomb. 4; Räs. 32; Egor 19;

⁵⁷ Ashmarin corrects Magnitskiy’s translation, as it is not a ‘guardian grain-drying barn’ but a ‘guardian of the grain-drying barn’.

⁵⁸ Postposition *valli* means ‘for’ (Ashm. V, 163).

Fed I, 26. The words *kētūs* ‘shepherd’ (Ashm. VII, 316), and *ketü* ‘flock’ are derivatives of the verb *kēt-* ‘graze, look after’, which exist in several Turkic languages, cf. Rad. II, 1480; it was already present in Old Turkic (Fed. I, 288; DTS 330); on its connection with the verb *kēt-* ‘wait’: Egor. 110-111. **IV.** prayer: Magn. 43-44; 44-45; 45/1; 45/2.

People prayed to the *avăn kētūs* when sacrificing the “grain-drying barn’s porridge” or the “grain-drying barn’s beer” (*avăn pätti, avăn säri*)⁵⁹ when the threshing was completed. In Maslovoy, a cock was killed for the sacrifice and, in addition to the porridge, they also baked a loaf or flat bread with the new flour. The prayer was held near a pole in the threshing yard. After the prayer, those present bowed down to the ground and threw a spoonful of sacrificial porridge each into the fire built around the pole (Magn. 43-44). In Cheshlam village, before they cleaned the barn after the threshing, they raked the leftover grain into one pile and the threshers walked around it three times, praying.⁶⁰ They hung an unthreshed sheaf under the roof of the barn to be its protector [lit. ‘its shepherd’]⁶¹ (Magn. 44-45).⁶²

Avăn sîḡčĭ

I. *Авын сыхчи* ‘guardian of the grain-drying barn’ (Magn. 86). **III.** *Avăn* is of Russian origin, see → *Avăn kētūs*. The Chuvash word *sîḡčĭ*, *sîḡča* has Turkic etymons: OT. *sak* ‘awake, alert’ *sakčĭ* ‘guard’ (cf. Cl. 803); it exists in several Modern Turkic languages, meaning ‘guard, guardian, protector’ (cf. e.g. Räs. 395-396; Zol. 65; Egor. 201; Fed. II, 77-78). **IV.** prayer: Magn. 52, 59-60.

⁵⁹ I quote the prayer under Magn. 43-44.

⁶⁰ I quote the prayer under Magn. 44-45. Two other prayers are cited by Magnitskiy from two other places: one is to the *Guardian of the grain-drying barn* and the other is to *Măn Toră* (‘great God’), which are presented in the anthology under Magn. 45/2 and Magn. 45/1.

⁶¹ In order to protect the farmyard and promote the breeding of the animals, the Bashkirs hang the neck bone of an animal on a pole in the yard (*mal babalarĭ*, see Bashkir → *Ađbar eyähe*).

⁶² Such an unthreshed sheaf of rye is also hung on the roof of the barn in Maslovoy, but Magnitskiy does not mention what function it has (cf. Magn. 44).

Magnitskiy's only piece of data does not provide many clues here. Magnitskiy lists *avān sīḫči* in one of the God-lists of the beer sacrifice, collected in the Bishev diocese,⁶³ among the *kiremets*. If Magnitskiy is right, then, even though the *avān kētüs* and the *avān sīḫči* have almost the same meaning ('guardian of the grain-drying barn'), we cannot regard them as identical in their function. We must also note that there is some difference between the two meanings of 'guard', *kētüs* meaning 'shepherd' and *sīḫčā* meaning 'guarder, protector'.

We also have some examples of *kētüs* and *sīḫča* appearing in parallel in compound spirit names; that is, the first part of the compound is the same. Such are the two different guards or shepherds of the farmyard: the *karta kētüsi* and the *karta sīḫči*.⁶⁴ *Sīḫči* and *kētüs* also appear independently in Magnitskiy's god-lists (for example, in the second round of the Maslovoy beer sacrifice). In Ashmarin, it appears in two different ways: *sīḫča* 'soul-protector', *sīḫčā* 'protecting spirit' (Ashm. XI, 123).

Ārās tītan

I. *Йырыс* or *Рыс тыдан* 'variable fortune, that is, going from one pagan to another' (Magn. 90); *ārās tītan* 'name of a deity' (Ashm. IV, 60). III. The equivalents of *ārās* 'luck, fortune' are found in several Siberian and Kipchak Turkic languages in the forms *irīs*, *rīs*, *rīzik*, meaning 'luck, fate' (cf. Rad. I, 1368-1369; Räs. 389; Fed. I, 87). It is an Arabic loan word in the Turkic languages (Räs. 389; Fed. I, 87; it got into the Turkic languages through Persian mediation, cf. Scher. 142-143); the modern meanings of Ar. رزق (*rizq*): 'means of subsistence, part, share, lot' (ARS 295). Magnitskiy provides the word *ārās* (in him, *yīrīs*) in the form *rīs*, too, which he identifies with the Persian word راز (*rāz*) 'secret', thus, the meaning of the compound would be 'secret-keeper' (Magn. 90).

Literally, *ārās tītan* means 'luck keeper'. As for the first part of the compound, there are a few scattered data where it occurs

⁶³ Magnitskiy did not note down a prayer text with this list.

⁶⁴ I quote a prayer to them and another farmyard spirit under Magn. 52.

independently, and the second part, *tītan*, meaning ‘keeper, holder’, also occurs in the names of other mythical beings.⁶⁵

In Magnitskiy’s list of gods and spirits invoked at the beer sacrifice, compiled in Cheshlam, *ārās tītan* is № 67, translated as ‘transient luck’. Magnitskiy’s spelling of the word (*ўырҫ, рҫ*) may suggest another possible transcription, in which case the word would be *yārās*, meaning ‘secret’. It seems as though Magnitskiy himself could not decide which form would be the right one, as he gave the meaning ‘transient luck’ in the main text, whereas in a footnote, he called this being the ‘keeper of a secret’ (Magn. 90). Since no other data of the being *yārās tītan*, or even of the word *yārās*⁶⁶ are available besides this one of Magnitskiy’s, this solution does not appear feasible. However, the compound *ārās tītan* appears in a note recorded by Ashmarin in the Belebeyev district. Unfortunately, Ashmarin only notes that there is a deity by this name (Ashm. IV, 60).

Ashmarin, however, also has a form *ārāsē* (Ashm. IV, 61), meaning ‘[his] luck’. He does not elaborate on this one, nor does he provide a context, his only explanation being that it is “the name of a deity”. He adds that the word-final possessive suffix (-ē) is not unprecedented in the case of mythical beings (*uprakanē*).

Čūk

I. ‘the spirit of the sacrifice’ (Magn. 8); ‘2. name of a spirit’ (Ashm. XV, 262). In compounds: *čūk-kēlē* ‘1. prayer, 2. name of a deity’ (Ashm. XV, 263); *kēlli čūkki* ‘general name for spirits that were prayed to’ (Ashm. VII, 242); ‘1. sacrificial ceremony, 2. Spirit staying at the site of the sacrificial ceremony’ (Skv. 253). **II.** ‘1. sacrifice; sacrificial ceremony, 3. sacrificial food’ (Ashm. XV, 261-262). In a late 17th-century source, it appears as a place-name: the name of a ravine or gulley (Dmitriev 1981, 138). **III.** In southern Siberian Turkic languages and in Kazakh, the word is connected

⁶⁵ For example, in Nikifor Pavlovich’s list: *tēnče tītakan Īra* ‘world-holding Good One’; *Šer šiv tītan Īrā* ‘country (earth-water)-holding Good One’; in Magnitskiy: *Čēlpēr tītakan* ‘keeper on a leash or rein’.

⁶⁶ According to Ashmarin’s dictionary, *yārās* only appears in Munkácsi (Munk. 30) and Magnitskiy. However, as Munkácsi adopted this piece of data from Magnitskiy; in fact, we do not have any more such data. Ashmarin adds that Magnitskiy’s data is probably wrong.

with Shamanism as a formula often appearing in Shaman-songs. For Turkic data and their relationship with the Chuvash data, see for example: Räs. 113-114; Skv. 253. It got into Chuvash through Tatar mediation: Tat. *čök* ‘fire sacrifice; fire sacrificial ceremony’ (TRS II, 583); Tat. *čük* ‘drink-sacrifice’ (Räs. 113). In most detail about the Turkic data of the word, see: WOT I, 259-261. IV. prayer: Vish. 239-240; 240-241; Magn. 8-9, 20, 58, 108-109; Rek. 1898, 184-185; Ashm. VII, 246.

Primarily, *čük* means ‘sacrificial ceremony’, but it is also invoked in several prayers and asked to have mercy. In these cases, the deity or spirit invoked at the beginning of the prayer is in fact not the *čük*. The form *čük širlaš* (‘*čük*, have mercy!’) usually appears in the closing formula of prayers.⁶⁷ The first such record dates from 1846 (Vish. 241).⁶⁸ However, there is also a prayer collected in 1885, with a longer formula: *čük širlaš, an päraš!* ‘*čük*, have mercy, forsake [us] not!’, which does not only appear at the end of the prayer but sixteen times throughout it, both as the opening and closing formulae of its separate sections. Thus, although the majority of scholars do not regard *čük* as a mythical being, Ashmarin, Magnitskiy and Skvortsov may be right in assuming that *čük* did have such a meaning, too. The hundreds of Chuvash deities and spirits include quite a few that had originally meant a prayer or sacrifice or even the place of these (see, for example → *Kěľě*; → *Xärpan*; → *Mamale*) and, over time, they became so saturated with sacred content that they began to be seen as independent entities. One stage of this process can be highlighted by the form *učuk Turri*⁶⁹ ‘field sacrifice’s God’, which was preserved in a prayer collected in 1900 (PK 136: prayer 374). They pray to the *čük* in this complex form in some other prayers, too. What is invoked is not a general concept such as the sacrifice or the ceremony, but the actual, specific sacrificial ceremony: *Tasa učuk širlaštär!* (‘Let the pure⁷⁰ field sacrifice have mercy!’).

⁶⁷ Some examples of such prayers: Magnitskiy 8; Ashm. XV, 262; PK 57: prayer 192, PK 67: prayer 212, PK 121: prayer 331), PK 25: prayer 343.

⁶⁸ Vishnevskiy translates the prayer-ending *čük širlaš* as ‘indeed have mercy!’ – wrongly.

⁶⁹ *Učuk* is a compound: *uy* ‘field’ + *čük* ‘ceremony’.

⁷⁰ The word *tasa*, meaning ‘pure, tidy, healthy, bright’ is not a frequent attribute of Chuvash mythical beings, but neither is it completely unprecedented.

Eḡepper

I. ‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. III, 41). **III.** Ashmarin suggests that it might originate from the Arabic form *Allah akbar*. Scherner does not deal with this name, so he presumably does not share Ashmarin’s view.

Ashmarin provides a single, brief data from the Yantikov district, which suggests that *Eḡepper* might have been a female deity, the mother of God (Ashm. III, 41).

Esrel

I. ‘devil’ (18th-century vocabulary: Dmit. 287); ‘death or a spirit which takes the soul out of the dead body’ (Fuks 1840, 92); ‘death, the spirit which takes the body out through the back of the neck’ (Thomas: Anderson 1906, 11); *Эсрель* ‘spirit of death’ (Zol. 8); *Esrel* 1. ‘spirit of death’ (Ashm. III, 33; Fed. II, 481); its further variations: *Esreylě*, *Esrelě*, *Esrellě*, *Esril* (Ashm. III, 33-34); *Ecpelě* ‘evil god attacking humans and animals, causing a cruel death (if a sacrifice is not offered to it)’, it is not identical with the Arabic angel of death (Sboev 94-95); *Эсрель* ‘angel of death’ (Magn. 112. > Nik. II, 134); *esrel*, *esrelə* ‘death (personified)’ (Paa. 11); *esrel* ‘angel of death’ (Gomb. 5); *ěsrějl’ə* (*ěsrěl’ə*, *isrěl’*) ‘spirit of death’, it is also called “chief of the cemetery” (Mész. 43); ‘the god of death, a helper of Satan’ (Inf. 19); *Эсрель* ‘death-demon’ (ME II, 538); *esrel* 1. ‘spirit of death’, 2. ‘hostile, evil person’ (Egor. 346); *esrel* ‘death (as a character in tales); swearword’ (Akhm. 14); *esrel* ‘1. (myth.) angel of death’ (Skvor. 637). **II.** ‘2. in phrases as a swearword’ (Ashm. III, 33; Fed. II, 481); ‘2. as a swearword: devil, evil spirit, impure force, ~ *pustār!* ‘the devil take it!’, ~ *śuri!* ‘devil’s brood!, little devil!’ (Skvor. 637). **III.** Basilov originates this form directly from Islam, spreading from the 9-10th centuries onwards (ME II, 538). The word goes back to the Arabic word عزرائيل (*‘izrā’īl*) ‘angel of death’ (ARS 513), (already in Zolotnitskiy: Zol. 8; see also: Gomb. 5; Räs. 33); According to Egorov, the Persian word حزرائیل may have been the original, adopted form (Egor. 347). Scherner considers it a much later adoption, assuming its mediation by Tatar mullahs. However, the Tatar original can only be an inferred form: **Āzra’īl*, and

Shevle, for example, provides the name of the deity in the first place as *Tasa pěr tură* (‘Pure one god’) in the list of deities and spirits collected by him (Shevle: Ashm. III, 66-68. It is not easy to accurately interpret, see → *Tură*. It appears at another place in Ashmarin in the form *Tasa măn tură* ‘pure great god’: Ashm. XIII, 225), and he also has a compound *tasa śulě* without a context (→ *Śul*). It also appears in some prayers, for example in a goose-sacrifice offered to *Kepe*, where both God and *Kepe* appear with the attribute *tasa* (Ashm. VI, 190; similar prayer: PK 61-62: prayer 200).

by no means the present-day Tatar literary form *Gäzra'il* (Scher. 138).⁷¹ The word exists in several Turkic languages: Tat. *Gazrail*, Bash. *Ġazrail*, Nog. *Azrail*, Kyrg. *Azireyil*, *Azreyil*, Kum. *Azireil*, Osm. *Azrail*, Az. *Āzrail*, Tkm. *Ezrāyil*, Uzb. *Azrāil* 'angel of death' (Scher. 138). It got into Finno-Ugric languages partly from Tatar (Mari *azêreñ*, *äzrenə*) and partly from Chuvash (Mansi *esreil*) (Räs. 33). IV. mythical legend: AshmVv. 48; Mész. 43, 44.

Esrel is a complex mythical being. It was first mentioned in Chuvash in the *Русско-чувашско-марийско-мордовский словарь* (*Russian-Chuvash-Mari-Mordvin Dictionary*) from 1737-1738 as *эзреули*, meaning 'devil (Rus. *дьявол*)' (Dmit. 287). It appears in two basic forms in Chuvash beliefs. One of them is human: a thin, wizened, ugly old man, who carries a scythe, a large knife or a sabre. In some records, his eyes are on the back of his neck; in other descriptions, he most closely resembles a horse-doctor because of the tools he carries (hammer and awl). Its other appearance is significantly different from this: it is a huge creature, the size of a haystack, its body is covered with long hair, it has protruding eyes and carries a large knife (Mész. 43, 44; Ashm. III, 33-34; Ashmarin 1982, 47; End. 64).

In the literature, the interpretations 'angel of death' and 'spirit of death' can be regarded as common. Mészáros's approach significantly differs from the two previous, non-identical interpretations: he identified *Esrel* with the being *Masar puši* ('chief of the cemetery') (Mész. 43-44). Enderov, who analysed a mythical text corpus bigger than previous authors, pointed out that *Esrel* was also related to diseases (End. 63-69).

The interpretation 'angel of death' puts the figure of *Esrel* in an Islamic context,⁷² which only provides a partially appropriate framework for interpretation in the system of Chuvash mythical beings. In fact, in the case of Chuvash beliefs, the notion of angel can

⁷¹ The Arabic *ʿain* has two equivalents in Tatar. In earlier adoptions, Arabic *ʿain* = Tatar Ø; and in later ones: Arabic *ʿain* = Tatar *g* (Scher. 75).

⁷² The Muslim "angel of death" is not named in the Quran as *ʿIsrāʾil*, but it is found in Islamic tradition. For a brief summary review: ME I, 488; IsE IV, 292-3.

only be used in a restrictive sense; therefore, the meanings ‘spirit of death’ or ‘personified death’ may be more accurate. Nevertheless, Mészáros’s suggestion, the ‘chief of the cemetery’, does not seem acceptable, either; as it actually the person first buried in a particular cemetery. Not only is its field of meaning much narrower than that of *Esrel*, but neither is it identical with *Esrel*’s nature and role in the belief system. (Unfortunately, Mészáros discussed the two beings together and it is not clear in his collections which of his data refer to which mythical being.)

One of *Esrel*’s main functions is that, at the onset of death, it takes the soul out of the human body, which notion corresponds to the Muslim tradition of ‘*Izrā’īl*’.⁷³ Several stories suggest that *Esrel* is visible to humans,⁷⁴ while according to other narratives, he used to be visible a long time ago, but is invisible today because of people’s sin of putting him into a coffin and throwing it into water or burying it⁷⁵ (End. 65-66). According to another legend, when people used to be immortal, they asked God to make them mortal because there were so many of them on the face of the earth that they could hardly breathe. God sent *Esrel* but, due to his activities, hardly any people were left on earth, when a resourceful man locked *Esrel* in an iron coffin, which he sank to the bottom of the sea. Thus, for 300 years, until God released him, people did not die (Egorov 1994, 123).

Even though related to death and destruction, there is also a different notion associated with *Esrel*. It can appear as the destroyer of livestock (and sometimes the family members), revenging the farmer for not offering it a sacrifice. Basically, two kinds of sacrifice are offered to *Esrel*: the black lamb sacrifice (Sbo. 94-95, Mikhaylov 1890, 116-117) and the goose-sacrifice⁷⁶ (Magn. 212; Mikhaylov

⁷³ The first recording of it, referring to the Chuvash, is from 1828, in an article by Protopope Aleksandr, published in 1845 (Aleks. 15-16).

⁷⁴ Mészáros’s relevant memorat is quoted under Mész 43.

⁷⁵ The relevant mythical legend is quoted under Ashmarin 1982, 47-48.

⁷⁶ According to Mikhaylov, the lamb-sacrifice is offered by the family behind a closed gate and door, and the goose-sacrifice is offered by a male family member in the vegetable garden (Mikhaylov 1890, 117).

1890, 116-117).⁷⁷ The most important difference between these two is that the lamb was always sacrificed within the family, at the time of some actual disease, whereas the goose-sacrifice was a regular, atoning (or preventive) community sacrifice at which several spirits were prayed to. In this capacity, *Esrel* is a being similar to the → *Vupkăn*, as described early by Protopope Aleksandr. The name also suggests the connection of the two beings: *Kaş̣χi vopχan Esrel* (Aleks. 15), and in Mikhaylov, in the form *Kaş̣χi v̇ṗχ̇in Esrel' uzal* (Mikhaylov 1890, 116). Aleksandr calls it the spirit of wrath, along with the *yěrěχ*, while Mikhaylov calls it a cruel, evil spirit. The two forms are translated by Enderov as 'nightly gluttonous *Esrel*' and 'nightly gluttonous bad *Esrel*' (End. 64). Though this translation is accurate, it can also be interpreted as a compound name, meaning 'nightly *vupkăn-esrel*' or 'nightly *vupkăn-esrel* bad one'.⁷⁸ Similarly, the fact that the names of these two beings occur together in incantations⁷⁹ suggests that they are in fact related. On the basis of these data, *Esrel* can also be classified as a disease-demon. Nikol'skiy believed that some disease-demons or destructive evil spirits (*sulu vilen*, *χayar amak*, *tīman amak*, *χitām*)⁸⁰ could be considered specific manifestations of *Esrel* (Nik. II, 134).

Traditionally, some Chuvash deities and spirits are attributed a father, mother and, more rarely, children. No such data are known in the case of *Esrel*, but a belief claims that young girls who die as virgins become *Esrel*'s wives after death (Magn. 138) and have to wash their *Esrel*-husband's underwear (Magn. 141). About the notions after death, see also the entry → *Vilě*.

⁷⁷ In the Maslovoy list of the goose-sacrifice, it appears as the seventh of nine evil spirits (Magn. 212).

⁷⁸ In the name *Kaş̣χi v̇ṗχ̇in Esrel' uzal*, the word *uzal* (→ *Usal*) is not necessarily an adjective.

⁷⁹ Such incantations are also quoted by Mészáros, e.g. Mész. 299-301.

⁸⁰ I write about these in more detail in the next entries: → *Amak*, → *Xitām*, → *Vilě*.

Etem tură, Atam tură

I. a) *ƏdemTop* ‘god of thunder and lightning’ (Mil.: Nik. I, 495); b) *atam* ‘name of some deity, from the name Adam’ (Ashm. II, 133). II. a) *əðəM* ‘(hu)man’ (Zol. 8; Ashm. III, 35-36; Skvor. 637); b) the compound *atam vată* means ‘old man’, and there are two gulleys called *Atam širmi* (‘Adam ravine’) in the Civil’ and Yadrin districts (Ashm. II, 133). III. The relationship of Chuvash words *etem* and *atam* is not without problems. In Chuvash, *etem* is a Tatar-mediated (*ādām*) Arabic word (Scher. 139). The Biblical name exists in several Turkic languages in the forms *adam*, *adām*, *ādām*, meaning ‘human, man’, which go back to the Arabic word *آدم* (*ādām*) (Ashmarin 1902, 119; Räs. 5; Egor. 347; Fed. II, 482). IV. prayer: Pav. 27/4-5.

The form *Edem tor* only appears in Mil’kovich’s record (Nik. I, 495); it is a question whether it is related to the form *Atam tură* in Ashmarin (Ashm. II, 133). The meaning provided by Mil’kovich (‘god of thunder and lightning’) is ultimately unclear. Even though in the Chuvash mythology, several deities are related to thunder and lightning (e.g. → *Aslati*, → *Śisem*), on the basis of later collections, these are not related to the word *etem*.

Ashmarin, who interprets *Atam tură* as the name of some deity, also cites a brief part of a prayer⁸¹ in his dictionary (Ashm. II, 133), which he had found in Nikifor Pavlovich’s *Notebook*.⁸² The prayer, which was recited to avert harm done by evil spirits,⁸³ includes several compounds with the word *atam*, besides *Atam Tură* ‘Adam God’: *Atam Tură amăšě* ‘Adam God’s mother’, *Atam Pülěχśě* ‘Adam Pülěχśě (distributor)’, *Atam pülěχśě amăšě* ‘Adam Pülěχśě’s mother’, *Atam Tăvašši* ‘Adam doer or worker (helper with the work)’,⁸⁴ *Atam Tăvašši amăšě* ‘Adam doer or worker’s mother’, *Atam upraši Amăšě* ‘Adam guardian’s mother’, *Atam upraši* ‘Adam guardian’.⁸⁵

⁸¹ Quoted under Pav. 27/4.

⁸² He had already published Pavlovich’s collection in the Appendix to his article of 1921 (although he does not reference it here in his dictionary).

⁸³ The prayer text is quoted under Pav. 27/4-5.

⁸⁴ Ashmarin cites S. A. Karmalov’s manuscript, where this meaning of *Tăvašši* ‘helper with the work’ appears (Ashmarin 1902, 33). This form often occurs in prayers collected by Magnitskiy (Magn. 62, 85, 86).

⁸⁵ The name → *Pülěχśě* often occurs independently as well as together with other names. *Tăvašši* occurs independently (see previous footnote). For the data on

Xayar

I. *Xoar* ‘roadside evil spirit’ (Fuks 1840, 92); *Khoar* ‘evil spirit of the roads’ (Thomas: Anderson 1906, 11); *хаярь* ‘cruel, wild, raging’ (Soc. 38); *хаярь ширш* ‘evil spirit’ (Soc. 13); besides the meaning ‘evil, wrathful’, Zolotnitskiy provides the following compounds: *Тор’ хаяре* ‘God’s wrath’, *сырь хаяре* ‘earth’s wrath’, *сылъ хаяре* ‘wind’s wrath’ (Zol. 91-92); ‘evil, bad; evil spirit who makes people quarrel (Paa. 33); ‘12. name of an evil spirit’ (Ashm. XVI, 9); as well as *хayar amăš* ‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. XVI, 9) [‘*хayar*’s mother’]; *хayar aššē* ‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. XVI, 10) [‘*хayar*’s father’]; *šul хayarē* ‘name of evil spirits who live on the roads’ (Ashm. XI, 222) [‘the road’s bad one (*хayar*)’]. **II.** *хаярь* ‘wrathful, bad’ (VishN. 184); ‘bad, evil’ (Gom. 15). Compounds in Zolotnitskiy: *Хаяр съырла* ‘bilberry’;⁸⁶ *Хаяр уда* ‘sage (salvia)’; *Хаярна* ‘rage’; *Хаяр ўкне* ‘bewitched by the evil eye’;⁸⁷ *Хаяр амак* ‘suffering’ (Zol. 92); ‘1. angry, strict, evil; evil person; 2. angry; 3. scary; 4. cruel; 5. bad; 6. wrathful; 7. wild; 8. heavy, pouring (rain); 9. anger; 10. strictness; 11. name of a disease (Ashm. XVI, 7-9). **III.** The word is of Arabic origin and got into Chuvash through Tatar mediation: Ar. عيار (*‘ayyār*) ‘drunk, tramp’ > Tat. *γayyar* ‘cheater, cunning’ > Chuv. ‘evil, strict’ (Scher. 77); as well as with the same etymology and relevant Turkic data (Tat; TobTat; Kyrg; Uzb.): Gom. 15; Räs. 152; Egor. 288; Fed. II, 315.⁸⁸ **IV.** incantation: Ashm. I, 166; Elle 29-30; prayer: Vish. 240-241Magn. 58, 59-60, 84-87; Ashm. 1921, 34; Pav. 27-28, 28; Mész. 126-127.

In some of the literature, *хayar*, similarly to → *Usal*, only appears as an adjective meaning ‘bad, evil’, while other authors interpret it as a mythical being. Salmin observes that one of the main characteristics of the *хayar* is that, contrary to the *usal*, it harms people for no reason, mainly by causing diseases (Sal. 475). Some data referring to the *хayar* as a mythical being suggest that it is some peril or disease threatening people along the roads (that is, at some external site, outside the villages).

In Magnitskiy’s record, at the time of the beer-sacrifice, the *хayar* is included among the deities and spirits invoked in prayer:

uprašši, see the entry → *Upram*.

⁸⁶ Paasonen writes about the *хajar širli* (his spelling): “some berry used for a disease caused by the *хajar spirit*” (Paa. 33).

⁸⁷ In Mészáros’s collection, the eye used for bewitching (evil eye) is the so-called ‘bad eye’: *usal kuš* or *хayar kuš* (Mész. 334).

⁸⁸ Fedotov misspelt the Arabic form as غيار.

as № 58 in the Bishev list and № 24 in the Cheshlam list⁸⁹ (Magn. 86, 88). Besides, its name also appears in the Bishev list of the goose-sacrifice, as № 17 (Magn. 112). In his paper on the more significant mythical beings, Ashmarin devotes a separate entry to the *χayar* (AshmVv. 51); however, it must be mentioned that his data are questionable. Ashmarin adopted all his data referenced here from Vishnevskiy. Vishnevskiy's notes on coins thrown away by the roadside in fact do not refer to the *χayar* but to the *kiremet* (cf. Vish. 234). Here, Ashmarin may re-evaluate Vishnevskiy's data on the basis of other records, which claim that coins were usually thrown by the roadside for the *χayar*.

Paasonen quotes an extract from a prayer: "Oh, thou good evil spirit, protect us from all bad [things]!",⁹⁰ where the *χayar* is the spirit invoked as well as the 'bad', from which they want protection (a more accurate translation of the text: 'Oh, good evil! Thou protect us from thy evil ones and thy bad [things]!').

Nikol'skiy lists the *χayar amak*⁹¹ among the bad deities, with the meaning 'angry, bad', noting that perhaps this being can be regarded as a manifestation of the angel of death, → *Esrel*, along with three other bad deities: *Sulu vilen*, *Timan amak*, → *Xiām* (Nik. II, 134). Magnitskiy also has the compound *χayar amak* (Magn. 112), which is also cited in Ashmarin's dictionary: "*Χayar amak* is the name of angry, evil spirits which, after the father's death, torment and torture the children or the whole household, if the father died without keeping the promise he had made to his own spirits" (Ashm. I, 195). Here, *χayar* can be interpreted as the attribute of *amak*, which was already an obsolete, hardly understandable word at the beginning

⁸⁹ In this case, the form *χayarē* appears. Probably, the full form of this and the next item (*inkekē*) would be *turā χayarē* ('God's bad') and *turā inkekē* ('God's trouble, misfortune'), which Magnitskiy did not spell out completely. This is supported by the word-final possessive suffix and the form *turā šulē* ('God's way' or 'God's year'), also with a possessive suffix, which is the preceding item in the list.

⁹⁰ Paasonen's transliteration: "ej iřā χajar, χajarāndan χādarāndan ezā siχla" (Paa. 33).

⁹¹ See also → *Amak*.

of the 20th century (→ *Amak*). Nikol'skiy's other piece of data referring to the *χayar* also has an attributive function. According to this, among the countless *kiremet*s, one of the most evil ones is the *Xayar kiremet*. The *χayar kiremet* is also mentioned by Sboev: 'bad *kiremet*' – the cruellest, most frightening deity. It causes all kinds of trouble and suffering to people, which gives it pleasure. A black animal (horse, bull or ram) is sacrificed to it, depending on the proportion of misfortune caused by it, as advised by the healer. However, the Chuvash also turn to the *χayar kiremet* asking it to bring trouble and misfortune unto their enemies or even kill them. In this case, no sacrifice is needed, it only has to be visited and asked with a prayer or incantation to cause misfortune, which the *χayar kiremet* will gladly do (Sbo. 86-88). There are some other compound forms in Ashmarin's dictionary, of which he knows no more than that they are the names of deities or spirits: *χayarlă kuran*, *χayar siren*, *χayar tavrašĕ*, *χayar tură*⁹² (Ashm. XVI, 11-12).

Diseases caused by the *χayar* usually include a very strong headache, sweating and reddening. Besides the head, usually the belly area was affected, and if patients could not be helped, they died within a few hours. To prevent troubles caused by the *χayar*, the Chuvash would offer sacrifices, especially at weddings, military conscriptions or before embarking on long journeys. In the latter case, they threw coins at an outdoor site (usually at the edge of the field) so that the *χayar* would leave them, together with the coins (475-476). Mészáros, who did not regard the *χayar* as a mythical being, only has two pieces of related data. One of them is a boil in the armpit, called *χayarak*, against which a countdown incantation was used, and the other is *χayarkă*, meaning 'sacrificial money' in some dialects (Mész. 148, 389).

Besides the adjective and proper noun forms of *χayar*, it often occurs together with the name of some deity or spirit, with or without a

⁹² The form *χayar tură* is particularly interesting, as it means 'bad or evil God', which can also be translated as 'God of the bad or evil', or simply as 'evil spirit'. On the reverse form of the compound (*Tură χayar*), see below. Ashmarin's other compound forms are hard to interpret.

possessive suffix, in which forms the literature usually interprets the *ḡayar* as meaning ‘wrath’, and thus translates it as ‘God’s wrath’, ‘earth’s wrath’, etc. Nikifor Pavlovich’s Chuvash prayers, recorded in 1883-1884, include a lot of such compound forms among the deities and spirits invoked,⁹³ for example: *Turā Xayar*⁹⁴ ‘God *ḡayar*’, *Turā Xayar amāšē* ‘God *ḡayar*’s mother’, *Vāršālā ḡayar* ‘enmity *ḡayar*’ *Vāršālā Xayar amāšē* ‘enmity *ḡayar*’s mother’, *šiv ḡayar* ‘water *ḡayar*’, *šiv ḡayar amāšē* ‘water *ḡayar*’s mother’, *šēr ḡayar* ‘earth *ḡayar*’, *šēr ḡayar amāšē* ‘earth *ḡayar*’s mother’, *tām ḡayarē* ‘frost’s *ḡayar*’,⁹⁵ *tētre ḡayarē* ‘fog’s *ḡayar*’, *āšā ḡayarē* ‘warmth’s *ḡayar*’, *ārša ḡayarē* ‘dry fog’s (or powdery mildew’s) *ḡayar*’, *šavra šil ḡayarē* ‘whirlwind’s *ḡayar*’. Even if we accept the previous interpretation (somebody’s wrath, for example God’s wrath, water’s wrath, warmth’s wrath), we must keep in mind that these forms appear in this way as names of deities or spirits, which is supported by the fact that in some of these names, the spirit’s mother also appears (e.g. earth-wrath’s mother, water-wrath’s mother). We can add that the forms *ḡayar amāšē* (‘*ḡayar*’s mother’) and *ḡayar aššē* (‘*ḡayar*’s father’), which feature in prayers,⁹⁶ too, also suggest that the form *ḡayar* itself was indeed the name of some spirit or deity.

Xärpan

I. *Хурбан* ‘mediator to the Great God and the other divine beings’ (Vish. 232); *Хурбан-Тора* ‘god of the sacrifice’ (Sbo. 82); ‘2. sacrifice’ (Zol. 99); ‘sacrifice, the

⁹³ Some of the incantations quoted by Zolotnitskiy include various forms like “x + *ḡayar*” (such as water *ḡayar*, frost *ḡayar*; dead *ḡayar*) (Zol. 178).

⁹⁴ In the Chuvash data, I retained the chaotic forms of lower and upper-case initials as found in the sources.

⁹⁵ Nikifor Pavlovich translates it as ‘bad of the frost’. *Tum ḡayar* is a well-documented disease-name, e.g. Zol. 178, 180: ‘wrath from frost’ [clearly an incorrect translation]; Mész. 332: ‘cold fever’ (he provides an incantation in the same place); Paa. 172: ‘tetanus-like disease’. Its two further compound forms are *kělē tum ḡayarē* (→ *Kělē*) and *šiv tum ḡayarē* (→ *Šiv*). The relationship between *tām* ‘frost’ (Paa. 165; Ashm. XIV, 264) and *tum* is not entirely clear (for more on this, see: Ashmarin 1921, 35).

⁹⁶ E.g. Ashm. XVI, 9.

god of sacrifice' (Magn. 91, 94); 'uplifter of the sacrifice to God' (Nik. II, 133); 5. 'name of a deity' (Ashm. XVI, 362); *χōrban* 'the name of God's father', known only to the northern Chuvash (Mész. 16); *χârban* 'some spirit (which dries up people's body parts)' (Paa. 43.); '2. (obs.) pagan deity' (Skvor. 548); *χârpan* or *χârpan turri* 'deity who lifts the sacrifice offered to God up to him' (Sal. 397). **II.** 1. 'bream (Rus. *леуш*)' (Zol. 99, 70); '1. unknown meaning, 2. name of a fish (bream)', 3. in compounds: *χârpan urapi* name of the wagon used at weddings 4; family nickname' (Ashm. XVI, 362);⁹⁷ '1. bream, carp-bream 2. *vat*⁹⁸ ~ (swearword) old hag, crone, old geezer' (Skvor. 548). **III.** Ar. قربان (*qurbân*) 'sacrifice' (ARS 630); the Chuvash initial *χ*- suggests an earlier adoption (Scher. 80; about the word *χârpan*: Scher. 85). About the origin of the Chuvash word, Zolotnitskiy notes the following: < Ar. *kurban* (sic!), Tat. *kurman*; Christian Tatar *balik kurmanî* (fish-sacrifice)⁹⁹ – the Chuvash meaning 'bream' might originate here (Zol. 99); see also: Magn. 91; Mész. 16; Ashmarin 1902, 119-120; Ashmarin 1982, 23; Fed. II, 333; Scher. 85; Sal. 397; on the other Turkic data: Räs. 302. **IV.** prayer: Magn. 92, 115-116; Pav. 27/9, 27-28; Ashm. VII, 39.

The interpretation of *Xârpan* is made significantly harder by the fact that, already in the case of early recordings as well as in later analyses, authors were aware of the etymology and original meaning of the word (Arabic *qurbân* 'sacrifice'), which basically defined their interpretation, perhaps with the only exception of Paasonen and Ashmarin, the latter having more various data.

The *Xârpan* already appears in Vishnevskiy's work, published in 1846, as the eighth of God's subordinates. The author notes that the Chuvash also offer him sacrifices so that it would not prevent other sacrifices from arriving at their intended destinations (Vish. 232). According to Sboev's description from 1856, the Chuvash were only able to turn to higher deities by offering a preliminary sacrifice to the *Xârpan*-god, the god of sacrifice. Prayers and requests reached the upper echelons of the gods via *Xârpan* (Sbo. 82).

Xârpan appears in Magnitskiy as the ninth member of the fourteen gods listed at the beer-sacrifice in Bayteryakov, with the meaning 'god of sacrifice' (Magn. 91). In the description of the

⁹⁷ Ashmarin devotes a separate entry to each of the five meanings.

⁹⁸ *Vat* means 'old'.

⁹⁹ Mashanov recorded about the Christian Tatars' fish-sacrifice that they would offer white salmon (Rus. *нельма*) on these occasions (Mashanov 1875, 23).

bee-sacrifice, the *Xārpan* (here, in the form *χurban*) is attributed the meanings ‘sacrifice’ as well as ‘bream’. The origin of the latter meaning is that the Christian Tatars held a fish-sacrifice in summer, so the name of the sacrificial fish (Tat. *balık kormanı*) came to also mean the name of the deity to whom the fish was offered (Magn. 95-96).¹⁰⁰ *Xārpan*’s name¹⁰¹ appears in a completely different context, too: at the sacrifice held to avert the destruction of people and livestock (*Vil tavraš*).

Mészáros believed that *Xārpan*¹⁰² was actually the name of God’s father which, due to the fading of Islamic influence, had lost its original meaning of ‘sacrifice, sacrificial animal’, and then the name was used to invoke the being to whom the animal was sacrificed. (In the case of God’s father, it was a white ram: Mész. 16).¹⁰³ In another place, he cites Magnitskiy’s above information and remarks that he himself had heard from the Chuvash living along rivers that they used to sacrifice fish to the *kiremet* (Mész. 40).

Salmin, who regards *Xārpan* as the uplifter of sacrifices, amends the earlier descriptions in two instances. Firstly, he notes that in some records, the person collecting for the sacrifice is called *χārpan*, which, in his opinion, supports the meaning of *Xārpan* being ‘god of sacrifice’. Secondly, he writes that at the time of two important sacrifices, the *učuk* and the *čükleme*,¹⁰⁴ *Xārpan* was always prayed to, which suggests that this deity is strongly connected with agriculture. Both of Salmin’s comments are highly debatable. The fact that the person collecting the sacrifice is called *χārpan* in a certain place does not suggest that this name would also refer to the god of sacrifice. What is more, Ashmarin has some data about *Xārpan* also being a family nickname (Ashm. XVI, 362). As for the two

¹⁰⁰ This possibility was first suggested by Zolotnitskiy. However, he thought of it in the other way around: that the name of the fish may originate from the Tatar compound ‘sacrificial fish’ (Zol. 99).

¹⁰¹ I cite this prayer under Magn. 115-116.

¹⁰² Mészáros spells it as *χōrban*.

¹⁰³ Animals were sacrificed to various deities, so Mészáros’s theory is not convincing, either – Ashmarin rejects it, too (AshmVv. 23).

¹⁰⁴ *Učuk* means ‘field sacrifice’ and *čükleme* or *sāra čükē* means ‘beer sacrifice’.

sacrifices mentioned by Salmin, in the case of the *učuk*, there is no data at all referring to offerings to *Xārpan*,¹⁰⁵ and in the case of the *čükleme*, *Xārpan*'s name is only mentioned once in Magnitskiy, even though he has a list of some 160 gods and spirits invoked during the beer-sacrifice only.

In Ashmarin's seventeen-volume dictionary, *Xārpan* as a deity appears in various compounds (Ashm. XVI, 362), unfortunately, with minimal context. However, the compounds and the brief extracts of prayers do not support the ideas outlined above, namely, that *Xārpan* would be some kind of sacrifice-god. (This might be the reason why Ashmarin refrained from providing a narrower meaning of the *Xārpan*; he only wrote that it was "the name of a deity"). The compounds include *karta xārpaně* 'barn's *xārpan*', *ut xārpaně* 'horse's *xārpan*', *ěne xārpaně* 'heifer's *xārpan*',¹⁰⁶ *Kepe xārpan*, *Šēr xārpan* 'Earth *xārpan*'. Ashmarin also provides some prayer extracts which, he claims, clearly show that the 'sacrifice' meaning of *xārpan* was definitely not known, as people connected the word *xārpan* with the Chuvash verb *xärt-* 'dry'¹⁰⁷ by folk etymology (he elaborated on this in his university lectures, cf. AshmarinVv. 23).¹⁰⁸ It seems that Paasonen may have known such a prayer, too, which is why he gave the meaning of the word as 'some spirit (which dries out people's body parts)' (Paa. 43).¹⁰⁹ In Nikifor Pavlovich's

¹⁰⁵ It cannot be found in Zolotnitskiy, neither in Magnitskiy, nor Mészáros, and not even in the recently published volume of prayers (PK), which also includes several manuscripts.

¹⁰⁶ With a brief excerpt of a prayer: *Širlax, ut xārpaně, širlax, ěne xārpaně* ['Have mercy, horse's *xārpan*, have mercy, heifer's *xārpan*'] (Ashm. XVI, 362).

¹⁰⁷ A few prayer texts refer to this, one of them cited by Ashmarin: (1982, 23). A similar prayer is published in the PK, in which the *Xārpan* is asked not to dry out the earth, not to drain the waters and not to parch the grain and the livestock (PK 63: Prayer 5).

¹⁰⁸ In Chuvash beliefs, dehydration and 'dry disease' appear in several places and in several forms, see → *Tipiri*.

¹⁰⁹ Thus, it is perhaps easier to interpret Skvortsov's dictionary data, cited above, which defines the present-day meaning of *vat xārpan* as 'old hag, old geezer' (Skvor. 548); as the word *xārpan* is associated with the meaning 'dried-out, wizened'.

Notebook, also published by Ashmarin, (Ashmarin 1921, 26-36) *χārpan* and *χārpan's mother* appear twice: among the prayers to avert the “harm caused by bad spirits”, with the following request: “Dry [me] out not, torment [me] not!” (Ashmarin 1921, 27); as well as in prayers said against harm caused by falling onto the ground. In the latter prayers, *Śēr Xārpan amāšē* (Earth-*Xārpan's mother*) and *Śēr Xārpan* (Earth-*Xārpan*) are invoked and the following words prayed: “Have mercy at the time of harm coming from falling on the ground, amen!” (Ashmarin 1921, 28).

Xěrlě-śir

I. *Хирлсир* ‘a deity’ (Geor. 176); *хирлсир* ‘name of a deity’ (Pal. 159); *Херле сир* ‘one who fertilizes the soil’ (Vish. 232); *Херле сьыр* ‘spirit of the fertilized soil’ (Magn. 29); ‘Saint Nicholas’ (Magn. 88); ‘some good spirit living in the sky’ (Mész. 20); ‘god of the fertile red soil, fertilizer of the soil’ (Sbo. 82; Magn. 29, 67; Nik. II, 132; AshmVv. 28); *χěrlě-śirti* ‘*kiremet*, found in the red ravine; sometimes simply by the name of *χěrlě śir*’ (Rek. 421),¹¹⁰ ‘3. name of a *kiremet*; god of water’ (Ashm. XVII, 51); in compound words: *χěrlě-śir amāšē* [*χěrlě-śir's mother*], *χěrlě-śir aššē* [*χěrlě-śir's father*], *χěrlě-śir irri* [*χěrlě-śir's good one or spirit*], *χěrlě-śir kiremet amāšē* [*χěrlě-śir kiremet's mother*], *χěrlě-śir turri* [*χěrlě-śir's god*] ‘names of deities’ (Ashm. XVII, 52), *χěrlě-śir kiremet*, *χěrlě-śir kiremečē* ‘names of *kiremets*’ (Ashm. XVII, 52). II. *χěrlě* ‘red’ + *śir* ‘bank (of water)’ (Zol. 67); ‘1. name of ravines, gullies or streams where the mud is red; 2. name of a forest’ (Ashm. XVII, 51-52). III. Both *χěrlě* and *śir* are words of Turkic etymology – ComTurk. *qiz*, *qizil* ‘red’, MidTurk. *yar* ‘steep bank, slope’; both words have been preserved in several Modern Turkic languages, cf. Räs. 188, 269; Egor. 225, 299; Fed. II, 155, 343; GTJ 602. IV. prayer: Magn. 30, 58, 59-60, 84-87; 91-92; Pav. 28-29, Mész. 126-127.

It appears in several 18th-century sources which only recorded the names of a few important gods and spirits; in addition, it ranks high among the invoked deities in sacrificial lists of gods, which may lead to the conclusion that it must have been a very important figure of the Chuvash pantheon in the past. However, its importance and exact meaning had both faded by the 20th century. Mészáros could

¹¹⁰ Rekeev quotes this in a list of *kiremets* where a place name also appears in the name of the *kiremet* (or *irā*).

not find any actual belief related to it (Mész. 20) and Salmin simply regards it as a *kiremet*-type, earthly, localised spirit (Sal. 429).¹¹¹

In Magnitskiy's lists of the beer-sacrifice gods, *Xěrlě-šīr* is of key importance: of the 87 deities and spirits listed in the Maslovoy list, it is the fifth in the first round; in the Bishev list, it is the third of 85; in the Cheshlam list, it is the fifth¹¹² of 69; and in the Bay-teryakov list, it is the second of 14 invoked deities. Besides this, it is mentioned in a prominent place in the prayers recited during the field-sacrifice (*učuk*) as well as the goose-sacrifice (Magn. 29; 112). It also occupies a prominent place in Shevle's manuscript list of gods, where it features as the fifth deity of the first line (Ashm. III, 66). In Vishnevskiy's list, it follows God and its court, → *Pülěχšě* and its court and → *Pīχampar* in the line of deities (Vish. 232). Ashmarin quotes from a manuscript prayer that after the Chuvash made a sacrifice to God (*Tură*), they also made an offering of porridge to *Pülěχšě* and *Xěrlě-šīr* because, as the saying goes: "If *Pülěχšě* and *Xěrlě-šīr* do not lend, nor will God give" (AshmVv. 29). Based on all this, Skvortsov's claim that, together with *Pülěχšě* and *Pīχampar*, *Xěrlě-šīr* belonged to the highest rank of gods immediately following *Tură* (Skv. 245-246), could be considered well-founded, at least at an earlier time.

Skvortsov also suggested that some of the more prominent, presumably feminine and earth-bound deities (→ *Kepe*, → *Šēr-šiv*, → *Xěrlě-šīr* and *Tură amăšě*) are in fact one and the same figure (Skv. 166-167), but he cannot support this assumption with data.

By the beginning of the 20th century, *Xěrlě-šīr* had lost both its earlier significance and meaning. According to Ashmarin's dictionary data, its literal meaning ('red bank') came to the fore, and it

¹¹¹ This idea is also supported by some of the data in Ashmarin's dictionary (cf. Ashm. XVII, 51).

¹¹² In this place, Magnitskiy gives the meaning 'Saint Nicholas', that is, he identifies the figure of *Xěrlě-šīr* with that of *Mikul Tură* (Magn. 88). Mészáros also has some data about two icons being worshipped in Cheboksary as the deities "earth's father" and "earth's mother". This seems to support Magnitskiy's interpretation even if we do not know any other similar descriptions, because both cases concern deities strongly attached to the earth (see → *Šēr*).

was not used any longer as the name of a celestial deity but only as a name for banks of waterways and gullies where the clay was red (cf. Ashm. XVII, 51).¹¹³ Naturally, this process did not happen at once. In Magnitskiy's sacrificial god-lists, *Xěrlě-śir* appears in its independent form at the beginning of the lists at a higher level of the hierarchy, but at the same time, some of its compound forms occur as the names of *kiremets*. This duality can already be found in the work of Sboev who, in the mid-19th century, described *Xěrlě-śir* in two different forms: a deity of high status as well as the name of a *kiremet* (Sbo. 86-87).

Xěrt śurt

I. *Хирь-сортъ* 'female house spirit (Rus. *кукимора*)' (VishN. 183); 'female deity' (Zol. 93); 'benevolent house spirit' (Kam. 4); 'house or forest spirit, ghost, (Rus. *баба яза*)' (Magn. 49); 'female house deity' (Magn. 78, 90); Vir. *χ'értsort*, An. *χ'értsut* 'house guarding spirit' (Munk. 38); 'master, protector of the house' (Rek. 420); *χərt-surt* 'house elves (a married couple)', «*arlâ arâmlâ; aržinn tũlda kil pâχat, arâma pũr-tre purnat*» 'a married couple; the man watches the house from outside and the woman resides inside the house, near the fireplace' (Paa. 37); 'deity protecting the house' (Ashm. XVII, 59); 'the guardian spirit of the house' (Mész. 20); 'house spirit, the female guardian spirit of the fireplace' (Egor. 299) 'the name of a spirit; the name of the holiday held in honour of the spirit' (Fed. II, 346); 'house spirit' (Sir. 499; Skvor. 555); 'protector of the fireplace' (Sal. 443). III. As to the origin of the compound, Ashmarin proposes that the existing dialectal *χer-sut* form may be the original, whose second part may go back to the Ar. word *zat* ('person') (Ashm. 1923, 126). Egorov presumes the Chuvash word *χěr* 'girl' to be the first part of the compound, which adopted the final *-t* sound of the second part by assimilation, and he conditionally traces the second part back to Arabic *suret* 'appearance, looks, form, idea, figure' (Egor. 299-300). Fedotov proposes the Finno-Ugric origin of *śurt* (Fed. II, 346), which is also supported by Basilov, who ultimately traces this form used by the Finno-Ugric peoples of the Volga-region back to the Russian word *чѣрм* 'devil' (ME II, 589). IV. prayers: Magn. 50, 51, 58; AshmVv. 31-32; Mész. 21.

Xěrt śurt is a house spirit found in every house, which protects the inhabitants and keeps the peace within the family. It lives next to the

¹¹³ Such data were collected by Magnitskiy already in the second half of the 19th century: Magn. 1880, 167.

fireplace or on top of the oven. According to some records, it is invisible; some others describe it as a young girl or an old woman who likes to spin; or it is imagined as an old married couple (Magn. 50; Mész. 20; Paa. 37; AshmVv. 31). To honour it, a sacrificial holiday was held once a year,¹¹⁴ usually in November or later (e.g. Magn. 49;¹¹⁵ Fed. II, 346; description of such a ceremony: Kam. 7; Magn. 49-51, Ashm. XVII, 56-57). When a bride was brought to the house or when they wanted to placate the house spirit, an occasional offering of porridge was made to it on top of the regular annual sacrifice. In Mészáros's data, unlike the other offerings, this one was always made by the hostess, which suggests that the figure of the *χěrt śurt* was primarily associated with women (Mész. 20-21). From this fact and from its connection to the fireplace, Egorov concludes that the figure of the *χěrt śurt* can be linked to the Old and Modern Turkic notion of *Umay* (Egor. 299).¹¹⁶

As the keeper of the family peace, the *χěrt śurt* dislikes and even punishes turbulence and quarrels within the family. When such events occur, fearing that the *χěrt śurt* might leave the house, the Chuvash try to placate it by all means,¹¹⁷ because misfortune and trouble will befall a house abandoned by its *χěrt śurt* (Kam. 6; AshmVv. 31).

According to Mészáros's collection, the concept of the *χěrt śurt* is not quite the same for the northern and southern Chuvash. In the south, it is a being associated with the house and the family, whose primary task is to protect the house and keep the family peace. The *χěrt śurt* is held in great esteem; in addition to the sacrifices

¹¹⁴ I quote three of the prayers recited at such times, under Magn. 50; Magn. 51; AshmVv. 31-32.

¹¹⁵ Magnitskiy mentions two dioceses where the *χěrt śurt* sacrifice is held in March (Magn. 51).

¹¹⁶ Several authors have written about the Old Turkic *Umay* and relevant later ethnographic data, perhaps the most important being: Dyrenkova 1928; Potapov 1973; Sinor 1984.

¹¹⁷ A prayer addressed to the *χěrt śurt* says that humans are of a quarrelsome nature and the spirit is asked not to be angry with them for it. I quote this prayer under AshmVv. 31-32.

presented to it, when the family returns home from a visit, it is the first one to be greeted when they step inside the door and when a guest arrives and brings some cake, the *χěrt śurt* is also given some. If it is believed to be dissatisfied for some reason, they try to reconcile it with an offering of porridge, because it can cause diseases to both man and his animals. In the case of the northern Chuvash, the *χěrt śurt* also likes to dwell in the stable, where it takes care of the horses it likes because of their colour. It usually plaits their manes,¹¹⁸ which must not be undone (Mész. 20-21). This is already mentioned by Kamensky, although he adds that it must be a rare phenomenon because he had heard from other Chuvash that the *χěrt śurt*, who protects the house, has nothing to do with horses and livestock. In Paasonen's description, the *χěrt śurt* is an old couple, of whom the man supervises the house outside and the woman inside.

The *χěrt śurt* is also connected to the dead in some way: on the occasions of mourning holidays remembering the dead (candle day, autumn beer day, the day of "burning the moccasins"), a candle is also lit for the *χěrt śurt* (Mész. 20-21; Ashm. XIII, 37).

A few prayer extracts are also known where the mother and father of the *χěrt śurt* are mentioned (*χěrt śurt amašě*, *χěrt śurt aššě*: Ashm. XVII, 58-60), but these are rare forms. In prayers, the most common epithet of the *χěrt śurt* is *iră* 'good' (besides the prayer texts quoted by me, cf. e.g. PK 184-188).

Among earlier records, both in Mil'kovich and Sboev, there is also a guardian house spirit or god, but not by the name of *χěrt śurt*. In Mil'kovich, it is called *Kilti Tură* ('house God'), the twenty-fifth of the 33 good deities listed; and in Sboev, it goes by the name of *Kil'ran Tora*, the third in the line of good earthly deities (Sbo. 83). Further spirits associated with the house are *kil pušě* and *kil tuχmarě* (for both: → *Puś*), *kil χuśi* (→ *Xuśa*).

¹¹⁸ A spirit that plaits horses' manes in the stable and also takes care of its favourite horses is a widespread notion in the area.

Xěvel

I. *Хвель* ‘Sun’ *Хвель амыже* (sic!) ‘Sun’s mother’ (Mil. 137; Nik. I, 495); *Хвель* ‘Sun, which is regarded among the gods’, *Хвель аможе* ‘his mother’ (Fuks 1840, 92); *Kvel* ‘Sun’ and *Kvel-Amoge* (Thomas: Anderson 1906, 11); *хвель* ‘Sun (which they pray to)’ (Vish. 232); *Хвель* ‘god of the Sun’ (Kam. 4); *Хвель тора* ‘god of the Sun’; he has a wife and children (Sbo. 82; Zol. 154); *Хвэль аише* ‘Sun’s father’, *Хвэль амыже* ‘Sun’s mother’, *Хвэль хулги* ‘Sun’s ears’, *Хвэль сьоначе* ‘Sun’s wings’, *Хвэль ори* ‘Sun’s feet’ (Zol. 154; Magn. 63, 64, 84, 89, 91; these data are repeated by Nikol’skiy: Nik. II, 132); ‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. XVII, 5-9); its compound forms: *xěvel amāš*, *xěvel aššě*, *xěvel inkek* ‘names of deities in the second round’ (Shevle: Ashm. XVII, 9-10),¹¹⁹ and: *xěvel šunačě* ‘name of deity in the fifth round’ (Ashm. XVII, 12) [‘Sun’s wings’]; ‘God personifying the Sun’. Not only was the Sun worshipped but also its father, mother and children, and sometimes even its body parts (ears, wings, feet) were worshipped as gods (ME II, 538). **II.** ‘Sun’ (Zol. 92; Paa. 38); ‘1. sun, 3. oath’ (Ashm. XVII, 5-9). **III.** The word is of Turkic etymology, Old Turk. *quyaš* originally ‘the heat of the scorching (midday) sun, later with the general meaning: Sun’¹²⁰ (cf. Cl. 679; also Zol. 153; DTS 464); it exists in several Modern Turkic languages with meanings such as ‘Sun, sunlight, hot sun, sunny side’ (cf. Räs. 301; Egor. 297; Fed. II, 341). **IV.** prayer: Magn. 58, 84-87; 91-92; Pav. 28-29; Vish. 239-240; incantation: Elle 29-30.

The Sun as a deity has been well recorded in various compounds since the 18th century, mentioned by Mil’kovich, Fuks, Thomas, Vishnevskiy as well as Sboev. However, besides the fact that it belongs to the good celestial deities and the Chuvash pray to it among others, nothing more specific is revealed.¹²¹ Zolotnitskiy proposed that the being *šut tēnce torā* ‘bright world’s god’, featuring in several prayers, might be identical with the Sun God (Zol. 154-155).

It also appears in all four of Magnitskiy’s beer sacrifice lists of gods in various compound forms, usually at the end of the first third

¹¹⁹ Here, Ashmarin says the second round wrongly, as Vasil’ev (Shevle) in fact placed the beings associated with the Sun in the fifth round.

¹²⁰ In Turkic languages, there is another family of words: OT. *kün* originally meaning ‘Sun’, then ‘day’; it later maintained this meaning in the majority of Turkic languages; its derivative *künāš* originally meaning ‘sunlight’, then ‘Sun’ (cf. Cl. 725, 734; for modern data, see: Sev. III, 101-102; 103-104; GTJ 64-66).

¹²¹ As far as Kamensky knew in the second half of the 19th century, the Chuvash did not know anything specific about these deities (the god of Sun, the god of Moon, the god of Sky).

of the names listed, after the greater, more significant gods, generally in the same block with the deities of → *Šut tēnče* ('bright world'),¹²² → *Kăvak χuppi* and the wind (→ *Šil*) (Maslovoy list: round X, deity 38-42; Bishev list: deity 16-17; Cheshlam list: deity 31-36; Bayteryakov list: deity 5-6).

In incantations, the Moon (→ *Uyaχ*) also appears besides the Sun, for example: "The Sun turns, let it turn! / The Moon turns, let it turn! / Let the bad, the trouble (*usal-těsel*) scatter!"¹²³

Χītām

I. *Χιτām* '2. disease-causing spirit' (Vish. 235); 'the spirit of revenge, the spirit causing the death of farm animals' (Magn. 119); 'guardian spirit of sheep, which can also destroy them' (Mész. 23); 'tight-fisted' (Ashm. XVI, 116); 'notion connected with deceased ancestors' (Skv. 249); 'in the farmyard, an evil being causing the death of livestock' (Den. 44); *Χιтам* 'demonic being coming from the soul of a person for whom no funeral feast was; it was blamed for the plague killing the animals' (ME II, 538). **II.** *χιτām* '1. hardening' (Vish. 235). **III.** Vishnevskiy starts the interpretation of the word from *χīt-* 'harden, stiffen' (for the background of this Turkic-etymology word, see e.g. Egor. 315-316; Fed. II, 385-386); this etymology is repeated by Salmin, not referring to Vishnevskiy's earlier statements (Sal. 486). **IV.** prayer: Mész. 24; Magn. 120.

Χītām is a demon mostly causing disease and the death of domestic animals, although some sources describe it as a guardian spirit.

In the first half of the 19th century, Vishnevskiy described the *χītām* spirit as a kind of disease-demon to whom cramps and numbness of the limbs were attributed. Magnitskiy recorded several opinions; one of his data providers claimed that *Χītām* was simply a proper noun,¹²⁴ others said it was the spirit of revenge or the desire

¹²² In Ashmarin's dictionary, *šut tēnče* means the 'name of a deity'. There are in fact prayers where this compound appears among the deities invoked; and not only in Magnitskiy do we find such data.

¹²³ I quote the text of one such incantation under Elle 29-30.

¹²⁴ Although Magnitskiy does not refer to it in the part about *χītām*; in previous chapters of his book, in connection with the origin of *kiremets*, he talks about a certain *Χītām*, the landlord who, out of greed, locks his own sons in a cave, where they die. In the legend, the landlord goes by different names in different areas: in Osinkinoy village he is *Migĩš*; in Maslovoy, *Sorīm* and in the Yadrin

for revenge itself. He also quotes K. Stepanov, who claims that the *χītām* is a spirit coming from the souls of people for whom no funeral feast was held after their death or who had owned nothing in their lives, or of brides who died before their wedding. According to most data, the *χītām* is a spirit which causes plague in the farmyard. To prevent this, regular animal sacrifices were made in its honour: the head and feet of sheep and cows were offered to the *χītām* (Magn. 119).¹²⁵ Mészáros only found the beliefs related to the *χītām* among the northern Chuvash.¹²⁶ He recorded that this figure is primarily a guardian spirit which takes care of and protects the sheep.¹²⁷ However, his data also include the destructive nature of the *χītām*, as it was also thought to bring disease to lambs. When that happened, an offering was made to the *χītām* so that the disease would not spread to the other animals. The carcass of the dead animals were scorched and thrown into the stream while saying a short prayer.¹²⁸

Nikol'skiy believed that the figure of the *χītām* may be regarded as one of the manifestations of → *Esrel*, just like the *sulu vilen*, the *χayar amak* and the *tīman amak* (Nik. II, 134). Even if this is not entirely accurate, there is a connection between the two beings, at least in the records where *Esrel* appears as the destroyer of the farmyard. Mikhaylov attributes a similar function to the being called *kaśχi*

district, he is *Χītām* (Magn. 4-5). Mészáros also quotes the legend, where the landlord is called *Makar* (Mész 35).

¹²⁵ Magnitskiy is quoted by AshmVv. 33 and Den. 44.

¹²⁶ Mészáros provides data that do not appear either in Magnitskiy or in Sboev, and at the same time, he writes “It was only worshipped by the northern Chuvash and even there, it has been forgotten by today’s generation” (Mész. 24). It is not clear where Mészáros got his data and the text of the sacrificial prayer from if he himself did not find any living tradition.

¹²⁷ As Mészáros writes that, at the time of his collection, the *χītām* had already been forgotten, he could only conclude from the text of the prayer quoted by him that the *χītām* was primarily not destructive, but rather a kind of guardian spirit.

¹²⁸ I quote the prayer under Mész. 23.

*vupkăn esrel usal*¹²⁹ (Mikh. 116).¹³⁰ Denisov assumes that the *χitām* is most closely related to the figure of → *Vupkăn* which, among other things, also causes the destruction of livestock (Den. 44).

Skvortsov was of the opinion that, on the basis of the sacrifices offered to it, the *χitām* was associated with ancestor worship (Skv. 248-249), which view I consider unfounded.

Xuša (x's χuši)

I. *Xuša* ‘master/owner/host’; its compounds: *Valēm χuša*; *kil χuši* ‘house’s master’ (Mész. 22), ‘name of a spirit, house’s owner’ (Ashm. VI, 213-214); *vite χuši* ‘stable’s master’ (Mész. 49; Ashm. V, 255); *karta χuši* ‘corral or stable’s master’ (Rek. 420; Ashm. VI, 115); *tisker kayăksen χuši* ‘beasts’ ruler’ (that is, *Piχampar*)’ (Paa. 102); *šu χoši* ‘water’s master’ (Mész. 74). **II.** *kil χuši* ‘1. host’ (Ashm. VI, 231); *kayăk χuša* ‘predatory animal’ (Ashm. VI, 16); **III.** The Chuvash word *χuša* is of Persian origin: ModPer. خواجه (*xāğē*) ‘high-ranking man, principal, master, lord, teacher, professor, sage’ (Gaf. I, 303). It exists in several Turkic languages, well-documented since the 12th century, meaning ‘master, owner, merchant’, e.g. Uzb; Tat; Bash. *χuža*, Kaz. *χoža* ‘master’; Kyrg. *kožo* ‘hodja, lord, master’; Az. *goča* ‘old man’; Osm. *hoca* ‘teacher, professor, mullah’ (Räs. 161; Chuvash: Egor. 310; Fed. II, 371; Scher. 60). **IV.** mythical story: Magn. 29.

Xuša, meaning ‘owner/master’, does not occur independently as a mythical being, but it does in compounds. The most important, most frequently occurring compound where the second part is the word *χuša* (‘owner/master’) is, in all probability, the figure of → *Valēm χuša*, which I discuss in a separate entry. Besides, this second part appears in the name of some mythical beings of lesser importance, only known in certain areas.

The *kil χuši* ‘house’s owner/master’ is probably identical with the *kil puś(ě)* ‘house’s head or chief’ (→ *Puś*); although they are not easy to compare, as we only have one or two pieces of data for each of them. What is more, the *kil χuši* is described differently in different records. In Ashmarin’s single piece of data, the *kil χuši* is not

¹²⁹ A mythical being with such a compound name is also mentioned by Protopope Aleksandr in a record from 1828 (Aleks. 15).

¹³⁰ I write about this being in more detail under → *Esrel*.

a benevolent being. The ‘house’s master’ sometimes appears in the form of a snake, when the inhabitants must leave the house (Ashm. VI, 214). An entirely different image unfolds from Mészáros’s description: the ‘house’s master’, who lives in the cellar with his wife (they are imagined as an old couple), looks after the house and its valuables, including the beer barrel in the cellar, guarding them from thieves (Mész. 22-23). On the basis of these unclear data, it is hard to establish the relationship of these figures with other house spirits (e.g. → *Xěrt śurt, kilti tură*).

In some places, not only the house but also the stable has its master, the *vite χuśi*. According to Mészáros’s collection, it is only known by the southern Chuvash, while in the north, its features are associated with the *χěrt śurt*. It has its favourite horses in the stable, based on their colour, which it cares for and feeds, but it tortures and beats the other horses (Mész. 48).¹³¹ Its favourite pastime is to plait the manes of the horses, which the farmer (host) must not undo lest he anger the stable spirit (Mész. 48; Ashm. V, 255). Ashmarin has a single record of another being, the *karta χuśi* (‘corral or stable’s master’), which is claimed to be a worse, more wrathful being than the *śuyttan*, which lives in the water and only occasionally on the land (Ashm. VI, 115). It is a question how these beings are related to the *karta turri(sem)*, the ‘corral or stable’s god(s)’, invoked in prayers, whom the Chuvash ask to protect their livestock (Ashm. VI, 115), and to the *karta puśi* ‘corral or stable’s head’ (→ *Puś*).

There are scattered data for the compound *kayăk χuśa* (‘beast-master’).¹³² According to some descriptions, this is actually one of the names of → *Piχampar*.¹³³ However, quite a different idea is suggested by the mythical story, briefly summarised by Magnitskiy, about

¹³¹ Mészáros presents a similar being, the *vuśni* (in Mészáros: *vũžnĩ*) which does not only take care of and feed the horses but also the cattle. It even snatches feed from the neighbours to give to its favourite animals (Mész. 48-49). On the other hand, Ashmarin claims that the *vuśni* is some kind of rodent (Ashm. V, 287).

¹³² In some records, it appears as the ‘master of wolves’, e.g. Mész. 23.

¹³³ In Ashmarin, the compound *kayăk χuśa* is not a mythical being but an actual ‘predatory beast’ (Ashm. VI, 16).

the origin of the chief of the beasts,¹³⁴ which is an interesting variant of the ATU 555-type folk tale.¹³⁵

Among the names of the various water spirits (→ *Šiv*), Mészáros recorded the forms *šu xoši* ‘water’s master’ and *šu pošě* ‘water’s head’. The Chuvash imagined these as living in lakes and offered sacrifices to them at the time of fishing (Mész. 74-75).

Iye

I. *ьӓ* ‘house spirit’ (Zol. 11); ‘evil spirit, bath spirit, house spirit’ (Magn. 148; Den. 32; Fed. I, 161); Buin *iĵe*, Mal. *iā* ‘will o’ the wisp, witch’ (Gom. 6); *âjĵe* ‘some evil spirit; if a child is sickly and does not grow, this spirit is to blame’ (Paa. 13.); ‘evil spirit harming small children’ (Mész. 41); ‘bad, or rather, mocking being, who sometimes helps the inhabitants of the house who offer sacrifices to it (but at the same time, it is also one of Satan’s helpers)’ (Inf. 19); ‘1. devil, mocking house spirit; 2. Guardian of trade and bee-keeping’ (Nik. II, 134); its variants: *āya*, *āyya*, *āyye*, *ĕye*, *ĕyye*, *iya*, *iyye*, *iyya*, *iya*, *ye* ‘evil spirit’ (Ashm III, 44, 83-87; IV, 30, 32, 97, 98, 260); ‘house devil’ (ME I, 254); ‘evil being, dangerous to people and livestock’ (Sal. 469). **II.** *iyele* ‘argumentative, quarrelsome person’ (Mész. 43). **III.** The Old Turkic word *iđi* ‘master, owner’ (Cl. 41; DTS 203) has been retained in most Turkic languages, meaning ‘master, lord’. Turkic data: Rad. I, 694-695; Egor. 67; Räs. 169; Fed. 161. In Tatar and Bashkir, it means ‘master spirit’. In Chuvash, it has not been retained as the development of the Old Turkic word but is a Tatar loanword. **IV.** incantation: Magn. 146-147, 146-147/2; Mész. 42; AshmVv. 46; Nik. I, 373.

Basically, the *iye* has two different characters features: one is a harmful spirit associated with certain places and the other is a spirit dangerous to babies.

Magnitskiy describes its origin as follows. The → *Šuyttan*, who had lived in heaven beside God, was cast down to earth by God, shattering into countless pieces. Some of these pieces fell onto

¹³⁴ Quoted under Magn. 29.

¹³⁵ The usual ending to the fairy tale commonly known in Europe as “The Fisherman and his Wife” is that the over-ambitious poor man returns to his original poverty. There is another ending, which is lesser known in Europe, when the insatiable protagonist of the story (or his wife) is turned into an animal as a punishment. The Chuvash story ends in a third way: even though the greedy man remains a rich lord or farmer, he is degraded from culture back to nature and becomes the master of beasts.

houses and became house spirits (*pürt iyi*), others fell into the bath and became bath spirits (*munča iyi*), and so on (Magn. 148).

The name *iye* does appear in many different compounds, some of which are related to certain places: earth-*iye*, road-*iye*, water-*iye*, house-*iye*, bath-*iye*, corral-*iye*, forest-*iye*, field-*iye*, mill-*iye*, ravine-*iye*.¹³⁶ However, there are some compound forms which are not related to places: wealth-*iye*, crying-*iye*, face-making-*iye*, prayer-(*kēlē*)-*iye* (AshmVv. 46). The *iye* generally causes paralytic diseases or epilepsy (Sal. 470) in a way that, in the places (or situations) named above, it sticks to or knocks into people or sometimes bites them. Several taboos are also related to these places, for example, one must not sit on the ground, lie down in the field or leave a child alone in the bath.

The *iye* is particularly dangerous to babies, as described by Mészáros in the most detail (Mész. 41-43). The *iye* makes babies sick, harms them and tickles them at night. The diseases caused by it are generally cured by smoking, by beating the *iye* and with incantations.¹³⁷ According to Nikol'skiy's collection around Kozmodemyan, the *iye* most often causes rashes, scabies, boils, furuncles and abscesses in babies, which were cured with incantations (Nik. I, 372-373).¹³⁸ Puny, slow-growing babies were believed to have been changed by the *iye*; the name of such a changeling was *iye olāštarnā* 'iye-changed' (Mész. 43; Ashm. III, 219).

Inkek

I. *Иньгек* 'trouble, misfortune' (Magn. 88); (a) *kiremet* (Magn. 86); '4. name of a deity, 5. name of an evil spirit' or '*kiremet*' (Ashm. III, 123-124); in compounds: *ингек сьўрэдэгэнь*, *Тор' ингегу*, *сьиль ингегу* (from a prayer) 'misfortune, disease, suffering, punishment' (Zol. 13); *Иньгек сьўредегэнь* 'executor or inducer of punishment (as a deity)' (Magn. 64), *Иньгек сьўредегэнь* 'leader of trouble and misfortune (as a spirit)' (Magn. 89); *sol inkek* 'name of a deity on the road' (Ashm.

¹³⁶ See the listed data in AshmVv. 46 and Magn. 147. The → *Ana iyi* ('plot, margin *iye*') also belongs here.

¹³⁷ Mészáros quotes such an incantation (Mész. 283-284).

¹³⁸ I quote this under Nik. I, 373.

XII, 217); *inkek siren* ‘averted of trouble, name of a deity’ (Ashm. III, 124); *inkek süreteken* ‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. III, 124). II. *iŋgek* ‘misery, misfortune’ (Paa. 17); ‘1. Trouble, misfortune, 2. material loss, 3. mock-name; weak, insignificant man’ (Ashm. III, 123-124); ‘1. trouble, misfortune, 2. damage, loss’ (Egor. 70; Skvor. 114). III. Etymology under → *Amak*. IV. prayer: Magn. 58, 59-60, 84-87.

Data referring to the *inkek* as a mythical being (the personification and thus, the causer of trouble and misfortune) are actually only found in Magnitskiy and Ashmarin. In Magnitskiy, the *inkek* appears in four sacrificial god-lists with various translations. At the beer-sacrifice in Maslovoy village, *inkek süreteken* (*Иньгек сьӳредегэнь*) appears as № 47 in round XI, meaning the ‘executor or inducer of punishment’ (Magn. 64);¹³⁹ in the Bishev list, it is № 67: *Иньгегу* (Magn. 86, without translation);¹⁴⁰ in the Cheshlam list, № 25 (*Иньгекке*), translated as ‘misfortune, trouble’ (Magn. 88); in the same list, № 42 is *inkek süreteken* (*Иньгек сьӳредегэнь*), translated as ‘leader of trouble, misfortune’ (Magn. 89).¹⁴¹ In the Bishev list of the goose-sacrifice, it is № 16, untranslated (Magn. 113).¹⁴²

At another place, Ashmarin has another compound form, the *sol inkek*, identified as the name of a deity found on the roads (Ashm. XII, 217).

İră

I. *ырă, ыры* ‘good, honest’ (Soc. 35); *ирсан* ‘another name for *kiremets*’ (Geor. 176); ‘the place of pagan worship in Chuvash is *ирзям* and in Mordvin, *киреметь*’ (Lep. 211); *азлыр, кснир, сиолсюрен-ирзене* ‘god-names’ (Pal. 159); ‘saint’ (Vish. 231); ‘guardian angel’ (Vish. 244); ‘goods spirit, guardian spirit’ (Magn. 47, 64); ‘*kiremet*’ (Magn. 85); *irăsem* or *kiremet* ‘spirits of lesser significance, which appear by various names, are many in number and not particularly significant’ (Rek. 421-422); ‘*kiremet*’ (Ashm. III, 59); ‘good spirit; in nature, the principle of good’ (Ashm.

¹³⁹ The relevant prayer is quoted in the anthology under Magn. 58.

¹⁴⁰ The relevant text is quoted in the anthology under Magn. 59-60.

¹⁴¹ As we can see, Magnitskiy translates *inkek süreteken* in two different ways, neither of which is actually accurate. The verb *süret-* means: ‘bear, take, carry, transport; travel, traverse, travel away; break a horse to the rein’ (Ashm. XII, 304); thus the compound could be translated as: ‘bearer of trouble, misfortune’.

¹⁴² At the same place, Magnitskiy quotes the prayer recited at the time.

III, 60); in place names, as part of a compound: ‘*kiremet*’¹⁴³ (Ashm. III, 60); ‘good ones – all pagan deities and spirits, including *kiremets*, are called in this way by the Chuvash’ (Skv. 225). II. *Iipa* ‘good, generous; rich’ (VishN. 91); ‘good’ (Zol. 11; Gomb. 7); ‘1. good, healthy, holy’ (Ashm. III, 48); ‘pure, good-intentioned’ (Ashm. III, 60); ‘1. good, appropriate 2. respected’ (Skvor. 629). III. So far, three different etymologies have been suggested. One originates the word from OT. *īduq* ‘holy’ (on the Old Turkic word, see: Cl. 46; DTS 217; Sev. 649-650); the other claims that the Chuvash word is the equivalent of ComTurk. *arī* ‘beautiful, true, holy’. Both possibilities are suggested by Räs. 25, 164; whereas Fedotov originates the word *īrā*, meaning ‘good, appropriate, kind, holy’, from the Common Turkic word *arī*, and considers the word *īrā*, appearing in the names of various spirits, to be of Tatar mediation (Tat. *izgi*) (Fed. II, 474-475); Tat. *izge* ‘1. holy, good, honest, saintly, ascetic’ (TRS 162). The word is indeed of Turkic etymon, but goes back to OT. *ādgū* ‘good’ (Cl. 51). It exists in several Turkic languages, with detailed literature: WOT I, 307-310. IV. prayer: Magn. 54, 58, 59-60, 84-87; Vish. 239-240; Pav. 26, 27/1-3, 27/5, 28, 28-29; Mész. 126-127; Elle 47-52. (prayers 27-32).

The *īrā* is a difficult-to-identify element of pagan Chuvash beliefs. The primary meaning of the word is ‘good’, but its plural form already appears in the earliest, 18th-century records as the collective name of the *kiremets*. Mészáros assumed that the positive attribute applied to the *kiremets* was created by fear of them, along with the desire to win their favours. However, the relevant data show a more nuanced picture. There are earlier as well as later sources in which the *īrā* is not associated with the *kiremets* but refers to (an) all-positive, holy being(s) associated with God. Skvortsov believes that the names of sacrificial places (→ *Kiremet*), the prayers recited there (→ *Kělē*) and the earthly spirits and saints (*īrā*) invoked there were sometimes used interchangeably, or that any of these could mean the sacrifice itself, the place or the spirits invoked in the prayers said there (Skv. 164). Nevertheless, the majority of the hitherto most important summary works (e.g. Mészáros, Denisov, Salmin) do not discuss the figure of *īrā* as an independent supernatural being.

¹⁴³ Several similar place-names appear in Ashmarin’s dictionary, such as: *Müntupe īrāsem* (Ashm. VIII, 24); *Sar χunta vīrtakan īrā* (Ashm. XI, 9); *Takka-var patenči īrsem* (Ashm. XIII, 60); *Tavānvarti īrāsem* (Ashm. XIII, 218); *Čenpekri īrāsem* (Ashm. XV, 173); *Šur Xunta vīrtakan īrā* (Ashm. XVII, 240); *Pimērselēnči īrsem* (Ashm. IX, 214).

Of the earliest sources, in Georgi and Lepekhin, the *iră* is in fact a synonym of the *kiremet*. Pallas's list includes a few other names of deities after God and the *kiremet*, such as the *азлыр* (*aslă iră* 'great good one')¹⁴⁴ and the *кшнур* (*kěšĕn iră* 'small good one'), which appear in other sources as names of *kiremet*s, as well as the form *сиюлсюрен ирзене* (*śul śürĕn irăsem* 'good ones goin on the road'). In Mil'kovich's list, it appears among the good deities, sometimes as an adjective (*iră Tură* 'good God')¹⁴⁵ and sometimes as a noun (*śürĕn iră* 'going good one'), besides occurring several times in the names of *kiremet*s listed by him (I quote these at the entry → *kiremet*). In Vishnevskiy's paper, the *iră* also appears in various forms: an adjective on one hand: *Мун ура топа* (*Măn iră Tură* 'Great, good God') (Vish. 231), and a noun on the other: *Мун ура* (*Măn iră* 'great good one'). Vishnevskiy translates the latter as 'guardian angel' and lists it among God's helpers, noting that it, too, has its own servant, the *сюрен ура* (*śürĕn iră* ['going good one']), who goes before it (Vish. 244).

Sboev lists the form *Ипа Тора* (*Īră Toră* 'Good God') among the celestial good gods. He does not interpret it as a noun phrase with an attribute, but as meaning the 'god of good-will, protector of married life and the family'.¹⁴⁶

In Magnitskiy's sacrifice lists, the *iră* appears at several places and in several compounds. Magnitskiy interprets some of these as independent, usually some kind of protective or guardian spirits (e.g. Magn. 48, 64), and some others as good spirits associated with a certain place (e.g. the good spirit found in the city of Cheboksary, the good spirit found in Sviyazh,¹⁴⁷ the good spirit found in

¹⁴⁴ Here and in the following, I cite the form as it appears in the source, and in brackets, the Latin transliteration based on the present-day Chuvash spelling, as these old forms are sometimes hard to interpret.

¹⁴⁵ Sboev also has the same form (Sbo. 81).

¹⁴⁶ Sboev translates all compounds in the list as possessive structures (e.g. abundance's God, sacrifice's God, wind's God).

¹⁴⁷ Sviyazh is an island-fortification at the confluence of the rivers Sviyaga and Volga (its Chuvash name is *Sĕve*). It requires further study why it is of such paramount importance among Chuvash beliefs. It already appears in Mil'kovich's

the wilderness around Makar), yet at other places as *kiremets* (e.g. Magn. 85). Magnitskiy's interpretation is not always consistent; for example, the form *Aslă Īră* ['Great Good'] is translated as 'main guardian' in the Maslovoy list and as 'the main *kiremet*' elsewhere (Magn. 89). The *īră* also appears in Nikifor Pavlovich's list several times in various compounds, which Ashmarin translates as 'saint'. For example, Ashmarin's version of the *Tură uměncě šüreken Īr* ['Good One going before God'] is 'Saint who leads the service before God' (Ashm. 1921, 30). Here, also, there are several forms associated with a certain place: 'Good One lying' at a place (in a lake, on the bank); however, it is worth mentioning that the majority of the names here do not denote an actual place. For example: 'Good One lying in Lake Milk',¹⁴⁸ 'Good One lying in white *χun*',¹⁴⁹ 'Good One lying in yellow *χun*', 'Good One lying on a red bank',¹⁵⁰ 'Good One lying in *Văl*'¹⁵¹ (Pav.: Ashmarin 1921, 28).

collection, is present in three of Magnitskiy's beer-sacrifice god-lists (Maslovoy, Cheshlam and Bishev) as well as in Shevle's list. What is more, it seems that the same island had earlier been called *Yěřχ(ov)*. It occurs in a Russian annal *Никоновская летопись* (*Nikon Chronicle*) related to the year 1469 in the form of "на Ирыхове острове (on the Irych Island)" and again in 1565-1567, in a land-registry from Sviyazh as "против Ирехова острова (opposite the Irech Island)". These two early data are cited by Dmitriev 1981, 134-135).

¹⁴⁸ About Lake Milk, see: Mész. 59-60. Here, Mészáros points out that Lake Milk also appears in an Altaic shaman-song (Mészáros refers to Radloff, and the Altaic shaman-song was originally recorded by Verbitskiy (1893). However, Lake Milk in the Chuvash material is not the only possible interpretation; probably the same form is recorded by Magnitskiy once as *сьуда кълъ* (Magn. 64) and another time as *сют куль* (Magn. 91) and are translated as 'bright lake'.

¹⁴⁹ *Šur χun* and *Sar χun* are some kind of toponyms (*šur* 'white'; *sar* 'yellow'), not identifiable (Ashmarin 1921, 35).

¹⁵⁰ The 'red bank' itself is also a mythical being → *Xěrlě-šir*.

¹⁵¹ According to Ashmarin, the word *Vălra* contains the name of the river *Vīla* or *Vil* (1921, 32), which appears in the names of several villages (1921, 35; for more data: Ashm. V, 198). Furthermore, it occurs in several records in the names of spirits. In the Buin district: *Vălăra vīrtsa kayan irăsem*, *Vălări iră*; Yal'chik district: *Vălăra vīrtan irăsem*; Pervomay district: *vălăr iră* (Ashm. V, 300). As the name of a *kiremet*: *Vīlări*, and as the name of a spirit: *Vălări irăsem* (Ashm. V, 198). The name of the deity was already recorded by Mil'kovich in the 18th century in the form *выляры ирзам* (*Vălări irăsem*) as the name of the

In Ashmarin's dictionary, besides the common meaning of *iră* as 'good', the following further meanings are provided: 'saint, holy', 'some *kiremet*' and the 'principle of good in nature' (Ashm. III, 48-60). Besides, he also notes that the *iră* and the *kiremet* seem inseparable from each other (Ashm. III, 65). However, in his university lectures, Ashmarin presented a description that referred to the *iră* as saints, or saintly people who had lived long before and were holier than his contemporaries (AshmVv. 52-53).¹⁵²

The word *iră* also occurs in compounds, the second part of which is a word meaning 'bad, evil', e.g. *iră xayar*, *iră usal*, which Ashmarin assumed to be collective names for the good and evil spirits alike. As this is not the only occurrence of *iră* in the names of decidedly harmful beings (for example, in several records, it is used as a synonym for *kiremet*), we can accept the possibility suggested by Mészáros that the Chuvash used the attribute 'good' for fear of these beings as well as in order to win their favours (Mész. 32). However, I would not exclude the possibility that the word *iră*, which was much less common in everyday use than as part of the religious vocabulary, appears in the names of mythical beings not as 'good' in a moral sense but rather as a general expression of numinosity.¹⁵³

Yěřę

I. *Ирүк* 'a small bunch of willow-branches set up in the house in autumn, which is worshipped and feared' (Geor. 177); *upux*, *epux* '1. A bunch of goat-willow branches

greatest *kiremet*, which is the father of all *kiremet*s and whose eldest son is *Cepöe Keöe* (*Šerti Kepe*) (Mil.: Nik. I, 499); his data was probably adopted by Fuks, too (1840, 126). Magnitskiy quotes a record saying that the chief deity of the Chuvash who relocated to Belebeyev from Kazan and Simbirsk was *varli izrem* which, in its correct form, is perhaps the same as the *Vil(ă)ri irăsem* ['good ones from Vil'] (Magn. 68). Paasonen interprets the form *välära* in a completely different way than before: *välära-vjrdan* 'some spirit, a saint who died in battle and was taken to Paradise' (Paa. 200).

¹⁵² Unfortunately, Ashmarin does not provide the source of his quote here; judging from the nature of the text, this description shows a strong Christian influence.

¹⁵³ It is also worth adding that some harmful mythical beings seem not to have been all-bad in the past; one of the best studies about this: Goto 2007.

with pieces of tin hung on it, which is worshipped' (Pal. 157); 'a wicker basket in which leaves of rowan, pieces of tin and colourful silk is placed and the head of a lamb is sacrificed to it' (Aleksandr 1845, 16); 'small idol in a basket, prayed to at the time of diseases of the eyes, ears, teeth and skin' (Fuks 1840, 96-97); 'small piece of tin hung on a rowan branch, replaced every year' (Thomas: Anderson 1906, 11); 'spirit causing rashes, scabies and eye disease' (Vish. 235); '1. deity causing eye and skin diseases; 2. a basket placed in the barn, decorated with branches, sequins and coins, containing a lamb's head, sacrificed to this god' (Sbo. 95); *üupux* 'saint, holy (adopted from Christian Tatars)' (Zol. 16); 'usually some kind of tree which causes external diseases, especially abscesses' (Smelov 1880, 532); '1. offering, consecration, 2. the object offered, 3. the place of offering and the dwelling place of the spirit that the offering is made to, 4. the spirits themselves to whom the offering is made' (Magn. 81); 'spirit causing diseases (smallpox, furuncles, measles, rashes, conjunctivitis)' (Nik. II, 134); 'an evil spirit' (Paa. 26); '(in the North) invisible good spirit (sometimes appearing in one's sleep as an old maid) to whom they turn to in case of abscesses, swellings or eye-ache. It is only harmful if offended. A small box is made from elm-bark for the offerings intended for it; (in the South) this elm-bark box itself is called *jěřěx'* (Mész. 24-27); *Ирuxъ* causing various skin and eye diseases (one of Satan's helpers)' (Inf. 19); '1. (originally) object offered or dedicated to a spirit; (later) name of a spirit; (then) evil spirit' (Ashm. V. 141-144); '(obs.) sacrificial object dedicated to a spirit; vengeful evil spirit' (Egor. 80); '1. (relig.) idol (as a symbol of the evil spirit); ~ *puśšap* 'bow before the idol'; ~ *e ěnenni* 'idol worship'; *yěřěx-yaraχ* (collective noun) 1. pagan gods; 2. evil spirit, evil force' (Skvor. 128); '1. Patron of the family and the farm, represented as a doll; (later) it was regarded as an evil spirit; what is more, some ~s adopted the functions of the *kiremet* (ME I, 651); '1. Deity (of a *kiremet*-type), 2. material symbol of the deity, 3. dwelling-place of the deity' (Sal. 418); **II.** '2. swearword, 3. sacrifice, 4. disease (Ashm. V, 141-144); '2. whimsical, crotchety, stubborn (man); 3. quarrelsome; *yěřěxlen* 'be whimsical, stubborn' (CRS 123); 2. (swearword) 'scoundrel, scamp; *yěřěxlen* 'be whimsical, stubborn' (Skvor. 128; Mész. 27). It often appears in toponyms, too; of this, see: Czeglédi 1982, 25. Its earliest occurrence in a toponym can be dated to the 15-16th century (on its early data, see: Dmitriev 1981, 134-135).¹⁵⁴ **III.** It originated from the OT. word *īduq* 'saint/holy' by Zolotnitskiy, Egorov, Fedotov and Skvortsov (Zol. 150; Egor. 80; Fed. I, 199-200; Skv. 163), but the comparison poses serious phonological problems. Malov's and Magnitskiy's assumption that it originated from Hebrew (Heb. *yarak*- 'scrape along, vegetate'; *yarak*, *yerek* 'fresh sprout, the green of something, green vegetation') is also wrong (Malov 1882, 16; Magn. 81). **IV.** prayer: Mész. 25; Magn. 58.

¹⁵⁴ I write about these data in more detail at the entry → *Īrā* and in the footnote to the place-name Sviyazh.

Basically, the *yěřěχ* is a spirit associated with diseases affecting, primarily the eyes and the skin. In the majority of records, it dwells inside the house, where a small basket is made for it to live in. In other records, it either dwells in an outbuilding (e.g. a barn) or in nature, inside a tree. The literature sometimes interprets it as a bad and sometimes as a good spirit. The background reason for this was not only the fact that the *yěřěχ* was associated with different characteristics in different areas, but also that this notion must have undergone a lot of changes during the 19th century (similarly to the → *Kiremet*).

In 1840, Fuks describes the *yěřěχ* as an idol placed in a small basket, to which they pray in case of eye, ear, tooth and skin diseases. She says that the healer makes the doll from tin and its elm-bark basket is thrown into the river and a new one is made every year (Fuks 1840, 96-97).¹⁵⁵ Mészáros also wrote in detail about the *yěřěχ* doll and the little basket made for it but, according to his collection, this was only a living tradition among the northern Chuvash at the beginning of the 20th century. In the south, only the basket was called *yěřěχ*, and no doll was made to live in it. (Mész. 24-27). The feminine nature of the *yěřěχ* is shown by the fact that it was most often imagined as an old woman or an old maid,¹⁵⁶ and it was also more connected to the women in the family, as a girl getting married took the *yěřěχ* from her parents' house to her new home. The sacrifices offered to the *yěřěχ* usually included kissel, dumplings or flat bread, as well as pieces of tin, which were hung on a broom stood upside down under her basket (Mész. 24).¹⁵⁷ Other descriptions also

¹⁵⁵ First, A. Fuks recorded that the basket was thrown out together with the *yěřěχ* every autumn (Fuks 1840, 92), but later, when answering a question, she wrote about the *yěřěχ* in more detail, clarified her previous comment, saying that only the basket would be thrown away and the doll kept (Fuks 1840, 96-97).

¹⁵⁶ According to Ashmarin's description, the Chuvash *yěřěχ* dolls kept in the State Russian Museum not only include feminine depictions but also grey old men and children (Ashm. V, 141).

¹⁵⁷ Goto regards the metal pieces hung on branches and on the broom as proof of the feminine nature of the *yěřěχ*. He believes that these refer to a female costume widespread in the Volga region, adorned with many coins on the chest

mention various other sacrificial objects or animals, for example a lamb (Sbo. 95); a white duck (Mil. 228; Nik, I, 503); dry tree branches (Magn. 82); rags and yarn (Rek. 340); nails cut from the sick person's fingers and toes, as well as a few of their hairs (Vish. 235; Magn. 82).

Some other records describe the *yěřěχ* as one or a few trees, on the branches of which silver coin and tin pieces were hung in the hope of recovering from diseases causing rashes (pl. Smelov 1880, 532; Magnitskiy 1891, 4). In Pallas and Georgi's early records, the *yěřěχ* was a bundle of branches placed in the house and worshipped. It was replaced with a new one every autumn and the old one was thrown into the river (Pal. 157; Geor. 177). It is worth mentioning that the broom stood upside down (that is, with its "branches" pointing upwards) under the *yěřěχ*-basket in the house and the sacrifice placed upon it or hung from it may also refer to the notion of the *yěřěχ* associated with trees. Nevertheless, the notion of *yěřěχ* connected with some outdoor location shows a lot of similarity with the *kiremets*, as Rekeev already wrote about the mixing of the two concepts (Rek. 340-341; as well as Magn. 78; Mész. 26-27).¹⁵⁸ When comparing and contrasting the notions of *yěřěχ* and *kiremet*, Goto highlighted some basic differences. While the *kiremet* is basically masculine in nature, related to an outdoor site and of foreign origin, the *yěřěχ* is feminine in nature, related to an indoor site and of Chu-vash origin (Goto 2007).

At the time of greater sacrifices, the *yěřěχ* was also given offerings. In Magnitskiy's Maslovoy list of the beer sacrifice, the *yěřěχ* is the fourth deity invoked in round XV (Magn. 81).¹⁵⁹ Mészáros also mentions that at the end of the goose sacrifice offered to the great

(Goto 2007, 158-159). I regard the tin pieces cast by the healer primarily as a cure for rashes with imitative magic (such diseases were mostly associated with the *yěřěχ*).

¹⁵⁸ The *yěřěχ* was also mixed with the *tūr kēlli* (→ *Kēlē*) besides the *kiremet* (Magn. 78-79). Some other forms, such as the *Avanski kēlli* (→ *Kēlē*) and the → *Valēm χuśa* also seem to be a mixed *kiremet*-*yěřěχ* notion.

¹⁵⁹ In Shevle's manuscript, it is the eighth spirit of round VII (Ashm. III, 67).

kiremet, they also offer mush made from oats or peas to the water, fire and the *yěřěχ* (Mész. 148; also cited by: AshmVv. 34).

Yulaš opășka

I. ‘freeing husband or old man’ (Magn. 86); Ashmarin identifies its compound with other forms (*yolaš-yolan*, *yulavăș-opășka*) with the figure of → *Yulavășă*, which also appears in Pavlovich (Pav.: Ashmarin 1921, 15). As for the two parts of the compound *yulaš-opășka*: 1. *Yulaš* appears in Ashmarin with several meanings: ‘leftovers’, ‘name of a spirit’, proper noun – a man’s name and the name of a forest; as well as in two compounds: *yulaš amașě* ‘name of a deity’ and *yolaš-yolan* ‘name of a spirit’ (Ashm. IV, 318-319). 2. The word *upaška*, *opaška*, meaning ‘husband, widower’ (Ashm. III, 255); ‘husband, spouse, old man’ exists in some other Turkic languages, and it was adopted from Chuvash into mountain Cheremis, where it also occurs in the names of lesser deities (Zol. 136-137; cited by: Ashmarin 1924, 15). **III.** Magnitskiy originates the Chuvash word *yolaš* from the Tatar forms *yuluš* ‘redemption’ *yuluš*- ‘free, excuse’,¹⁶⁰ and thus translates it as ‘freeing’ (Magn. 86, see also: Ashmarin 1922, 15). Ashmarin, on the other hand, explains it from the word → *Yulavășă*, along with various other forms (Ashmarin 1921, 14-15). Fedotov equates the forms *yulaš*, *yulaški* with Old Turkic *qalınču* ‘leftover, remainder; useless remains, rubbish’ (Fed. II, 484; on Old Turkic data, see e.g. DTS 412; Cl. 624). OT. *qalınču* is a derivative of the OT. verb *qal*- ‘remain’ (on Old and Modern Turkic data, see. Cl. 615; DTS; Räs. 224; Egor. 347).

This mythical being in this form is only found in Magnitskiy, as the 55th item on the Bishev beer sacrifice god list. Magnitskiy gives its meaning as ‘freeing husband’ or ‘freeing old man’, which is difficult to interpret. In Ashmarin’s dictionary, one meaning of *yulaš* is ‘remainder’, but it was considered by neither Magnitskiy nor Ashmarin. The previous, 54th item on the Cheshlam list is *yularan palaran*, meaning ‘collecting the leftovers from the sacrifice’.¹⁶¹ It frequently occurs in the long lists of deities and spirits that the beings which show some semantic connection follow one another (e.g. earth’s father, earth’s mother; livestock-giving God, base of

¹⁶⁰ In fact, the Tatar word *yol*- means ‘save, free’ (TRS 188).

¹⁶¹ In the Maslovoy list, there is no meaning provided by Magnitskiy, but in the Cheshlam list, there is (Magn. 86; 90). Magnitskiy’s translation is actually an interpretation, as the word ‘sacrifice’ is not included in the compound, which simply means ‘collector of leftovers’.

the livestock, guardian of the livestock). On the basis of this, we cannot rule out the possibility that a being meaning ‘collecting the leftovers (from the sacrifice)’ is followed by the one called ‘left-over(’s) old man’.¹⁶²

Yulavšă

I. Without meaning (Pav.: Ashmarin 1921, 27).¹⁶³ III. Ashmarin identifies the word with the form *yolavčĭ*, surviving in the charters of the Golden Horde, which is a derivative of the verb *yola-* ‘be on the road’ (Ashmarin 1921, 13-16). Egorov and Fedotov also originate the Chuvash word from the OT word *yol* ‘road’ (on its data, see e.g. Cl. 917), along with the Chagatai and Uyghur forms *yalavač*, *yalabač*, *yalauč* ‘envoy, prophet’, as well as the Tatar and Bashkir forms *yulaučĭ*, *yulausĭ* (*yulsĭ*) ‘traveller, passenger’ (Egor. 347; Fed. II, 483). The *-a-* sound in the first syllable of the early data do not support this origin. Clauson starts from the Iranian word *yalāvač*, *yalāwač*, *yalāvar* ‘messenger, envoy; (later) prophet’, the second part of which is *-vāč*, *-wāč* ‘sound’, although he cannot originate the first part of the word from any language (Cl. 921; on this, and on the Iranian origin of the word and its contamination within the Turkic languages with the words *yol* ‘road’ and *qulavuz* ‘accompaniment on the road’: Doer. IV, 106-107). Räsänen refers to Ramstedt’s Mongolian etymology with a question mark (Mong. *žala-* ‘drive, lead, direct’, see Räs. 181), but this option can be ruled out. In Chuvash, the compound *yula yup-* means ‘slander’; and *yala* ‘suspicion, sin, shame’, along with the verb *yala-* ‘falsely accuse’ are present in early Turkic sources as well as several modern languages (cf. Cl. 919; Räs. 181). IV. prayer: Pav. 27/6.

This mythical being in this form only appears in Nikiifor Pavlovich’s manuscript *Notebook of Sacrifices*, among the names of deities invoked in prayers that were recited when somebody was harmed by an evil spirit. Besides the name, its mother (*Yulavšă amăšě*) also

¹⁶² In the case of Chuvash mythical beings, there are often parallel forms of unmarked possessive forms and possessive structures, e.g. *vărman tură*, *vărman turri* (forest god, forest’s god), *mol nikēs*, *mol nikēsě* (wealth base, wealth’s base), so the compound can be translated as a possessive structure.

¹⁶³ Pavlovich only recorded the given texts in Chuvash, and Ashmarin did not translate the given forms into Russian. In an earlier part of his article, he claimed that, considering its etymology, the word must have originally meant ‘traveller, passenger, wanderer’ but the meaning ‘false accusation, slander’ was later associated with this mythical being due to a folk etymology (Ashmarin 1921, 14; 31).

appears, as well as *Tupavšă*¹⁶⁴ and its mother, *Tupavšă amăšě*. At the time of recording, the Chuvash must have associated these beings with accusation and perjury, because in the prayer, these four deities are asked to save people from accusation and perjury.¹⁶⁵

Ashmarin traces back the name *yulavšă* to the time of the Golden Horde, and believes that a contemporary official title (*yolavčĭ*) survived and became the name of a spirit or deity over time.¹⁶⁶ He also relates this form to the names that include the word *šüren*, *šüreken* ‘going/walking’, which occur in various compounds and in relatively large numbers (e.g. *Kepe uměňče šüreken Pülěχšě* ‘*Pülěχšě* going before *Kepe*’, *šol šüren ĭră* ‘good one going on the road’, *Tură uměňče šüreken* ‘going before God’). Ashmarin assumes that these forms, which are difficult to interpret in themselves, can actually all be considered the Chuvash translations of *yolavčĭ*.

Kăvak χuppi

I. *Квак хону (озилать)* ‘opening of the celestial gate (the Chuvash believe that whoever sees this natural phenomenon will be lucky)’ (Mil. 213; Nik. I, 498); *Квак-хонну* ‘blinking, opening of the sky or the eyelashes of the firmament’ (Magn. 63); *Квак-хонну* ‘sky’ (Magn. 88); ‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. VII, 96); *kăvak ušălan* ‘momentary light flashing in the dark’ (Nik. II, 132); ‘God, who gifts good luck’ (Sal. 402). **II.** ‘momentary atmospheric light phenomenon in the sky’ (Zol. 33); ‘gate of the sky’ (Mész. 84); ‘rare, sudden celestial light phenomenon (not the same as the aurora borealis)’ (Ashm. VII, 95-96); ‘celestial door’ (Ashm. 1921, 32); ‘northern light, flashing, distant lightning’ (Den. 17). Form of the noun *χupă* ‘closed; lid; skin, cover; bark, bast’ with a third person singular possessive suffix (Ashm. XVI, 170-171), derived from the verb *χup-* ‘close, lock, lock away; hide, lock away; imprison’ (Ashm. XVI, 170-171). **III.** Chuv. *kăvak* < OT. *kök* ‘blue; sky’; the word has been retained in several Modern Turkic languages (on Old Turkic data, cf. e.g. Cl. 708-709); on modern data, e.g. Zol. 33; Räs. 287; Egor. 96; Fed. I, 246); more on the Turkic background: WOT 519-521. On the data *qap-*, *qapĭg*, *qapġa*, present in

¹⁶⁴ The Chuvash word *tupa* means ‘oath’.

¹⁶⁵ False accusation and slander would sometimes lead to suicide, which I will mention in the entry → *Tipiri*, in connection with *tip-šar* ‘dry trouble’.

¹⁶⁶ Besides Ashmarin, Skvortsov also tried to originate Chuvash deities from earlier (Volga Bulgar) official titles (e.g. *tēper*, see → *Tipiri*).

several Turkic language branches, and on the relevant literature, see: Räs. 233; GTJ 510-511. IV. prayer: Magn. 58, 59-60, 84-87, 91-92; Pav. 28-29.

It is not regarded as a mythical being by the majority of the literature. Even though it is associated with a certain belief (whoever sees this light phenomenon can make a wish and it will be granted),¹⁶⁷ it does not make this rare natural phenomenon a mythical being. However, one cannot ignore the fact that it is included in several god lists among the deities invoked. It appears in all four of Magnitskiy's beer sacrifice lists, which come from four different places: Maslovoy: round IX, second deity; Bishev: fifteenth deity; Cheshlam: twenty-seventh deity; Bayteryakov: seventh deity (Magn. 6389). Besides, on page 9 of Nikifor Pavlovich's collection of prayers, in the prayers said for the grain and the people, not only the *kāvak χuppi*, but also its mother (*Kāvak χuppi amāšē*) is invoked (Ashmarin 1921, 29). Nevertheless, Salmin probably exaggerates when he claims that the *kāvak χuppi* must have been such a significant being that it would immediately follow *Turā* and *Pülēχšē* in the hierarchy of Chuvash deities (cf. Sal. 402-403).

A phenomenon (or spirit name) similar to the *kāvak χuppi* is the form *χāval ušlan*, appearing in Magnitskiy's Maslovoy list, the meaning of which Magnitskiy gives as: 'momentary light during darkness' (Magn. 63). Ashmarin also records it in his dictionary, with the meaning 'name of a spirit' – only referring to Magnitskiy's data, which seems to be the only one (Ashm. XVI, 308). However, Ashmarin has a compound *χāval ušālčē* in another entry, which a source, already unknown to Ashmarin, had considered identical with *kāvak χuppi* (Ashm. XVI, 308). Both *χāval ušlan* and *χāval ušālčē* can be translated as 'opening of the light'.

It is worth noting that, in present-day Chuvash, *kāvak* does not mean sky, but primarily means 'blue'.¹⁶⁸ Perhaps Mészáros's relevant Tatar data is the key to the solution, as Tatars also know about this

¹⁶⁷ Description about this can be found in both Magnitskiy and Mészáros (Magn. 63; Mész. 84-85).

¹⁶⁸ Actually, the modern equivalents of the Old Turkic word *kök* ('blue') mean 'sky' in the majority of Turkic languages. In Chuvash, it is primarily a colour

light phenomenon and associate it with similar beliefs¹⁶⁹ and stories. (Mész. 85). We know from Mil'kovich's early records that this belief was shared by the Chuvash by the same name in the 18th century.

Kepe

I. *Kaḃa* 'name of a deity' (Geor. 176); *Keḃe* 'name of a deity' (Pal 159); *Keḃe*¹⁷⁰ 'possessing fate or power on earth and underground' (Mil. 137; Nik. I, 495, 498); *Keḃe* 'spirits, who protect them [i.e. the Chuvash] like angels' (Fuks 1840, 92); *Les Kébéés* 'guardian angels' (Thomas: Anderson 1906, 11); *Keḃe* 'good spirit, who saves from many troubles' (VishN. 103); *Мун Кебе* 'ambassador and interpreter' (Vish. 232); *Keḃe* 'fate, controller of all things on earth and underground, especially of human fate' (Sbo. 80); *Keḃe* 'fate, destiny, lot; controller of the fate of the human race' (Zol. 33; same: Magn. 64); *kebene* 'a spirit' „*tūrā ūmāñ, Džī, ūnāñ tāvanā*” 'being before God, related to him' (Paa. 62.); 'controller of the fate of the human race' (Nik. I, 133); 'head of the angels; mediator between God and people' (Mész. 19); *Szulti kepe* 'fate god' (ME II, 475, 538); 'one of the most significant female figures of the Chuvash pantheon' (Skv. 166-167).¹⁷¹ **III.** As a place name (in the form of *Kuḃe xupe* 'Kepe's meadow'), it was already mentioned in the 17th century (1649-1651) (Dmitriev 1981, 135). **II.** Three attempts at etymology can be mentioned: (1) Arabic origination: Ar. الكعبة (*al-ka'ba*) 'Kaba' (كعبة *ka'ba* 'cube') (ARS 691), shared by: Mészáros 19; Ashm. VI, 189. Sboev also suggests an Arabic origin, but he starts from the Arabic word قضاء (*qaḏā*) 'fate'¹⁷² (Sbo. 80). (2) Finno-Ugric origin: Cher. *kāḃā* 'sky'; Eastern Cher. *kaba* 'fate-goddess';¹⁷³ Voty. *kaba-inmar* 'fate-deity'; Finn. (Kalevala) *kapo, kave* 'goddess' (Räs. 253-254). Akhmet'yanov

term ('blue, grey'), meaning 'sky' only in a few compounds, e.g. *kāvak tüpe* 'sky, firmament' (cf. Ashm. VII, 91-96; Fed. I, 245).

¹⁶⁹ Naturally, in a Muslim guise – for example, the “opening of the sky's gate” is a time of divine grace, when Allah grants everybody's wish.

¹⁷⁰ Mil'kovich had the form *Keḃe cyḏby*, which Nikol'skiy, who re-published his article, presented in the form *Сюльде Кебе*. Mil'kovich's word *cyḏby* may be the Russian word *судьба* 'fate', as at another place, where Mil'kovich records a story about *Кепе*, he translates it as: “Once upon a time, *Kepe* or fate wishing to find out... (В одно время, *Кебе* или судьба желая узнать...)” (Mil. 230).

¹⁷¹ Chulkov also describes it as a feminine deity – although a Cheremis goddess (Chulkov 1782, 179).

¹⁷² The present-day meaning of the Arabic word: '1. jurisprudence; 2. judicial proceeding; 3. court records; 4. enforcement; 5. fate, judgement; 6. annihilation, liquidation' (ARS 644).

¹⁷³ An early record of this meaning: Chulkov 1782, 179.

originates the Mari and Udmurt data ultimately from Arabic, independently from Finnish (Akhm. 31); and Ashmarin believes that the Mari data is a borrowing from Chuvash (AshmVv. 26). (3) A Hebrew origin is presumed by Malov: Heb. *kokab* ‘star’ (Malov 1882, 25). IV. mythical story: Inf. 19-22; prayer: Vish. 239-240; Magn. 58, 59-60, 84-87; Pav. 28-29; Mész. 128; Ashm. VII, 39.

Basically, *Kepe* appears in descriptions in two different ways. One of its identities is a fate deity, and the other is an angel-like mediator in the communication between heaven and earth.

According to Mil’kovich’s 18th-century record, *Kepe*, living in the sky, determines the fate of those living on earth and controls it with the help of mediators (→ *Pülěχšě* and → *Pixampar*). This idea was adopted (without adding later data) by Sboev and Nikol’skiy, and partly Salmin, too (Sbo, 80; Nik. I, 133; Sal. 399400). According to the other notion, *Kepe* in fact mediates between God and people, taking people’s prayers to heaven (Vish. 232; Mész. 19),¹⁷⁴ which relates it to the figures of → *Xārpan* and → *Pülěχšě*. According to the description of Fuks and Thomas in the 1840s, it rather means ‘guardian angel’. Mészáros publishes data suggesting that *Kepe*’s helpers are the → *Pirěštis* (people’s personal angels), whose leader is *Kepe* (Mész 19; also cited by: AshmVv. 26).

To a certain extent, the notion of *Kepe* is also associated with the mother and the family. This has not really been discussed by the literature so far; perhaps only Skvortsov’s remark refers to it. Skvortsov mentions the figure *śut tēncene śuratna Aslā Ama* ‘this world, bright-world-birthing Great Mother’,¹⁷⁵ which he considers identical with *Kepe*. He even adds that *Kepe* had also integrated the earlier figures → *Šēr-šiv*, → *Xěrlě-šir* and *Turā amāšě* into itself (Skv. 166-167).¹⁷⁶ Ashmarin mentions a saying: “The mother is *Kepe*. One must not quarrel with her”, which he originates from

¹⁷⁴ Mészáros says that this formula is often added onto the end of the sacrificial prayer: “Let it get from us to *kēbē* and from *kēbē* to God” (Mész. 19).

¹⁷⁵ As well as a being *Šerti-šultipe śut tēncene titan Ama* (‘earthly-upper light-world-holding Mother’). Unfortunately, he does not provide the source of these data.

¹⁷⁶ I do not consider all these beings identical.

Tatar, where mothers' title of honour includes likening them to Kaba (AshmVv. 26). We can also add that the prayers, some of which are particularly meant for *Kepe*,¹⁷⁷ (or for deities whose name includes *Kepe*), are associated with the family. One of them is the prayer of a family goose sacrifice¹⁷⁸ and the other is the prayer said in the family if all of their children die.¹⁷⁹

According to some descriptions, *Kepe* also has a father and a mother (*Kepe aššě*, *Kepe amāšě*), and it also appears in several compounds: *śut śantalāk tītan kepe* 'light-world-holding *Kepe*', *šēr-śiv tītan kepe* 'earth-water-holding *Kepe*' (Vish. 239-240);¹⁸⁰ *Kepe uměnce śüreken Pülěχšě* '*Pülěχšě* going before *Kepe*'. Besides, it also appears in compounds where the second part means 'trouble, bad, misfortune': *Kepe χayar*, *Kepe inkeki*, *Kepe sinkere*, *Kepe sinker śürene* (Magn. 197). In addition, it can form compounds with the *kiremet*, too: *Kepe kiremet*, *Kepe kiremečě* (Magn. 84). These compounds suggest that the meaning of *Kepe* has also undergone a lot of change.

Kěļě

I. *Мун киле* 'great *kiremet*', *ксинь киле* 'small *kiremet*' (Magn. 64); 'some evil spirit, usually identified with the *kiremet*' (Mész. 41); *kəļə* 'prayer; worship; sacrifice; spirit of sacrificial places' (Paa. 63); '4. name of a deity' (Ashm. VII, 244); '*kiremet*-type deity' (Sal. 430); in compound forms: *Aslā kěļě* 'name of a *kiremet*' (Ashm. VII, 244) ['great *kěļě*']; *Kěļě alāk uměnce tārakan* 'name of a deity in the sixth round' (Shevle: Ashm. VII, 244) ['standing before *Kěļě*'s door']; *Kěļě alāk uśakan* 'name of a deity in the sixth round' (Shevle: Ashm. VII, 245) ['opening *Kěļě*'s door']; *Kěļě amāš* 'name of a deity' (Ashm. VII, 245) ['*Kěļě*'s mother']; *Kěļě ilen* or *kěl ilen* 'name of a deity' (Ashm. VII, 233, 245) ['prayer taker']; *kělli čūkki*

¹⁷⁷ Salmin was wrong in claiming that they did not pray specifically to *Kepe*. Actually, he says that there were no verbal texts dedicated specifically to it (Sal. 400).

¹⁷⁸ Such a text is quoted by the PK 6162, too.

¹⁷⁹ The prayer was recited in honour of eight different deities (all eight names include the name *Kepe*), but it actually asks God (*Turā*) for protection and help.

¹⁸⁰ In the list, *Kepe* is preceded by the following forms: 'bright-world-holding', 'this world, bright-world-holding's mother', 'bright-world-holding *Pülěχšě*', 'bright-world-holding *Pülěχšě*'s mother'; as well as: 'earth-water-holding', 'earth-water-holding *Pülěχšě*', 'earth-water-holding *Pülěχšě*'s mother'.

‘general name of deities prayed to’ (Ashm. VII, 242); *kělěse paxsa šüreken* ‘the one who supervises the alms’ (Magn. 83), the same in Ashmarin: ‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. VII, 246) [‘going one who supervises the prayer’]. **II.** ‘prayer, demand’ (Zol. 34); ‘1. prayer, 2. good wish, 3. church service’ (Ashm. VII, 244); *kələ tu-* ‘to worship’, as well as: *kəl-tum xajarə* ‘disease coming from the spirit of the sacrificial place (*kələ*)’ (Paa. 63); *kěl kětüsě* ‘protector of the *kiremet*’ (Ashm. VII, 245); *kěl tum xayarě* ‘disease caused by the spirit of the place of prayer’ (Ashm. VII, 234). **III.** According to several scholars, the Chuvash word is of Tatar origin (Zol. 34; Gomb. 5. Räs. 270; Fed. I, 270); Róna-Tas, however, originates the Tatar word *keläü* ‘prayer’ from Middle Chuvash (Róna-Tas 1997, 497); the Chuvash verb *kěle-* ‘ask for’ and the noun *kělevsě* ‘priest’ belong to the word family *kala-* ‘speak’.¹⁸¹ The Tatar *kelä-* ‘want, ask for, pray’, *keläü* ‘prayer’,¹⁸² *kelän-* ‘beg’, *kelänči* ‘beggar’ (cf. Rad. II/2, 1411; Gomb. 5; TTDS 236-237) are not present in the other Turkic languages. Fedotov’s tentative assumption that the Chuvash word is related to the Old Turkic verb *qol-* ‘ask for, beg’, cannot be substantiated. Räsänen equates it to Mongolian *kili-* ‘suffer, ask, make an effort’ (Räs. 270), and Fedotov to Tungusic verbs (Fed. 271). On the possible connection of the Tatar word and the Russian *клянчить*, *клянча* ‘beg(ging), cadg(ing)’, see: Egor. 105, Vasmer II, 259-260. Egorov also raises its connection with the word present in almost all of the Turkic languages: *tıl*, *dıl* ‘language, speech’ (Egor. 105). **IV.** prayer: Magn. 58; Pav. 28-29; Elle 47-52. (3-26. as well as prayer 33); Ashm. VII, 246; *tür kelli*: Magn. 58, 59-60, 84-87; Pav. 28.

First and foremost, *kělě* means ‘prayer’; but in several descriptions, it is associated with some spirits, as well. These are partly → *Kiremet-*, partly → *Yěřěx*-type beings, which are sometimes identical with it. These words were used as synonyms by the Chuvash. *Kělě* also appears in the sources in compounds with proper nouns as well as attributes, when it can clearly be associated with the notion of the *kiremet*.

In Magnitskiy’s god lists, *kělě* appears in several places, which Magnitskiy considers *kiremets*, for example, *măn kělě* and *kěsen*

¹⁸¹ I must thank András Róna-Tas for the clarification.

¹⁸² In his Christian Tatar collection, Mashanov recorded a sacrificial ceremony which was held for the health of the farmyard and to prevent infectious diseases from destroying the livestock. The name of the goose (at other places, goat or lamb) sacrifice is *kaz kläü* ‘goose prayer’, or *täkä kläü* ‘goat prayer’ (Mashanov 1875, 24).

*kěľě*¹⁸³ in the beer sacrifice list (Magn. 64). Magnitskiy writes in more detail about some compound forms. In the Maslovoy list of the beer sacrifice, the 80th spirit or deity invoked is *Avanski kelli* (Авански килли). On the basis of a local story,¹⁸⁴ Magnitskiy interprets *Avanski* as a male nickname, which comes from the Chuvash word *avan* ‘good’.

In Maslovoy village, there once was a rowan bush in the apple orchard belonging to a chiropractor and incantor, nicknamed *Avanski*. The locals believed there was a *yěřěχ* spirit living in this bush, to whom they regularly took sacrificial gifts. Magnitskiy visited this place in 1875 and found various rags, bits of yarn and pea-sized tin pieces (*nuxrat*) strung on yarn. Egorov, Magnitskiy’s data provider in Maslovoy, recounted that *Avanski* had daughters, who were given a branch each from the rowan bush as a dowry, and thus it was propagated (Magn. 76-77). Magnitskiy thought that, even though the locals regarded the given being as a *yěřěχ*, it was more likely a *kiremet*. The dwelling place of the spirit is indeed more characteristic of *kiremet*s, just like its way of propagation, but the sacrificial gifts rather suggest a *yěřěχ*. However, the daughters taking with them the spirit (or its dwelling place) when getting married is again suggestive of a *yěřěχ*.¹⁸⁵

Magnitskiy mentions other examples of similar, sacred bushes and trees from the Cheboksary district, of which he unfortunately only recorded the name *Sovkkay kelli*. In Semenchinoy (Šinčas)

¹⁸³ In Magnitskiy’s transcription: *мун киле* and *ксинь киле*. They are the third and fourth deities invoked in the eleventh round of the Maslovoy list. The attributes *măn* ‘great, big’ and *kěšěň* ‘small’ are also often attached to the → *Kiremet* as well as to the → *Īră*.

¹⁸⁴ A childless couple finally has a baby boy who they name Ivan. When the mother is asked what the child is like, she answers *avanski* – in Magnitskiy’s translation: ‘He seems good, kind of good’.

¹⁸⁵ This account is particularly educational in showing how difficult some mythical beings are to outline and how hard it is to clarify the relationship of similar mythical beings to each other. The issue of *yěřěχ* – *kiremet*, raised by Magnitskiy, is further complicated by the fact that in this case, the place (and being) itself is called *kěľě* (*Avanski kelli*).

village, there was a grove of some 200 trees in the threshing yard of a pagan Chuvash called Sovkkay, which is called *Sovkkay kĕlli*. *Sovkkay* is a pagan Chuvash name (Magnitskiy's data is the only one for it, we do not know of such a name from any other source). The locals would bring it cocks, small sacrificial flat bread (*yus-man*), buttered flat bread, sour soup, pancakes, flat bread fried in lard, tin, lead money and yarn as sacrifices (Magn. 77). The other four beings and their main features are the following: (1) A tree trunk looking like a bear, sanding in a gulley or, according to others, a rowan bush at the same place; (2) A linden tree in the garden of a Chuvash, to which money and geese were offered as sacrifices; (3) A shrubbery along the road where the Chuvash going to market would throw pieces of bread onto the bushes; (4) A linden tree in a sexton's garden¹⁸⁶ where they threw coins and prayed at dawn, and the sexton would sometimes find burnt animal bones around the linden tree (Magn. 77-78).

Mészáros knows two different meanings of it. Firstly, he records that the Chuvash attribute muteness to the *kĕlē*, which befalls people who accidentally fall down at a place where the *kĕlē* is staying. As a consequence, the *kĕlē* is angered and makes the person mute. Paasonen also recorded a similar meaning: “the *kəl-tum xajarə* is a disease originating from the spirit of the sacrificial place (*kəla*), which befalls a person who happens to be near the spirit's dwelling place while it is sporting there by itself or in company” (Paa. 63). Furthermore, Mészáros concluded from his data collected among the southern Chuvash that the *kĕlē* was considered identical with the *kiremet* there (Mész. 41).

In Shevle's God list, the eighth and ninth items of the sixth round are the compound forms *kĕlē alān umĕnĕe tārakan* (‘standing before the *kĕlē*'s door’) and *kĕlē alāk uśakan* (‘opening the *kĕlē*'s door’) – the *kĕlē* does not appear on its own. It is particularly strange because these compound forms suggest the existence of a *kĕlē*, which is higher up in the hierarchy (whose door they stand before or open).

¹⁸⁶ I will revisit this data at → *Kiremet*.

It also appears in compound forms in Nikifor Pavlovich's *Notebook of Sacrifices*: *šiv šinči kělě amăšě* 'water-bound *kělě*'s mother', *šiv šinči kělě* 'water-bound *kělě*' – here, these forms are meant as invocations of prayers recited in case of falling in water. Besides, in prayers recited for people and grains, deities number 32 and 33 are *Šavra šil killi amăšě* 'whirlwind's *kělě*'s mother' and *kělli* '[whirlwind's] *kělě*'.

Kiremet

I. *Киреметь* 'place of pagan worship, in Chuvash *ирям*, in Mordvin *киреметь*' (Lep. 211); *кереметь* 'evil spirits which live in the forests near the villages [of the Chuvash] and bring diseases and misfortunes unto them; there are main, medium and smaller *keremets* or *irzam*, by another name, among them' (Mil. 136; Nik. I, 496); 'Chuvash and Cheremis deity and the place of prayers' (Chulkov 1782,180); 'name of Satan, to which, in opposition to God, animal sacrifices are offered in order to avoid diseases and misfortunes' (Aleks. 9-11); *кереметь* 'sacrificial place situated outside the village; the main deity after God', it has a family: *керемет-аш*, *керемет амаже*, *керемет уевли* '*kiremet*'s father, mother, son' (Pal. 158-159); the *киреметь*, which they also call *ирсан*, is similar to the Cheremis *keremet* in every way (Geor. 177); 'a group of a few trees, to which they offer sacrifices, this is what a *kiremet* is' (Fuks 1840, 76); 'their evil deities and *kiremets* live in the fields and in forests' (Fuks 1840, 126); *киреметь* and *кирелле* 'place of Chuvash worship' (Vish. 104); 'the basis and cause of evil, it is invisible but lives on earth; it can attack people and their livestock with all kinds of diseases' (Vish. 233); '1. sacrificial tree; 2. evil spirit' (Ale. 365); 'the greatest of bad deities, it was originally God's eldest son' (Artem. 57-58); 'originally God's eldest son, who was killed by people; later a being causing all kinds of evil and trouble to man' (Sbo. 85-88); 'pagan sacred place' (Munk. 7; also cited by: Gomb. 12); 'the chief being in the realm of evil spirits' (Zol. 35; also cited by: Gomb. 12); '1. name of God's eldest son, who was killed by people; 2. the evil spirits of those killed by people; 3. name of countless trees and gullies, which are the successors of the original *kiremet*; 4. name of the ceremony held for the *kiremet*; 5. in a metaphorical sense, the name of a benevolent spirit' (Magn. 1-2); *irăsem* or *kiremet*: 'spirits of lesser significance, which appear by various names, are of a considerable number and not particularly significant (Rek. 421-422); *kiremet* '1. evil spirit; 2. *kiremetlăx* 'place where the spirit called *kiremet* abides' (Paa. 73); 'originally, spirit of the dead, which could be good (*iră*) or evil (*çayar*); according to another origin, the lord that had escaped from God and on earth demands a sacrifice from people or else tortures them' (Vasil. 5-9); 'evil spirit abiding in the earth who brings all kinds of diseases to people and their livestock in order to force some sacrifice from them' (Mész. 32); '1. cult of the forefathers;

2. there are a limitless number of *kiremet*s in forests, lakes, at rivers, most of them evil beings' (Nik. II, 134); '1. the place where sacrifices are offered to evil spirits; 2. sacrifice offered to evil spirits; 3. evil spirit; 4. (as a swearword) devil' (Sir. 167; with the first three meanings: Skvor. 179); 'group of inferior spirits; they come from the souls of highly esteemed people (ancestors and magicians, among others); the sacred places where their cult is practised are called the same (ME II, 651); '1. demiurge and cult-hero; 2. place of sacrifices offered to the higher deities; 3. syncretic mixture of different cults; 4. evil spirit; 5. abode of the evil spirit; 6. place of sacrifice offered to the *kiremet*-spirits; 7. sacrifice to the evil spirits; 8. personification of death; 9. demonic evil spirit; 10. folklore figure; 11. swearword; 12. place name' (End. 72). **II.** It often occurs in toponyms, on which see: Czeglédi 1982, 25-26; Magnitskiy also mentions a few (Magnitskiy 1880), and there are over a hundred data in Ashmarin's dictionary (Ashm. I-XVII). **III.** It exists in the languages of several Turkic peoples of the Islamic faith (e.g. Osm; Tkm; Az; Kyrg; Kaz; Uzb.) meaning, 'miracle, grace, miracle made by a saint, generosity' (summarised by: Egor. 113; Fed. II, 297; on some other shades of meaning: Dallos 2018a, 73-76). The word is of Arabic origin: Ar. كرامة (*karāma*) 'honour, fairness; generosity', its plural is كرامات (*karāmāt*) 'miracle' (ARS 684). It got into Chuvash through Tatar mediation (Gomb. 12; Egor. 113; Fed. II, 297; Scher. 31-32). It exists in present-day Tatar, meaning 'miracle' (TRS 259, 320). In Bálint's collections among Christian Tatars, it appears in the meaning 'misbelief, superstition' (WD 291), and it also had a meaning similar to the Chuvash among Christian Tatars (Sofi. 679). Scherner assumes that the word was adopted from Tatar as late as the 18th century or even later (Scher. 31-32; also, on the time of sound shifts, see: Scher. 14). This is contradicted by the fact that there is data from Chuvashia from 1638 for *kiremet* as a place-name (on this and some other 17th-century data, see: Dmitriev 1981, 136). According to another etymological possibility, claimed by Basilov, it would be related to the Alt. word *körmös* 'inferior spirits', Tel. *kürmüs* 'guardian spirit of the house' (ME II, 651). This etymology can be rejected, just like Malov's earlier assumption that the word would be of Hebrew origin (Heb. *kerem* 'garden') (Malov 1882, 3-7 – approvingly cited by Sal. 11). **IV.** mythical legend: Inf. 19-22; Magn. 2-3; Mész. 35-36; 36/1, 36/2, 36/3, 37; Zem. 156, 157-158; prayer: Vish. 240-241; Magn. 8-9, 46, 58, 59-60, 84-87; Mész. 126-127.

The *kiremet* is one of the most characteristic and complex beings of the Chuvash belief system. It already appeared in the earliest records, and later, too, countless articles and papers have discussed this mythical being, which was widely known in the Volga-region (among Finno-Ugric as well as Turkic-language peoples). The picture emerging from the descriptions is far from unified, just like the stories regarding the origin of the *kiremet*. On one hand, *kiremet*

means an external place which is somewhat different from its surroundings, like a small grove or a solitary tree, a waterside clearing or a gully. There can be more than one *kiremet* around each village, but at the same time, there were great *kiremets* that were worshipped by the whole Chuvash people. Thus, it seems that there was some kind of hierarchy among the *kiremets*. On the other hand, the *kiremet* is also an evil spirit, which can bring sickness and misfortune to humans and can be placated with sacrifices. The spirit can be sometimes identified with its dwelling place, but it can also cause diseases far away from that place. Nevertheless, there are records and interpretations suggesting that the *kiremet*, or at least some of the *kiremets*, may have been benevolent or formerly benevolent spirits.

The Chuvash had two basic explanations for the origin of the *kiremets*. According to one of them, the souls of the dead became *kiremets*, and other legends suggest that they were believed to be of celestial origin. On the basis of the notion of dead people becoming *kiremets*, several scholars assumed that the *kiremet*-belief had evolved from a cult of the dead or from ancestor-worship (e.g. Mész 38; AshmVv. 36). We might refine this idea somewhat by noting that it is not a general belief regarding the soul of each dead person. Nor is it about the notion that “the souls of people who did not die a natural death” continue to exist as a being dangerous to the living,¹⁸⁷ which notion can be found among the beliefs of many other peoples besides the Chuvash. The various legends available to us about how the *kiremets* came to be include one in which robbers attack a Russian icon-merchant, take his money and scatter his icons in the forest (Mész. 37).¹⁸⁸ The data also include a Tatar or

¹⁸⁷ Although the ‘prerequisite’ of becoming a *kiremet* is often (but not always) for someone to die a violent death, this alone is not a sufficient condition. There is not a single legend in which a murdered baby would be the antitype of a *kiremet*, but there is a *kiremet* which came from a spellcaster who died a natural death, but was buried in the wrong place (on the latter data, see: Fuks 1840, 126-127).

¹⁸⁸ In another variant, a Chuvash host, called Torganzi, murdered a Russian icon-peddler and hung his icons on tree branches (Magnitskiy 1882, 165). In this case, however, Torganzi himself became a *kiremet* (the place is called

Bashkir soldier,¹⁸⁹ a Chuvash landlord (Magn. 4; Mész 36),¹⁹⁰ a Chuvash chief of robbers (AshmVv. 36) and a Chuvash spellcaster (Fuks 1840, 126-127; Mész. 36).¹⁹¹ These people who had once-lived and became *kiremets*, seem to be characterized by some kind of outsider-ness. They are either foreigners (Tatar, Russian) or of a special social status¹⁹² (a wealthy landlord, a robber, a young man too eager to marry,¹⁹³ or a spellcaster, who communicates with otherworldly forces).

According to another belief, the *kiremet* was originally of celestial origin, who got to earth either as punishment or because of people's sins. It is already mentioned in very early records that *Kiremet* was God's firstborn son, whom people killed, obeying Satan (e.g. Inf. 19-22;¹⁹⁴ Artem. 58).¹⁹⁵ Then the people, afraid of God's wrath, burnt his son's body and scattered his ashes. In all the places where

Torganzi kiremet) and not his victim, the Russian icon-seller. Perhaps it is more about the actual place becoming a *kiremet*, due to the crime itself and to the icons scattered about (in Chuvash, an icon is denoted by the word *turǎ*, which also means 'God' or 'deity', see → *Turǎ*).

¹⁸⁹ The Pugachev's rebellion also left its mark on Chuvash historical legends (Dmitriev 1986, 72). In addition, the origin of several *kiremets* was attributed to contemporary bloodsheds: sometimes hanged Russian priests and at other times, murdered rebellious soldiers were considered the antitypes of some *kiremets* (Magnitskiy 1919, 229).

¹⁹⁰ Legend has it that a rich man, in order to gain more lands, buried his sons alive in four pits, so that they would tell the people who asked that it was his land. The lord gained large areas of land in this way, but his sons died in the pits, all four of whom then became *kiremets*.

¹⁹¹ According to a legend, the origin of healing by magic is also associated with a *kiremet*. I quote this text under Magn. 2-3.

¹⁹² Here, I would like to somewhat clarify the observation made by Masanori Goto, who mentions Chuvash people of particularly high socio-economic status (Goto 2007, 147). In my opinion, the picture is wider than that, as it includes not only rich people but also those who are different from the average, either upwards or downwards.

¹⁹³ The young man, who is too eager to marry, is sent by God into a stream to find a bride. Later, the same young man pleads with God to save him from starvation, who decrees that people sacrifice the blood of the slaughtered animals to him (Zemlyanitskiy 1869; also cited by: Magn. 6-7; Mész. 34-35).

¹⁹⁴ I quote this legend in the anthology under Inf. 19-22.

¹⁹⁵ Pallas has a piece of data claiming (Pal. 159) the other name of *tor* (→ *Turǎ* 'God') is *keremet aš* (*kiremet aššē* 'kiremet's father').

the ashes fell, trees sprouted. These, in turn, were hostile to people (its first detailed description: Sbo. 85). Several other legends suggest the celestial origin of *Kiremet*, but in these, an angel or *Kiremet* himself rebels against God, and is sent to earth as a punishment.¹⁹⁶

Some authors do not consider the *kiremet* as particularly significant, or regard it only as a place surrounded by taboos, where evil spirits live (e.g. Rek. 421-422). Okhotnikov, for example, claims that all other scholars before him had misunderstood the meaning of the *kiremet*, as it is only a certain place and does not involve any supernatural force (Okhotnikov 1920, 27).¹⁹⁷ Timofeev wrote that in the small, secluded village where he worked as a schoolteacher, the worship of the *kiremet* was in no way different from the worship of other spirits and deities. Thus, no particular fear or anxiety was associated with this notion, as opposed to the village where he grew up, although that one was situated at the meeting of commercial roads, which made it a more open place in many ways (Timofeev 2002, 55).

However, many more descriptions attest to the fact that the *kiremet* is not only one of the most significant beings of the Chuvash belief system, but also one of the most formidable. It is a cause of various diseases and misfortunes, on both the individual and the collective level. The *kiremet*s were offered sacrifices, both individually and collectively, on a regular basis as well as occasionally. The quality and quantity of the sacrifice was decided in each case by the

¹⁹⁶ Such a legend is also quoted by Magnitskiy, based on Zemlyanitskiy's record (Zemlyanitskiy 1869, 5; Magn. 5-6; Mész. 34). Its short summary is the following: *Kiremet* had once been one of the officers of God, but he refused obedience and fled. When he was found, he was taken to court and sentenced to life imprisonment, but God felt this was too harsh a punishment, and instead he ruled that *Kiremet* could live in streams and forests and eat what people would give him. *Kiremet* later married and had a host of children and grandchildren. According to another legend, *Kiremet* had originally been an angel, but because of his disobedience, God cast him down to earth and people were so scared of him that they began to offer him sacrifices, lest he harm them (Mész. 36).

¹⁹⁷ At the same time, though, Okhotnikov writes at length about how scary the place itself was, one was not allowed to talk, nor laugh nor stamp their feet loudly, and how afraid they had been as children even to approach these places.

healer.¹⁹⁸ On the occasion of larger, community sacrifices, animal sacrifices were offered. We also have data showing that in the event of theft, all the inhabitants of the village had to take an oath that included a self-imprecation invoking a *kiremet*, or drinking water that had come from the *kiremet*'s source. The criminals were so afraid of the *kiremet*s that they would rather confess their crime.¹⁹⁹

The *kiremet*s can also be considered a group of Chuvash mythical beings (Salmin, among others, treats them as such), although, it is sometimes hard to say whether a particular being is a *kiremet*, which has its own name, or a separate mythical being, which is similar to the *kiremet*s in many aspects (e.g. *Čemen*²⁰⁰ → *Valem χuśa*). The picture is made even more complex by the fact that, in some records, the data providers treat the words *kiremet*, *yěřĕχ* and *iră* practically as synonyms.

The hierarchy of *kiremet*s has been documented by several scholars; the first description was provided by Müller, on the basis

¹⁹⁸ Mészáros provides an interesting description of this. The healer listed the names of *kiremet*s one by one, and the name that gave him some sensation was identified as the *kiremet* that had caused the given disease or problem, so that was the one a sacrifice had to be offered to. The sensations could be various; in some places, the healer kept his finger on the patient's artery, and its beating harder was the sign; in other places, the healer would fasten a lead ball on a foot-long thread and hold it above the patient while listing the names. Where the 'pendulum' would swing, that *kiremet* was the cause of the trouble (Mész. 269).

¹⁹⁹ Two such cases are mentioned by Goto (Goto 2007, 147-148).

²⁰⁰ Mil'kovich wrote in detail about a local *kiremet* called *Čemen*. It was an important *kiremet* to which the Chuvash regularly offered sacrifices, primarily in order to avoid diseases; and also, brides living in the area would not get married without first offering a sacrifice to it (Mil. 215-216). Later research did not record any further data. In Ashmarin's dictionary, this word only appears as a place-name and in two compounds, which are names of *kiremet*s: *Čemen kiremečĕ*, *Čemen kĕlli* (Ashm. XV, 172). In the greater summary works, it is only mentioned briefly by Salmin (Sal. 427-428), and in the ČM (396-397), summarising Mil'kovich's description in both places. I have found a prayer that includes *Čemen* among the names of beings. This was recorded by V. Nikiforov in 1905 as a prayer recited at a "Household's porridge" ceremony. The formula *Čemen širlay!* 'Čemen, have mercy!' appears here (publication of the prayer: PK 182: prayer № 483).

of material collected by him in the first half of the 18th century.²⁰¹ Müller divides the *kiremets* into three large groups: the family or clan group; the *kiremets* associated with one village; and those worshipped over a much larger area of 10-20 villages or even more extensively (Müller 2001, 113-114).²⁰² Mil'kovich's description from the second half of the 18th century provides a more detailed description and classification of *kiremets* known to him.²⁰³ It includes great, medium and small *kiremets*. The great ones are the following: *vilarī irāsem* 'all *kiremets*' father'; *šerti kepe* 'earthly fate' (the eldest one of the *vilarī irāsem*'s four sons); *Kutār sultan*; *Sëve šinči irāsem* 'saints found in Sviyazh'; *Čilnē šinči irāsem* 'saints found on the River Chiln'. The medium ones are: *Malim Xuša*, *Mintüpe irāsem*, *Ašulvar irāsem*; and the small ones: *Kěšēn irāsem*, *Vātalāx irāsem*.²⁰⁴ Besides these, there are 5-6 *kiremets* near every village and every sacrificial site, too, which are called *mamalya* (→ *Ma-male*). Furthermore, every Chuvash believes in 12 more *kiremets*, which are in their own and nearby villages (Mil. 138; Nik. I, 496).

Vishnevskiy used a different classification for the *kiremets*, which he interpreted as the principle of bad and evil. He believed that there were a few names generally applied to the *kiremets*, such as *anatra vīrtakan*,²⁰⁵ based on their earthly abode, 'resting/lying²⁰⁶ below [on earth]'. The number of *kiremets* is very large as, besides the generally known *kiremets*, each village had its own *kiremets*, which had a chief, the *ulput kiremečē* 'landlord's (or lord's) *kiremet*', which

²⁰¹ The name *Borodon* first appears in Müller, too, which Skvortsov deciphered as the *kiremet* called *Xura Tāvan* in Il'minsk (Müll. 113; Skv. 141).

²⁰² Müller applied this threefold hierarchic classification not only to the Chuvash but also to the Maris and the Udmurts.

²⁰³ Mil'kovich entitles this list "bad deities or *kiremets* and *irās*". In the names listed by him, as we can see below, the word *kiremet* does not appear even once.

²⁰⁴ In Mil'kovich's article, published in the periodical *Северный архив* (*Northern Archive*) in 1827, these beings appear slightly differently. On this, see the chapter: "Lists of gods and spirits", sub-chapter "Mil'kovich's list".

²⁰⁵ In Vishnevskiy: *анатра вырдагган*.

²⁰⁶ The literal meaning of the Chuvash word *vīrtakan* is 'lying', which is translated by some, especially earlier authors (e.g. Vishnevskiy, Magnitskiy) as 'resting'. In this book, I have retained the translations of the given authors.

could choose its abode freely; therefore, it was sometimes called *irėkre vīrtakan* ‘resting where it pleases [freely lying]’. Vishnevskiy interpreted the compound forms as the great *kiremet*’s helpers or subordinates, of which he recorded the following ones:²⁰⁷ *Măn kiremet umēnče*²⁰⁸ ‘Near the person of the *kiremet* [being before the Great *kiremet*]’; *Măn kiremet Pülěχšě*;²⁰⁹ *Măn kiremet pušě* ‘Opener of the door of the *kiremet*’s abode [Great *kiremet*’s head or leader (?)]’;²¹⁰ *Măn kiremet kepe* ‘The *kiremet*’s envoy’; *Măn kiremet xayar* ‘Great *kiremet*’s servant [Great *kiremet*’s bad one]’; *Măn kiremet tēperě (tipiri)*²¹¹ ‘cleaner of the Great *kiremet*’s abode [Great *kiremet-tipiri*]’. Of these forms, the Great *kiremet* and the Great *kiremet*’s envoy also have a mother: *Măn kiremet amāšě* ‘the Great *kiremet*’s mother’; *Măn kiremet pülěχšě amāšě* [‘the Great *kiremet*’s messenger’s mother’]. According to Vishnevskiy, the Chuvash also distinguished the *kiremet*s on the basis of their actions, dividing them into *xayar* (‘bad, evil’) and *yāvaš* (‘peaceful, calm’) *kiremet*s (Vish. 232-233).²¹² Vishnevskiy regarded the compound *kiremet* names whose first part is a proper noun (e.g. *Surām kiremet*, *Vilri kiremet*) not as mythical beings but as place-names (Vish. 234).

²⁰⁷ After the names, I provide Vishnevskiy’s translation, and use square brackets for clarification.

²⁰⁸ I provide Vishnevskiy’s data in the main text in Latin transliteration based on modern orthography. Vishnevskiy has the following forms: *Мун кереметь увынче*, *Мун кереметь люлюхсь*, *Мун кереметь пуче*, *Мун кереметь кебе*, *Мун кереметь хаярь*, *Мун кереметь тибери*; as well as *Мун кереметь амуж*, *Мун кереметь люлюхсь амуж*.

²⁰⁹ Here, Vishnevskiy did not provide a meaning.

²¹⁰ Vishnevskiy has the form *Мун кереметь пуче*, which is difficult to interpret. The meaning that Vishnevskiy provides does not make it easier to accurately reconstruct the name of this *kiremet*, either. The correction *pušě* was suggested by Skvortsov (Skv. 253), which is semantically hard to interpret, as the Great *Kiremet* probably did not have a head or chief, and even if it had, it would precede it in the order of *kiremet*s (see also: → *Puś*).

²¹¹ See → *Tipiri*.

²¹² Vishnevskiy also notes that the *kiremet*s they do not act with equal force, so the Chuvash distinguish between angry and calm *kiremet*s (Vish. 233).

Sboev listed seven types of *kiremet* as the names of the most typical *kiremet*s: *aslă kiremet*²¹³ ‘the main *kiremet*’ – in the case of general, great disasters (drought, famine, plague) several villages offer sacrifices together to the great or main *kiremet*, while the lesser, local *kiremet*s are offered sacrifices because of local or family misfortunes. *Kēmēl kiremet* ‘silver *kiremet*’ – before embarking upon promising business undertakings, people take silver or tin coins to this *kiremet*, lest it destroy their enterprise. *Pilēk tüpē kiremet* ‘*kiremet* on five mounds’ – a white lamb was offered to it in sacrifice. *Čărăšlăvăr kiremet* ‘*kiremet* in a spruce forest’; *Xērlē-šīr kiremet* – *kiremet* whom the fertility of the earth depends on; it is not the same as the *Xērle-šīr-tură*, which seeks to increase the fertility of the earth, whereas the *kiremet* seeks to decrease it. In order to prevent destruction by this *kiremet*, the Chuvash offered a foal-sacrifice every five years.²¹⁴ *Yăvăš kiremet* ‘peaceful *kiremet*’ – even though it gives people trouble, it is not very grave, and this *kiremet* is easy to placate by sacrificing a small animal. *Xayar kiremet* ‘bad, cruel *kiremet*’ – the cruellest, most formidable deity. It causes people all kinds of trouble and suffering, which gives it pleasure. A black animal (horse, bull or ram) is sacrificed to it, depending on the magnitude of the misfortune caused by it, according to the healer’s advice (Sbo. 86-87).

Based on his collection in Ulkhash village, Mészáros only listed five *kiremet*s of different ranks to whom the Chuvash regularly offered sacrifices. These are: the main good one (*Aslă iră*); the smaller than the main one; the smaller than the two main ones; the smaller than the three main ones; the smallest one (Mész. 39).

²¹³ I unified Sboev’s transcription and provide a Latin transliteration according to modern Chuvash orthography above. The beings appearing there are the following in Sboev: *Асли-кереметь, Кюмюль-кереметь, Пилик-тюбе-кереметь, Чиришлавар-кереметь, Херле-сирь кереметь, Йиваиш-кереметь, Хайар-кереметь*.

²¹⁴ Here, Sboev notes that at the time of such sacrifices, the prayers always include the name *Mikul-Tură*, but nobody was able to tell him why this Christian saint’s name was invoked here (Sbo. 87). On *Mikul-Tură*, see also → *Tură*.

The *kiremet* is one of the main beings of Chuvash beliefs, but also one of the hardest to interpret. The reason for this is not only that the Chuvash assumed the existence of countless *kiremet*s but also that the ideas regarding it are so broad and without clear boundaries that the *kiremet* could assimilate all sorts of, sometimes contradictory, qualities. In the literature, there is a debate as to what extent the *kiremet*s became fearful due to the Orthodox missionary work, which somehow interpreted the *kiremet* as the synonym of Satan (see, e.g. Vovina 2002; Goto 2007). What may help clarify this question is the fact that the notion of the *kiremet* was associated with some object of the Orthodox faith in various forms. According to data collected in the second half of the 19th and at the beginning of the 20th century, certain churches or the icons in a church, or even a late priest's or sexton's former abode could be considered *kiremet*s by the Chuvash (on more about this, see: Dallos 2012).

Kuykäräš

I. 'treasure-hoarding imaginary figure' (Mész. 49; 96); *kuykäräš*, *kuykäruš* 'fairy-tale bird which makes people rich; snake hatching from a bird's egg (?)' (Ashm. VI, 255-256); 'devil, evil spirit' (Ashm. I, 166). **II.** '1. (folklore) bird of good luck, 2. quiet person' (CRS). A very diligent person is said to "work like a *kuykäräš*" (Mész. 49). **IV.** mythical story: Mész. 49.

This mythical being is only discussed in detail by Mészáros. Ashmarin describes it as a fairy-tale creature, and once mentions it as a devil, an evil spirit, along with the → *Alpastă*.

As far as Mészáros was informed, a long-lived cock was able to lay an egg from which a *kuykäräš* would hatch, which would then hoard all kinds of treasure for its master. However, since it always has to be given work to do, the farmer would want to get rid of it after a while. In this case, the *kuykäräš* must be entrusted with an impossible task that it cannot perform. The *kuykäräš* then, in shame, finds another master for itself, and takes all the treasure with it.

Mamale

I. ‘one of the names of the small *kiremets*’ (Mil.: Nik. I, 496); *mamale*, *mamali*, *mamalē*, *mamalle* ‘1. Name of a deity (Ashm. VIII, 185-186); as well as *me-mele*, *memelle* ‘id.’ (Ashm. VIII, 223-224). **II.** *мамаля* ‘cripple, poor man, cottar’, *мамаля-окси* ‘money left at the sacrificial place’ (Zol. 42); ‘sacrificial coins’ (Ashm. VIII, 185; Sbo. 90; Mész. 148, 182); in a similar sense, also: *mamala okši* and *ma-melelēχ ukša* ‘money to buy the sacrificial animal with’ (Ashm. VIII, 187); *mamalā* ‘tin’ (Ashm. VIII, 187); *mamali* ‘small sacrificial buttered flat bread’ (Elle 46). **III.** In Osm., *muamele* means ‘behaviour; bargain, transaction, deal, procedure’ (TuRS 634), as well as ‘behaviour; profit, gain, interest’ (Rad. IV, 2169.), and in Az., *müamilā* means ‘behaviour, attitude, interest’ (AFS 398). The word is of Arabic origin; Zolotnitskiy related it to the Arabic word *mal* ‘wealth’ (Zol. 42), which cannot be supported. Radloff traces it back to Ar. word *معاملة* (*mu‘āmala*) (Rad. IV, 2169), which today means: ‘1. behaviour; thing, trade’ (ARS 542). With similar etymology, see also: Ashm. VIII, 186; Fed. I, 341.

Originally, the word probably meant the coins scattered as sacrifice or the money collected for a sacrificial animal, and it was later applied to the spirit or deity to whom the sacrifice was offered. The majority of the literature does not regard it as a mythical being, but there are several pagan Chuvash deities and spirits which originally meant prayer, sacrifice or the place of the sacrifice (e.g. → *Xārpan*, → *Kēlē*, → *Kiremet*), but over time, they were personified and worshipped.

The *mamale* was first recorded by Mil’kovich in the 18th century. It was found at places of prayer or by hedges and walls. Only the smallest *kiremets* were called *mamale*, which were worshipped locally, in one or two villages and were only offered coins as a sacrifice (Mil.: Nik. I, 496).

In the first half of the 19th century, Vishnevskiy mentions it as the name of silver coins and tin pieces found at the sacrificial places, together with the *noχrat* (Vish. 234). Descriptions by Sboev and Mészáros also include such coins offered to the *kiremets* (Sbo. 90; Mész. 14, 182). Zolotnitskiy describes the *mamalya*-money as coins left at the places of prayer, which could have earlier been left as alms for the poor and disabled. He must have arrived at this interpretation from the meaning of the word known to him as ‘crippled, unable to work, poor’; however, several records testify that no Chuvash would ever touch the coins scattered at the sacrificial places.

According to Rekeev, *mamale* (in his spelling: *memele*) is the name of the prayer said to *Kepe*, in which it is asked to make the other spirits benevolent towards people. Besides, in his own family, *mamale* was the name of a prayer said to three local, lesser spirits (Rek. 1898, 190).

Nikěs

I. ‘leader of the foundation’ (Magn. 62); ‘foundation (name of a deity or spirit)’ (Magn. 85); *karta nikěšě* ‘foundation of the farm-yard (name of a spirit)’ (Magn. 52); *mol nikěs* ‘foundation of wealth (name of a spirit)’ (Magn. 88); *uy nikěšě* ‘name of a spirit’ (Ashm. IX, 22) [‘foundation of the meadow and field’]; *nikěs tītan* ‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. IX, 23) [‘holder of the foundation’]; *nikěs tu* ‘name of a *kiremet*’ (Ashm. IX, 23) [‘foundation maker’]. **II.** *huzuc* ‘found(ation), founding (Zol. 45); ‘base, foundation’ (Ashm. IX, 22). **III.** The word exists in some Kipchak and Turki languages with the same meaning, e.g. Kyrg. *negiz*, *neñiz* ‘(in various meanings:) base, foundation’ (Yud. II, 56); Tat. ‘base, foundation, essence’ (TRS 398); Bash. *nigeđ* ‘1. (noun and adj.) found(ation), 2. test paper, 3. essence’ (BRS 458-459). In Chuvash, the word is of Tatar origin (Räs. 352); on Turkic data, see also: Egor. 139; Fed. I, 374. **IV.** prayer: Magn. 52, 58, 59-60, 84-87; 108-109.

Magnitskiy lists it in two beer-sacrifice god-lists among the deities invoked: № 15 in the Maslovoy and № 32 in the Bishev list. Furthermore, it also appears in compound form in the sacrificial prayer offered to the spirits of the farmyard as *karta nikěšě* ‘farmyard’s foundation’, and as item 16 in the Cheshlam beer-sacrifice god-list: *mol nikěs* ‘wealth foundation’.²¹⁵ In addition to Magnitskiy’s data, Ashmarin mentions two more mythical creatures whose compound names include the word *nikěs*: *uy nikěšě* [‘meadow’s foundation’] and *nikěs tītan* [‘foundation holder’]. Both of Ashmarin’s data were collected in Belebeyev. We have no other data for the abstract, supernatural meaning of *nikěs*. It ought to be mentioned that, at the time of building a house, when the foundation was laid and the *nikěs niměřě* ‘foundation’s porridge’ ceremony held, they did not pray to *nikěs* but to *šěr yīš*, the earth’s master.²¹⁶ The same ceremony was

²¹⁵ I quote this prayer under Magn. 52.

²¹⁶ I quote this prayer under Magn. 108-109.

also known among Tatars by the name *nigez botkası*, also meaning ‘foundation’s porridge’ (on the Tatar ceremony: Yus. 356).

Pereket

I. *Pereket Tură* ‘god of abundance’, *Pereket Amăšë* ‘its mother’ (Mil.: Nik. I, 495); *nepezzemь Topa* ‘god of wealth’ (Sbo. 81); its compounds: the god of abundance’s mother and children,²¹⁷ as well as: *yëtem perekečë* ‘gain and increase of the threshing yard’, *kăšăl perekečë* ‘gain and increase of the stack’ (Sbo. 81); ‘god of abundance’ (Nik. II, 132); ‘4. name of a deity’ (Ashm. IX, 166); *perečet* ‘id.’ (Ashm. IX, 167); ‘god of frugality and wealth’ (Sal. 466). Its compound forms in Magnitskiy: *uy perekečë* ‘spirit who gifts the field its gain’ (Magn. 68); ‘field’s gain’ (Magn. 89); *item perekeče* ‘gift-giver to the threshing yard’ (Magn. 68); ‘success of the threshing yard’ (Magn. 89), ‘name of a *kiremet*’ (Magn. 86), *kăšăl perekeče* ‘spirit who gifts gain (to the threshed stack of grain)’ (Magn. 68), ‘success of the stack’ (Magn. 89); *kil perekeče* ‘gift-giver of the house’ (Magn. 68), ‘success of the house’ (Magn. 89); *karta perekeče* ‘gift-giver of the farmyard’ (Magn. 68); *këlet perekečë* ‘gift-giver of the shed/pantry’ (Magn. 68). In Ashmarin: *pereket amăšë* and *pereket aššë* ‘female deity and name of a deity from the eighth round’ (Shevle: Ashm. XI, 166) [‘abundance’s father and abundance’s mother’]; *pereket parakan* ‘name of a deity from the eighth round’ (Ashm. IX, 167) [‘abundance-giver’]; *pereket tïtan*, *pereket torri* ‘names of deities’ (Ashm. IX, 167) [‘abundance-keeper’ and ‘god of abundance’]; in Shevle’s manuscript, the second to sixth deities of the eighth round: *Item perekečë*, *uy perekečë*, *Pereket amëš*, *Pereket aššë*, *Pereket parakan* (Ashm. III, 67); *šol perekečë* ‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. XII, 219).²¹⁸ **II.** ‘1. abundance, 2. savings; 3. rain’ (Ashm. IX, 166); ‘abundance, gain, savings’ (Zol. 47); ‘abundance’ (Paa. 95); ‘1. wealth, 2. savings, 3. wealth, abundance’ (Skvor. 285). **III.** Of Turkic languages, it exists in several Kipchak, Oguz and Turki languages, meaning ‘abundance, donation, wealth’ (cf. Räs. 70, Egor. 154, Fed. I, 414). It got into Chuvash through Tatar mediation (Paa. 95; Scher. 23). The Arabic origin of the word was already suggested by Sboev (Sbo. 81) – Ar. بركة (*baraka*) ‘blessing’ (ARS 67). It probably got into Turkic languages through Persian mediation (on the Persian data, see: Gaf. I, 101). Malov’s Hebrew origination of the word *barak* ‘blessing, mercy’ (Malov 1882, 26) in this form is wrong (actually, it can only be taken into account in the case of the Semitic etymology of the word). **IV.** prayer: Magn. 53; 59-60, 84-87; 91-92, 187-188; Rek. 1898, 184-185.

²¹⁷ Sboev did not record these in Chuvash.

²¹⁸ Here, Ashmarin refers to Magnitskiy; however, at the given place (p. 59), no mythical being appears but a prayer says: “Let the road rejoice with gain!”. In this case, God (*Tură*) is invoked in the prayer, which is included in the Anthology under Magn. 59-60.

The first record where the *pereket* appears as a mythical being is Mil'kovich's description from the 18th century. Mil'kovich mentions the names *Pereket Tură* and *Pereket Amășă* ('*Pereket* God and *Pereket*'s Mother') as numbers 12 and 13 among the 33 good deities (Mil.: Nik. I, 495).

In Sboev's list, № 13 among the celestial good deities is *Pereket*-God, the god of abundance, mentioned together with its mother and children, as well as the gain or increase of the threshing yard and the stack. *Pereket tură* and its family have the power to give abundance to people in their vital needs; they gave the abundance of the land's yield and also guarded the treasures hidden in the earth (Sbo. 81; repeated by Nikol'skiy, who claims that the compound forms "gain of the threshing-yard and the stack" are actually forms that became independent by the personification of specific aspects of the deity *Pereket tură*: Nik. II, 132-133).

It appears in various compounds in several of Magnitskiy's beer-sacrifice lists, and Shevle also listed several of its compound forms in the eighth round of the deities.²¹⁹ Salmin, repeating some of this data, discusses the figure of *pereket* among the "other deities"²²⁰ (Sal. 466).

On the basis of the word's primary meaning ('abundance, wealth'), this mythical being belongs to the semantic circle which, together with the names of several other Chuvash deities and spirits, is associated with the sacrifice, its place, the prayer said there and the object of the prayer, and when these factors became names of deities (such as → *Kělě*, → *Kiremet*, → *Čük*, → *Xărpan*, → *Mamale*).

Piḡampar

I. *Пиҫамбар* (deity) (Geor. 176); 'messenger of fate' (Mil.: Nik. I, 495); 'protector of animals from wolves and other beasts; protector of fire' (Mil.: Nik. I, 498); *пиҫамбарь* 'wolf-God, patron' (VishN. 130); 'spirit protecting the flock or herd and people from wolves and bears (as God's helper)' (Vish. 232); '1. giving people their spiritual character according to *Kepe*'s instructions; giving the healer the ability to

²¹⁹ On Magnitskiy's and Shevle's data, see the introduction to the entry.

²²⁰ Salmin discusses the deities and the spirits in separate groups. He divides the deities into three big groups: celestial, *kiremet*-type and other deities.

see into the future; 2. protector of domestic animals (from beasts, over which it has power)' (Sbo. 81; Zol. 202); 'prophet' (Magn. 88); 'guardian of wolves' (Rek. 420); 'ruler of beasts, wolves (and bears)' (Paa. 102); 'master of wolves' (Mész. 23, 469); '1. god of fire; 2. giver of the soul and protector of healers; 3. protector of livestock' (Nik. II, 132); *Piḡampar*, *Piḡanpar* '1. giver of good qualities to people, giver of the ability to see into the future to the healer; protector of domestic animals from beasts; 2. guardian angel; 3. prophet; 4. chief (master or prince) of wolves, god of beasts' (Ashm. V, 34; VI, 15; IX, 251-252; X, 57); 'name of the spirit which gives good qualities to people and protects domestic animals from predators' (Sir. 281); '1. name of the spirit which gives good qualities to people; 2. guardian angel' (Skvor. 299); 'messenger of fate' (ME II, 538). **III.** Persian loan word پیغمبر (*peygāmbar*, *peygāmbār*) 'prophet' پیغام (*paygām*) 'message, news' (Zol. 202; Egor. 162-163). It exists in the language of several Islamised Turkic peoples, e.g. tafsir XII-XIII. *paygambar* 'envoy, prophet'; Bash; Uyg. *päygāmbār*, Tat. *päygambār*, Kyrg; Kaz. *paygambar*, Osm. *peygamber*, Nog. *payḡambar*, Kum. *payḡammar*, Kara. *bay-ganbar* 'prophet' (Egor. 162-163; see also: Räs. 382; Fed. I, 438; Scher. 164-168). **IV.** mythical story: Inf. 19-22; prayer: Vish. 239-240; Magn. 30, 53/2, 58, 59-60, 84-87, 91-92, 115-116; Pav. 27/8; Mész. 23.

Piḡampar appears in the Chuvash belief system with two different meanings. It is a celestial deity which is strongly related to the concept of fate and, as the ruler of wild beasts or wolves, it is also the protector of domestic animals. According to Mészáros, these two features can be separated along geographical lines: in the south, it is associated with the animals and in the north, it is known as a sky-dwelling spirit, similar to → *Pülēḡšě* (Mész. 23). However, this assumption is somewhat contradicted by the fact that in the 18th century, Mil'kovich knew both meanings; in addition, on the basis of the sound form of the data he recorded, Mil'kovich relied on Northern Chuvash (Viryal) data. On the other hand, it is precisely Mészáros who quotes a northern beer-sacrifice prayer in which *Piḡampar* is asked to hold his dogs (actually, wolves)²²¹ and not to destroy the livestock (Mész. 161-162).²²²

In some records, *Piḡampar* is the lord, master, or god of wild beasts or wolves (*kaškārsen turri*, *kayāk xuśa*). In this capacity,

²²¹ On wolves being *Piḡampar*'s dogs, see: Mész. 94.

²²² The relevant three lines of the prayer: "Hey, *Piḡampar*, have mercy / silence your dogs / don't let them destroy our livestock!" (Mész. 161-162).

people pray to it²²³ to protect their livestock and the farmyard and not to release his wolves. Mil'kovich also recorded that this mythical being was originally also associated with fire, which he tries to prove by his observation that, at the time of brewing beer, the Chuvash would not light the fire under the cauldron until they prayed to *Piḡampar* (Mil.: Nik. I, 498). On the basis of this, Sboev believed that *Piḡampar* may originally have been a Fire God, and with time, its meaning narrowed and it became the protector of shepherds and even later, of livestock (Sbo. 81; also adopted by Nikol'skiy: Nik. II, 132). The original meaning of the Persian word 'prophet' and the only reference, recorded by Mil'kovich, which can be interpreted in various ways, does not support this theory at all. As we can see in the data provided above, the original meaning of the word, 'prophet', also appears in Chuvash. That this is not only a retrospective analytical observation is demonstrated by some compounds occurring in a few sources, such as the forms *Ali piḡampar* (Ashm. I, 110) and *Muḡamet piḡampar* (Ashm. IX, 252). It may also be related to its meaning 'prophet' that the Chuvash attributed the healer's ability to foresee the future to a gift given by *Piḡampar* (on the connection with seeing into the future, see: Sbo. 81; Zol. 202).

Mil'kovich also recorded *Piḡampar*'s nature associated with the fate of humans. According to this, on the instructions of → *Kepe*, its two helpers, *Piḡampar* and *Pülëḡśě* give people the various characteristic features and spiritual nature (Mil.: Nik. I, 498). This description was adopted by Sboev and Nikol'skiy, too, among others (Mil.: Nik. I, 498; Sbo. 81; Nik. II, 132).

Pirěšti

I. 'angel' (Munk. 42; Mész. 19; Nik. I, 133; ME II, 538); 'angel, guardian spirit, soul, ghost' (Paa. 103); 'good spirit, angel' (Egor. 161; CRS 297); 'personal guardian deity' (Sal. 59). **III.** The Persian word فرشته (*firišta*) got into Chuvash through Tatar mediation (on the Persian origin and further Turkic data, see: Egor. 161; Räs. 145; Fed. II, 434; Scher. 5, 65). **IV.** mythical story: Rek. 419.

²²³ Such is the prayer extract quoted in the previous footnote.

We only know descriptions of the *pirěšti* from the very end of the 19th century; no trace of it is found in any of the earlier sources. It is described in the records in three different ways: as a personal guardian angel, as some notion of the soul and as a house spirit.

The first detailed description was given by Rekeev, who described the *pirěštis* as the most significant spirits after *Pülěxšě*, as angels who protect people from all kinds of evil. According to his collection, a *pirěšti* lives inside every human being, and if someone sleeps with their mouth open, it comes out in the shape of a little white animal.²²⁴ Immediately before a person's death, the *pirěšti* departs from the body (Rek. 419-420).

In Mészáros, the *pirěšti* is a personal, always invisible angel who walks beside and looks after people throughout their lives; as Mészáros puts it, it follows people everywhere except to the tavern.²²⁵ In the north, where Christianity spread earlier and sank deeper, it is not called *pirěšti*, but → *Ankěl*²²⁶ which, after a person's death, leads the soul through the person's life in forty days, showing it its good and bad deeds (Mész. 19–20). Mészáros's assumption that the *pirěšti* would be identical with the mythical creature called *Tură uměnce šüreken* 'going before God', cannot be substantiated.

To Paasonen's knowledge, the dead also each have a *pirěšti*, which goes to the commemoration of the dead – which is why Paasonen interprets the word as also meaning 'soul' or 'ghost' (Paa. 103). Paasonen also writes that every person actually has two *pirěštis*; one sent by God and the other by Satan. The *pirěšti* appointed by God sits on a person's right shoulder and leads them on the path of good, and the one appointed by Satan sits on the left shoulder, leading the person on the path of evil (ibid). Ashmarin recorded a similar, although not identical, description in Belebeyev. According to this, the angel sitting on the right shoulder records the person's good deeds, whereas the one sitting on the left shoulder records the bad ones (AshmVv. 2728).

²²⁴ I quote such a mythical story under Rek. 419.

²²⁵ This remark also suggests that the figure of *pirěšti* is a rather late arrival.

²²⁶ In Mészáros: *ānχel, tōrren ānχelǵa*.

In a description from Chistopol, the *pirěšti* is mixed with the characteristics of house spirits: every house has its own *pirěšti*, who lives on the stove and the people offer it sacrifices by putting food on the stove (AshmVv. 28).²²⁷ On the basis of more recent collections, it seems that the *pirěšti* has gradually assumed the role of a house spirit (cf. MLX 79).

Puš (x's pušě)

I. *puš* ‘head, chief’; its compounds: *čikě pušlaχě* ‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. XV, 200) [‘head of the dividing line or margin’]; *karta puš(ě)* ‘name of a spirit, head of the stable’ (Ashm. VI, 114); *Kapma nyce* ‘master-spirit of the stable, or lord of the stable (pen)’ (ME II, 538.); *kil puš(ě)* ‘2. Name of a spirit; something like the *χěrt šurt*, house angel’ (Ashm. VI, 212); *kiremet pušě* or *pušlaχě* ‘*kiremet*’s chief’ (Ashm. VI, 239); *masar pušě* ‘cemetery’s head (chief)’ (Magn. 190; Mész. 43; Ashm. VII, 205); Моргарды бось ‘head from Urazmetyev’²²⁸ (Magn. 89); *šū bōžə* ‘water’s head’ (Mész. 74); *vārman pušě* (Ashm. V, 323) [‘forest’s chief’]. **II.** *puš* ‘head (leader), person, end, facade of a building, front part, beginning’ (Ashm. X, 15-31); *kil puši* ‘1. host’ (Ashm. VI, 212); *šu pošě* ‘spring (of water)’ (Ashm. XVII, 207); **III.** The word is from a Turkic etymon, recorded since the earliest sources and it exists in all Turkic languages. OT. *baš* ‘head, leader; beginning’ (cf. Cl. 375); on its Modern Turkic data, see: Räs. 64; Sev. II, 85-88; Egor. 168; Fed. I, 452. **IV.** prayer: (*karta puš*) Magn. 115-116; (*masar pušě*) Ashm. XV, 56; (*šiv pušě*) Mész. 75; incantation: (*masar pušě*) Magn. 152.

The word *puš* ‘head’ itself does not belong to the mythical beings, but because it often occurs as the second part of their names, I devoted a separate entry to it.

The *kil puš(ě)* ‘house’s head’ can probably be related to the figure of the → *Xěrt šurt*, and may be paralleled with the beings which

²²⁷ They also invoked it in prayer, asking it to protect them in their sleep and to provide orientation during their travels.

²²⁸ Place-name, given like this by Magnitskiy as based on Zolotnitskiy’s data. Zolotnitskiy starts from a Chuvash village name, Morgar (Zol. 248), but Ashmarin presumes a form *mur karti puš*, which means: ‘chief-guardian of the animal cemetery where the animals that died in the epidemic were buried’ (Ashm. VIII, 272 – the Chuvash word *mur* means ‘infectious disease’, cf. Ashm. VIII, 269). Ashmarin’s suggestion is probably correct, so the name of this *kiremet* is simply ‘chief of the epidemic or animal cemetery’, which form is parallel with other ‘cemetery’s chief’ forms.

occur in a few god-lists (such as *kilti tură* ‘house God’ and *kil turri* ‘house’s god’), whose responsibility is also to ensure the protection of the house. Due to the scarcity of data, we cannot decide if it is related to the figures of *kil xuši* and *kil tuxmarě*.²²⁹

According to Chuvash beliefs, various beings also lived in the stable and pens, not just in the house. One of these is the *karta pušě* ‘stable’s head’²³⁰ which being, as it turns out from the records referenced by Ashmarin, was regarded as the protector and guardian of livestock (Ashm. VI, 114). Magnitskiy recorded a prayer, at the beginning of which God, the creator of grain and livestock, was invoked, but at the end, the *karta puš* was called upon to implement the breeding of the cattle that was requested (Magn. 115).²³¹

In terms of learning about the otherworldly notions of the Chuvash,²³² another important being is the *masar pušě* ‘cemetery’s chief’, which Mészáros identified with → *Esrel*, the personified figure of death (Mész. 43). Their full identification is probably not correct, as in the other descriptions, the *masar pušě* appears as the first of the dead buried in a given cemetery (e.g. Magn. 190; Ashm. VII, 205). Thus, as a mythical being, it was rather a specific local spirit, relating to the world of the dead. The same is suggested by Mészáros’s note that at the time of funerals, the *masar pušě* was asked for a piece of land (Mész. 214). However, as suggested by a song recorded by Ashmarin (Ashm. XV, 56),²³³ the *masar pušě* also played some role in the other world (*leš tēnče*), which the pagan Chuvash regarded as similar to this one in many respects. Magnitskiy has a form *murkarti puš*, which is not clear, but it was probably a

²²⁹ This being appears in Ashmarin’s dictionary without any context, with a reference whose explanation cannot be found among the abbreviations of the dictionary. Ashmarin only provides the meaning ‘house spirit’ (Ashm. VI, 213).

²³⁰ Another such being is the *karta sīxčēi* ‘protector of the stable (sty, pen)’, as well as the *karta xuši* ‘master of the stable (sty, pen)’ (→ *Xuša*), on these, see: Ashm. VI, 114-115.

²³¹ I quote this prayer under Magn 115-116.

²³² On this briefly, see → *Vilě*.

²³³ It is the song of the ‘cemetery’s head’ (*masar pušlaχě*), which I quote in the Anthology under Ashm. XV, 56.

kiremet meaning ‘head of the plague or animal cemetery’. (I discuss this in slightly more detail in the footnote to Magnitskiy’s data in the introduction to the entry).

A similar feature – being associated with an external site (inhabited by non-humans) – is shared by the figure *čikě pušlaxě* ‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. XV, 200), literally, ‘head of the border (borderline, margin)’. Unfortunately, without a context, it is not possible to determine its nature more accurately, nor its relationship to another being associated with the field margin (→ *Ana iyi*).

The *kiremet pušě* ‘kiremet’s head’ may have already occurred in Vishnevskiy,²³⁴ and Ashmarin also describes such a figure (*kiremet pušě* or *pušlaxě*) ‘head of the ceremony (name of a spirit)’ (Ashm. VI, 239). Ashmarin interprets it in the following way: here, the *kiremet* is the place itself and its head is the “*kiremet* itself”. This being is rather strange (we have no more data for it), as the *kiremet* on its own already means the place itself as well as the spirit living there (see also → *Kiremet*).

Among the names of the various water spirits (→ *Šiv*), Mészáros recorded *šu xoši* ‘water’s master’ (→ *Xuša*) and *šu pošě* ‘water’s head’, which lived in lakes and were offered sacrifices at the time of fishing (Mész. 74-75). There is one piece of data for the lord of the forest, in the form *vārman pušě* (Ashm. V, 323), which may be a variant of the being *vārman turri* ‘forest’s god’ or the *vārmanti* ‘of/from a forest’ (data on both of them: Ashm. V, 323). Due to the scattered data, almost without context, their relationship with the → *Ar-šuri* is hard to clarify.

Püləxšě

I. *Полихс* ‘name of a deity’ (Geor, 176); *тюлхс* ‘name of a deity’ (Pal. 159); *пилюгсе, пилюхся* ‘prescriber of the fate of those on earth’ (Mil.: Nik. I, 495); *Пиликсе* ‘God’s helper’ (Fuks 1840, 92); *Pêlixé* ‘God’s helper’ (Thomas: Anderson

²³⁴ It is a problematic piece of data, as Vishnevskiy has a form: *kiremet puče* (‘opener of the door of the *kiremet*’s abode’), which is hard to interpret, and which was corrected by Skvortsov in the following way: *kiremet pušě* ‘the head (chief) of the *kiremet*’ (see → *Kiremet*).

1906, 11); *Пюлюхъ* ‘good spirit’, *Пюлюхси* ‘angel’ (VishN. 138); *Пюлюхсь* ‘messenger’ (Vish. 232); *пюлюхси* ‘fate-giver (as instructed by *Ке́пе*)’ (Sbo. 80–81; with the same interpretation: Nik. II, 133, Ashm. X, 80–81); *пӱлӱх*, *пӱлӱхси* ‘angel, distributor’ (Zol. 55–56); *пӱлӱхси* ‘distributor, messenger’ (Magn. 29); ‘archangel’ (Magn. 87); *пӱлӱхсӑ* ‘good spirit closest to God, distributor’ (Mész. 17; with similar meaning: Skv. 245); ‘ill-willed spirit, which can withhold the good things given by God’ (Paa. 111); ‘God’s messenger, helper’ (Sal. 396). **III.** Derivative of the verb *pül-*. Its Turkic data: OT. *böl-* ‘divide, separate, differentiate’ (cf. Cl. 375; DTS 117); modern Turkic data: Rad. IV, 1302–1304; Sev. II, 214–217; Räs. 84; Paa. 111; Egor. 17; Fed. I, 459. The OT noun derived from the verb, *bölük* ‘section, part’ (Cl. 339), exists in many of the Modern Turkic languages (see the literature at the verb). The Chuvash suffix *-śě* is probably the equivalent of the ComTurk. agental suffix (nomen agentis) *-çi*, or possibly the ComTurk. diminutive suffix *-čik*, but this is less probable (Ashm. 1921, 10). Sboev suggested that the name may have been created as the translation of the Tatar (originally Arabic) name *Qasim* (‘the one who distributes’) (Sbo. 80–81; as well as: Zol. 56); and Ashmarin found it conceivable that it was preserving the memory of a Volga Bulgarian title (Ashm. 1921, 10; briefly repeated: AshmVv. 25). **IV.** mythical story: Rek. 418–419; Inf. 19–22; prayer: Vish. 239–240, 240–241; Magn. 30, 58, 59–60, 84–87, 91–92; Pav. 26, 27/1–4, 27–28, 28; Rekeev 1898, 184–185; AshmVv. 9/1; Elle 47–52 (prayer 2).

In the majority of prayers, *Pülěχśě* is the second or third deity invoked after God (*Tură*) or God’s mother (*Tură amăśě*). This fact gave rise to the interpretation (shared by the majority of the literature) that it must have been the most important celestial deity after God. However, this notion is somewhat contradicted by the fact that *Pülěχśě* appears in several compounds where the first part is a certain lesser deity or spirit, e.g. *vilě pülěχśě* ‘definer of the dead’ (Ashmarin 1921, 4.);²³⁵ *Măn kiremet pülěχśě*²³⁶ ‘the great *kiremet*’s messenger’ (Vish. 233); *Ке́пе uměñčě śüreken pülěχśě* [*pülěχśě* going before *Ке́пе*]

²³⁵ In this list, Ashmarin provides several figures related to the dead, such as the scribe of the dead; the chief of the cemetery; the head and the representative of the dead, etc. (Ashmarin 1921, 4).

²³⁶ I provide Vishnevskiy’s and Magnitskiy’s data above in Latin transliteration based on modern orthography. The following forms appear in the original works: *Мун кереметь пюлюхсь* (Vish. 233); *Ке́бе умыньче сӱрегень Пӱлӱхси* (Magn. 197); *Асла ыра умыньчэ сӱрегень пӱлӱхси*, *Хирле сӱыр умыньчэ сӱрегень пӱлӱхсь*, *Килэ умыньчэ сӱрегень пӱлӱхсь* (Magn. 113).

(Magn. 197);²³⁷ *Aslā irā uměncě šüreken pülěχšě* [‘*pülěχšě* going before a Great good’]; *Xěrle šir uměncě šüreken pülěχšě* [‘*Pülěχšě* going before the red bank’]; *Kilē* or *Kělē uměncě šüreken pülěχšě* [‘*Pülěχšě* going before the house (or prayer?)’]²³⁸ (Magn. 111).²³⁹

The first known detailed record regarding *Pülěχšě* dates from the second half of the 18th century. Mil’kovich describes *Pülěχšě* as fate (*Kepe*)’s messenger, who writes the fate of the new-born child on its forehead. This piece of data is not only important because it is very early, but also because some of the later literature also relied on Mil’kovich’s work as their source (e.g. Sbo. 80-81; Nik. II, 133; Sal. 397). Nevertheless, Ashmarin remarked that there was actually no other data for such a close relationship of *Kepe* and *Pülěχšě* (AshmVv. 24). Ashmarin even cites an example where *Kepe* is actually *Pülěχšě*’s “subordinate”, in the same line as → *Piχampar* (AshmVv. 32). In Vishnevskiy’s record from 1846, *Pülěχšě* has the meaning ‘messenger’. However, it is the first named deity after God, God’s mother and God’s “servants”, highlighting its special position, which is further reinforced by the fact that only God, *Pülěχšě* and *Kiremet* have servants (door-opener and somebody going before them). Its meaning as ‘messenger’ might be the reason why 19th-century Orthodox literature translated the word ‘angel’ as *pülěχšě* (see: Zol. 56; Magn. 87-88).

²³⁷ This being appears in connection with a prayer recited in the family if all of their children died, where the first part of the name of every deity invoked is *Kepe*. The form mentioned above is preceded by *Kepe*, *Kepe*’s father and *Kepe*’s mother and followed by names like *Kepe*’s wrath or evil, *Kepe*’s misfortune, etc.

²³⁸ The word *kil(ē)*, meaning ‘house’, appears in Ashmarin’s dictionary in the names of a few deities and spirits, e.g. *kil turri* ‘house’s god’, *kil tuχmarē* ‘house spirit’ (Ashm. VI, 213). Mil’kovich also has a form *Кулпан Топа*, meaning ‘house spirit’, which Nikol’skiy interprets as *kilti turā* (Nik. I, 495). In Zolotnitskiy’s dictionary, *kil*’ also occurs with the meaning ‘prayer’, related to the Tatar word *kiläü* ‘worship, service’ (Zol. 34. see also → *Kělē*); however, it is not entirely clear what it means in Magnitskiy’s list, as he does not provide any kind of meaning. On the basis of parallel forms, it is much more probable that it is not the word meaning ‘house’ here, but the word → *Kělē*.

²³⁹ The last three figures are found in Magnitskiy, among the deities invoked at the goose sacrifice.

According to Mészáros, one of *Pülěχšě*'s most important characteristics is that it delivers people's prayers to God (although he mentions in connection with the etymology of the word that, as a good spirit nearest to God, *Pülěχšě* may have some kind of a distributive function).²⁴⁰ Thus, if *Pülěχšě* becomes angry for some reason, it will prevent the prayer from reaching God; therefore, a small porridge and flat bread sacrifice is offered to it annually. This earthly sacrifice and its role to deliver prayers relate *Pülěχšě* to → *Xārpan* (at least on the basis of how Vishnevskiy described *Xārpan*'s role). Paasonen not only interprets *Pülěχšě* as an ill-willed spirit, but also claims that, in the communication between the earthly and the celestial worlds, it may actually prevent heavenly gifts (good things coming from God) from reaching people (Paa. 111). Rekeev also knows of similar data, quoting a saying: "Even if God were to give it, but *Pülěχšě* grants it not, the good things (*iră*) will not be visible" (Rekeev 1905; I cite it from Ashmarin 1921, 5). Its relationship with → *Xěrlě-šir* is suggested by the data in a manuscript Chuvash prayer collection, quoted by Ashmarin, which says that, after the sacrifice offered to God, a smaller sacrifice was offered to *Pülěχšě* and *Xěrlě-šir*, where the sacrificial porridge was cooked in a large pot for the former and in a small pot for the latter. It is also mentioned in this manuscript that the Chuvash say that if *Pülěχšě* and *Xěrlě-šir* do not grant it, then God will not give, either (Ashm. 1921, 29 < *Čavăš kělěsem*, 10).²⁴¹

Ashmarin believed that *Pülěχšě*'s name appears primarily in prayers said in order to avoid natural disasters and the evil eye (AshmVv 24). In fact, it can be linked to a wider range of phenomena, as it is also invoked in the beer sacrifice, goose sacrifice, field sacrifice, as well as at the sacrifice offered for rain (cf. e.g. Magnitskiy, Mészáros, PK texts).

²⁴⁰ In 1921, this role is mentioned by Ashmarin as the most common meaning of *Pülěχšě* at the time (Ashm. 1921, 5).

²⁴¹ I provide a more detailed variety of this saying, embedded in a story, under Rek. 418-419.

In Nikifor Pavlovich's *Notebook of Sacrifices*, it appears in various compounds in prayers to avert harm inflicted by evil spirits, and Shevle's manuscript also includes several compound forms whose second part is *Pülëχšě*, for example 'son-daughter-creating *Pülëχšě*',²⁴² 'grain-creating *Pülëχšě*',²⁴³ 'livestock-creating *Pülëχšě*',²⁴⁴ 'soul-creating *Pülëχšě*',²⁴⁵ 'Adam *Pülëχšě*',²⁴⁶ 'Earth *Pülëχšě*', 'Water *Pülëχšě*'.²⁴⁷ At the beginning of the entry, I already noted the contradiction that on one hand, *Pülëχšě* occupies a prominent place in the god-lists, but on the other hand, it also appears as the subordinate of lesser deities and spirits. In the background to this, we can perhaps assume the disintegration of a stricter hierarchical order that had once existed, which can also be surmised in the case of → *Tură* 'God, deity'. *Pülëχšě* on its own or in compounds such as *Aslă Pülëχšě* 'Great *Pülëχšě*' and *Pülëχ Tură* '*Pülëχ* God' could have been the name of a specific deity (whose exact meaning, function and characteristics can hardly be defined today), and as it lost (part of) its exact and specific nature, its meaning simply shifted towards 'some deity'. Ashmarin suggested another possible direction of this process, too, according to which *Pülëχšě* approached God (*Tură*) in its meaning, which might be supported by the phrase occurring in certain

²⁴² *Бвѣл-хѣр љратакан Пүлѣхѣи* is the third deity of the second round of gods (Shevle: Ashm. III, 66).

²⁴³ *Вьльѣх-чѣрлѣх љратакан турă* is the third deity of the third round of gods. At the end of the round is an independent *Pülëχšě* form, which also appears as the second member of the first round (Shevle: Ashm. III, 66).

²⁴⁴ *Вьльѣх-чѣрлѣх љратакан Пүлѣхѣи* is the sixth deity of the third round. (Shevle: Ashm. III, 66).

²⁴⁵ This form appears in Pavlovich in various forms: *čun šurakan Pülëχšě* 'soul-birthing or creating *Pülëχšě*', *čun šurakan Pülëχšě amăšě* 'soul-birthing or creating *Pülëχšě*'s mother', *čun püren Pülëχšě* 'soul-giving *Pülëχšě*', *čun püren Pülëχšě amăšě* 'soul-giving *Pülëχšě*'s mother' (Pav.: Ashmarin 1921, 27).

²⁴⁶ The latter two pieces of data are provided by Nikifor Pavlovich among the prayers used against harm inflicted by evil spirits (Pav.: Ashmarin 1921, 27).

²⁴⁷ The latter two data are provided by Nikifor Pavlovich among the prayers used against diseases caused by falling onto the ground and into the water. With these forms, the mother of these beings also appears: *šer Pülëχšě*, *šer Pülëχšě amăšě*, *šiv Pülëχšě*, *šiv Pülëχšě amăšě* (Pav.: Ashmarin 1921, 27-28).

prayers: *Turášām-Pülěχšēm* ‘my dear God-Pülěχšēm’ (AshmVv. 25). As the beliefs of the pagan Chuvash were influenced over several periods by Orthodox missionary work of varying intensity, as well as by Islam, mediated by Tatars, these (sometimes opposing) processes could even take place simultaneously.

Several prayers also mention *Pülěχšē*’s mother (*Pülěχšē amăšē*), who always follows *Pülěχšē* in the line of deities invoked. Salmin claims that *Pülěχšē amăšē* is identical with *Xārpan*’s wife, and he also writes about *Pülěχšē* having children (Sal. 397), but I have not found any data to support this claim.

Šiv (+ x)

I. Šiv ‘4. name of a deity’ (Ashm. XVII, 175); ‘deity of water’ (Sal. 464). In compounds: *aslă šiv* ‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. XVII, 175)²⁴⁸ [‘big water’]; *kěšēn šiv* ‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. XVII, 175) [‘little water’]; *šiv amăšē* ‘water’s mother’ (Pav.: Ashmarin 1921, 28); as well as ‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. XVII, 177); *šiv aššē* ‘water’s father’ (Pav.: Ashmarin 1921, 28); and ‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. XVII, 177); *šiv xayarē* ‘water’s bad one’ (Pav. 5); and ‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. XVII, 185); *šiv xayar amăšē* ‘water’s bad one’s mother’ (Pav.: Ashmarin 1921, 28); and ‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. XVII, 185); *šiv χălti* ‘1. rubbish accumulating in the water; 2. name of a deity’ (Ashm. XVII, 185); *šu xoši* ‘water’s master’ (Mész. 74); *šiv kēteken* ‘earth’s and water’s protector’ (Nik. II, 133),²⁴⁹ *šiv māk(ă)ri* ‘water spirit’ which, according to superstitious people, sometimes comes out of the water and moos like a cow²⁵⁰ and can take any shape it wants to (Ashm. XVII, 181); *šiv nimērē* ‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. XVII, 181) [lit. ‘water’s sour soup’];²⁵¹ *šu pošē* ‘water’s head’ (Mész. 74); *šiv pülěχši* ‘water’s *pülěχšē*’ (Pav.: Ashmarin 1921, 28); *šiv pülěχši amăšē* ‘water’s *pülěχšē*’s mother’ (Pav.: Ashmarin 1921, 28); *šiv seχmečē* ‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. XVII, 183) [lit. ‘water’s difficulty or bad’]; *šiv sinkerē* ‘name of a deity’ (Ashm.

²⁴⁸ Ashmarin quotes a prayer extract here and also at the entry *kěšēn šiv*, in which the big water is asked for wholesomeness and health for the animals and the little water is asked for food and drink for the livestock.

²⁴⁹ Here, Nikol’skiy probably misspelt the Chuvash name, which is *šēr-šiv kēte(ke)n*, the way it appears in every source, and it is also suggested by the meaning given by Nikol’skiy himself.

²⁵⁰ Perhaps a similar mythical being is the Tatar → *Su ügez* (‘water bull’).

²⁵¹ On this piece of data, Ashmarin refers to Magnitskiy only, who, on the other hand, says that the “water’s sour soup” is a sacrifice held in honour of the water spirit. Thus, there is no such mythical being.

XVII, 183) [lit. ‘water’s misfortune or bad’]; as well as ‘water’s disease’ (Mész. 73) *šiv šinči kělě* ‘water-bound *kělě*’ (Pav.: Ashmarin 1921, 28); and ‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. XVII, 184);²⁵² *šiv šinči kěl amāšě* ‘water-bound *kělě*’s mother’ (Pav.: Ashmarin 1921, 28); and ‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. XVII, 184); *šiv tumḡayarě* ‘name of a deity’, which lives in the water and causes diseases to people (Ashm. XVII, 184); *šiv turri, šu turri* ‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. XVII, 184.), and ‘water’s deity’ (Pav.: Ashmarin 1921, 28; Sal. 464); *šiv turri amāšě* ‘water’s god’s mother’ (Pav.: Ashmarin 1921, 28); and ‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. XVII, 184); *šiv turri umēnče šūreken irā* ‘good one going before the god of water’ (Pav.: Ashmarin 1921, 28), and ‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. XVII, 184); *šiv vātāš* ‘name of a deity (third deity of the sixth round)’ (Shevle: Ashm. III, 67; and Ashm. XVII, 179); *šiv or šu vutāš* ‘water spirit’ (Magn. 56; Mész. 75; Ashm. XVII, 179); *šivri pornagan irā* ‘(good) spirit living in the water’ (Magn. 54); *šivri šuyttan* ‘water devil’ (Den. 38), and *šiv šuytaně* ‘water devil, water’s devil’ (Ashm. XVII, 186); *шыѡру иуѡттан* ‘water devil who attacks bathers and pushes them underwater’ (ME II, 538); **II.** ‘1. water, 2. rain, 3. river’ (Ashm. XVII, 171-175). **III.** The word is from a Turkic etymon, already present in Old Turkic (on OT data, e.g. *sūv* ‘water’ Cl. 783; DTS 512-513); preserved in all Modern Turkic languages (GTJ 87; on Chuvash and Turkic background, see also: Zol. 108; Räs. 461; Egor. 340; Fed. II, 465-466). **IV.** prayer: Magn. 30, 54, 58; Vish. 239-240; Pav. 28; Elle 52-54. (prayer 1); incantation: Mész. 75.

The water and its spirits do not comprise an abstract supernatural group like, for example, some compounds of → *Šēr* (‘earth’), (which is generally classified by the literature among the good celestial deities), nor do their names appear in the various great sacrificial god-lists.²⁵³ These beings are harmful water-bound spirits, who are offered sacrifices at certain times, and the diseases caused by them are cured by magical procedures.

²⁵² Ashmarin does not add any notes to this and the next figure, nor does he account for the data. In all probability, they come from Nikifor Pavlovich’s *Notebook of Sacrifices*, where these are the names of the eighth and ninth deities on page 5. Besides, the PK also quotes a prayer, recorded in 1920, which includes these names, as well as some other compounds, in which water appears as the dwelling place of *kělě*: *šiv šinči aslā kělě amāšě* [‘water-bound great *kělě*’s mother’], *šiv šinči aslā kělě* [‘water-bound great *kělě*’], *šiv šinči vātālāḡ kělě amāšě* [‘water-bound middle *kělě*’s mother’], *šiv vātālāḡ šinči kělě* [‘water-bound middle *kělě*’], *šiv šinči kēsēn kělě amāšě* [‘water-bound small *kělě*’s mother’], *šiv šinči kēsēn kělě* [‘water-bound small *kělě*’] (PK 57: prayer 191).

²⁵³ Actually, only in compounds like *šēr-šiv kēten*, where *šiv* is not the basic defining nature of the deity (see → *Šēr*).

So far, Magnitskiy and Mészáros have written in most detail about the beliefs associated with water and the spirits living in water, and several water-bound creatures appear in an incantation recorded by Nikifor Pavlovich.

Magnitskiy gives a detailed description of a ceremony in Maslovoy which is held at the well or spring where water is carried from. In the prayer said at the sacrifice, the water-bound good one (*iră*) is invoked and asked neither to dry out nor to flood the water.²⁵⁴ Barley flat bread, butter and sour soup are taken to the water, half of which is put in it and the other half eaten at home. In the Bishev diocese, a similar sacrifice is offered to the → *Vutăš* (in Magnitskiy: *водыни*), where all of the sacrificial food is put into the water. In other places (e.g. in the Kozmodemyan diocese, near Cheboksary, bread, eggs and coins are sacrificed to the spirit of the water (Magn. 54-56). Mészáros recorded that an annual atoning sacrifice was offered to the water's father and mother (Mész. 73) as well as to the *aslă-iră šivě* 'the great good one's water' (Mész. 148).²⁵⁵

In the Bichurin diocese, a ceremony was held at the start of fishing, where some earth was thrown into the water, accompanied by the cry: "Give fish!" (Magn. 56), whereas in the Kozmodemyan district, Mészáros found some data about throwing bread and pouring arak in the water for the water's master (*šu xoši*) or the water's head (*šu poše*).²⁵⁶

The spirits living in the water cause people various diseases.²⁵⁷ Bathing, or even passing by the water at night can cause shivering

²⁵⁴ I quote the prayer under Magn. 54.

²⁵⁵ Here, Mészáros considers the being *aslă iră* to be a *kiremet*.

²⁵⁶ I quote the prayer said at this time under Mész. 75-76.

²⁵⁷ Ashmarin mentions the disease *šiv χitti* (Ashm. XVII, 185), which means something like 'heaviness of the water', cf.: *χită* 'hard, solid, heavy; burden, difficult situation; stingy, tight-fisted; cruel, tight, strict, rude, rough, sharp; strictly, seriously; many, very, persistently, bravely; name of a disease; name of a meadow' (Ashm. XVI, 115-116); *χitlăχ* 'strictness, difficulty, barrier, ban; avarice' (Ashm. XVI, 108); see also → *χităm*. In Mészáros, however *šiv sinkerě* is a name of a disease, which Ashmarin considers the name of a deity (Mész. 73; Ashm. XVII, 183).

with cold (Mész. 73), falling into the water can cause fever (Magn. 56), and drinking from the water can in turn cause all kinds of other diseases. In order for the water drunk directly from the stream or spring not to cause any harm, the fact of drinking was usually denied with formulas such as “It wasn’t me who drank” or “It was the Russian and his wife who drank” (Ashm. XVII, 184; Mész. 74), and in Staroy village by the River Yordaš, mink’s claws were thrown into the water. The diseases were cured with a sacrifice of bread and eggs (Magn. 55) or with incantations.²⁵⁸

Šuyt(t)an

I. *Шаӱмана* ‘the evil; one of the lesser deities’ (Geor. 177); ‘god of evil and darkness’ (Sbo. 78), *шойтан* ‘devil, Satan’ (Zol. 107); ‘evil spirit, devil’ (Paa. 153); ‘devil, Satan, the evil; devilish, Satanic, evil’ (Sir. 567; Skvor. 621); ‘devil’; as well as: *шыӱри шыӱттан* water devil, who attacks bathers and pushes them underwater (ME II, 538). Another form: *шадӱн* ‘evil spirit, devil’ (Munk. 1887, 41); *шадын* ‘dark force, evil spirit, devil’ (Magn. 264); *šadun* ‘some evil spirit’ (Paa. 147).²⁵⁹

II. ~ *kēventi* ‘cockchafer; ~ *māyraki* (or *χuranē*) ‘snail’; ~ *χupaxxi* ‘fern’; (obs.) ‘Christmas season (from Christmas to Epiphany)’; *šuyttanlan* ‘be enchanted, bewitched’ (Sir. 567); ~ *čēppi* ‘little devil, rascal’; *mēn ~ē ku?* ‘What the devil? What the hell?’; *lāpkā*; *šayttanlā* ‘devilish(ly), hellish(ly); *šuyttanlan* ‘become bestial’ (Skvor. 621). **III.** The Turkic equivalents of the Chuvash word *šuy(t)tan* exist in several Turkic languages. The word is of Arabic origin; it entered Chuvash from Tatar (Räs. 441; Egor. 338; Fed. II, 469; Scher. 29, 35). **IV.** prayer: Fuks 1840, 141; incantation: (*šatīn*) Magn. 146-147, 146-147/2; mythical story: Inf. 19-22; Mész. 14, 29, 86.

The ‘devil, evil spirit’ meaning of *šuyttan* can already be found in early sources, although, according to more detailed descriptions, this mythical being fits more into the line of lesser, local spirits. However, the data available to us are numerous and diverse here, too.

²⁵⁸ I quote such an incantation under Mész. 299 and Pav. 5.

²⁵⁹ According to Magnitskiy, this Chuvash form is of Hebrew origin: Heb. *šed* ‘dark force, evil spirit, Satan’ (Magn. 146) – this origination is certainly wrong. Paasonen considers it the adoption of Russian *уамын* ‘impure, evil spirit, devil, Satan’ (Paa. 147). I would suggest the possibility that the Chuvash *šatun*, *šatīn* is related to the form *šuyttan*, but is an adoption from a different language at a different time.

In the 18th-century Russian-Tatar-Chuvash-Mordvin dictionary, the Chuvash equivalent of the Russian word meaning ‘devil’ is *шуйман*, and in the Russian-Chuvash-Mari-Mordvin dictionary, *эзрейли* (→ *Esrel*) (Dmit. 287). Another piece of early data is Georgi’s record from 1773 about the Chuvash *šaytana*, which is also important because Georgi notes that for the Chuvash, the *šuytan* is one of the evil, lesser deities, which is believed to live in waters (Geor. 177). Zolotnitskiy remarks about the word that it not only means the devil or Satan, but all kinds of beings that are in connection with evil.

In the mid-19th century, Sboev imagined the origin of the Chuvash belief system to have been of a basically dualistic nature, where good was represented by God (*Turā*) and evil was represented by Satan (*šuyttan*). Over time, however, these two beings were gradually replaced by a great many lesser beings, which assumed different properties of the original two principles and thus became independent, good or bad mythical beings in their own right. Sboev’s idea also resonated with the literature (e.g. Sal. 476), although his theory is not supported by data. Mészáros notes that there are a lot of *šuytans*, so it is not the name of a single evil supernatural being or “evil” itself, and that it is even not entirely the same concept for the Northern and Southern Chuvash (Mész. 28-32). In the South, it is associated with water, whirlwinds and lightning²⁶⁰ – it lives at the bottom of lakes, in baths or watermills, is dangerous to humans because it drowns people or takes their intestines out in the bath. In the north, it lives in the stream or by the fireplace in the grain-drying barn, it is a guardian of treasure, it changes babies and gives spellcasters the power to harm. Ashmarin discusses the figure of *šuyttan* in his article on mythical beings (Ashmarin 1982, 34), but in the original Chuvash examples cited by him, what actually appears is the → *Usal* (‘bad, evil’) and not the *šuyttan*. Salmin makes an important observation: the *šuyttan* is not only the name of an actual evil spirit but also an umbrella term for various beings that

²⁶⁰ God destroys the devils with lightning; to escape, the devil takes various shapes in order to get into people’s houses or get a lift on their wagons; see also → *Aslati*, → *Šišem*. I quote a relevant mythical legend under Mész. 86.

are harmful to humans, such as the → *Iye*, which removes people's intestines in the bath, the → *Vupār*, which pushes people at night or a water spirit like the *šivri* or the → *Vutāš*.

Ashmarin's dictionary includes the word *leš*, the primary meaning of which is 'that one, the other', which was also used as a synonym for the *šuyttan* (Ashm. VIII, 83). It must have been used instead of an ineffable name due to a taboo (it probably did not refer to the *šuyttan*, or not exclusively to it).²⁶¹

Seχmet

I. '4. a spirit' (Ashm. XI, 102). In compounds: *χajar-seχme, Ďžə, šil-seχme, Ďžə, ingek-seχme, Ďžə* 'certain spirits' (Paa. 116); *vutlā seχmet* 'name of a spirit' (Ashm. XI, 102) ['fiery *seχmet*']; *cupь cexmem* (Magn. 91), and *šēr seχmečē* 'name of a deity' (Ashm. XI, 102; cf. also: Paa. 133) ['earth's *seχmet*']; *šil seχmečē* 'name of a deity', from the second round (Ashm. XII, 150) ['wind's *seχmet*']; *turā-seχmet* 'name of a deity' (Ashm. XIV, 159) ['God-*seχmet*']. **II.** 'fatigue, worry, trouble, loss' (Munk. 40); '1. trouble, misfortune, 2. disease, 3. person who keeps swearing for no reason' (Ashm. XI, 102). **III.** For the etymology of the word, see Bashkir → *Zäχmät*. **IV.** prayer: Magn. 91-92; incantation: Ashm. I, 166.

The word *seχmet* is not discussed among mythical beings by the majority of the literature. Similarly to the beings → *Inkek* and → *Sinker*, the primary meaning of *seχmet* is also some kind of trouble or misfortune; but, in opposition to the former beings, the *seχmet* means some kind of spirit or perhaps deity in compound words. In some of its compounds, the other part is also a word meaning something bad, evil, trouble or misfortune, such as *inkek-seχmečē*, *χayar-seχmečē*, *sinker seχmet*. In some other compounds, it is associated with the elements: *šēr seχmečē* 'earth's *seχmet*', *vut seχmet* or *vutlā seχmet* 'fire's or fiery *seχmet*', *šil seχmečē*, 'wind's *seχmet*', *šiv seχmečē* 'water's *seχmet*'. Besides, it also appears in a compound with the word *Turā* ('God'), in the form of *turā-seχmet*.

²⁶¹ A similar, originally taboo name is the Bashkir → *Näṭtā*, meaning 'something'.

In Magnitskiy's beer-sacrifice list from Bayteryakov, the 'earth's *seḡmet*'²⁶² appears as the last one of the deities invoked (Magn. 91), following the earth's father, mother and vapour.²⁶³

Sinker

I. '4. name of a deity' (Ashm. XI, 149); in compounds: *Сыль сынґере* 'wind's strength' (Magn. 63), and the same form, meaning 'averted of misfortune' (Magn. 89), and *šil sinker(ě)* 'deity of the second round' (Ashm. XII, 150); *Сынґерь сыґрень* 'sender of strength' (Magn. 64); *sinker-seḡmet* 'name of an evil spirit' (Ashm. XI, 150); *sinker-siren* 'name of an evil spirit' (Ashm. XI, 150); *sol sinker* 'name of a spirit, which attacks people on the road if not placated' (Ashm. XII, 220). II. *sinґer*: *inґek-sinґer* 'all kinds of loss, misfortune' (Paa. 122); '1. misfortune, unexpected event, trouble; 2. contagious disease; 3. terrible, scary thing; 5. solidification'²⁶⁴ (Ashm. XI, 149). III. The etymology of the word is not discussed by Fedotov, nor by Egorov; so far, only Magnitskiy has tried to clarify the origin of the word – without success. Magnitskiy originated the Chuvash word from the Persian word سنکړ *senḡer* (sic!) 'fortification, barrier, barricade', which he had found in Budagov's dictionary (Bud. I, 638). The word exists in modern Persian, too: سنکړ (*sānkār*) 'trench, rampart, fortification' (PRS 293). Of the Turkic languages, it

²⁶² In Magnitskiy, *šer seḡmet* appears in dative case (just like all the other deities or spirits invoked), in the form of *сирь сеґметне*.

²⁶³ The Chuvash forms of these are: *šer aššě*, *šer amašě*, *šer pu*; in this sacrificial list of Magnitskiy's, those invoked are in dative case. Magnitskiy gives the names in the following forms: *Сирь ашшене*, *сирь амышине*, *сирь пуне*, *сирь сеґметне*.

²⁶⁴ Ashmarin provides examples in various contexts for the first four meanings of the word *sinker* (misfortune, trouble, disease, scary thing), but he gives no example for the fifth meaning, which is very different from the others (solidification). In fact, we can find no text here, only one reference to Munkácsi. Munkácsi gives this word in his article "Notes on Chuvash Linguistics" as *сынґерь* 'fortification, barricade' (Munk. 40). Munkácsi refers to Magnitskiy in providing the meaning of the word. Thus, Ashmarin's only dubious piece of data goes back to Magnitskiy. Magnitskiy provides this meaning in the vocabulary that he compiled of the words not found in Zolotnitskiy's Chuvash dictionary (Magn. 261-264). In other parts of Magnitskiy's book, this word appears several times in the various lists of gods and spirits, usually translated as 'strength'. It only becomes clear from a footnote on page 63 that he identified the Chuvash word with the word سنکړ *senḡer* 'fortification, barrier, barricade' in Budagov's dictionary. Probably, this was his basis for translating it in the lists as 'strength', for want of a better word. However, this word with this meaning does not exist in Persian, nor in any Turkic language.

got into Chagatai and Azeri, which adopted many Persian loan words, with similar meanings: Chag. ‘fort(ification)’ (Bud. I, 638; Rad. IV, 448-449); Az. ‘shelter, bunker’ (AFS 551), also ‘trench, rampart, fortification’ (ARL IV, 109)’. The Chuvash word *sinker* cannot be originated from this Persian word. IV. prayer: Vish. 240-241; Magn. 58, 59-60, 84-87.

The compound *inkek-sinker*,²⁶⁵ meaning ‘bad’, ‘trouble’, ‘misfortune’, often appears in Chuvash prayers, from which they ask for deliverance and protection. Similarly to → *Inkek*, it is also true for *sinker* that only Magnitskiy has data suggesting that it is also a mythical being (as it appears among the deities and spirits invoked), but Ashmarin provides some other compound forms from other collections which include the word *sinker*, which can be interpreted as some kind of evil spirit, such as *sinker-seḡmet* ‘name of an evil spirit’ and *sinker-siren*²⁶⁶ ‘name of an evil spirit’ (Ashm. XI, 150).

Magnitskiy has this word in various beer-sacrifice god-lists with various meanings, which are incorrect, due to its erroneous etymology. It usually appears at the back of the list, in the last quarter among the deities and spirits invoked, usually in some compound form. There is only one place where it appears independently: *sinker* (сѣынгерь) is the 68th invoked being in the Bishev list, where no meaning is provided by Magnitskiy. In Maslovoy village, the 36th name of round X is *Śil sinkerě* (Сѣиль сѣынґере), translated by Magnitskiy as the ‘wind’s strength’, but in fact meaning ‘wind’s misfortune (trouble)’. In round XI, the name of the 48th deity or spirit is *Sinker śüren* (Сѣынґерь сѣўрень), ‘sending strength’ in Magnitskiy, but ‘involving misfortune’ in fact. № 73 is *śul sinker* (Сѣоль сѣынґерь), given here without translation; actually meaning ‘the road’s misfortune’ (or ‘trouble on the road’).

²⁶⁵ In Ashmarin, it is also found in the form of *inkek-sinkek* (Ashmarin 1898, 115); he wrote in his dictionary that this form had the same meaning ‘(some kind of) trouble’ as *inkek-singer* (Ashm. III, 124).

²⁶⁶ The second part, *siren*, is not easy to interpret; Ashmarin translates the compound *inkek siren* as ‘averted of trouble, name of a deity’ (Ashm. III, 124 – probably based on the verb *sir-* ‘take away, remove’), whereas he interprets the compound *sinker siren*, which has the same meaning, although he does not translate it, as an evil spirit (Ashm. XI, 150).

In the Bishev goose-sacrifice, offered for the recovery of the sick, № 17 of the 24 deities and spirits invoked is *sinker*, and № 18 is *sinker siren*. In the family prayer recited if all of the children have died, where they always invoke → *Kepe* and its compound forms, the last two beings invoked are *Kepe sinkere* and *Kepe sinker süren*.

Šēlen

I. *Сюльрань* ‘aerial phenomenon similar to some kind of snake, so it is called flying snake’ (Mil.: Nik. I, 495); *Сюльрань* ‘flying snake, which is believed to bring the gift of children; when they see it, they request a child from it’ (Mil.: Nik. I, 498); *Сюлан* ‘Deity who flies through the air and gifts women with fertility’ (Sbo. 82); *сьюлэнь патши, сьюлэнь аише амыж* ‘snake tsar, snake’s father, mother’ – healing forces occurring in incantations (Magn. 151); *šēlen* ‘2. snake which protects domestic animals (old belief)’ (Ashm. XIII, 58); *селен* ‘celestial snake who grants the gift of children to those who turn to it’ (ME II, 538). In compound forms: *šēlen amāšē* ‘name of a spirit’ (Ashm. XIII, 59); *šēlen aššē* ‘name of a spirit’ (Ashm. XIII, 60 < Magn. 151); → *Věre šēlen*. **II.** ‘1. snake’ (Ashm. XIII, 58). **III.** The word is from a Turkic etymon; for its etymology, see Tatar → *Yılan*. **IV.** incantation: Magn. 151.

The snake is associated with various notions in Chuvash beliefs. Mil’kovich described it in the 18th century as a flying snake living in the air, which brings the gift of children – it was later repeated by Sboev. Both authors list it as № 23 of the 33 good deities.²⁶⁷ Nikol’skiy also wrote about the snake in this sense, but probably only on the basis of the two previous authors, as no such belief is mentioned anywhere later. Nikol’skiy supposed that this mythical being might be identical with the son-and-daughter-creating God (*ivāl-χēr šuratakan tură*) (Nik. II, 132).

In Magnitskiy, neither *šēlen* nor its compounds appear as mythical beings in any of the sacrificial God-lists, but in an incantation against snakebite, the prince of snakes (*šēlen patša*) and the snake’s father and mother (*šēlen aššē, amāšē*) are mentioned as good spirits, listed among the healing forces.²⁶⁸ In one of Ashmarin’s records, the

²⁶⁷ Mil’kovich listed 33 good deities; in Sboev, there are 33 good celestial Gods and 8 more good earthly deities.

²⁶⁸ I quote the incantation under Magn. 151.

snake also appears as a good spirit, the protector of the farmyard, which shows Tatar parallels. There are several Tatar examples of the protector of the farmyard seen in the shape of a snake (Tat. → *Abzar iyäse*).

A completely different notion was recorded by Mészáros: It claims that there used to live man-eating giant snakes which, when they took to destroying people excessively, were wiped out from earth by lightning (*aśa*) (Mész. 105).²⁶⁹

In folk tales, three and seven-headed snakes kidnap princesses and keep them imprisoned in their underground realm (Mész. 105); that is, they belong to the half-anthropomorphic and half-zoomorphic type of wife-abducting enemies.

Šēr (+ x)

I. *Cup* ‘name of a spirit or deity’ (Pal. 159; Ash XIII, 101.); *šēr* ‘spirit of the earth’ (Sal. 453). Its compound forms: *Cup acue* (as well as his wife and children) ‘earth-creating God’ (Sbo. 82); *šēr aššē* ‘earth’s father’ and *šēr amašē* ‘earth’s mother’ (Mil.: Nik. I, 495; Nik. II, 132; Ashm. XIII, 89; Sal. 454-455); *Szer-asse* ‘creator of earth’, a kind of creator God; besides, some sources mention mother earth, *Cep auue*’s wife (ME II, 538); *šēr yīš* ‘earth’s master’ (Rek 1898, 186; Ashm. XIII, 91), and: *šer-jjžə* ‘earth’s ruler or master, who has parents and master’, *šer-singerə*, *šer-sexmε*, *Đžə* etc. (Paa. 133); *šēr xayarē* ‘name of a spirit’ (Pav.: Ashmarin 1921, 27; Ashm. XIII, 99); *šēr xayar amāšē* ‘name of a spirit’ (Pav.: Ashmarin 1921, 27; Ashm. XIII, 99); *šēr Xārpanē* ‘name of a spirit’ (Pav.: Ashmarin 1921, 27; Ashm. XIII, 99); *šēr yīš*, with the meaning ‘earth’s family’ (Magn. 29; Mész. 60) [lit. ‘earth’s master’]; *šēr yīš amašē* ‘a deity’ (Pav.: Ashmarin 1921, 27; Ashm. XIII, 91) [‘earth’s master’s mother’]; *šēr kāk(ā)ri* or *šēr kakkāri* ‘earth’s breasts; name of a deity’ (Ashm. XIII, 92; Pav.: Ashmarin 1921, 27; Den. 21); as well as *šēr kāk(ā)ri amāšē* ‘name of a deity’ (Pav.: Ashmarin 1921, 27); *šēr kansērē*²⁷⁰ ‘name of a spirit’ (Ashm. XIII, 92); *šēr-šiv kēten* ‘earth-water’s shepherd’ (Magn. 30; Ashm. XIII, 100); *šēr pakarti* ‘earth’s inside; name of a deity’ (Ashm. XIII, 94), *šēr pu* or *pāvē* ‘earth’s vapour (typical during the morning hours in

²⁶⁹ This idea is related to the belief that lightning (→ *Šišem*) destroys the devils.

²⁷⁰ The word *kansēr* means ‘restless, uncomfortable, difficult’ (Ashm. VI, 59-60). Thus, the meaning of the compound is approximately: ‘earth’s difficulty’. In several spirits’ names, the second part is a word meaning some kind of ‘trouble, difficulty, loss’.

spring); name of a deity' (Magn. 84;²⁷¹ Ashm. XIII, 96); *šer pülëχši* and *šer pülëχši amăšë* 'name of a deity each' (Pav.: Ashmarin 1921, 27; Ashm. XIII, 95); *šer-šiv aššë* 'a synonym for God' (Vis. 234);²⁷² *šer-šiv tüt(ak)an toră* 'name of a deity' (Ashm. XIII, 100) ['country-holding God']; as well as *šer-šiv tüt(ak)an iră* and *šer-šiv tüt(ak)an iră amăšë* (Pav.: Ashmarin 1921, 28.) ['earth-water-holding good one' and 'earth-water-holding good one's mother']; *šer-šu këten* first deity of the sixth round (Ash XIII, 100; Shevle: Ashm. III, 67); *šer seχmečë* 'name of a deity' (Ashm. XIII, 95); *šer siχčë* 'name of a deity' (Ashm. XIII, 96); *šer sinkerë* 'earth's wrong, disease' (Mész. 295-296); the same in Ashmarin: 'name of a spirit' (Ashm. XIII, 96); *šer sulu* 'ninth deity of the first round' (Ševle: Ashm. III, 66);²⁷³ *šer tavraš* 'name of a deity' (Sal. 453);²⁷⁴ *šer tütki* 'name of a deity' (Ashm. XIII, 98); *šer tivlečë* 'name of a deity' (Ashm. XIII, 98);²⁷⁵ *šer turăš*, *šer turăš amăšë* (Pav.: Ashmarin 1921, 27-28); *šerti toră* (Ashm. XIII, 98). **II.** *šer* '1. earth, 2. earth as matter, soil 3. Planet Earth, 4. area, settlement, area ownership; 5. topic; 6. result, end' (Ashm. XIII, 84-89). **III.** Chuv. *šer* < OT. *yer* 'earth, place' (see e.g. Cl. 954; DTS 257); the word has been retained in numerous Modern Turkic languages (cf. e.g. Sev. IV, 191-192; Räs. 198; Chuvash data with Turkic background: Zol. 68; Egor. 211; Fed. II, 110). **IV.** prayer: Vish. 239-240; Magn. 20, 30, 58, 59-60, 84-87, 91-92, 108-109; Rekeev 1898, 184-185; Pav. 27-28; Ashmarin 1921, 34; incantation: Mész. 60.

²⁷¹ At another place, Magnitskiy provides the meaning 'earth's trunk' (Magn. 89), where the name of the spirit is in the dative case, which was misunderstood by Magnitskiy.

²⁷² The compound *šer-šiv* literally means 'earth-water', but already in Old Turkic, it meant a politically or geographically unified territory, i.e., country, which meaning has been retained till today in several Turkic languages (cf. Dallos 2004). Ashmarin provides three meanings in his dictionary: 'country; countryside; name of a deity' (Ashm. XIII, 100); in fact, *šer-šiv* does not mean any deity, only appears in the names of certain deities as the object of the protection of the given deity (a deity protecting the country).

²⁷³ The word *sulu* 'wrong, loss' appears in the names of several deities (cf. Ashm. XI, 168). For example, *Tură sulu*, which Nikol'skiy translates as 'divine whip' (Nik. II, 132). This meaning appears in Magnitskiy in the form *Toră šoli* (in the Maslovoy beer-sacrifice list, as deity № 44 in round IX). The word *sulu* does not mean 'whip', but *šula/šola* does (Ashm. XII, 223); therefore, Magnitskiy's translation is the correct one.

²⁷⁴ The word *tavraš* has an extensive field of meaning in Chuvash: 'circle, around, circumstance, dowry, good feature, family, clan, cult' (cf. Ashm. XIII, 145-147).

²⁷⁵ The word *tivlet* means 'mercy, happiness, luck; name of a deity' (Ashm. XIV, 31). As the name of a deity, it appears as № 31 in Magnitskiy's Bishev list, as well as in the compound names of some mythical beings: *tivlet tütan* (Ashm. XIV, 32), *tivlet ama* (Ashm. XIV, 31).

Although the earth and/or its spirit (*šěr*) occurs in prayers on its own, the compound forms are much more frequent, of which the earth's father (*šěr aššě*), earth's mother (*šěr amāšě*), earth's master (*šěr-yiš*) and earth-water's shepherd or guardian (*šěr-šiv kěten*) are the most common names. The literature usually classifies them as good earthly deities. They occupy a prestigious place in the hierarchy of supernatural beings – in the sacrificial lists, they are generally found among the deities invoked in the first round. Nevertheless, as mythical beings, these figures associated with the earth do not have a well-defined character, nor are they accompanied by any mythical story describing their origin or nature.

The name *šěr* appears in two 18th-century descriptions. Pallas recorded the names of eight lesser deities besides *Turā* (God), the fifth of which was *šěr* (Pal. 159), and in Mil'kovich, № 15 of the good deities is *šěr aššě* 'earth's father' and № 16 is *šěr amāšě* 'earth's mother'. At the beginning of the 19th century, Vishnevskiy recorded the compound *šěr-šiv aššě* 'earth-water's father' among the synonyms for God (Vish. 231). At the same time, however, in a prayer recorded by him, it appears in five different forms: *šěr šiv tītan* 'earth-water-holder', *šěr šiv tītan amāšě* 'earth-water-holder's mother', *šěr šiv tītan pūlēχšě* 'earth-water-holding *pūlēχšě*', *šěr šiv tītan pūlēχšě amāšě* 'earth-water-holding *pūlēχšě*'s mother', *šěr šiv tītan kepe* 'earth-water-holding *Kepe*'. Sboev lists the being 'earth's father' as № 14 of the good celestial deities, who has a wife and children and is the creator of the earth (Sbo 82; adopted by Nikol'skiy, too: Nik. II, 132 and Basilov: ME II, 492).

At several places in Magnitskiy's sacrificial god-lists, four compound forms follow each other: *šěr yiš* 'earth's master', ²⁷⁶ *šěr aššě* 'earth's father', *šěr amāšě* 'earth's mother', *šěr kěten* 'earth's shepherd'. In three of the beer-sacrifice lists, Maslovoy, Bishev and

²⁷⁶ Magnitskiy provides the meaning 'earth's family', which he explains in one place as the family of the spirits living on earth (Magn. 29), an interpretation shared by Mészáros (Mész. 60). The meaning is corrected by Ashmarin (Ashm. I, 83; XIII, 91), although Paasonen and Rekeev previously translated it correctly as 'earth's master' (Paa. 133; Rek. 420).

Cheshlam, they are the 7-10th invoked deities of the first round, just like in the case of the Bishev list of the prayer recited at the goose-sacrifice and the Maslovoy list of the *učuk* (meadow or field sacrifice).²⁷⁷ In Nikifor Pavlovich's collection, in the prayers said for the people and the grain, the forms *šěr šiv tītan īră* 'earth-water-holding good one' and *šěr šiv tītan īră amăšě* 'earth-water-holding good one's mother' appear (Ashmarin 1921, 27-28).

Rekeev has the compound names of four such deities. Rekeev interprets the being *šěr šiv tuna Tură* as the god creating the earth and the water and considers it the second most significant one in the hierarchy of deities, along with the god creating the soul (*čun šuratakan tură*). He identifies *šěr yış* 'earth's master' with the god creating the grain (*tiră-pulă šuradan*)²⁷⁸ (Rek. 420). He also mentions the beings 'earth's father' and 'earth's mother' (*šěr aššě, šěr amăšě*), but claims that these are spirits of lesser importance, which are not worshipped by the entire Chuvash people (Rek. 423).

Mészáros recorded that in Cheboksary, two icons in a chapel were regarded as the earth's father and mother. There are several records about the Chuvash incorporating icons into their own belief system.²⁷⁹

It is interesting that these names do not appear in ceremonies closely associated with agriculture or in the prayers said there, nor in incantations for the good yield of crops,²⁸⁰ but in several incantations recited to heal or prevent diseases caused by falling down onto the ground. Nikifor Pavlovich provides fourteen different compound forms appearing in prayers said at the time of falling on

²⁷⁷ This steady position is worth mentioning because the hierarchy of gods and spirits is in fact quite changeable. A typical example of this is the figure of → *Pülěxšě*, which often appears immediately after God, but also as the name of a lesser spirit in other sources.

²⁷⁸ This god-name appears in several of Magnitskiy's lists – independently of the form *šěr yış*.

²⁷⁹ In more detail, see Dallos 2012, with further literature.

²⁸⁰ In Mészáros's collection, in the harvest prayers said to the field, → *Ana* is invoked (I quote two such prayers under Mész. 67- 68).

the ground.²⁸¹ Mészáros also quotes an incantation recited in case of children's diseases caused by falling on the ground, which features the beings earth's father and earth's mother.²⁸²

Thus, on one hand, *šēr* (and its compound forms) is a prestigious, high-ranking deity not closely related to the earth (arable land), and on the other hand, it is a local, threat-posing, disease-causing spirit living on earth, especially in the forms of the earth's father and mother.

Šerti patša

I. *Cepde nađua* 'earthly ruler, tsar (one of the deities)' (Mil.: Nik. I, 495, also cited by: Ashm. XIII, 98); 'earthly tsar'; the second name in prayers (Sbo. 82; Nik. II, 132). II. *patša* 'king (tsar), kingdom, state' (Ashm. IX, 138). III. *šerti* 'earthly'; for the data of the word *šēr*, see → *Šēr*. The word *patša* was adopted to Chuvash from Tatar (Scher. 48). It is of Persian origin and exists in several Modern Turkic languages (e.g. Osm; Tat; Kaz; Uyg.) (Egor. 145; Räs. 377; Fed. I, 391); ModPer. پادشاه (*padšāh*) 'ruler, prince, king; empire, kingdom, state; of a ruler, empire, king' (Gaf. I, 125). IV. prayer: Geor. 178; Fuks 1840, 141; incantation: Magn. 146-147, 151;²⁸³ Elle 29-30.

The name *šerti patša* only occurs in prayers. It was first recorded by Mil'kovich in the 18th century, as № 4 of the good deities, immediately after God, God's father and God's mother (Mil.: Nik. I, 495). His record is later repeated by Artem'ev and Nikol'skiy and perhaps already Sboev, too. From the fact that in the invocation of certain prayers, the celestial God is immediately followed by the earthly ruler, ahead of the other deities, Sboev concluded that the Chuvash deified their earthly leaders and endowed them with a divine nature. It is perhaps a slightly exaggerated idea. On one hand, at the time when the first data were recorded, the word *patša* was no longer the actual title of the ruler of the country or empire, but on the other hand, it is always the king of folk tales. Of course, it

²⁸¹ *Šēr Turāš, Šēr Turrāš amāšē, Šēr Pülēχši, Šēr Pülēχši amāšē, Šēr aššē, Šēr amāšē, Šēr kākri amāšē, Šēr kākri, šēr Yiši amāšē, šērYiši, šēr Xayar amāšē, šēr xayar, šēr χārpan amāšē, šēr χārpan*. I provide the translation of these in the Anthology under Pav. 27-28, along with the prayer said to them.

²⁸² I quote the incantation under Mész. 60.

²⁸³ In these two prayers in Magnitskiy, the compound form *šerti patša* does not appear, only the form *patša*.

cannot be completely ruled out that it had been preserved in prayers from centuries before. However, it only appears in few prayers, and it is also worth mentioning that it usually occurs as a set phrase: *śulti Tură, śerti patša*, which can perhaps be translated as ‘upper godhead, earthly kingdom’, in which case, *śerti patša* is obviously not a mythical being. However, Magnitskiy’s collection includes two prayers and incantations in which the word *patša* occurs without the attribute ‘earthly’. In these, they ask that mercy come from God and goodness come from the padisah.²⁸⁴

Śil

I. *Силь* ‘wind’ and *Силь амыже* ‘its mother’ (Mil.: Nik. I, 495); *Силь* ‘wind’s god’ and *Силь аможе* ‘its mother’ (Fuks 1840, 92); *Sille* ‘wind’ (Thomas: Anderson 1906, 11); ‘wind (to which they pray)’ (Vish. 232); *Силь-Тора* ‘wind’s god, it has a wife and children’ (Sbo. 82); compound forms in Magnitskiy:²⁸⁵ *śil amăšĕ* ‘wind’s mother’ (Magn. 63, 84, 89, 91); *śil aššĕ* ‘wind’s father’ (Magn. 63, 89, 91); *śil inkekĕ* ‘wind’s punishment’ (Magn. 63), ‘wind’s misfortune’ (Magn. 89); *śil sinkerĕ* ‘wind’s strength’ (Magn. 63), ‘averted misfortune’ (Magn. 89); *śil śunačĕ* ‘wind’s wings’ (Magn. 84, 89); *śil sĭχĕr* ‘wind’s guardian’ (Magn. 63), ‘protector from misfortune’ (Magn. 89); *śil tĭtχanĕ*, without meaning (Magn. 91); *śil χayarĕ* ‘wind’s wrath’ (Magn. 63, 89); compounds in Nikifor Pavlovich: *Śil amăšĕ* ‘wind’s mother’, *śil śunačĕ* ‘wind’s wings’, *Śavsa*²⁸⁶ *śil amăšĕ* ‘whirlwind’s mother’, *śavra śil χayarĕ* ‘whirlwind’s bad one’, *Śavra śil killi amăšĕ* ‘whirlwind’s *kĕlē*’s mother’, *Śavra śilpe śüreken śunatlă Īră* ‘winged Good One going with the whirlwind’ (Ashm. 1921, 29); *śil* and its compound forms: *śil amăš(ĕ)*, *śil aššĕ*, *śil aĭi* [‘wind’s son’],²⁸⁷ *śil inkekĕ*, *śil seχmečĕ*, *śil śunač(ĕ)* ‘names of deities from the second round’ (Shevle: Ash XII, 146-150); ‘God personifying the wind’ (ME II, 538.); ‘deity of the wind’ (Sal. 463) and, one lower in the hierarchy: *śil amăšĕ* ‘wind’s mother’ (Sal. 464). **II.** ‘wind, air’ (Zol. 69); ‘wind’ (Paa. 136; Ashm. 12, 146-148). **III.** The word is from a Turkic etymon, already present in Old Turkic (cf. Cl. 916) and retained in several Modern Turkic languages (cf. e.g. Räs. II, 117; Sev. IV, 174-176; Egor. 213; Fed. II, 117; GTJ 40; WOT 784-787). **IV.** Magn. 51, 58, 84-87, 91-92; Pav. 28-29; Rek. 1898, 184-185; Mész. 130, 133-134, 136, 139, 146.

²⁸⁴ I quote the prayer and incantation under Magn. 146-147 and Magn. 151.

²⁸⁵ I provide the forms and spelling used by Magnitskiy in the subchapter “Lists of gods and spirits”.

²⁸⁶ Misspelling; the correct form is *śavra*.

²⁸⁷ Such a compound form appears in the case of *Tură*: *Tură aĭi* ‘God’s son’ (→ *Tură*).

The wind and the wind's mother already appeared as good celestial deities in Mil'kovich's list compiled in 1783. Although as a mythical being, it only occurs in prayers (not a single legend or memorat related to the wind is found in the volume of Chuvash mythical beliefs, see: MLX), the wind and its various compounds (its father, mother, wings, bad one, etc.) are considered part of the Chuvash pantheon by the majority of scholars of beliefs.

In Magnitskiy, all four beer-sacrifice god-lists include several compound forms, usually at the end of the first third of the listed names, following the greater, more significant deities, in the same bloc as the sun (→ *Xěvel*) and its deities, the "bright world" and the → *Kāvak χuppi* beings (Maslovoy list: deities № 32-37 of rounds IX-X; Bishev list: deities № 18-19; Cheshlam list: deities № 31-36; Bayteryakov list: deities № 12-14).

The literature generally classifies the wind and the god of the wind as good deities (e.g. Mil'kovich, Sboev, Salmin); however, in some prayers, they ask for protection from the wind²⁸⁸ and sometimes the spread of some epidemics is associated with the wind.²⁸⁹ Perhaps this is the reason why Shevle, in the list of gods compiled by himself, separated the compound forms including the wind, and those he considered good ones (the wind's father and mother) were placed in the front of the hierarchy, in the second round, whereas others were placed way further back, in the fifth round (wind's wings, wind's bad one). However, Mészáros believed that all these beings were regarded as dangerous because they may damage the house and the grain (Mész 76).

Śišem

I. *Аслади созимбе* 'god of lightning' (Fuks 1840, 92); *Asladi-Sozimbe* 'god of lightning' (Thomas: Anderson 1906, 11) [Fuks and Thomas's two compound forms literally mean 'thunder with lightning']; '2. name of a deity' (Ashm. XII, 172-173); 'god of lightning (in the same way as *aśa*)' (Den. 18); 'god of lightning' (ME II, 538). Its compound forms: *Śišem amāšē*, *śišem śunačē*, *śišem umēnče śüreken irā*

²⁸⁸ I quote such prayers under Magn. 51; Mész. 130, 133-134, 136, 139, 146.

²⁸⁹ Such prayers are found in the Anthology under Magn. 91-92.

‘lightning’s mother, lightning’s wings, good one going before the lightning’ (Pav.: Ashmarin 1921, 28; Ashmarin’s data are repeated by: Den. 18). **II.** Its first record is from 1737-1738: *сусемь* ‘lightning’ (Dmit. 288); ‘1. lightning’ (Ashm. XII, 172-173). **III.** The words *yašin* ‘lightning’ and *yašna-* ‘flash, sparkle’ already appear in al-Kashgari’s 11th-century dictionary and they exist today in several Turkic languages (e.g. Uzb; Tat; Bash; Shor, Nog; Uyg.) meaning ‘lightning, sparkle’ and ‘flash, shine’ (DTS 246; Räs. 192; Egor. 214; Fed. II, 123). The Chuvash word *śiśem* is a derivative of *śiś-* ‘flash, sparkle, shine’, which might in turn come from the OT. verb **yaš-* (Räs. 192; Fed. II, 123.). For OT. forms *yaša-*, *yašnā-*, *yašin* (‘shine, flash, lightning’), see: Cl. 977, 979. **IV.** mythical story: Mész. 86; Ashm. XII, 173; incantation: Elle 29-30; Mész. 341; Pav. 28-29.

Although not considered a mythical being by most scholars, in two early 19th-century sources, lightning (together with thunder) also appears as the name of a deity (Fuks 1840, 92; Thomas: Anderson 1906, 11).²⁹⁰ However in a long prayer recited “For the grain and the people”, the names lightning’s mother, lightning’s wings and the Good One going before the lightning appear among the deities and spirits invoked (Pav.: Ashmarin 1921, 28-29). It was probably on the basis of these that Ashmarin thought this word not only meant ‘lightning’ but also the ‘name of a deity’, which he included in his 17-volume dictionary (Ashm. XII, 173). His assumption was adopted by Denisov, too: Den 18-19). Maybe a comment is due here: in Fuks and Thomas, the word *śiśem* in fact does not appear on its own, and in Pavlovich’s list, lightning itself does not occur among the deities invoked, only its mother, wings and the “Good One going before it”. Thus, it is questionable whether the lightning can be considered a mythical being at all.

On the basis of available folk belief texts, *śiśem* is most likely a natural phenomenon in the system of Chuvash beliefs which is associated with certain beliefs, for example the notion that God destroys

²⁹⁰ Sboev also provides such a compound meaning (‘god of lightning and thunder’), although it stands as the meaning of the Chuvash *Асла-аддуй-Тора* (which is actually the form → *Aslati*) (Sbo. 80). Later Nikol’skiy adopted it, too (Nik. II, 132).

the devils with the lightning.²⁹¹ Incantations against the evil eye and for the healing of eye diseases seem to be semantically related to this notion, as in these, *śiśem* occurs in the context of becoming purified from evil and diseases.²⁹² However, Zolotnitskiy also recorded a part of a prayer where God was asked to save the person from thunder and lightning (Zol. 200).

Śul (*x* + *śul*)

I. *Шалыга Апа* ‘god of roads and crossroads’ (Fuks 1840, 92; in the form *Schalouga Ara*, without meaning: Thomas: Anderson 1906, 11); *Суол-Топа* ‘protector of roads and travellers’ (Sbo. 82); in compounds in Magnitskiy: *śul inkek* ‘misfortune on the road’ (Magn. 86); *śul inkek* ‘name of a *kiremet*’ (Magn. 89); *śol sinker* ‘avertor of misfortune’ (Magn. 89); *śol sinker* ‘name of a *kiremet*’ (Magn. 86); *śul śüren irā* ‘good travel-companion’ (Magn. 65); *śul śüren irā* ‘good travel-companion’ – name of a *kiremet*’ (Magn. 87); *śul xayarē* ‘name of a *kiremet*’ (Magn. 87); *śol iyi*, *śol vupārē*, *śol šatīnē*²⁹³ (Magn. 147); in compounds in Nikol’skiy: *śul turā* ‘road God’, and *śul śüren irā* ‘good travel-companion, wanders in the air, helps those drowning, swimmers and boaters’ (Nik. II, 133); in compounds in Ashmarin: *yut śul* ‘name of a deity’; *tasa śul(ē)* ‘name of a spirit’ (Ashm. XII, 216); *śul ir* ‘name of a spirit’; *śol inkek* ‘name of the deity on the roads’ (Ashm. XII, 217); *śol perekečē* ‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. XII, 219 < Magn. 69); *śol sinker* ‘name of a spirit, which attacks people on the road if not placated’; *śul šavārnāšē* ‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. XII, 220) [‘bend in the road’]; *śul śüreken irā* ‘name of a deity which protects from misfortunes on the road’; *śul śüre(ke)n irā* ‘name of a deity (protects from all kinds of threats on the road)’ (Ashm. XII, 221); *śul xayarē* ‘name of evil spirits who live on the roads’; *śul xayar* is also the name of a disease,²⁹⁴ which is cured with a plant called *śul xayar uti*²⁹⁵ (Ashm. XI, 222). **II.** ‘road’ (Ash XII, 214); as well as: *śul amakē* ‘name of a disease’ (Ashm. XII, 217). **III.** The Chuvash word is from a Turkic etymon; it already existed in Old Turkic as *yul* ‘road’ (cf. Cl. 917), and has been

²⁹¹ I quote one such description under Ashm. XII, 173. The Bashkirs have a very similar concept, Bash. → *Šaytan*. Mészáros records a belief that all the giant snakes that had ever lived on earth, which ate and destroyed people, were struck by lightning (*aša*), and none of them remained (Mész. 106).

²⁹² I quote the incantations under Elle 29-30; Mész. 341.

²⁹³ The second parts of the compounds are each a harmful mythical being, see → *Iye*, → *Vupār*, → *Šuyt(t)an*.

²⁹⁴ A similar disease is *śul amakē* (its data: Ashm. XII, 217), and also see the entry → *Amak*.

²⁹⁵ The name of the plant means ‘*xayar* grass on the road’.

retained in several Modern Turkic languages (for these, see e.g. Räs. 205-206; Sev. IV, 217-219; GTJ 531; Chuvash data with Turkic background: Zol. 71; Egor. 216-217; Fed. II, 131). IV, prayer: Magn. 59-60; Elle 47-52. (prayers 21-26) incantation: Magn. 146-147, 152.

The word *śul* ‘road’ does not mean a mythical being in itself, but several of its compounds mean some kind of spirits on the road, which are dangerous to humans, e.g. *śul xayar*, *śul inkek*, *śul iyi*, *śul vupărě*.²⁹⁶ Different from these evil spirits are perhaps the beings which protect people on the road, such as *śul tură* ‘road God’, as well as the form *śul śüren iră* ‘good one going on the road’, invoked in prayers. However, not much data is available about these. The form ‘road God’ was interpreted as a positive being by Sboev (and some other scholars following him), but we encounter no other record of such a deity in any other source. In Magnitskiy’s lists, where the “good one going on the road” appears, it is preceded by spirits associated with the road that are hostile to man, and → *Īră* is not always of a positive nature, either.

There are two more compound forms, the meanings of which are doubtful, where the second part is possibly the word meaning ‘road’ or the same with a possessive suffix. The first one is *tasa śul(ě)*, which appears in Ashmarin’s dictionary without any reference or context, as meaning ‘name of a spirit’ (Ashm. XII, 216). Literally, the name could possibly have meant ‘road of the clean one’.²⁹⁷ The second, similar compound form is *tură śulě*, which occurs in several sources, but its meaning is unclear; in the descriptions where a meaning is provided, there are several different ones. The name appears in two of Magnitskiy’s beer-sacrifice lists (in the forms *Top’ cъоли* and *Тора cъоли*), translated in two different ways: it is ‘divine whip’ in the Maslovoy list and ‘divine road’ in the Cheshlam list (Magn. 63, 88). In Pavlovich’s *Notebook of Sacrifices*, in the prayer said for the grain and the people, the compound appears in three different forms in a rather prestigious place, after God and

²⁹⁶ The second parts of the compounds are each a harmful mythical being (see → *Xayar*, → *Inkek*, → *Iye*, → *Vupăr*).

²⁹⁷ Slightly more on the adjective *tasa* ‘clean’ at → *Čük*.

Püləxsə: tură şulě amăšě, tură şulě, iră tură şulě. Ashmarin translated these as ‘divine year’s mother, divine year, holy divine year’ (Ashmarin 1921, 28, 31). In his dictionary, Ashmarin gave the form *tură şulě*, but without an accurate translation, only adding ‘name of a spirit’ (Ashm. XIII, 159). Paasonen also has this compound without an accurate translation; on the basis of his collection, he called it ‘some spirit who « belongs to the company of God »’ (Paa. 174). As far as the various interpretations are concerned, it is not easy to clearly support or discard any of them. The Chuvash word *şul* means both ‘road’ and ‘year’, therefore, *tură şulě* can equally mean ‘God’s road’ or ‘God’s year’. Ashmarin considers the latter more likely, as in Pavlovich’s *Notebook of Sacrifices*, after invoking the deity by this name, the prayer continues with ‘grant a good life!’. Here, in Chuvash, ‘life’ is expressed with the compound word *kun-şul* (lit. ‘sun-year’). Nevertheless, Ashmarin discussed the form *tasa şul(ě)*, which has a similar structure, not under the meaning ‘year’ but ‘road’. The meaning ‘God’s year’ also seems to be contradicted by the fact that ‘year’ does not appear in the name of any mythical being, but there are several names including ‘road’. As we saw above, besides the meaning ‘divine road’, Magnitskiy also assumed the meaning ‘divine whip’. This is not excluded, either, as in the 19th century, the word *şula* ‘whip’²⁹⁸ was still in use, and its form with a possessive suffix (*şuli*) may have been transcribed by Magnitskiy as *сьоли*. It is also worth taking into consideration that, while in Pavlovich’s prayer, the form *tură şulě* appears in a prominent position and probably as a positive being (this seems to be the case in Paasonen’s data, too), in Magnitskiy’s sacrificial list, it is followed by deities and spirits (God’s trouble, God’s bad one)

²⁹⁸ The word appears in the Chuvash vocabulary compiled by Vishnevskiy, published in 1836, with the meaning ‘whip’ (VishN 147); in Zolotnitskiy, meaning ‘whip’; here, Zolotnitskiy also provides the compound *Тор’ сьоли* ‘divine whip’, occurring in prayers (Zol. 71). In one of his articles, Ashmarin writes that the word was already obsolete and out of use at the time (Ashmarin 1921, 31). In his dictionary, he only provides the word and its meaning with reference to Zolotnitskiy.

that suggest a harmful or, at least, frightening being. The explanation might be that originally, there were two mythical beings, whose names sounded similar but their natures were quite different. Based on the data, I assume the existence of two different beings: a negative or frightening one meaning ‘God’s whip’ and a more positive one meaning ‘God’s road’.

Several of Magnitskiy’s data testify that the compounds of *śul* often appear in the names of *kiremets*, too (for these data, see the introduction to the entry).

Śut tēñce, Śut śantalāk

I. *Сють тюня* ‘god of light’ (Mil.: Nik. I, 495); *сюдь-сяндалыкъ* ‘light, world’ (VishN. 156); *сюд сьюльде вырдан* ‘[the one] resting in the bright world above’ (Vish. 240); *Сюдь-Тунзы-Тора* ‘creator of light (it is in its power to send light and warmth to people)’ (Sbo. 80); *Сьют тўньчи (Тора)* ‘god of this world’ (Magn. 63); *śut-tān, Džē* ‘the bright world (personified and worshipped)’ (Paa. 143); *śutā tēñce* ‘light world, bringing light and warmth to people’ (Nik. II, 132); *śut tēñči* ‘the bright (light) world’, and *śut śantalāk* ‘bright (or light) world’ (Ashmarin 1921, 28; 32); ‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. XII, 282; XV, 56); *Сута тенче* ‘god personifying the light’ (ME II, 538). **II.** *śut* ‘bright’ (Ashm. XII, 279) + *tēñce* ‘world, lightness, light’ (Ash XV, 54), and *śantalāk* ‘weather, climate, sun, the visible world, heavenly body, planet Earth’ (Ashm. XII, 39-41). **III.** Of the word *śut(ā)* and words based on the same verbs in Turkic languages: WOT 409-411; the Turkic equivalents of *tēñce* (for these, see Räs. 141; Fed. II, 217) are eventually of Arabic origin: Ar. دنيا (*dunyā*) ‘light, world’ (ARS 263), it got into Chuvash through Tatar mediation (Scher. 53); the word could have entered the Turkic languages from Persian, too; for the Persian dictionary data, see Gaf. I, 350. As far as the origin of *śantalāk*, various etymological attempts are known, summarised by: Fed. II, 84-85; see also: Egor. 202. **IV.** prayer: Vish. 239-240; Magn. 58, 91-92; Pav. 28-29.

The two forms (*śut tēñce* and *śut śantalāk*) are identical, meaning ‘bright (light) world’. In Ashmarin’s opinion, after *tēñce*, of Arabic origin, entered the Chuvash language, the name was doubled over time, but originally it must have been one God (Ashmarin 1921, 34).²⁹⁹ Although the two forms usually appear independently of each

²⁹⁹ In fact, we do not know exactly when each of the two suffixes was established in Chuvash.

other (earlier authors know either one or the other form), in a prayer recorded in Nikifor Pavlovich's *Notebook of Sacrifices*, the two deities appear one after the other.³⁰⁰ Thus, at the time, for the Chuvash people reciting the prayer, the two deities were not identical.

This mythical being is usually not discussed in the great summary works,³⁰¹ yet it seems to have been an important figure of the Chuvash pantheon at an earlier time. The being *śut tēnče* already appears in Mil'kovich's 18th-century list, and in a prominent place: as № 5 of the 33 good deities. In one of Vishnevskiy's prayers³⁰² from a few decades later, we can find the being *śut śantalāk tītan* ('bright world holder') and its various compounds.³⁰³ Sboev also mentions the being *śut tēnče* in a prominent place, as № 4 of the celestial good deities (only preceded by God and its family, mother and children). In Magnitskiy's beer sacrifice lists, it only appears at the bottom of the hierarchy, and only in one list: in round IX of the Maslovoy deities. In Skvortsov, there is *śut tēnčene śuratna Aslă Ama* ('bright-world-birthing great mother'), as well as *Śerti-śültipe śut tēnčene tītan Ama* ('earthly-upper bright-world-holding mother') (Skv. 166-167), unfortunately, without further reference.

It is difficult to form a more accurate picture of this mythical being because its name has only been preserved in prayers and in some lists as an invoked deity. Those scholars who attribute some function to it, for example Sboev, who characterises it as the creator of light (Sbo. 80; repeated by: Nik. II, 132), only attempted to explain a hard-to-interpret being with their own interpretation.

³⁰⁰ I quote the prayer under Pav. 28-29.

³⁰¹ It does not appear as a mythical being for example in Mészáros, Denisov and Salmin.

³⁰² I quote the prayer under Vish. 239-240.

³⁰³ *Śut śantalāk tītan* 'universe-holder' [lit. 'bright-world holder']; *śut śantalāk tītan Toră amăš* 'universe-holding mother' [lit. 'bright-world-holding God's mother']; *śut śantalāk tītan Pülěxšě* 'universe-holder's messenger' [lit. 'bright-world-holding Pülěxšě']; *śut śantalāk tītan Pülěxšě amăš* 'universe-holding messenger's mother' [lit. 'bright-world-holding Pülěxšě's mother']; *śut śantalāk tītan Kepe* 'universe-holder's messenger' [lit. 'bright-world-holding Kepe'] (Vish. 239).

The first part of the compound (*śut*) can be found in some similar names, only occurring in one or two records, such as *śut amāšē* [‘bright (one)’s mother’] (Ashm. XII, 280); *śutā kül ami* ‘bright lake’s mother’ (Magn. 91; and ‘name of a deity’ Ashm. XII, 280); *śutā kül vīrtakan irā* ‘spirit [lit. ‘good one’] resting in the bright lake’ (Magn. 64).³⁰⁴ In the above-mentioned prayer, recorded by Vishnevskiy, there is the being *śut śulte vīrtan*³⁰⁵ [‘the one] resting in the bright world above’³⁰⁶ and some further compounds of it.³⁰⁷ Besides these, Magnitskiy has a compound form in which the word *tēnče* appears: *Шор тўнчи* (*śurā tēnče* ‘white light (of here)’ [lit. ‘white world’] – the fourteenth deity invoked in the Bishev list (Magn. 84).

Tipiri

I. *Тиберу* ‘x’s cleaner’ [in the compound name *Мун кереметь тиберу* (*Mun kiremet tipiri*) ‘the great *kiremet*’s cleaner’] (Vish. 233); *Тьерь ыра* ‘family or clan’s protector’ (Magn. 48, 86); *tipiri* ‘name of a(n erstwhile) spirit (*tipē irri* ?)’ (Ashm. XIV, 56). **II.** ‘2. disobedient (person); 3. finicky; 4. power-hungry’ (Ashm. XIV, 56). **III.** In this form, the word is hard to originate either from Chuvash or any other language. So far, there have been four attempts at interpreting and identifying the origin of the word. Probably starting from the word *tipter*, meaning ‘order’,

³⁰⁴ Zolotnitskiy also mentions something similar: in certain places, the bright lake is a big lake where spirits live, according to Shamanic beliefs (Zol. 75). Ashmarin gives a completely different account in connection with a village called *śütkül* (= *śut kül*). At the site of the village, there used to be a lake, which leaked away because, so the Chuvash believed, impure things were thrown into it, and once a girl even threw her own baby into the lake (Ashm. XII, 310).

³⁰⁵ This form was mentioned by Ashmarin in his university lectures, too, unfortunately without any explanation, only describing Vishnevskiy’s data (AshmVv. 53).

³⁰⁶ Skvortsov believes that this hard-to-interpret form could be a misspelling, and he suggests that the word *külte* (‘in the lake’) stands instead of *śulte*, noting that such a being (resting in the bright lake) also occurs at other places (Skv. 252).

³⁰⁷ *Śut śulte vīrtan* ‘bright-above resting’; *Śut śulte vīrtan Torā amāšē* ‘bright-above resting god’s mother’; *Śut śulte vīrtan Pülēxšē* ‘bright-above resting’s messenger’; *Śut śulte vīrtan Pülēxšē amāš* ‘bright-above resting’s messenger’s mother’ (Vish. 240). The compounds *Śut śulte vīrtan Torā* ‘God resting in the bright lake’ and *śut śantalāk śuratakan turā* ‘bright-world-creating God’ appear among the deities invoked in a sacrificial prayer to avert the destruction of livestock. I quote this prayer under Magn. 115-116.

Vishnevskiy thought that *kiremet tipiri* might mean ‘the *kiremet*’s cleaner’. (Actually, the places outside villages, regarded as *kiremet*s, were indeed kept in perfect order, but this task was assigned to specific persons). The word *tipiri* can by no means be derived from the form *tipter*. Magnitskiy interpreted the name as a compound (*мнерь ыра*), where *мнерь* ‘family, clan’ would be a Persian loan word (ModPer. تبار)³⁰⁸ (Magn. 86). However, this word with this meaning does not occur in any other Chuvash source, so this solution can also be discarded. Ashmarin also assumes a compound behind the word *tipiri*, which may have been a form *tipě irri* (Ashm. XIV, 56). Ashmarin does not assign a meaning to it – in this form, it means the ‘the good(ness) of the dry(ness) (a spirit)’. Skvortsov suggests that *tipiri* might be traced back to the second part of the Old Turkic compound title of nobility *elteber*, which was also used by the Volga Bulgars; thus, the meaning of the given form would be ‘the great *kiremet*’s courtier’ (Skv. 248). Unfortunately, this etymology can also be discarded for semantic as well as phonological reasons.³⁰⁹ IV. prayer: Vish. 240-241.

Although this being was already recorded in the first half of the 19th century, its meaning is not clear. In Vishnevskiy, it is one of the *kiremet*s or the lesser beings serving the *kiremet*s. In the prayer quoted by Vishnevskiy,³¹⁰ the ‘Great *kiremet tipiri*’ is the last one of the seven *kiremet*s listed, so, taking into consideration the hierarchical structure of the prayers invoking spirits, this being must have been a spirit of lesser significance or lesser harmful power. Vishnevskiy also notes that the Chuvash sacrificed geese to this being in the hope of avoiding diseases (Vish. 236).³¹¹

³⁰⁸ In fact, this word in Persian does not mean family or clan, but ‘origin, race, dynasty’ (see PRS 107).

³⁰⁹ There are several problems with Skvortsov’s theory. One of them is that the Volga Bulgar title of nobility was not simply ‘(some kind of) title of nobility’ but specifically the official title of the head of the Empire (who was Almiš at the time our written source refers to). The phonetic difficulties are even more serious, as the Oghur Turkic (Volga Bulgar or Khazar) form of the word is *yiltavar* (in Ibn Fadlan’s record), where the word-initial *y*- prosthesis, the velar vowel harmony and the *b > v* shift are all Oghur characteristics (cf. Ligeti 1986, 457-458, with further literature); therefore, the absence of these in later data cannot be explained.

³¹⁰ I also quote it in the Anthology, under Vish. 240-241.

³¹¹ At the same place, he lists the sacrifices offered to the other *kiremet*s, too: the great *kiremet* and its mother were offered a sheep and the great *kiremet*’s *pülěχšě* a lamb.

In the second half of the 19th century, we find in Magnitskiy the name *t(ě)per ĭră*, which might be related to the *tipiri*; however, Magnitskiy regards it as a protecting spirit, giving it the meaning ‘protector of the family or clan’. This form appears at two places in his lists of gods and spirits. One is the sacrifice held after the new grain was harvested (*kil yış pätti* ‘the household’s porridge’),³¹² when in Bishev, 12 gods and spirits were offered sacrifices. In this line, *t(ě)per ĭră* is № 9, and what is important, it is both preceded and followed by the names of *kiremets*. The name also appears at another place in the Bishev list, at the occasion of the great beer-sacrifice, when *t(ě)per ĭră* is № 63 of the 87 deities and spirits invoked, directly preceded by the “small *kiremet*”. Thus, despite Magnitskiy’s interpretation (based on faulty etymology), as far as its meaning and nature is concerned, this being can be considered identical with the *kiremet* recorded by Vishnevskiy.

Ashmarin suggested that this name could date back to a compound *tipě ĭrri*, in which case, the word *ĭră* (‘good’, whose genitive case form is *ĭrri*), often appearing as the second part in the names of *kiremets*, would support the possibility outlined above that it is indeed the name of a *kiremet*. If the form *tipiri* indeed includes the word *tip*, *tipě* ‘dry’,³¹³ then we can find some similar mythical beings that also include this word (as the first part of compounds). Such are *tip ěyye* ‘name of a spirit’ (Ashm. XIV, 58);³¹⁴ *tip šerti* ‘name of a spirit (dry-land devil)’³¹⁵ (Ashm. XIV, 59); according to one data provider, the *tip šerti* is even worse and more evil than the *šivri*;³¹⁶ and the *tippi* ‘evil spirit that causes emaciation’ might also

³¹² Mészáros also wrote about this sacrifice (Mész. 152-153). According to his record, 12 small flat breads (along with porridge) were sacrificed to the “twelve good ones”. Unfortunately, Mészáros did not record the names of the 12 good ones (perhaps his data providers did not name them, either).

³¹³ Sboev explains the Chuvash word *tip* from the Arabic word *تب* (*tabb*) ‘destruction, death’ (cf. ARS 97) (Sbo. 89).

³¹⁴ There is only one piece of data for it, without a wider context.

³¹⁵ The literal name of the being is ‘of dry (dried up, parched) land’.

³¹⁶ This and the previous data are both from Alsheevo village in the Buin district (Ashm. XIV, 58-59).

belong to this group (Ashm. XIV, 60). In Chuvash beliefs, drying out or ‘dry trouble’ (*tip šar*) appears at several places in various forms. For example, when Vishnevskiy lists all the diseases and misfortunes against which the Chuvash prayed to the *kiremets*, he also mentions *šir-šar*, which he translates as ‘dry trouble’ (Vish. 241). In Ashmarin’s dictionary, however, this meaning is found under the compound *tip šar* (Ashm. XVII, 133).³¹⁷

Tură

I. *Topa* ‘God’ (Müll. 113); *Tópa, моръ* ‘God’, *Торъ аму* ‘goddess’ (Soč. 13); *Top* ‘God’ (Pal. 159); *Topa* ‘the highest God’, *Тора амуи* ‘the highest God’s wife’ (Geo. 176); *Тора* ‘God’, *Тора амышъ* ‘Godmother’, as well as *кюдесра-Тора* ‘icon, depiction’ (VishN. 170); *Тора* ‘the beginning of all good and gracious (as opposed to the dark and bad Satan)’, and *Сюлду тора* ‘first one of the gods, the highest’ (Artem. 57); ‘God, icon’ (Zol. 84); Buin *tură* (gen. *turrân*); Mal. *toră* (gen. *torân*) ‘God’ (Gom. 157); *tură* ‘God; holy picture’ (Paa. 173); *tšun pürden tură* ‘soul-giving God’ (Paa. 111); *ăne-turri* ‘cow-protecting God’ (Paa. 173-174); *tură-şylă* ‘some spirit who «belongs to God’s company»’ (Paa. 174); *tură-ymăn, Džē šüren* ‘some spirit who belongs to God’s company’ (Paa. 174); *turăš* ‘cabinet in which the holy pictures are held, holy picture’ (Paa. 174); *tură, toră* ‘God, deity; saint/holy; icon’ (Ashm. XIV, 155-157; for the meaning of ‘holy’, also: *tură šivě* ‘holy water’ [‘God’s water’] Ashm. XVI, 159); its compounds (for example): *vılăχ torri* ‘name of a deity, god of livestock’, *kêtesri tură* ‘icon’ (Ashm. XVI, 157) [‘God in the corner’]; with the meaning ‘name of a deity’: *čun šuratakan tură* [‘soul-creating God’], *čun püren tură* [‘soul-giving God’], *tură alăk uşakaně / tură alăkne uşan* [‘the opener of God’s door’], (Ashm. XVI, 157); *tură ača / tur ači* [‘God’s son’], *tură uměñče šüreken* ‘deity of the sixth round’ [‘going before God’], *tură vākăřě* [God’s bull],³¹⁸ *tură-pülěχ* (Ashm. XVI, 158); *tura-seχmet, tură-sinker, tură tala, tură tatli* (Ashm. XVI, 159); with the meaning ‘name of a spirit’ and ‘name of an evil spirit’: *toră*

³¹⁷ *Tip šar* ‘dry trouble’ is a very interesting phenomenon in Chuvash folklore. It means a kind of suicide when a person hangs himself, but not in his own home but at his enemy’s gate, usually as a “closing act” of some revenge or false accusation or defamation. The phenomenon was described by Fuks in the first half of the 19th century, since when it has gathered quite a large literature (see e.g. Magn. 123-126; Nikitina 2005). False accusation and defamation and the avoidance of these even appear in prayers (I quote one of them under Pav. 27/6).

³¹⁸ This being may be related to the field sacrifice called *vākăř čükě* (*vākăřpa učuk*) ‘ox-sacrifice (field sacrifice with an ox)’ (cf. Ashm. V, 296).

inkekě (Ashm. XVI, 158); *tură xayar* (Ashm. XVI, 159); as well as: *turăš*, *torăš* ‘1. icon, 2. name of a deity’ (Ashm. XVI, 160); and *tură amăšě* ‘name of a deity, divine mother; the icon of the God-birthing mother’ (Ashm. XVI, 157); 1. ‘God, deity, divine’ ~ *amăšě* ‘Godmother’; ~ *papay* (ironic) ‘God’; ~ *pani* ‘divine grace’; *tur šákri* ‘communion bread’; ~ *širni* ‘1. fate, destiny; 2. fatal’; ~ *tavrašě* ‘God and (all of its) surroundings’; ~ *vīrānne xur* ‘deify, glorify’; ~ *kašartār!* ‘God forgive!’ 2. ‘icon’ (Sir. 442); 1. ‘God, deity, divine, godly’; ~ *šutlā šīn* ‘religious person’ ~ *ra kēltāvakan* ‘church-goer’; ~ *ra ēneneken* ‘believer’; 2. ‘icon’ ~ *vīrāně* ‘shelf or chest standing in front of the icons, icon-holder, glazed icon-cabinet; *tav (muxtav)* ~! ~ *šěkēr!* ‘thank god!’; *aḡ*, ~! ‘oh, my god!’; *tupata ~šān / ~šān ta!* ‘to my word of honour; so help me God!’ (Skvor. 496). **II.** *ujaradi pər tūră* (from a folk song) ‘will the only sky clear up?’ *tūr(ă)-pallī* ‘birth-mark’ (Paa. 174, 190); 3. *tur kačaki* (zoo.) ‘night-jar’; 4. *tur laši* ‘ladybird’; 5. *tur palli* ‘birth-mark’ (Sir. 442). **III.** The Chuvash being *tură* was first associated with the figure *Thor*, of Scandinavian mythology, by Müller in the 18th century (Mil.: Nik. I, 113) and, even though the word has a clear Turkic etymology, this faulty etymology has often been repeated from the 19th century to date (lastly, e.g., by Sal. 386). The Chuvash word is in fact the equivalent of Old Turkic *tāgri* ‘sky, God’ (DTS 544; Cl. 523-524) (cf. e.g. Räs. 474; Egor. 259; Fed. II, 252-253). The word has been preserved in the vocabularies of all Turkic languages; for peoples who converted to a monotheistic faith, meaning ‘God’, elsewhere ‘sky’ (for further reference, cf. also: Doer. II, 577-579). The Chuvash meaning ‘icon’ also appears in Tatar and Bashkir (*täre*), which Egorov related to the Middle Persian word *طور* (*tour*) ‘picture; appearance (looks); mode’ (Egor. 259). **IV.** legend: Inf. 19-22 (*šūlti Tură; čun šuratakan Tură*); prayer: Müll. 119; Pal. 159; Geor. 178; Lep. 213; Rekeev 1898, 184-185; Magn. 20, 28, 30, 44-45, 45/2, 46-47, 49, 53/1, 58, 59-60, 84-87, 91-92, 115-116; Pav. 26, 27/1-4, 27/6, 27-28, 28, 28-29; Ashm. VII, 39; AshmVv. 8-9; AshmVv. 9/2; Fuks 1840 141; Mész. 133-134, 127, 128, 129/1-3, 130, 131, 136, 139, 144/1-2, 146; Elle 47-52; incantation: Mész. 15; Elle 29-30.

Tură is the most central, key element of the Chuvash belief system. As the centuries-long, more or less successful Orthodox missionary work used this word to denote the Christian concept of God, the meaning of this word must have undergone a greater change than other elements of the belief system.³¹⁹ There has been a debate for almost a century and a half in the literature whether originally and in essence, *Tură* appeared as the only creator God in the earlier

³¹⁹ The other central element of Chuvash beliefs so exposed to changes in meaning was perhaps the *kiremet*, diabolised by Orthodoxy.

Chuvash belief system or, on the contrary, *Tură* was a notion that could mean even the smallest, least significant spirit³²⁰ as well as the greatest, most powerful supernatural being.

The word appears in the earliest records, initially only with the meaning ‘God’. Later, the meanings ‘deity’ and ‘icon’ appear, too. The early recorders probably did not know the latter two meanings, due to the few and often inaccurate data available.

In mythical texts (primarily prayers), *Tură* is invoked the most often, and even in the case of sacrifices held in honour of other gods, *Tură* is always the supernatural being appearing in the first place. In pagan prayers, *Tură*’s prominent position above all other deities is unquestionable; however, the word *tură* appears in many compound forms. Some of these are preceded by an adjective; some are possessive or nominative case noun + noun structures; and some are participle forms such as ‘(something)-giver or -creator’. Some of these forms are also used as the names of lower-status, less important mythical beings in the hierarchy of deities.

Its most frequent attributive forms are *śulti tură* ‘upper God’ and *măn tură* ‘great God’.³²¹ In the majority of the literature (e.g. Vishnevskiy and Mészáros), these forms are considered identical with *Tură* as the only or highest God. However, in Ashmarin’s dictionary, these compounds each appear as the names of lesser deities

³²⁰ *Tură* also appears in compounds such as *kiremet tură*, *vărman tură*, or even *vupkăn tură*.

³²¹ Shevle provides a different compound, not found elsewhere, when he gives the name of the highest God as *Tasa pěr tură*. As it means ‘pure one God’, it is possible that Shevle did not provide this form as one existing in the tradition, but he only wanted to indicate that the highest being of the Chuvash belief system is the ‘only God’. In his dictionary, Ashmarin provides the same god-name in the form of *Tasa măn tură* ‘pure great God’ (Ashm. XIII, 225), which may be an accidental misspelling or perhaps Ashmarin wanted to improve on Shevle’s strange compound. *Tasa* (‘pure, healthy, light’) is a very rare attribute of deities, although there are one or two examples of it (cf. Ashm. XIII, 225 – in these cases, Ashmarin considers the word *tasa* to mean ‘saint, holy’); and it sometimes occurs as the attribute of the words ‘ceremony’ and ‘road’, when these have some sacred meaning, see → *Čük*, → *Śul*. In the latter two cases, though, it is questionable whether these forms can be regarded as mythical beings.

(VIII, 310; XII, 294) and Magnitskiy also interprets them as the names of separate deities. In fact, both ideas can be supported. In some prayers God, invoked in the first place, appears in an attributive form, and in other, parallel prayers, it appears without adjectives. In yet other prayers, God is invoked first and these attributive forms appear later, after lesser deities.³²²

There is a similar debate among scholars with regard to beings where the compound name ‘(something)-birthing or -creating God’³²³ appears. The most frequent of these are: *ivāl-χěr śuratakān turā* ‘child (son-daughter)-creating God’,³²⁴ *tir-pul śuratakan turā* ‘grain-creating God’,³²⁵ *vilāχ-čěrlēχ śuratakān turā* ‘livestock-

³²² Such is, for example, the beer-sacrifice list from Bishev, in which the first god invoked is *Turā*, whereas deity № 17 is *Mān Turā* [‘Great God’] (Magn. 84).

³²³ Such compound forms do not occur in 18th and early 19th-century records, but several of them can be found in Magnitskiy, Shevle, Pavlov and Ashmarin. It is probable, however, that these forms were not created in the second half of the 19th century but are from an earlier period, because in non-religious and non-ritual texts at this time, the primary meaning of the verb *śurat-* was ‘bear, give birth’. In contrast, in the names of gods and deities, probably the earlier meaning of the verb (‘create’) is reflected. The verb *yarat-*, meaning ‘create’, already existed in Old Turkic (cf. e.g. Cl. 959-960), and its past participle form (*yaratqan*) has been preserved in the vocabulary of many Turkic-speaking peoples which converted to Islam, meaning ‘creator, the Creator’.

³²⁴ Such compounds do not only occur with the word *turā*, but → *Ama* ‘mother’ and → *Pülēχšē* can also appear as the second part (Ashm. III, 48). These three forms are presented as the first three deities of the second round of prayers in Shevle’s manuscript (cf. Ashm. III, 66). In Magnitskiy’s Maslovoy and Bishev lists, only the compounds featuring God appear (child-creating God): in the third round of prayers in the Maslovoy list (Magn. 62), and as the 43rd god-name in the Bishev list (Magn. 85). However, in the Cheshlam list, *ivāl-χěr śuratakan turā* is immediately followed by the form *ivāl-χěr śuratakan sīχčī* as the 13th deity, which Magnitskiy translates as ‘children’s guardian’, but this compound in fact means ‘child (son-daughter)-creating guard’.

³²⁵ There are also forms such as *tir-pul śuratakan amēš* and *tir-pul śuratakan pülēχšē* (Ashm. XIV, 3). In Shevle’s manuscript, these forms appear as the first three beings of the third prayer round (Ashm. III, 65). In Magnitskiy’s Cheshlam beer-sacrifice god-list, № 17 *tirā-polā śoratakan torā*, translated as ‘giver of grain and all earthly gain’, is followed by the deities called *tirā-polā nikēs* ‘grain’s foundation’ and *tirā-polā sīχčī* ‘grain’s guardian’ (Magn. 88). Only the being named ‘grain-creating God’ appears in Magnitskiy’s Bishev list, as № 35,

creating God'³²⁶ and *čun šuratakan tură* 'soul-creating God'.³²⁷ Some forms only occur in Magnitskiy, such as *mol šuratakan Tură* 'wealth-creating God',³²⁸ *šurt šuratakan Tură* 'house-creating God' (Magn. 62), as well as *χurt šuratakan Toră* 'steel-creating God',³²⁹ *χorś šuratakan Toră* 'bee-creating God'³³⁰ and *čeček šuratakan* 'flower-creating',³³¹ too.

There are some compounds in which the word *tură* certainly appears in the names of spirits or deities of lesser significance. In

translated as 'giving wealth to the grain' (Magn. 85), as well as in the Maslovoy list in the fourth round, meaning 'giving all kinds of grain' (Magn. 62).

³²⁶ Besides *vilăχ-čērlēχ šuratakān tură*, there are also the forms *vilăχ-čērlēχ šuratakan amēš* / *vilăχ-čērlēχ šuratan ama* ['livestock-creating mother'] and *vilăχ-čērlēχ šuratakān pülēχšē* ['livestock-creating *Pülēχšē*'] (Ashm. V, 203), which are, in Shevle's manuscript, the deities invoked as fourth, fifth and sixth in the third round of prayers. In Magnitskiy's Maslovoy and Bishev lists, there is only the form *vilăχ-čērlēχ šuratakān Toră* (Magn. 62, 85) and, at one place, a longer form of the same: *višše türle vilăχ-čērlēχ šuratakān Toră* 'three-kinds-of-livestock creating God' appears, which Magnitskiy translated as 'three kinds of livestock giver' (Magn. 88).

³²⁷ Besides, on the second page of Nikifor Pavlovich's *Notebook*, there are also: *čun šuratakan tură amăšē* 'soul- birthing God's mother', as well as *čun šuratakan Pülēχšē* ['soul-birthing *Pülēχšē*'] and *čun šuratakan Pülēχšē amăšē* ['soul-birthing *Pülēχšē*'s mother'] (Pav.: Ashmarin 1921, 31). The soul-giving God only appears in Magnitskiy's very short, Bayteryakov list, at the prestigious third place among the 14 deities invoked (Magn. 91). However, it already occurs in Mil'kovich's 18th-century description, as seventh of the 33 deities listed, in the form *чонь сюрадань торь* (Mil. 137). For some reason, Nikol'skiy quotes this in the form "*Иок-аордан Тора* (sic!)" (Nik. I, 495).

³²⁸ The god invoked in the sixth round of the Maslovoy list. In this list, from the third to the eighth prayer rounds are gods who create something: the child-creator, grain-creator, livestock-creator, wealth, and then bee- and steel-creating gods. In the Bishev list, the form *mol tăvagan toră* appears, which Magnitskiy translates as 'wealth-gifting God' (Magn. 85), lit. 'wealth-making God'.

³²⁹ Magnitskiy provides the translation 'strength-giver' (Magn. 85), but *χorś* in Chuvash does not mean 'strength', only 'steel' (cf. Ashm. XVI, 229; Mész. 9). Magnitskiy also has a form *χorś antaran tură*, translated as 'lowerer of strength, stability' (Magn. 90), it actually means 'lowerer of steel'.

³³⁰ It appears in two God-lists: in the seventh prayer round in Maslovoy (Magn. 63) and as deity № 48 in Bishev (Magn. 86).

³³¹ In Magnitskiy, this form does not include the word God (Magn. 62), but in Nikol'skiy, it appears in the form: *čeček šuratakan tură* (Nik. II, 133).

these cases, it occurs in a possessive structure or simply in the form $x + \textit{tură}$ or $\textit{tură} + x$. There are several forms like this already in Mil'kovich's 18th-century list,³³² for example: *Etem Toră* 'thunder and lightning God',³³³ *iră Toră* 'good-deed God',³³⁴ *Pereget Toră* 'abundance God',³³⁵ *kilti tură* 'house spirit [house God]', *kartari tură* 'livestock God [farmyard God]', *χirti toră* 'field God', *vărman toră* 'forest spirit [forest God]'.³³⁶ Sboev repeats Mil'kovich's data,³³⁷ and also mentions the names of the Sun, Moon and Wind god (*χēvel toră*, *uyaχ toră*, *śil toră*),³³⁸ the *χērlē-śir* God (*χērlē-śir toră*), the sacrifice-God (*χārpan toră*), as well as the 'door-opening God' (*alāk ośan toră*).³³⁹ Towards the end of Magnitskiy's sacrifice lists, among the lesser deities or spirits, there are several compounds which also carry some negative connotations, for example *toră sulu* 'God's whip',³⁴⁰ *toră χayarē* 'God's wrath', *toră inkekē*

³³² In the transcription of the listed beings, I did not follow Mil'kovich's notation method but Nikol'skiy's amended forms.

³³³ This form is hard to interpret. In later records, thunder and lightning appear as *aslati*, *aśa*, *śiśem*, but Nikifor Pavlovich's *Notebook of Sacrifices* also has a form *Adam toră* (Pav. 27). Although its exact meaning is not clear, it can hardly be associated with thunder and lightning (cf. also: Ashm. II, 133 – here, it is the name of a deity, the first part of which may be related to the name Adam).

³³⁴ The Chuvash form is actually not a possessive construction; for the first part of the compound, see → *Īră*.

³³⁵ The Chuvash form is actually not a possessive construction; for the first part of the compound, see → *Pereket*.

³³⁶ The literature usually identifies this form with the → *Ar-śuri* (cf. pl. End. 30-31). In also occurs in the form *vărman puśē* (Ashm. V, 323), meaning 'forest's head (chief)'.

³³⁷ With the difference that, instead of Mil'kovich's *Etem toră*, which is hard to interpret, he has *Aslati toră* as thunder god.

³³⁸ In this list, when quoting Sboev's data, I did not include his transcriptions, as they do not contain any additional information.

³³⁹ Sboev interprets the *alāk ośan toră* as the 'opener of the gods' door', and others usually follow suit (e.g. Vishnevskiy, Nikol'skiy), although at other places, it appears simply as *alāk uśan* 'door-opener'. Sboev's form actually means 'door-opening God'.

³⁴⁰ This translation is doubtful. There is a Chuvash word *sulu*, meaning 'wrong, [evil eye]' (for more details, see → *Vilē*), and Ashmarin knows about the word

‘God’s punishment’.³⁴¹ Several of these also appear in Nikifor Pavlovich’s *Notebook of Sacrifices*, along with the form *turā tala* ‘God-debate’.³⁴²

In its meaning of ‘icon’, the word *turā* poses yet more problems. The basic question here is why the Chuvash people started to use their own word meaning ‘God, deity’ to denote the specific objects of an (at least initially) foreign religion. The roots of this must lie in the icon-worship of Russian Orthodoxy and even more so in Russian folk religiosity.³⁴³ We know from some earlier records that in Chuvash villages, the missionary priest made it mandatory to set up icons in the houses, which the Chuvash did under duress, and they even prayed in front of these icons – to their own deities. The Russian religious worship of icons was integrated into the beliefs of the Chuvash and was assimilated into the pantheon of local deities or spirits worshipped in some objectified form (such as the *yērēx* or the *kiremet*). By the way, in the line of Chuvash beliefs of the late 18th and especially of the 19th century, which we know better,

śola ‘whip’, recorded earlier but already obsolete (Ashmarin 1921, 34; for more details, see → *Śul*).

³⁴¹ Similarly, as in the case of Mil’kovich and Sboev, in this list, I provide Magnitskiy’s data, too, in an amended form. In the Russian translation of the data quoted here, Magnitskiy uses attributive constructions (divine whip, divine wrath, divine punishment), but the Chuvash forms are possessive structures. These forms not only appear in the beer-sacrifice lists but also at the goose-sacrifice, where each of the deities and spirits invoked is some kind of bad or dangerous being.

³⁴² Ashmarin originates the Chuvash word *tala* from the Arab تعالي (*ta‘ālā*) ‘most high’ (with Tatar mediation – Tat. *tägälä*: Ashmarin 1902, 119, 121; Ashmarin 1921, 31). Scherner accepts Ashmarin’s etymology, adding the form found in Ashmarin’s dictionary *turtal* ‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. XIV, 173; Scher. 76). Ashmarin also includes the form *torta turri* ‘god of the forked wagon-shaft’, which is found in Magnitskiy and is difficult to explain (Magn. 115), which might go back to this same compound. The etymology of the word is probably correct, yet it does not clarify the meaning relevant to the given community. On the basis of the prayer in Nikifor Pavlovich’s *Notebook of Sacrifices*, the compound form (*Turā tala*) must have been associated with quarrelling and debate for the praying community, due to the Chuvash word family *tal*, *tav* ‘quarrel, debate’ (see: Ashm. 134-135, 164-165).

³⁴³ On this issue, see also: Dallos 2012.

several figures can be discovered that suddenly appeared, without being particularly embedded, in the system of beliefs, which was, at that time, already changing relatively quickly.³⁴⁴

There were specific icons in some churches that were highly respected among the Chuvash, to which they came to offer sacrifices from distant villages; however, these sacrifices (pieces of bread, thread and fabric), as well as the prayers said here, all corresponded to pagan sacrificial rites. One of the most important places was in Ishak,³⁴⁵ and the icon most fundamentally integrated in Chuvash beliefs was the depiction of the miracle-working Saint Nicholas. Sboev wrote about the worship of *Mikul tură* ('Nicholas God' or 'Nicholas icon') already in the middle of the 19th century (Sbo. 87). This being appeared in several later records, too, sometimes as an independent being and sometimes identified with the figure → *Xěrlě śīr*. Already in Sboev, the figures of *xěrlě śīr tură*, who was responsible for the fertility of the earth, and *Mikul tură* were associated. Sboev himself asked his data-providers why *Mikul tură* was always present in the prayers at the occasion of the foal-sacrifice held for the fertility of the earth every five years, but they could not answer this question.

Uyaχ

I. 'Moon (to which they pray)' (Vish. 232); *Oux mopa* – it has a wife and children, too; *oux* means 'Moon, month' (Sbo. 82; Nik. II, 132). **II.** *oŭyx* 'Moon, month' (Zol. 156);³⁴⁶ 'Moon, month' (Ashm. III, 177-186). **III.** The word had already existed in Old Turkic *āy*, meaning 'Moon, month' (Cl. 265), and still exists in several Turkic languages (cf. Sev. I, 98-99; Räs. 10; GTJ 55; Chuvash data with Turkic background: Zol. 156; Egor. 270; Fed. II, 271); the word-final -χ only exists in Chuvash, where it is a regular form. **IV.** prayer: Vish. 239-240; incantation: Elle 29-30.

³⁴⁴ An interesting example of this is the figure *kušpučě*, which is invoked in a prayer along with several other beings. It might originate from the Russian word *зочноду!* ('Oh, Lord, my God!'). I quote the prayer under Ashm. VII, 39.

³⁴⁵ There is a record already from 1828 about the healer advising going to Ishak to offer a sacrifice (Aleks. 15).

³⁴⁶ According to Zolotnitskiy, unlike the Sun, the Moon was not regarded as a deity (Zol. 156-158).

The Moon as a mythical creature only appears in a small fraction of the literature; mostly mentioned by early authors. Even Ashmarin does not regard it as a supernatural being, although he sought to include highly questionable beings in his dictionary in all cases. In the first half of the 19th century, Vishnevskiy mentions it together with the Sun and the wind as personified beings that the Chuvash pray to (Vish. 232). Sboev also listed the Moon, together with wife and children, among the good deities, following the Sun (Sbo. 82), which was adopted by Nikol'skiy (Nik. II, 132) as well as Kamensky.³⁴⁷

The Moon does not appear in any of Magnitskiy's beer-sacrifice lists, which include a great many deities, nor in Nikifor Pavlovich's *Notebook of Sacrifices*, nor in Shevle's list, but it does appear in incantations together with the Sun,³⁴⁸ as well as in a prayer recorded by Vishnevskiy, in the following form: "Sun, have mercy! / Moon, have mercy!"³⁴⁹

Upram

I. 'spirit who protects people at night' (Paa. 193. > Ashm. III, 257). III. The word is a derivative of the verb *upra-* 'protect, guard' (Paa. 139; Ashm. III, 256-257), a Mongolian loan word in Turkic languages, Mong. *abura-* 'guard, protect' (Fed. II, 282-283). On the Chuvash *+m* deverbative noun suffix, see: Levitskaya 157-158. IV. prayer (excerpt): Paa. 193.

This mythical being in this form only appears in Paasonen. Actually, Ashmarin adopted his data, but he does not add any other data to it (he probably did not know any). However, we have some examples of other derivatives of the verb *upra-* 'protect, guard'.³⁵⁰ Paasonen parallels the form *upram* itself, which he regards as a nightly protecting spirit, with the form *čun siḡlan tură*, which he translates as:

³⁴⁷ Although Kamensky, in the second half of the 19th century, already believed that the Chuvash did not know any details about these deities (the god of the Sun, Moon and Sky).

³⁴⁸ I quote such an incantation under Elle 29-30.

³⁴⁹ I provide the full text of the prayer under Vish. 239-240.

³⁵⁰ In prayers asking for protection, this verb often appears together with the verb *siḡla-*, also meaning 'protect, guard'.

“spirit which protects the human spirit by day (each person has such a spirit)”³⁵¹ (Paa. 189). In the prayer extract quoted by Paasonen in his entry, *upram* actually does not stand by itself but is joined in a compound with → *ĭră* (*Upram ĭră*). Thus, this form may not be an independent mythical being but *upram* is simply the first part of the compound with *ĭră*.³⁵²

Ashmarin provides (unfortunately, without a wider context), one piece of data each about the other derivatives of the verb *upra-*: *upravśa* ‘name of a deity’; *uprakaně* ‘protector (identical with the *pirěšti*)’; *Opras śüren*³⁵³ ‘name of a spirit’; *Uprašśi* ‘name of a spirit’ (Ashm. III, 257). We can add to these the name *Omra opran*, from the Bishev beer-sacrifice list, which Magnitskiy translated as: ‘guardian of life’ (Magn. 87). Ashmarin included Magnitskiy’s data in his dictionary, with the meaning ‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. III, 235).

Usal

I. An. *uzal*; Kur; Mal. *ozal* ‘bad, evil, the devil’ (Gom. 161); ‘bad, evil’ (Paa. 194); ‘4. devil, impure spirit or force; 5. misfortune, trouble (sometimes personified)’ (Ashm. III, 295-297). **II.** *ocal*, *ozal* ‘stupid, bad’ (Dmit. 297); *узаль* ‘bad, trouble’ (Soc. 65.), *озаль тывагань* ‘evil, rascal’ (Soc. 16); *ozal* ‘bad, evil, useless’ (VishN. 123); *ozal* ‘evil, bad’ (Zol. 18); ‘bad, evil’ (Paa. 194); ‘1. bad, evil, cruel; 2. bad being, bad person, rascal; 3. bad, loss, harm, misfortune; 6. trash, useless, disgusting thing; 7. misfortune, bad luck; 8. (swearword) devil; 9. snow storm; 10. badly’ (Ashm. III, 295-297). **III.** The word is from a Turkic etymon: OT. *osāl* ‘negligent, idler; negligence, idleness’ (Cl. 247). It exists in several Modern Turkic languages, meaning ‘careless, lazy’, or (especially in Turkic languages in the Volga region and also in some Kipchak languages) ‘bad’ (Sev. I, 479-481; Fed. I, 290; Räs. 365-366). For more on its data in Turkic and other languages, see also: Doer. II, 149-150. **IV.** incantation: Ashm. I, 166; Mész 60; Magn. 147; Elle 29-30; prayer: Vish. 239-240.

³⁵¹ The deity’s literal name is ‘soul-protecting God’.

³⁵² Thus, even though *upram* is a noun, this compound can be translated as ‘protecting good one’ or as the ‘good one of protection’ (in the case of compound god and spirit names, the possessive case is not always marked; see examples at → *Tură*).

³⁵³ The word *śüren* (‘going’) appears as the second part in the names of several deities and spirits.

The word was already recorded in the first half of the 18th century. In the Russian-Tatar-Chuvash-Mordvin dictionary, in the form *оcал*, meaning ‘bad’ and ‘stupid’, and in the Russian-Chuvash-Mari-Mordvin dictionary, in the form *оcал*, meaning ‘bad’ (Dmit. 297).

Although the *usal* appears in several mythical legends,³⁵⁴ the vast majority of the literature clearly does not consider it a mythical being. This name is not found in Magnitskiy’s great god-lists; neither Sboev nor Vishnevskiy or Nikol’skiy writes about it. Mészáros and Enderov do not list it among the mythical beings either, although in one place, Mészáros refers to the *usal* besides the *iye* as an evil spirit which changes new-born babies (Mész. 408). In Ashmarin’s article about mythical beings, the word *usal* appears as a synonym for *šuyttan* (devil) in the entry *šuyttan*, in relation to the devil-chase at Easter (AshmVv. 34-35). However, in another article, where he writes about the devil, he calls it *šuyttan*, but in the Chuvash belief texts cited by him, the actual word used is *usal*, not *šuyttan* (Ashmarin 1982, 34).

Salmin, on the other hand, discusses it not only as the name of a single mythical being, but as a collective group-name of earthly evil spirits (*usal*-type spirits). According to Salmin’s data, there are two notions about the origin of the *usal*. One of them claims that people who die unnaturally (those falling into a ravine or new-born babies killed by their mothers) become *usal*. According to the other idea, *Usal* was originally God’s (*Turǎ*’s) brother, and they divided the world between them in a way that *Usal* got the ravines, water-bodies and hidden places, whereas *Turǎ* got the meadows, forests and bright, clean places. The basic function of the *usal* is to punish and inflict diseases on people who do not comply with the norms (for example, those who go out into the field or the forest even if they have no job to do there or those who look out the window of the house at night). In this sense, the *usal*, as opposed to the → *Xayar*, is an avenging being which punishes people for the sins they committed (Sal. 468).

³⁵⁴ The latest text edition: MLX 376-396.

In prayers, it occurs on its own, but the compound form *usal-těsel* also occurs frequently, having the same meaning as *usal* ('impure force, all kinds of evil': Ashm. III, 299), as well as the forms *usal-ḡayar* and *usal-seḡmet*, which appear in Ashmarin with the meaning 'name of some spirit' (Ashm. III, 2); see also → *Xayar* and → *Seḡmet*.

Valēm ḡuša

I. Мелим хузя 'name of a *yěřḡ* spirit' (Zol. 151); Малем хузя 'yěřḡ spirit' (Magn. 68, adopted by Nikolsky: 'the name of a *yěřḡ*' Nik. I, 134), Мелим хузя '(spirit) a one-time horse-trader' (Magn. 87); *Malēm-ḡuša* 'the chief of all the saints in Paradise' (Paa. 84); *Yelim ḡuša* 'name of a *kiremet*' (Mész. 126); its further forms: *Mayum hoša* (Zol. 151); *Valem ḡuša*, *Valēm ḡuša*, *Valām ḡuša* '1. The name of a worshipped being' (Ashm. V, 161, 162, 165); *Melēm ḡuša* 'kiremet living in a hut, to which bloody sacrifices are brought' (Ashm. VIII, 222), *Melēm ḡuša amāšě* and *Melēm ḡuša* are given goose sacrifices (Ashm. VIII, 222); *Malēm ḡuša* (Ashm. VIII, 184); *Malām ḡoša* (Ashm. VIII, 185); as well as: *Valēm ḡuša kiremečě* 'name of a *kiremet*' (Ashm. V, 162); *Ilēm ḡuša* (Magn. 68-69); *Valēm-ḡuša amāšě* (Den. 63); *Yelim ĩrri* 'name of a *kiremet* invoked in the sowing sacrifice' (Mész. 126).³⁵⁵

II. (a) *Valem ḡuša* (2.) 'name of a ravine' (Ashm. V, 161); *Malām ḡoša* '2. name of a ravine' (Ashm. VIII, 181), and *Malām širmi* 'id.'; *Valām ḡuša* '2. name of a ravine' (Ashm. V, 165); (b) *ḡuša*, *ḡoša* 'host, owner, merchant, household' (Ashm. XVI, 246-247). **III.** The second part of the compound is clear: the word is of Persian origin (see → *Xuša*). The first part is less clear. Zolotnitskiy starts from the form *Malēm ḡuša*, and thinks that the compound originates from the name of a Muslim sheikh (saint), *Malyum ḡodža*, whose grave is near Mount Bilari (Zol. 151).³⁵⁶ This is questioned by Magnitskiy on the basis of the nature of the spirit (i.e. for semantic reasons) (1891, 13), but accepted by Romanov, who classifies this figure among the Islamic-rooted terms for Chuvash pagan spirits (Romanov, 1957, 195), and Denisov, who interprets it as a Volga Bulgarian relic of Chuvash mythology

³⁵⁵ According to Mészáros, this being is probably the same as Magnitskiy's *Malēm ḡuša*.

³⁵⁶ Zolotnitskiy takes the data from Berezin: on this hill stand the tombs of three great Muslim saints, as we know from the account of a 16th-century Tatar historian. Prior to Berezin's record, Kudryashev wrote in an article published in 1826 about a cemetery near Bilarsk called Balin-Gus, which was revered by Bashkirs and Tatars alike, that the water springing up there was supposed to have healing powers. (Kudryashev 1826; I quote from Torma: Tor. 18).

(Den. 63-64; cf. also Ashm. 1902, 20). Fedotov considers the form *Valēm χuša* as primary and associates the word *valēm* with the Chuvash word *valē, val'*, meaning 'part (of something)' (Ashm. V, 162, 164.), and also includes the names of two other mythical beings: *valle*³⁵⁷ and *valēs*^{358, 359}. IV. prayer: Ashm. I, 236; Magn. 58, 59-60, 84-87; Pav. 28-29; Mész. 126-127.

According to some descriptions, *Valēm χuša* is the name of a *kiremet*, and according to some others, the name of a *yěřēχ* spirit. There is also a record of a sacrifice presented specifically to it, and in the case of larger sacrifices, its name can be found among the deities and spirits invoked. In his list of *kiremets*, Mil'kovich mentions it among the "medium *kiremets*".

Magnitskiy gives a long description of a sacrificial place situated in a granary, which was called *Ilem χuša*.³⁶⁰ It was "operated" by a family and finally, at the request of the inhabitants, the Russian authorities liquidated it, as reported in 1870.³⁶¹ In the sacrificial place, two baskets made from elm bark were mounted on the wall, containing all kinds of sacrificial objects, such as thread, pieces of cloth, money, crust of bread, balls of dough, shapeless pieces of lead and wax, as well as an image of *Melim χuša*, made from a birch board and wax. Both the sacrificial objects and the image actually suggest a *yěřēχ* spirit; however, both the place of sacrifice and the mythical being showered with sacrificial objects are called *kiremet* in the Russian report.

³⁵⁷ According to Yurkin's description, every three years, a white lamb sacrifice was presented to *Valle* in a closed family circle so that the household chattels would not be lost or ruined. (Yurkin 1891, 28; also quoted by AshmVv. 29-30).

³⁵⁸ The meaning of the Chuvash *valēs* is 'the distributor of goods, the name of a spirit' (Ashm. V, 162). It is worth noting that the name → *Pülēχśē*, a significant figure in Chuvash mythology, also means 'distributor'.

³⁵⁹ Denisov also finds a connection with mythical creature *valle*, but he derives it from the Arabic word *vālī* 'holy' (Den. 64).

³⁶⁰ Magnitskiy automatically identifies it with the form *Malēm χuša*.

³⁶¹ According to the report, the owner of the barn was a Chuvash called Vasily Ivanov who, together with his wife, worked hard to ensure that the spirit of the sacrificial place inside their barn was well-known and feared in and around their village. For example, they would visit sick people and foretell the death of those who did not offer a sacrifice to the spirit living in their barn (Magn. 68-69).

Magnitskiy lists it in his Maslovoy list of the gods of the beer sacrifice as the first spirit of Round XV in the form *Melēm χuša*. He describes it as a *yěřēχ*-spirit, and in the Bishev list, it is called *Malēm χuša* and is the 74th spirit, regarding it as the ghost of a one-time horse trader.

In Nikifor Pavlovich's *Notebook of Sacrifices*, *Valēm χuša* is the 14th deity invoked in the prayer for the grain and the people. The being *Valēm χuša*'s mother also appears here. In this part of the prayer, the invoked deities and spirits are identified as *irā* (here, in the sense of *kiremet*). If Mészáros's *Yelim χuša* is also included here, which was prayed to at the ceremony called "porridge before sowing", then again, this form can be interpreted as the name of a *kiremet*.

Věri šelēn

I. 'fiery snake (flying in the air)' (Mész. 46); *věre šelēn* 'a mythical being; lit. irreconcilable snake' (Ashm. V, 358) and *věri šelēn* 'flying snake' (Ashm. V, 360); 'a spirit visiting widowed women, appearing to them as a man' (Ashm. V, 284); *Вери селен* 'fire-snake flying in the sky – at night, evil demons appear in its form' (ME II, 538); *věre šelēn* 'magical or ghost snake' (Sal. 471). **II.** *věri* 'hot' (Ashm. V, 364); *šelēn* 'snake'. Salmin gives the word *věre* as meaning 'magical' or 'ghost', possibly based on the verb *věr-* 'blow', whose secondary meaning is 'incant' (cf. Ashm. V, 354). **III.** (a) The first part, *věri*, either meaning 'hot'³⁶² (Ashm V, 358), or as a form derived from the verb *věr-* 'blow'³⁶³ are both questionable, primarily for semantic reasons; (b) *šelēn* is a word from a Turkic etymon, see Tatar → *Yılan*.

Věre or *věri šelēn* appears in translations as 'fiery snake'. Its literal meaning is 'hot snake', although in some records, it can be found in the form *vutlā šelēn*,³⁶⁴ which literally means 'fiery'. It is a being which appears in human form and has sexual intercourse with

³⁶² The word meaning 'hot' appears in connection with the Sun in the name of another mythical being: *věri χēvelten sīχlakani* 'protector from the hot Sun' (the sixth deity of Round II in Shevle's list).

³⁶³ If this etymology were correct, the Tatar word *öräk* 'ghost, spirit' would be a parallel (see: Tat. → *Öräk*).

³⁶⁴ For example Mész. 46. Enderov claims that the two different names show territorial differences: in the middle language-area the fire-snake, and in the southern areas, the *věre šelēn* was typical (Enderov 1997, 139).

humans (usually in the form of the victim's deceased or, more rarely, living spouse). The person it frequents will slowly lose weight, wither away and die (Ashm. V, 284; Mész. 46; Sal. 472).³⁶⁵ Among Tatars and Bashkirs, such a notion is associated with the *yuḫa*, which is also the name of a kind of snake (Bash. → *Yuḫa*; Tat. → *Yuḫa*).

Vilē

I. *Виляики* 'dead people in whose honour no commemoration was held; they cause pain in the belly and the lower back (Vish. 235; also quoted by: Ashmarin 1982, 53); *vileške* 'soul of deceased ancestors – when they are not remembered any longer, they cause trouble and disease' (Skv. 249). **II.** *vil*, *vile*, *vilē* 'dead, corpse, dead animal' (Ashm. V, 225-227; Fed. I, 122). **III.** A derivative of the verb *vil*- 'die'; Turkic etymon (OT. *öl*- 'die' Cl. 125-126; *ölüg* 'dead; a dead person, corpse' Cl. 142), this verb and several of its derivatives exist in all previous and Modern Turkic languages (cf. Sev. I, 525-527). The suffix *-ške* of the form *vileške*, recorded by Vishnevskiy, is a well-documented suffix in Chuvash, which partly has a diminutive function, but there are also several examples of it not changing the meaning of the word (cf. Levitskaya 1976, 149). **IV.** prayer: Magn. 187-188; Mész. 238, 240, 241, 252, 294; Ashm. VII, 246; incantation: Magn. 152.

Although Vishnevskiy alone discussed this figure as a mythical being,³⁶⁶ it can be found scattered in other authors in other contexts, so other data also attest to its former existence. Several beliefs were associated with it, which are important sources of information for us about the Chuvash's notions of death and the afterlife.

Vishnevskiy listed four beings that could cause some kind of disease according to the beliefs of the Chuvash, the fourth of which is the *vileške*.³⁶⁷ Its characteristics and meaning were summarised by Vishnevskiy in a single sentence: the dead who are no longer

³⁶⁵ In certain Chuvash areas, this being is known by the name of *aštak* (Mész. 46), see also: → *Aštaḫa*.

³⁶⁶ Even in his 17-volume dictionary, Ashmarin does not provide a meaning that would suggest that this word is also the name of a mythical being (except for its compound forms). He did mention this figure in his university lectures, but only quoting Vishnevskiy's single sentence – that is, he did not present any other data from any other record (Ashmarin 1982, 53; Ashm. V, 225-227).

³⁶⁷ The four mythical beings (according to modern Chuvash orthography) are → *Xitām*, → *Esrel*, → *Yērēḫ*, *vileške*.

remembered inflict bellyache and back-pain upon people (Vish. 235). Chuvash mythical beings include others which harm people because a funeral feast had not been held for them; what is more, according to certain notions, this is what turns them into demonic creatures (see → *Ar-śuri*, and in other places, such ideas are associated with the → *Xitām*), but those are only associated with funeral customs and the notions of afterlife at this one point. However, the *vilě* is closely related to these notions already by virtue of its meaning ('dead').

Although Mészáros did not discuss the *vilě* or *vileške*-type creatures among the mythical beings, he wrote in detail about the Chuvash's notions of afterlife and their relevant sacrifices (Mész. 212-239).³⁶⁸ According to Chuvash beliefs, the dead would stay near the living for a while after death, but at the time of a smaller feast held after the great funeral feast, they were released among (mixed together with) those who had deceased before them. The dead basically lived in the cemetery (their lives were quite similar to those of the living, they would even get married), and would only appear among their living relatives at the time of the annual sacrifice held for them. However, they could still harm the living in some cases, perhaps because "they were hungry", or because they were not commemorated on the day of sacrifice dedicated to them, or because an ill-intentioned person "accused" somebody and asked the dead to harm that person,³⁶⁹ or because they were spoken of without respect. A recurring element of sacrificial prayers is asking the dead to only come at their own time (during the annual sacrifice) and not

³⁶⁸ According to Mészáros's collection, the northern and southern Chuvash imagined this slightly differently. In the northern territories, the soul of the deceased was accompanied to the cemetery after the great funeral feast, where it lived on around the grave, along with the souls of the other dead. In the south, where the influence of Islam was stronger, although they believed in heaven and hell, these ideas peacefully coexisted with some beliefs of earlier roots, which were typical in the northern areas.

³⁶⁹ Mészáros even presents a curse formula: "Let his dead one grab him! Let his dead one see him!" (Mész. 253).

to come at any other time.³⁷⁰ Diseases caused by the dead include bone-, head-, tooth- and bellyache, jaundice and infertility. They were cured by reconciling the offended deceased with a food sacrifice³⁷¹ and the healer incanting upon the disease.³⁷²

The *vilē* occurs in various compounds, in other records, too, the most common of which is the form *kamalšar vilē*. *Kamalšar* means ‘(a person) without a family or relatives’, to which Ashmarin adds the meaning in his dictionary: ‘the name of a deity’ (Ashm. VI, 50).³⁷³ At the annual ceremonies held for the dead, the Chuvash always commemorated those dying without relatives³⁷⁴ as, according to their belief, diseases were mostly caused by the dead because of the lack of commemoration; therefore, the dead without relatives were particularly dangerous. Another variety of this being is someone who died on the road, that is, far away from his/her home: this is the *šulti vilē* ‘died-on-the-road’,³⁷⁵ who was also offered a sacrifice of flour and grist, thrown into the wind (Mész. 252).³⁷⁶

The form *sulu vilēn* appears in Magnitskiy’s god-list of the Maslovoy goose-sacrifice (where fundamentally bad, evil spirits are invoked), which he translates as the ‘breath of death’. (In the same prayer occurs the form *Turā sulu*, too, which Magnitskiy translates as ‘divine breath’, Magn. 112). *Sulu* in fact means ‘harm, corruption’ (cf. Ashm. XI, 168) and appears in the names of several lesser

³⁷⁰ I present such prayer texts under Magn. 187-188; Mész. 238, 294.

³⁷¹ It is interesting that the deceased is also dangerous for the spirit of the house → *Xěrt šurt*, besides the inhabitants of the house. This is suggested by the fact that, during the annual candle-ceremony (commemorating the dead), people prayed for health for themselves as well as for the *xěrt šurt*. I present the short prayer said here under Mész 240.

³⁷² Mészáros presents several of these: 289-295.

³⁷³ Some more relevant data in Ashmarin: *kamalšar*, *kamanšar*, *kamantay* ‘without relatives or family’; *kamalšar vilē* ‘dead without relatives’; *kamalšar vilēm* ‘bad, unfortunate, unexpected death’; *xěr kamanšar* ‘a girl dying before her wedding’.

³⁷⁴ I present such a prayer under Mész 241.

³⁷⁵ This being must be related to the form *šol villi* (‘dead of the road’), appearing in an incantation and recorded by Magnitskiy. I present such an incantation under Magn. 152.

³⁷⁶ I present the short prayer recited at this time under Mész. 252.

deities; according to Ashmarin, primarily in compounds whose first part is *tură* ‘god’ or *šēr* ‘earth’, such as: *tur sulu*, *tur sulu ama*, *šēr sulu*, *šēr sulu pülěxsi* (Ashm. XI, 168).³⁷⁷

Besides these, it also occurs in compounds whose first part is *vil*, and the second part of some of these are closely related to death or destruction. Such forms are *vil esreli* (where the second part is the demon of death, see → *Esreli*); *vil vupkăně*, as *vupkăn* is closely related to contagious diseases resulting in many deaths (see → *Vupkăn*). We can also find forms where the *vil* or *vilě* is simply connected to some bad, evil force, like *vil alpasti* and *vil xayarě*, but there are also some occurrences where it has a basically positive meaning, e.g. when it stands before → *Pülěxšě*: *vil pülěxšě* (I quote these data from Ashmarin; unfortunately, they appear in his dictionary without a wider context: Ashm. V, 231).

Vupăr

I. ‘witch’ (Zol. 28; Magn. 146); ‘evil witch eating the moon’ (Zol. 157); ‘evil spirit going about at night’ (Mész. 44); *vâbâr*, *vøbø* ‘witch (walking with a very thick copper stick)’, and *mana* or *pysrə* ‘I had a nightmare’ (Paa. 200); ‘evil spirit’ (Ashm. V, 268); its further forms: *văvăr* (Ashm. V, 295); *văpăr* (Ashm. V, 306); *lăpăr* (Ashm. VIII, 114); *lopăr* (Ashm. VIII, 90), ‘evil spirit, vampire, hobgoblin, nightmare, werewolf’ (Egor. 57); ‘usal-type evil spirit’ (Sal. 473); ‘evil spirit which 1. causes nightmares, 2. is responsible for the eclipses of the sun and moon’ (ME I, 254); ‘1. mythical evil spirit, vampire; 2. witch; 3. fairy-tale creature’ (End. 55-62.); ‘(obs.) evil spirit, vampire’; ~ *karčāk* ‘witch (Rus. *баба яга*)’ (CRS 80; Skvor. 85). **II.** in phrases: *vâbâr ujêxa šijet* ‘the moon is eclipsed [lit. the *vupăr* is eating the moon]’ (Paa. 200); ~ *pusnă* ‘the hobgoblin pushed him’; ~ *kurăkě* ‘thistle’;³⁷⁸ *vup-* ‘to wrong sy, bring misfortune (in connection with evil spirits)’; *ăna vupkăn vupnă* ‘he was wronged by an evil spirit’ (CRS 80; Skvor. 85). **III.** Besides Chuvash, this word exists in several Kipchak and Oguz languages, meaning either ‘gluttonous’, or ‘evil spirit, witch, vampire’ (cf. e.g. Sev. I, 465; Räs. 363-364, Egor. 57; Fed. I, 132). The verb *öp-*, meaning ‘swallow (up)’ already existed in Old Turkic (Cl. 4; and see also: DTS 368 – here, the meaning is ‘spoon up, gobble, swallow’). The

³⁷⁷ Shevle’s list also includes the name *Tură-sulu* as the last deity in the seventh round.

³⁷⁸ The thistle is related to evil spirits in Bashkir folk beliefs, too: it was recorded as the nest of the devil (Bash. → *Yen*).

Russian word *upyr*’ (and its equivalents in other Slavic languages) are considered to be of Turkic origin by several Turcologists (e.g. Rad. I, 1782; Dmitriev 1962, 548; Egor. 57); Vasmer does not accept it (Vas. III, 186-187); on the Turkic background, see also: WOT 64-66. IV. incantation: Magn.146-147, 146-147/2; Ashm. I, 166; mythical story: AshmVv. 50/1, 50/2.

In Chuvash mythology, *vupăr* has basically two meanings: on one hand, it is a nightly demon oppressor and on the other hand, it is the causer of spirit that causes the eclipses of the sun and moon. According to some records, it spreads diseases; besides, in fairy tales, it is also the name of the witch: *vupăr karčāk* ‘*vupăr* old woman’, *vupărlă karčāk* ‘*vupăr*-like old woman’, *vupăr karčăkě* ‘*vupăr*’s old woman’.

As a nightly demon oppressor, it stifles its victim and puts its finger on the sleeping person’s mouth, which stops them from breathing and moving (AshmVv. 49). In another record, the *vupăr* can be chased away if the person wakes up and is able to shout (Mész. 45). What is more, there is also a record in which they try to catch the *vupăr* (Ashm. V, 50).³⁷⁹ In order to avoid the pushing, the person frequented by the *vupăr* must put a cross in his mouth or on his forehead. It was customary that, upon waking, the pushed person would scatter some ashes in the street, shouting: “*Vupăr* never come again, I am throwing hot ashes!” (Mész. 45). The *vupăr* was imagined in various shapes: basically human, who would appear as a man to women and as a woman to men, but it could also turn into a cat, dog, bear or even objects (Mész. 45; AshmVv. 50; Sal. 473-474; End. 59). Besides pushing, nightmares were also attributed to the *vupăr* (pl. Ashm. V, 270).

Furthermore, the *vupăr* can also cause severe diseases to humans and calves (Mész. 45). In Magnitskiy’s data, it causes diseases with shooting pain, just like the → *Iye* and the *šatîn* (Magn. 146).³⁸⁰

In the notions that identify the *vupăr* as the causer of solar and lunar eclipses, it appears as a cosmic demon. Considering the etymology of the word (OT. *op-* ‘swallow (up)’), this notion seems

³⁷⁹ The text related to this is quoted under AshmVv. 50/2.

³⁸⁰ I quote the incantation against this under Magn. 146-147/2.

more original. In order to chase away the *vupăr*, the Chuvash threw burning logs or ashes towards the sky and tried to frighten it by shouting (Mész. 45; AshmVv. 50).

Vupkăn

I. ‘3. evil spirit which causes diseases’ (Zol. 27; Magn. 134); *Вопкăнь* or *Ахъ* ‘evil house spirit’ (Kam. 8); *vupkăn* ‘gluttonous monster travelling in the wind, causing diseases’, as well as: *vupkănlâ-anžârt*³⁸¹ ‘some spirit, even worse than the previous one’ (Paa. 204; the latter data quoted by, without identifying the source: Ashm. V, 273); ‘1. ravine, whirlpool; 2. evil spirit, to which diseases are attributed’ (Mész. 47); *Aslă-vupkăn* the sixth deity in round VII (Shevle: Ashm. III, 67); ‘1. name of a deity; 3. name of a disease’ (Ashm. V, 272); its further forms: *vopkăn* (Ashm. V, 27); *lopkăn* (Ashm. VIII, 91); (obs.) ‘1. evil and gluttonous spirit which ruins and destroys humans; 2. gluttonous’ (Egor. 57); (obs) 1. evil spirit (which is gluttonous and thereby ruins people)’ (Sir. 80); ‘1. (mythical) evil spirit, vampire; *šiv* ~*ě* water spirit’ (Skvor. 85); in compounds also: *Касьхи вопханъ Эсрель* ‘harmful spirit (which destroys the livestock if it is not offered the due sacrifice)’ (Aleks. 15). **II.** ‘1. whirlpool, depth, ravine; 2. greedy, gluttonous, voracious’ (Zol. 27; Magn. 134); ‘2. gluttonous, voracious’; 4. swearword (Ashm. V, 273; Egor. 57); ‘2. cake (offered to evil spirits as a sacrifice); 3. (swearword) damned; 4. Gluttonous; ~ *šin* ‘voracious’; ~ *kurăkě* ‘peanut’; *vup-* ‘do wrong, bring misfortune (in connection with evil spirits)’; *ăna vupkăn vupnă* ‘he was harmed by an evil spirit’ (Sir. 80). **III.** Just like → *Vupăr*, this word is also a derivative of the OT. verb *op-* (see its data under *Vupăr*). To the derived form *vupkăn*, Egorov lists the following Turkic data: Uyg. *opkan* ‘gluttonous, voracious’; Alt. *obkuš, obkiš kiži, obkun* ‘gluttonous person’; Oyr. *op-kîn*; Bash; Tat. *upkîn* ‘depth, ravine, whirlpool’.³⁸² **IV.** mythical story: Kam. 8-9.

Its first written record is from 1828, in a short work about the Chuvash written by Protopope Aleksandr. Here, a compound form appears whose meaning is ‘nightly *vupkăn-esrel*’ (see also → *Esrel*). In this description, this being basically destroys the farm animals if the master does not offer sacrifices to it. It could be reconciled with a black lamb sacrifice.

³⁸¹ The word *anžârt, anžârt* means ‘disease, which is caused by a person being in the vicinity of debating or quarrelling people; its symptoms are headache and vomiting’ (Paa. 14).

³⁸² Furthermore, Bálint gives a Tatar meaning ‘voracious, gluttonous monster’ (WD 268); see also Tat. → *Ubîr*.

At the end of the 19th century, Kamensky described the *vupkǎn* as the negative counterpart of the house spirit → *Xěrt-surt*. The *vupkǎn* brings misfortune to the inhabitants of the house and devours their food supply (Kam. 8-9). The other records basically attribute certain diseases to the *vupkǎn*, and Magnitskiy also describes a sacrificial ceremony held for the prevention of diseases.

According to Mészáros's data, collected from the southern Chuvash, primarily madness and mental illness were thought to be caused by the *vupkǎn* (Mész. 47), whereas in the northern collections, contagious diseases that destroy humans and animals, such as cholera, the plague and cattle plague were attributed to it (Magn. 134). According to Ashmarin's knowledge, it was seen as the cause of bellyache (AshmVv. 51-52).³⁸³

Magnitskiy describes a ceremony (*Vopkīn čūkleni*) where three black lambs³⁸⁴ and three pots of porridge were offered to three *vupkǎns* – *vupkǎn*'s God, *vupkǎn*'s father and *vupkǎn*'s mother (*vopkan Torri*, *vopkǎn aššě*, *vopkǎn amāšě*) in order to prevent contagious diseases (Magn. 134-135).³⁸⁵ Ashmarin's data from Belebeyev show the *vupkǎn*'s connection with contagious diseases causing many deaths: in the otherworld, one of the names of the chief of the dead is *vil vupkǎnē* ['dead's *vupkǎn*']³⁸⁶ (Ashm. V, 231).

Vut

I. *Bodoma* 'fire-deity' (Mil.: Nik. I, 503); and: *ɔom* 'dune'³⁸⁷ (Mil.: Nik. I, 495); *Bym amu* 'fire's mother' and *Bym azu* 'fire's father' (Magn. 68, repeated by: Nik, II, 133); *vydama* (*vyt-ama*) 'fire-mother' (Paa. 204); *vut* '3. (fire) deity' (Ashm. V, 282);

³⁸³ Ashmarin here quotes an incantation recited while curing the bellyache.

³⁸⁴ Thus, the black sheep sacrifice still appears almost half a century after its first recording in 1828.

³⁸⁵ The prayer said on this occasion is also quoted by Ashmarin: AshmVv. 51.

³⁸⁶ Among others, there are names such as *vilē tavrašē*, *masar pušlaḡ*, *vil pülēḡši*, *vil alpasti*, *vil esreli*, *vil ḡayarē* (Ashm. V, 231).

³⁸⁷ This meaning is corrected by Nikolsky to 'fire'. If this item was included in Mil'kovich's list, then in all likelihood it really means fire. However, Mil'kovich's article published in *Northern Archive* does not contain such data; see sub-chapter "Mil'kovich's list".

as well as its compound forms in Ashmarin: *vutama*, *vut ama*, *vut ami*, *vut amăš* ‘fire’s mother, name of a deity’ (Ashm. V, 278, 282); *vut aši*, *vut aššě* ‘fire’s father – name of a deity’ (Ashm. V, 278, 282); *vutlă usal* ‘name of a spirit (in incantations)’ (Ashm. V, 279); *vutlă usal* ‘name of an evil spirit’ (Ashm. II, 298); *vut seşmet*, *vutlă seşmet* ‘name of a spirit’ (Ashm. XI, 102) [‘fire damage, fiery trouble’]; *vutlă xayar*, *vutlă alpastă*, *vutlă văpăr* ‘names of spirits (in incantations)’ (Ashm. V, 280); *əym acu* ‘fire-father’, and *əym amu* ‘fire-mother’, spirit, whose origin may be related to Old Turkic mythology, as well as: *əym kaŭake* firebird, which carries the fire, signals conflagration and also puts an end to it (ME II, 538). **II.** *vut* ‘1. fire, spark, conflagration’ (Ashm. V, 276-277); *vut titni* ‘disease caused by the spirit of fire’ (Ashm. V, 281). **III.** The word had already existed in Old Turkic (OT. *ōt* ‘fire’ Cl. 34) and has been preserved in several Modern Turkic languages (cf. e.g. Räs. 366; Egor. 57; Fed. I, 133-134). **IV.** prayer: Mil. 503; Elle 52-54. (prayers 1-3); Magn. 51, 58, 59-60; Pav. 26, 28-29; Mész. 130, 133-134, 146; incantation: 146-147/2.

Fire as a deity already appears in Mil’kovich’s 18th-century description (as the last but one of the 33 good deities). Mil’kovich recorded a ceremony held by each family in their own home around the fireplace, as well as a prayer recited on this occasion (Mil.: Nik. I, 503).³⁸⁸ The sacrifice offered to the fire was also mentioned by Mészáros. However, in his case, the sacrifice was held on the bank of the stream immediately after the sacrifice called the “water’s mush”, which was offered to the *kiremet* called the “chief good”.³⁸⁹

The fire’s father and mother (*vut aši*, *vutama*)³⁹⁰ as deities or spirits appear in Magnitskiy, too, but only at the back of the Maslovoy beer sacrifice god-list in the 76-77th places. The Chuvash attributed the outbreak and spreading of conflagration to the fire’s father and mother. Mészáros recorded an incantation used in case of a fire, in which the fire’s father and mother were invoked and prayed to. Furthermore, the compound *vut sinkerě* ‘fire’s trouble or misfortune’ also appeared in the incantation (Mész. 78, 306). Ashmarin also lists several similar forms in which fire collocates with words meaning ‘bad, evil, trouble’ or the name of some evil spirit, for example: *vutlă xayar* [‘fiery bad one’] (→ *Xayar*), *vutlă alpastă* [‘fiery

³⁸⁸ The prayer text is presented under Mil. 503.

³⁸⁹ The text of the prayer recited here is presented under Elle 52-54.

³⁹⁰ I present its other forms in the introduction to the entry.

alpastă'] (→ *Alpastă'*), *vutlă seḫmet* ['fiery *seḫmet*'], (→ *Seḫmet*), *vutlă usal* ['fiery bad one'] (→ *Usal*), *vutlă vāpār* ['fiery *vupār*'] (→ *Vupār*) (Ashm. V, 279-280; XI, 102). These forms also appear in incantations.

Vutāš

I. *Шивень-тора* or, by another name, *водыш* [№ 27 in the list of good deities] (Mil.: Nik. I, 495); *вудыш*, *водыш* 'water spirit' (Zol. 28); 'mermaid' (Kam. 13); *водыш*, *шыв-вудыш* 'water spirit' (Magn. 54-56); '1. name of water spirit or evil spirit; 2. a spirit visiting widowed women and appearing to them as a man;³⁹¹ 3. water spirit lesser than the *vupār*; 4. bad deity living in water; 5. the spirit of fire' (Ashm. V, 284-286); as well as *šiv vutāš* 'water spirit' (Ashm. XVII, 178), and *vut* '4. water spirit' (Ashm. V, 282);³⁹² *šiv vātāš* 'the third deity of the sixth round' (Shevle: Ashm. III, 67); '1. water spirit, its synonym is *šivri*; it is ranked after the *vupār* and is the aquatic equivalent of the *suyttan*; 2. water deity, its attribute of honour is *irā*' (Sal. 480). III. At the end of the 19th century, Il'minsky suggested that its origin was *vut* 'fire' + *yāš* 'master' (Il'minsky 1890, 50). It was quoted by Ashmarin (Ashm. V, 285-286); accepted (though not referred to) by Egorov, with the amendment that the compound that had originally meant the 'fire's master' may have turned into a water spirit in Chuvash under the influence of the Mari word *əyð* 'water' and the names of Mari water-spirits and water deities derived from it (Egor. 58; see also ME I, 254). Fedotov also traces *vutāš* back to the word *vut* 'fire', while he assumes a suffix *-āš* (Fed. I, 134). The weak point of his theory is that the suffix *-š* in his examples is a deverbative noun suffix (of this suffix, see e.g. Levitskaya 1976, 164). IV. prayer: Magn. 54, 56; Elle 52-54. (prayer 2); mythical story: AshmV2, 17.

The notions of *vutāš* basically point to two types of mythical creatures: one is a water spirit which, except for one early record, is rather harmful; and the other is connected to fire and also suggests a harmful being. Of the two notions, the first one seems original, partly because there are more records of it and partly because its connection with fire probably developed secondarily, due to its name (in Chuvash, *vut* means 'fire').

In Mil'kovich's 18th-century description, the *vutāš* makes the water in which it lives clean and fit for use by people (Mil. 213;

³⁹¹ In other places, it is related to the → *Vēri šēlen* (Ashm. V, 284).

³⁹² The first meaning of *vut* is 'fire, name of the deity of fire' (Ashm. V, 282).

also cited by Ashm. V, 285); whereas in later descriptions, it most often appears as a dangerous being causing diseases (e.g. Ashm. V, 284-286; Den. 39-40). This duality of its both positive and negative quality does not necessarily refer to a temporal change, but is related to the ambivalence generally associated with local and master spirits. Another example of this is the fact that the Chuvash offered annual sacrifices on the banks of the water bodies from where they carried water (there are both 19th and 20th century data for this). Thus, in relation to water and its spirits, the duality also appears at the level of rites, embodied in the rites of thanksgiving and atonement on one hand, and in the ceremonies held in order to prevent and avert trouble on the other. On the occasion of the water's mush (*šiv-niměřě*) sacrifice, most often, flat bread and mush were offered – Magnitskiy even recorded a prayer recited at this ceremony;³⁹³ Ashmarin only quotes a shorter formula: *Vutăš širlax! Vutăš širlax!* 'Vutăš have mercy! Vutăš have mercy!' (Ashm. V, 285). At the time of fishing, a little bit of earth was thrown into the water, shouting "Water spirit, give [fish]!" (Zol. 28; Magn. 55).³⁹⁴ Furthermore, during some diseases (especially fever), eggs were offered to the *vutăš* as a sacrifice, pleading "Water spirit, have mercy, do not send a torturous disease onto me!" (Magn. 56).

As far as its looks are concerned, there are various descriptions. In his brief study written in 1879, Kamensky describes the *vutăš* as a mermaid, who can sometimes be seen as a young girl with very long hair, sitting at the edge of the water combing her hair (Kam. 13).³⁹⁵ In Ashmarin, the various *vutăš*-notions are connected with various descriptions. One of them claims that it can fly and assume a human shape when it visits a widowed woman in the form of

³⁹³ The prayer is quoted under Magn. 54.

³⁹⁴ In Zolotnitskiy and Magnitskiy, the Chuvash sentence is: *Vut par!* The item is interesting because *vut* actually means fire. Of course, it is a question of how accurate the record is.

³⁹⁵ Ashmarin also has some data of it as such a being; a mythical story about it is quoted under Ashm. V, 217. The water spirit combing her hair at the edge of the water is also known by Tatars, see Tat. → *Su iyäse*.

her late husband; another says that it was seen as a burning, flying head, from which sparks erupted (Ashm. V, 284-286). According to Salmin's data, it was imagined as a big fish, a black dog or a naked man (Sal. 481).

In Magnitskiy, in the sacrifice held for the water spirit and in the prayers recited during the disease caused by the water spirit, besides the forms *vutāš* and *šiv-vutāš* 'water-vutāš', the *šivra purnagan irā* 'good one living in the water' also appears (Magn. 54-56).³⁹⁶ A shorter form of this might be *šivri* 'being in the water', which form appears in Ashmarin as a separate entry meaning 'water devil, water spirit' (Ashm. XVII, 182).³⁹⁷ Furthermore, the forms *Šiv-aššē* 'water's father', *Šiv-amāšē* 'water's mother' and *šu-χuši*, *šiv pušē* 'water's master, water's chief', recorded by Mészáros, are partly identical in their function. As local spirits, they can be dangerous to humans, but they are also offered sacrifices at the time of fishing (Mész. 74-75).³⁹⁸ Some of Ashmarin's data specifies local spirits as follows: in the house, there is → *Xěrt šurt*; in the water, *šivri*; and in the forest, → *Ar-šuri* (Ashm. XVII, 182).

³⁹⁶ In Ashmarin's dictionary, the meaning of the compound is given incorrectly. Ashmarin quotes a *šiv niměrě* form, the meaning of which he gives, with reference to Magnitskiy, as follows: 'name of a deity' (Ashm. XVII, 182). In fact, Magnitskiy does not write about a deity here, but gives the name of the sacrifice offered to the water as *šiv-niměrě* – besides, Magnitskiy himself does provide the meaning of the compound as: 'water + kissel, mush' (Magn. 54). Thus, this compound is not a mythical being.

³⁹⁷ Furthermore, Ashmarin gives another form, too: *šivri āstarik*, which is identical with *šivri* (Ashm. XVII, 183). The word *āstarik* means 'old man' (Ashm. IV, 74), from the Russian word *чмапук*, meaning the same.

³⁹⁸ Mészáros believed that in some places, these beings were typically called *vutāš* (Mész. 75).

Lists of gods and spirits

Mil'kovich's list

In 1827, the journal *Northern Archive* published Kapiton Mil'kovich's series of articles on Chuvash ethnography, collected in 1783, without indicating the author's name. The article was re-published by Magnitskiy in 1888 and by Nikol'skiy in 1906. Since 1906, Chuvash ethnographical literature has basically used Nikol'skiy's text,³⁹⁹ but this is not identical with the text originally published in *Northern Archive* (which had been known to previous authors, such as Sboev and Magnitskiy). In the following tables, I summarise the names listed by Mil'kovich (1823, 136-138), and Nikol'skiy (Nik. I, 495-496).

In the first column of the table, I inserted a number which does not correspond either to Mil'kovich's or Nikol'skiy's numbering but makes referencing the data in this book easier. The second column contains the data published in Mil'kovich's article in *Northern Archive*, and the third column contains the same as given by Nikol'skiy. In the fourth column, titled Nikol'skiy's transcription, I provide the Latin transliteration of the corrected Cyrillic forms provided by Nikol'skiy. In the fifth column, the capital M after the meaning indicates that the given meaning was provided by Mil'kovich, and that it appeared in the original article. The letter N indicates Nikol'skiy's translation, which can either mean the form that he gives in the 1906 republication as a meaning provided by, or if Mil'kovich's original was corrected by Nikol'skiy for some reason. M, N stands for the two forms being identical. In square brackets, I provide the meaning suggested by me, with which I intend to clarify or correct these meanings. If the names given by Mil'kovich and Nikol'skiy are significantly different, I indicate in square brackets which name the translation suggested by me refers to – here, I also use M and N to mean Mil'kovich's and Nikol'skiy's data, respectively.

³⁹⁹ I did the same while writing my book, and also worked from the first volume of Nikol'skiy's book of collected material (Nikol'skiy 2004).

Good gods

No.	Mil'kovich	Republished, 1906	Nikol'skiy's transcription	Meaning
1.	<i>Сюлде Торь</i>	<i>Сюльде Тор</i>	<i>Šülti Tură</i>	'creator or celestial God' (M, N); ['upper God']
2.	<i>Серде падиша</i>	<i>Торраше</i>	<i>Tură Aššě</i>	'earthly tsar' (M); 'divine father' (N); [M: earthly padishah; N: God's father]
3.	—	<i>Торрамиже</i>	<i>Tură Amăšě</i>	'divine mother' (N)
4.	—	<i>Серде падиша</i>	<i>Šerti Patša</i>	'earthly tsar' (N)
5.	<i>сють тюнзя</i>	<i>сють тюня</i>	<i>Šută tēnče (?)</i>	'light's god' (M, N); [<i>šut tēnčě</i> 'bright world']
6.	<i>кебе судьбу</i> ⁴⁰⁰	<i>Сюльде Кебе</i>	<i>Šülti Kepe</i>	'God which has power inside the earth and under the earth' (M); 'fate or power which it possesses in the earth or under the earth' (N); [M: 'Kepe (fate)'; N: 'upper Kepe']
7.	<i>чонь сюрадань торь</i>	<i>Иок-аорадан Тора</i>	<i>Čun šuratan or šuratakan Tură</i>	'God which gives the soul' (M, N); ['soul-creating God']
8.	<i>хвель</i>	<i>Хвель</i>	<i>Xěvel</i>	'Sun' (M, N)
9.	<i>хвель амыже</i>	<i>Хвель алмыже</i>	<i>Xěvel Amăšě</i>	'Sun mother' (M, N); [Sun's mother]
10.	<i>эдемь торь</i>	<i>Эдем Тор</i>	<i>Etem Tură</i>	'god of thunder and lightning' (M, N); ['Etem (Adam?) God']
11.	<i>ири-торь</i>	<i>Ири Тора</i>	<i>Īră Tură</i>	'benefactor God' (M), 'god of benevolence' (N); ['good God']
12.	<i>перезеть-торь</i>	<i>Перезеть Тора</i>	<i>Pereket Tură</i>	'God of abundance' (M, N)
13.	<i>перезеть-амыже</i>	<i>Перезеть амыже</i>	<i>Pereket Amăšě</i>	'its mother' (M, N); ['abundance's mother]

⁴⁰⁰ The Russian word *судьба* ('fate') probably appears in the text (in italics) as a piece of Chuvash language data by mistake.

14.	<i>сюрень ирзамь</i>	<i>Сюрень Ир</i>	<i>Śüren Īră</i>	‘the one wandering in the air, which also saves those drowning in the water’ (M, N); [M: ‘going good ones’; N: ‘going good one’]
15.	<i>сєрраше</i>	<i>Сєррате</i>	<i>Śēr Aššē</i>	‘earth’s father’ (M, N)
16.	<i>сєррамыже</i>	<i>Сєррамыже</i>	<i>Śēr Amăšē</i>	‘earth’s mother’ (M, N)
17.	<i>сюрадонь торь ывымь⁴⁰¹</i>	<i>СюреданьТор</i>	<i>Śuratan Tură</i>	‘northern light’ (M), ‘northern light, which they call the divine son’ (N); [M: <i>śuratan tură ĭvăl</i> ‘son of God the creator’]
18.	<i>тюлюхсь</i>	<i>Пилюгсе</i>	<i>Pŭlěχśē</i>	‘God which orders the fate for those on earth’ (M) ‘orderer of earthlings’ fate’ (N); [Pŭlěχśē (‘distributor’)]
19.	<i>тюлюхсь-амыже</i>	<i>Пилюхся амыже</i>	<i>Pŭlěχśē Amăšē</i>	‘its mother’ (M, N); [‘Pŭlěχśē’s mother’]
20.	<i>пигамь-барь</i>	<i>Пигамбар</i>	<i>Piχampar</i>	‘messenger of fate’ (N); [P <i>ι</i> χampar]
21.	<i>сиргиже</i>	<i>Сергаже</i>	<i>Surax Aššē</i>	‘God who protects the herd and the flock’ (M), ‘protector of the herd and the flock’ (N); [M: <i>śēr yīšē</i> ⁴⁰² ‘earth’s master’]
22.	<i>бертерли</i>	<i>Бертерли</i>	<i>Pěr Těrli</i>	‘the one-person God’ (M), ‘of one kind’ (N) ⁴⁰³

⁴⁰¹ The word *ывымь*, appearing here, is probably a misspelling of *ывылъ*. This is how Magnitskiy interpreted it, too; nevertheless, he changed the order in his translation and thus interpreted this form as ‘son-creating God’ (Magnitskiy 1888, 20).

⁴⁰² The form *сиргиже*, found in Mil’kovich, is difficult to interpret; the reading *śēr yīšē* is suggested by Magnitskiy (Magnitskiy 1888, 21). I prefer this one to the completely unparalleled reading by Nikol’skiy, which is doubtful in itself.

⁴⁰³ Perhaps this form in this list does not simply mean ‘of one kind, the same’ (which *pěr těrli* literally means). I suggest that a kind of transformation of the Orthodox doctrine of the “same in being” or “same in essence” (homoousion –

23.	<i>сюлрань</i>	<i>Сюлрань</i>	<i>Šėlen (?)</i>	‘aerial phenomenon appearing in the form of a snake, which is called aerial snake’ (M), ‘aerial phenomenon, similar to some kind of snake, called flying snake’ (N)
24.	<i>ию-торь</i> ⁴⁰⁴	<i>Истора</i>	<i>Ėś Tură</i>	‘travel-companion God’ (M, N); [M: <i>śul tură</i> ‘Road-God’ (?)]
25.	<i>хилрань тора</i>	<i>Кирган-Тора</i>	<i>Kilti Tură</i>	‘house spirit’ (M, N)
26.	<i>хардрань торь</i>	<i>КардраньТора</i>	<i>Kartari Tură</i>	‘farmyard’s god’ (M, N) [N: ‘god in the farmyard’]
27.	<i>шиврань</i>	<i>Шивень</i>	<i>Šivri Tură</i>	‘water spirit, which is also called <i>vodiš</i> (<i>водыиш</i>)’ (M), ‘the one called <i>vodiš</i> ’ (N)
28.	<i>вурмань торь</i>	<i>Бурман-Тора</i>	<i>Vărman Tură</i>	‘forest spirit’ (M), ‘of a forest’ (N); [‘Forest God’]
29.	<i>хиррань торь</i>	<i>Хиррань-тора</i>	<i>Xirti Tură</i>	‘of a field’ (M, N); [‘Field God’]
30.	<i>силь</i>	<i>Силь</i>	<i>Śil</i>	‘wind’ (M, N)
31.	<i>синь амыже</i>	<i>Силамыже</i>	<i>Śil Amăšė</i>	‘its mother’ (M, N) [‘wind’s mother’]
32.	—	<i>Вот</i>	<i>Vută</i>	‘dune or fire’ (N); ⁴⁰⁵ [vut ‘fire’]
33.	—	<i>Силь-Синасе</i>	<i>Śil śunačė</i>	‘wind’s wings’ (N)

the Son and the Holy Spirit being the same in essence with the Father) appears here among the Chuvash mythical beings.

⁴⁰⁴ Certainly a misspelt form; Magnitskiy suggests the corrected form *Iye Toră*, but because the → *Iye* is a decidedly harmful spirit, its appearance among good, celestial deities is not likely. However, the meaning given by Mil’kovich points in another direction, on the basis of which I suggest a reading *śul Tură* ‘road God’.

⁴⁰⁵ Nikol’skiy says that the meaning ‘dune’ had been given by Mil’kovich and it is probably wrong. However, in the printed article, this piece of data is absent from Mil’kovich.

Bad deities (*kiremets* or *irăš*)**1. Great ones (*ослы – aslă*)**

34.	<i>вылры ирзамь</i>	<i>Вылары ирзамь</i>	<i>Vilari irăsem</i>	‘first main kiremet, which is the father of all kiremets; it has two sons’ (M), ‘first main kiremet, which is the father of all kiremets; it has four sons’ (N); [‘good ones of Vil’]
35.	–	(1) <i>серде кебе</i>	<i>šerti Kepe</i>	‘first son of the first main kiremet’ (N); [‘earthly <i>Kepe</i> ’]
36.	–	(2) <i>Кутыр султан</i>	<i>Kutăr sultan (?)</i>	‘second son of the first main kiremet’ (N)
37.	<i>сивя зинзи ирзамь</i>	(3) <i>Сивя Зензи Ирзамь</i>	<i>Sëve šinči (?) irăsem</i>	‘one of the sons of the first main kiremet’ (M) ‘third son of the main kiremet; saints found in Sviyazh’ (N); [‘good ones of Sviyazh’]
38.	<i>челна зинзи ирзамь</i>	(4) <i>Чильня Зензи Ирзамь</i>	<i>Čilně šinči irăsem</i>	‘the other son of the first main kiremet’ (M), ‘fourth son of the main kiremet; saints found in the Chilne river’ [‘good ones of Chilne’]
39.	<i>чемень</i>	–	–	‘second main kiremet’ (M); [Čemen]

2. Medium ones (*вода сердце – văta šerti*)

40.	<i>султонь ирзамь</i>	<i>Китам Ирзамь</i>	<i>kitem (?) irăsem</i>	–
41.	<i>малимь хозя</i>	<i>Малим хозя</i>	<i>Malim xūša</i>	–
42.	<i>миндюбя ирзамь</i>	<i>Миндюбя Ирзамь</i>	<i>Mintüpe (?) irăsem</i>	–
43.	<i>аскуль варь ирзамь</i>	<i>Ашул вар Ирзамь</i>	<i>Ašulvar irăsem</i>	‘saints living in the ravine (gully) of Azhulov’ (N)

3. Small ones (ксинь – *kěšēn*)

44.	кинъ ирзамъ	(1) Ксинь Ирзам	<i>Kěšēn irāsem</i>	‘small saints’ (N); [‘small good ones’]
45.	выдалы ирзамъ	(2) Вадалы Хирзам	<i>Vātalāḥ irāsem</i>	‘medium saints’ (N); [‘medium good ones’]
46.	мундубя	–	–	–
47.	алды зинзи	(3) Алзызинзя	<i>Asli šinči</i> (?)	–

Lists of ceremonies, prayers and incantations

In the following, I provide the lists of three authors: Magnitskiy, Pavlovich and Shevle, which feature a large number of invoked deities or spirits. In the tables, I first provide the name of the given being in the recording manner of the author (or the publisher), and in the next column, the Latin transliteration of the standard, literary (non-dialectal) form based on present-day, Cyrillic-script Chuvash orthography. In the case of Magnitskiy and Pavlovich, the next column features the meanings (translated from Russian into English) provided by the author or publisher (in the case of Pavlovich, it was Ashmarin). An empty box means that the author did not indicate the meaning of the mythical being. In Magnitskiy’s tables, the Notes column contains the translations with which I intend to clarify the translations provided by Magnitskiy, along with references to how Magnitskiy had translated the given forms at other places, as well as, especially in the case of problematic forms, Ashmarin’s more significant notes or corrections. In Shevle’s Chuvash-language study, no meanings are indicated (although he added notes to some beings); thus in the Shevle-table, there is no such column.

In the Notes column, I first indicate whether the given form can be found in the entry. An upward arrow ↑ indicates that I discuss the given being in a separate entry. A sideways arrow → and name (for example → *Turā*) indicates that, although the given form does not have a separate entry, I refer to it in another entry. If the given name occurs in several entries, here I indicate the one in which I discuss the given being in more detail. Its other possible occurrences are included in the Index.

1. Names of gods and spirits appearing in the beer sacrifice in Magnitskiy

Maslovoy list (Magn. 62-84)

Round I

	Name in Magnitskiy	Latin transliteration of name	Meaning in Magnitskiy	Notes
1	<i>Тора</i>	<i>Tură</i>	–	↑
2	<i>Пӗлхси</i>	<i>Pülěḡsí</i>	–	↑
3	<i>Тор амыш</i>	<i>Tură aměš</i>	God's mother	→ <i>Tură</i>
4	<i>Пиҫамбар</i>	<i>Piḡampar</i>	–	↑
5	<i>Хирлэ сьырь</i>	<i>Xěrlě-šir</i>	–	↑
6	<i>Сьырь йыш</i>	<i>šěr-yiš</i>	earth's family	→ <i>Šěr</i> ; 'earth's master' (Magn. 88; Ashm. I, 83); 'earth's lord' (Ashm. XIII, 91)
7	<i>Сьырь ашше</i>	<i>šěr-aššě</i>	earth's father	→ <i>Šěr</i>
8	<i>Сьырь амыш</i>	<i>šěr-aměš</i>	earth's mother	→ <i>Šěr</i>
9	<i>Сьырь шыв' ктэнь</i>	<i>šěr-šiv kēten</i>	–	→ <i>Šěr</i> ; ['earth-water's shepherd]

Round II

1 / 10	<i>Сьорт сьорадаган Тора</i>	<i>šurt šuratakan tură</i>	God birth-ing-creating the home	→ <i>Tură</i>
2 / 11	<i>Ами</i>	<i>ama</i>	the oldest mother	<i>ama</i> 'female; mother; world's mother' (Ashm. I, 185-186); helper of other spirits (Magn. 85-86); it appears in the name of several mythical beings
3 / 12	<i>Туваси</i>	<i>tăvašši</i>	worker	→ <i>Etem tură</i> ; Ashm. XIV, 241; 'doer (help)' as the helper of other deities and spirits (Magn. 85-86); 'helper with all kinds of peasant work' (Magn. 88)

4 /13	<i>Тохтассу</i>	<i>tăxtaśśi</i>	guard or keeper	Ashm. XV, 11; helper of other deities and spirits (Magn. 85-86); it stops the Chuvash from wrongdoing, that is, ‘stopper’ (Magn. 88)
5 /14	<i>Кӱтнессу</i>	<i>kětneśśi</i>	guard	Ashm. VII, 321; it appears in several compound forms
6 /15	<i>Нигизе</i>	<i>nikěšě</i>	leader of the foundation	↑; Ashm. IX, 23; ‘foundation’ (Magn. 85)
7 /16	<i>Сыхчы</i>	<i>sīχči</i>	guard	‘guard’ (Magn. 88); ‘guardian angel’ helper of other deities and spirits (Magn. 85, 86); appears in several compound forms
8 /17	<i>Чечек сьорадаган</i>	<i>čeček śuratakan</i>	flower-grower	→ <i>Tură</i> ; [‘flower-creator’]
9 /18	<i>Чечек аише-амыже</i>	<i>čeček aśšě-amăšě</i>	flowers’ father-mother	

Round III

1 /19	<i>Ывъл-хирь сьорадаган Тора</i>	<i>ivăĭ-χěr śuratakan Tură</i>	children-giver	→ <i>Tură</i> ; ‘children-giver’ (Magn. 88); ‘children (son-daughter)-bearer’ (Magn. 85); [‘son-daughter-creating God’]
-------	--	------------------------------------	----------------	---

Round IV

1 /20	<i>Тыр-бол’ сьорадаган Тора</i>	<i>tīr(ă)-pul(ă) śuratakan Tură</i>	all kinds of grain giver	→ <i>Tură</i> ; [‘(all kinds of) grain-creating God’]
-------	---	---	-----------------------------	---

Round V

1 /21	<i>Вълых- чирьлих сьорадаган Тора</i>	<i>vilăχ-čěrĭĭχ śuratakan Tură</i>	all domestic animals giver	→ <i>Tură</i> ; [‘(all kinds of) domestic animal-creating God’]
-------	---	--	-------------------------------	---

Round VI

1 /22	<i>Мол сьорадаган Тора</i>	<i>mol śuratakan Tură</i>	wealth-giver	→ <i>Tură</i> ; [‘wealth-creating God’]
-------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------	---

Round VII

1 /23	<i>Хортъ сьорадаган Тора</i>	<i>Xurt śura- takan Tură</i>	bee-giver	→ <i>Tură</i> ; Ashm. XVI, 234; ⁴⁰⁶ [‘bee-creating God’]
-------	--------------------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------	---

Round VIII

1 /24	<i>Хорсь андаран Тора</i>	<i>Xorś antaran toră</i>	strength, ⁴⁰⁷ so- lidity lowerer	→ <i>Tură</i> ; Ashm. XVI, 229; [‘steel-lowering God’]
-------	-------------------------------	------------------------------	--	--

Round IX

1 /25	<i>Сьют тўньчи (Тора)</i>	<i>Śut-tēñče</i>	God of this world	↑
2 /26	<i>Квак хоппи</i>	<i>Kăvak ħuppi</i>	blinking or the opening of the sky (‘eyelashes of the sky’)	↑; ‘sky’ (Magn. 88)
3 /27	<i>Хвал усьлан</i>	<i>Xăval uślan</i>	momentary light during darkness	→ <i>Kăvak ħuppi</i> ; ‘name of a spirit’ (Ashm. XVI, 308); [‘opening of brightness’]
4 /28	<i>Тор’сьоли</i>	<i>Tură śulě</i>	divine whip	→ <i>Śul</i>
5 /29	<i>Тор хаяре</i>	<i>Tură ħayarě</i>	divine wrath	→ <i>Xayar</i> ; Ashm. XIV, 151
6 /30	<i>Тор иньгеги</i>	<i>Tură inkekě</i>	divine punishment	→ <i>Inkek</i> ; Ashm. XIV, 158
7 /31	<i>Тор сыхчи</i>	<i>Tură sīħčī</i>	divine guard	
8 /32	<i>Сьиль аише</i>	<i>Śil aśšě</i>	wind’s father	→ <i>Śil</i> ; Ashm. XII, 149
9 /33	<i>Сьиль амыже</i>	<i>Śil amăš(ě)</i>	wind’s mother	→ <i>Śil</i> ; Ashm. XII, 148

⁴⁰⁶ Here, Ashmarin also gives the form *xurt śuratakan ama* ‘bee-creating mother’.

⁴⁰⁷ The meaning of *ħorś*, *ħuraś* is actually ‘steel’ (cf. Ashm. XVI, 229).

Round X

1 /34	<i>Сьиль хаяре</i>	<i>Śil ḡayarē</i>	wind's wrath	→ <i>Śil</i> ; Ashm. XII, 153
2 /35	<i>Сьиль иньгегеи</i>	<i>Śil inkeḡ</i>	wind's punishment	→ <i>Śil</i> ; Ashm. XII, 149
3 /36	<i>Сьиль сынгере</i>	<i>Śil sinkerē</i>	wind's strength	→ <i>Śil</i> ; Ashm. XII, 150; 'averted of misfortune' (Magn. 89); ['wind's trouble, damage']
4 /37	<i>Сьиль сыхчи</i>	<i>Śil sīḡčī</i>	wind's guard	→ <i>Śil</i> ; Ashm. XII, 148; 'guarding from misfor- tune' (Magn. 89)
5 /38	<i>Хвэль ашше</i>	<i>Xēvel aššē</i>	Sun's father	→ <i>Xēvel</i> ; Ashm. XVII, 10
6 /39	<i>Хвэль амыже</i>	<i>Xēvel amāš(ē)</i>	Sun's mother	→ <i>Xēvel</i> ; Ashm. XVII, 9
7 /40	<i>Хвэль хулги</i>	<i>Xēvel ḡulḡi</i>	Sun's ears	→ <i>Xēvel</i> ; Ashm. XVII, 13
8 /41	<i>Хвэль сьоначе</i>	<i>Xēvel śunačē</i>	Sun's wings	→ <i>Xēvel</i> ; Ashm. XVII, 12
9 /42	<i>Хвэль ори</i>	<i>Xēvel uri</i>	Sun's legs	→ <i>Xēvel</i> ; 'Sun's rays' (Ashm. XVII, 12)

Round XI

1 /43	<i>Кебе</i>	<i>Kepe</i>	God directing the fate of humankind	↑
2 /44	<i>Кебе киремечи</i>	<i>Kepe kiremečē</i>	<i>kiremet</i> of God directing the fate of humankind	[' <i>Kepe</i> 's <i>kiremet</i> ']
3 /45	<i>Мун киле</i>	<i>Mān kēlē</i>	great <i>kiremet</i>	→ <i>Kēlē</i>
4 /46	<i>Ксинь киле</i>	<i>Kēšēn kēlē</i>	small <i>kiremet</i>	→ <i>Kēlē</i> ; Ashm. VII, 309, 244
5 /47	<i>Иньгек сьүредегэнь</i>	<i>Inkek šūreteken</i>	punishment- producer ⁴⁰⁸	→ <i>Inkek</i> ; ['misfortune-carrier']

⁴⁰⁸ Magnitskiy's Chuvash data refers to the word *šūreteken* 'bearer, carrier'; whereas, on the basis of his translation, we ought to presume the form as *śuratakan* ('creator') here. It poses no difficulty to decide whether the recorded form or the translation is wrong, as in all the relevant data (not only in Magnitskiy), creation is only connected to humans and things useful for them (children, soul, livestock, grain, bees, steel). In contrast, the form *šūreteken* is usually

6 /48	Сьынгерь сьӹрен	<i>Sinker-siren</i> or <i>sinker</i> <i>šüren</i>	strength- sender	→ <i>Sinker</i> ; Ashm. XI, 150; XII, 303; means either ‘averted of trouble’ or ‘troublesome’; because of the previous form, ‘troublesome’ is more likely
7 /49	Тыра хонаси	<i>Tiră ħunasi</i>	grain-producer	Ashm. XVI, 162 ⁴⁰⁹
8 /50	Тыра хумгаси	<i>Tiră ħumġašši</i>	grain-grower	Ashm. XVI, 160 ⁴¹⁰
9 /51	Хум кргесь	<i>Ĥum krükeš</i> or <i>kěrekeši</i>	grain-roller	Ashm. XVI, 156 ⁴¹¹

Round XII

1 /52	Пылак параган	<i>Pilak parakan</i>	sweet-giver	Ashm. IX, 180; as the helper of other deities: Magn. 86
2 /53	Юсь параган	<i>Yüşë parakan</i>	bitter-giver	Ashm. V, 35
3 /54	Сьуда кӹльде вырдаган ыра	<i>Šută kül vîr- takan iră</i>	spirit resting in the bright lake	→ <i>Šut tēnče</i> ; Ashm. III, 65
4 /55	Хай пӹрень	<i>Ĥay püren</i>	decider (her- itage-leaver, gifter) of life	Ashm. XVI, 6; unknown <i>kiremet</i> (Magn. 90)

connected to bad or not really positive notions (trouble, misfortune, stormy wind). In the case of the above form, therefore, the recording must have been correct and the translation wrong: *inkek šüreteken* means ‘carrier of misfortune or trouble’ (which, moreover, also appears in another list).

⁴⁰⁹ Ashmarin only gives the form *ħunasi* – *ħunasi*, *ħunaši*, *ħunašši* ‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. XVI, 162); the meaning of the verb *ħuna-* is ‘grow, multiply’, and of the noun *ħuna* is ‘sprout (of a plant)’ (Ashm. XVI, 160).

⁴¹⁰ Ashmarin only gives the form *ħumġašši*, meaning ‘the name of a spirit’ (Ashm. XVI, 160). Cf. *ħumġav* ‘swinging’, *ħumġan-* ‘waving, rolling’ (Ashm. XVI, 158).

⁴¹¹ The two meanings of the compound in Ashmarin: ‘1. honorary place at the table (head of the table), 2. ‘name of a spirit’; he adopts both meanings from Magnitskiy (Ashm. XVI, 156. < Magn. 61, 64). Skvortsov interprets it differently, see the entry → *Alăk ušan*.

5 /56	Чар пүрень	<i>Čar püren</i>	prohibition giver (decider)	Ashmarin puts it after the word meaning ‘tsar’ (Ashm. XV, 149); ⁴¹² unknown <i>kiremet</i> (Magn. 90)
6 /57	Чильберь тыдаган	<i>Čělpěr tütakan</i>	keeper on reins (leash)	(also: Magn. 89)
7 /58	Эрнэ ватты	<i>Erne vatti</i>	week’s old woman, or overseer of the week	‘week’s old one’ ⁴¹³ – it can forgive if any work is done on Friday ⁴¹⁴ (Magn. 89)
8 /59	Сьол сьурень ыра	<i>Šul šüren irā</i>	good travel-companion	→ <i>Šul</i> ; Ashm. XII, 221; XII, 303; III, 65 as a <i>kiremet</i> : Magn. 87; [‘good one going on the road’]
9 /60	Асла ыра	<i>Aslā irā</i>	main guardian	→ <i>Irā</i> ; Ashm. II, 109-110; III, 64-65; <i>kiremet</i> (Magn. 86); ‘the main <i>kiremet</i> ’ (Magn. 89); [‘great good one’]

Round XIII

1 /61	Эльмень кўтъни	<i>Elmen kētni</i>	–	<i>Elmen</i> is a pagan man’s name, also known as a village name in the Yadrin and Sviyazh areas (Ashm. III, 313)
2 /62	Хай сирьми	<i>Xay širmi</i>	–	name of a Tatar holiday (Ashm. XVI, 7); <i>širma</i> ‘river, gully’

⁴¹² Ashmarin gives the meaning ‘name of a deity’; here, the word is connected to *čar*, meaning ‘tsar’ (Ashm. XV, 149). However, at another place he accepts Magnitskiy’s translation suggestion (Ashm. X, 83). If we start from the meaning given by Magnitskiy, the name of the mythical being is certainly *čaru püren* (Chuv. *čaru* ‘prohibition’).

⁴¹³ The word *erne* originally used to mean Friday and later the whole week (Ashm. III, 28).

⁴¹⁴ Obviously Islamic influence. However, Ashmarin has some data showing that the prohibition of work during *erne kaš* (the eve of Friday) was, at some places, interpreted as a prohibition for the eve of Sunday (Ashm. III, 29), which in turn suggests Christian influence superimposed on the previous Islamic influence.

3 /63	Кивь яль	<i>Kiv-yal</i>	–	name of Maslovoy (and other villages) (Ashm. VI, 194; Magn. 12, 66)
4 /64	Каракъ сьуваре	<i>Karak-šavar</i>	Thief-mouth (place name)	in Magnitskiy, also: 112-113; name of a spring (Ashm. VI, 88)
5 /65	Хирле сьырь	<i>Xěrlě-šir</i>	red (steep) bank – God who personifies earth	↑; ‘Saint Nicholas’ (Magn. 88); in Magnitskiy, also: 62, 84, 88, 91
6 /66	Шобаикарды ыра	<i>Šupaškarti iră</i>	good spirit found in the city of Cheboksary	→ <i>Īră</i> ; Ashm. III, 365
7 /67	Свиэри ыра	<i>Sěvere iră</i>	good spirit of Sviyaga or Sviyazh ⁴¹⁵	→ <i>Īră</i> ; in a different form in Ashmarin: <i>Sěvere vîrtakan iră</i> , <i>Sěve šinči irăsem</i> ‘name of a deity’, <i>Sěvere vîrtan</i> ‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. XI, 292)
8 /68	Магарь-ери ыра	<i>Makaryeri iră</i>	good spirit found in the wilderness near Makar	→ <i>Īră</i> ; Ashm. III, 65
9 /69	Хозанды ыра	<i>Xusanti iră</i>	good spirit found in Kazan	Ashm. III, 65

Round XIV

1 /70	Ой перегечь	<i>Uy perekečě</i>	spirit who gifts the land with its gain	→ <i>Pereket</i> ; Ashm. III, 168; as the helper of <i>Tir(ă)-pul(ă) šuratakan Tură</i> (Magn. 85); ‘gain of the field or meadow’ (Magn. 89)
-------	-------------	--------------------	---	--

⁴¹⁵ Sviyaga is the name of a river in Tatarstan and Sviyazh is an island-fort at the confluence of the Sviyaga and the Volga. Both are called *Sěve* in Chuvash. I added a few comments to the name and the occurrence of the island of Sviyazh in Chuvash beliefs in a footnote to the entry → *Īră*.

2 /71	Идэм перегечь	<i>Item perekečě</i>	gift-giver to the threshing yard	→ <i>Pereket</i> ; Ashm. III, 153; as a <i>kiremet</i> (Magn. 86) ‘success of the thresh- ing yard’ (Magn. 89)
3 /72	Кыжыл перегечь	<i>Kăšăl perekeč(ě)</i>	spirit who gifts gain to the threshed pile of grain	→ <i>Pereket</i> ; ‘success of the stack’ (Magn. 89)
4 /73	Киль перегечь	<i>Kil perekečě</i>	gifter of the house	→ <i>Pereket</i> ; ‘house’s success’ (Magn. 89)
5 /74	Карла перегечь	<i>Karta perekečě</i>	gifter of the farm-yard	→ <i>Pereket</i>
6 /75	Клеть перегечь	<i>Kělet perekečě</i>	gifter of the shed	→ <i>Pereket</i>
7 /76	Вут ами	<i>Vut ama</i>	fire’s mother	→ <i>Vut</i> ; Ashm. V, 278
8 /77	Вут ази	<i>Vut aši or ašě</i>	fire’s father	→ <i>Vut</i> ; Ashm. V, 278
9 /78	Хирт сорт	<i>Xěrt śurt</i>	house spirit, female deity	→ <i>Xěrt śurt</i> ; ‘house’s angel’ (Ashm. VI, 212); ‘house spirit (Rus. <i>кикимора</i> or <i>домовой</i>)’ (Magn. 90) ⁴¹⁶

Round XV

1 /79	Мелим хузя	<i>Melēm-χuśa</i>	<i>Yěřěχ</i> -spirit	in the forms → <i>Valēm- χuśa</i> , <i>Ilēm-χośa</i> , <i>Malēm- χośa</i> : Magn. 67, 87
2 /80	Авански килли	<i>Avanski kēlli</i>	<i>Avanski kiremet</i>	→ <i>Kělē</i> ; Ashm. I, 41
3 /81	Түр килли	<i>Tür kēlli or Türkēlli</i>	spirit of wor- ship, its place; the most im- portant <i>yěřěχ</i>	→ <i>Kělē</i> ; Ashm. XVI, 225–226

⁴¹⁶ *Kikimora* and *domovoy* are names of Russian domestic spirits, of which *kikimora* is rather a bad, harmful being, and *domovoy* is rather helpful.

4 /82	<i>Иурих</i>	<i>Yěřĕĕ</i>	consecration, its object, place, and the spirits to whom they sacrifice	↑
5 /83	<i>Сьорадан хорынь</i>	<i>Śuratan ħorānĕ</i>	birthing birch tree	‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. XII, 264)
6 /84	<i>Килезэ пыхса сӳрегэнь</i>	<i>Kĕlēse pāĕsa śūreken</i>	overseer of alms	‘name of a spirit’ Ashm. VII, 246; meaning: ‘overseeing the prayer’ ⁴¹⁷
7 /85	<i>Валясья бараган</i>	<i>Valeśše parakan</i>	distributor	Ashm. V, 161; as a <i>kiremet</i> (Magn. 87); ‘distributor of the sacrifice’ (Magn. 90)
8 /86	<i>Сьитъмэнне сьиттерь</i>	<i>Śitmenne śitter</i>	making up for lack	‘name of a spirit’ (Ashm. XII, 185); deliverer of the sacrifice (in case a sacrifice was omitted) (Magn. 90)
9 /87	<i>Ажа казар</i>	<i>Aša kašar</i>	Tolerantly forgive!	↑

Bishev list (Magn. 84-87)⁴¹⁸

1	<i>Тора</i>	<i>Tură</i>	–	↑
2	<i>Пӱлӱхси</i>	<i>Pŭlēĕsi</i>	–	↑; without meaning: Magn. 62, 84, 91; as the helper of other gods and spirits: 85; ‘archangel’: 87

⁴¹⁷ The field of meaning of the Chuvash verb *pāĕ-* is very broad and diverse: ‘look, examine, check, oversee, look after; treat, heal, nurse; protect, take care, guard; foretell; try’ (cf. Ashm. X, 170-175). We can find some more, scattered examples of it occurring in the name of a mythical being: *Yal pāĕi* ‘name of a deity [watcher of the village (?)]’, and *Masar pāĕi* [‘watcher of the cemetery’], which is identical with the being *Masar puśĕ* (Ashm. X, 175). About the form *masar puśi* (‘cemetery’s chief’), see → *Esrel* and → *Puś*.

⁴¹⁸ In this list, Magnitskiy did not divide the names into rounds, nor did he number them. I put numbers in the first column for easier referencing.

3	<i>Хирлэ сьыр</i>	<i>Xërle śir</i>	–	↑
4	<i>Тор' амыш</i>	<i>Turā amāšē</i>	–	→ <i>Turā</i>
5	<i>Пугамбар</i>	<i>Piḡampar</i>	–	↑
6	<i>Сьирь йыш</i>	<i>Śer yiš</i>	–	→ <i>Śer</i>
7	<i>Сьирь аише</i>	<i>Śer aššē</i>	–	→ <i>Śer</i> ; ['earth's father']
8	<i>Сьирь амыш</i>	<i>Śer amāš(ē)</i>	–	→ <i>Śer</i> ; ['earth's mother']
9	<i>Сьирь шыв' ктэнь</i>	<i>Śer šiv kēten</i>	–	→ <i>Śer</i> ; ['country's (earth-water's) shepherd']
10	<i>Сьирь пу</i>	<i>Śer pu</i>	earthly evaporation or vapour	→ <i>Śer</i> ; <i>śēr pāvē</i> 'spring (morning) mist' (Ashm. XIII, 95); 'earthly evaporation or vapour' (Magn. 89); 'earth's trunk' ⁴¹⁹ (Magn. 91) ⁴²⁰
11	<i>Переgetь</i>	<i>Pereket</i>	–	↑
12	<i>Переgetь амыже</i>	<i>Pereket amāšē</i>	–	→ <i>Pereket</i> ; as the helper of <i>ḡorś śoratakan turā</i> (Magn. 86)
13	<i>Мун тора</i>	<i>Mān turā</i>	–	→ <i>Turā</i> ; 'name of a deity' (Ashm. VIII, 310); ['great God']
14	<i>Шор тўньчи</i>	<i>Šurā tenčē</i>	white light (of here)	→ <i>Šut tenčē</i>

⁴¹⁹ Here, Magnitskiy seems not to have recognised the dative case (*pune*), although in the given list, all the names of deities and spirits are in the dative. Probably that is why he translated the name, which appears in other lists, too, differently from the others.

⁴²⁰ I suggest another possibility. There used to be a word *pū*, originally meaning 'lord, prince, clerk', which was already out of use at the beginning of the 20th century. It had only remained in some compounds (of this: Ashm. X, 73). One of the remaining compounds is the form *śērpū*, which had earlier meant 'captain, centurion' (where the first part, *śēr*, clearly means 'hundred'). However, *śērpū* also appeared in several place-names as early as the 16th century (for early data, see Dmitriev 1981, 137; for later ones: Zol. 249; Ashm. X, 73; XIII, 108–109). I believe that in these cases, we probably have the word *śēr*, meaning 'earth'. This may be supported by a piece of Paasonen's data, in the form of *śēr pēvē*, of which he writes that it means 'all the earth (land) that is in the world', adding that it is worshipped as a personified entity (Paa. 133); I would give the compound the meaning 'lord of the earth'.

15	<i>Квак хоппи</i>	<i>Kăvak χuppi</i>	–	↑; ‘blinking or opening of the sky (actually, the eyelashes of the firmament)’ (Magn. 63); ‘sky’ (Magn. 88)
16	<i>Хвэль амыже</i>	<i>Xěvel amăšě</i>	–	→ <i>Xěvel</i> ; Magn. 63, 84, 89, 91
17	<i>Хвэль сьоначе</i>	<i>Xěvel śunačě</i>	–	→ <i>Xěvel</i> ; Ashm. XII, 12; ‘Sun’s wings’ (Magn. 63)
18	<i>Сьиль амыже</i>	<i>Śil amăšě</i>	–	→ <i>Śil</i> ; Ashm. XII, 148; ‘wind’s mother’ (Magn. 63, 89; without meaning: 91)
19	<i>Сьиль сьоначе</i>	<i>Śil śunačě</i>	–	→ <i>Śil</i> ; Ashm. XII, 150; ‘wind’s wings’ (Magn. 89)
20	<i>Пыгыт пыган</i>	<i>Pikūt păḡan</i> (?)	visible in the distance	Both words are problematic ⁴²¹
21	<i>Твам-ыра</i>	<i>Tăvam ĩră</i>	great God	‘name of a spirit’ (Ashm. XIV, 236); the meaning of <i>tăvam</i> is questionable ⁴²²

⁴²¹ For the word *pikūt*, the meaning ‘distant’ is given by Ashmarin, too (Ashm. IX, 177), but he relies on only one source to support it: Munkácsi. Munkácsi, however, gives this meaning with reference to Magnitskiy (Munk. 42); therefore, except for Magnitskiy’s data here, there is no other data for this word and this meaning in the Chuvash language. Magnitskiy originates this word from the Arabic word بعيد ‘distant’ (Magn. 84) (Ar. بعيد *ba‘īd* ‘far, lengthy, long, incredible, stranger’ ARS 78), albeit wrongly. If we interpret Magnitskiy’s written form of пыган as *păḡan*, the word does not mean ‘visible’, but ‘looker, watcher’ (of which there are some other examples, as well; see the footnote to № 84 of the Maslovoy list).

⁴²² Magnitskiy starts out from the Persian word توان ‘strength, ability’ (cf. Bud. I, 383), but in Chuvash, there is no other example of the use of this word (cf. Ashm. XIV, 235). I would raise the possibility that the word is a noun derived from the verb *tu-* ‘do, work’, in which case its proper transcription is *tăvām* (‘work’). Of the deverbative suffix *-m*: Levitskaya 1976, 157-158. This possibility is supported by the fact that other derived forms of *tu-* also appear among the mythical beings (for example: *tăvaśśi*).

22	<i>Твам сьүрэдэгэн</i>	<i>Tāvam śūreteken</i>	creator of strength, power and abundance	‘name of a spirit’ (Ashm. XIV, 235); Magnitskiy’s translation is certainly wrong; ⁴²³ [‘carrier of work’ (?)]
23	<i>Кебе</i>	<i>Kepe</i>	–	↑; ‘God directing the fate of humankind’ (Magn. 64, 197)
24	<i>Кебе амыже</i>	<i>Kepe amāšē</i>	–	→ <i>Kepe</i> ‘tsarina of the bees’ (Magn. 89)
25	<i>Сьорт ктэнь Тора</i> ⁴²⁴	<i>Śurt kēten Turā</i>	–	Ashm. XII, 274; [‘house-guarding God’]
26	<i>Пүлүхси</i>	<i>Pülēχsi</i>	–	→ <i>Pülēχšē</i>
27	<i>Ама</i>	<i>Ama</i>	–	‘The oldest mother’ (Magn. 62); [‘female or mother’]
28	<i>Твасси</i>	<i>Tāvaśši</i>	doer (help)	→ <i>Etem turā</i> ; Ashm. XIV, 241; ‘worker’ (Magn. 62), ‘doer, helper with all kinds of peasant work’ (Magn. 88)
29	<i>Тохмаси</i>	<i>Tāχtaśši</i>	guardian, preserver	‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. XV, 11); ⁴²⁵ ‘guardian, preserver’ (Magn. 62); it prevents the Chuvash from wrongdoing, that is, ‘stopper’ (Magn. 88)

⁴²³ For the word *tāvam*, see the previous footnote. The word *śūreteken* certainly does not mean creation, but ‘bearer, carrier’.

⁴²⁴ Magnitskiy notes that “the helpers of this are the following”, but it is not clear how long the list of helpers within the list is – on the basis of other lists, *Пүлүхси*, *Ама*, *Твасси*, *Тохмаси* may belong here.

⁴²⁵ There is also a form *tātχaśši* (Ashm. XV, 3), which is a derivative of the verb *tātχa-* ‘defend, protect’, which probably appears here, too. It is a question whether metathesis was typical in some areas of the Chuvash language or it is Magnitskiy’s mistake.

30	<i>Рзя</i>	<i>Rśa</i>	passer-on of life's necessities	'name of a deity' (Ashm. X, 294; a questionable form, only Magnitskiy has such data)
31	<i>Тивлеть</i>	<i>Tivlet</i>	donation (grace, wealth)	'mercy, happiness, luck; name of a deity' (Ashm. XVI, 31)
32	<i>Нигизь</i>	<i>Nikēs</i>	foundation	↑; 'foundation's leader' (Magn. 62.)
33	<i>Сыхчи</i>	<i>Sīχčī</i>	guard(ian)	in Magnitskiy, also: 62, 88
34	<i>Мол сьорадаган ор тваган Тора</i> ⁴²⁶	<i>Mol śuratakan Turā</i>	God gift- ing wealth (money)	→ <i>Turā</i> ; 'wealth giver' (Magn. 63); 'God who gives wealth' (Magn. 88); ['wealth-creating God']
35	<i>Тыр-бол' сьорадаган Тора</i> ⁴²⁷	<i>Tīr(ā)-pul(ā) śuratakan Turā</i>	giver of wealth to grain	→ <i>Turā</i> ; 'giver of all kinds of grain' (Magn. 62); 'giver of grain and all earthly gain' (Magn. 88); ['(all kinds of) grain creator']
36	<i>Ой переgetь</i>	<i>Uy pereket</i>	–	→ <i>Pereket</i> ; 'spirit who gifts the field its gain' (Magn. 68); 'gain from the field or meadow' (Magn. 89)
37	<i>Переgetь амыже</i>	<i>Pereket amāšē</i>	–	→ <i>Pereket</i> ; Magn. 91: also without meaning; ['gain's mother']

⁴²⁶ Magnitskiy writes that its helpers are the same as those of *Сьорт ктэнь Тора* (Magn. 85) – cf. the footnote belonging to this being (Bishev list № 25).

⁴²⁷ Here, Magnitskiy also adds that the helpers are the same as those of *Сьорт ктэнь Тора* (Magn. 85) – cf. the footnote belonging to this form (Bishev list № 25). He further adds that its further helpers are the following beings; unfortunately, it is again not clear exactly which members of the list are intended – they are probably the following beings: *Уй переgetь*, *Переgetь амыже*, *Уй рзя*, *Уй сыхчи*.

38	Уй рзя	<i>Uy rśa</i>	creator of the field's crops	<i>Rśa</i> is the 30 th member of the list, there independently
39	Уй Сыхчи	<i>Uy sīχčī</i>	field's guard	'name of a deity' (Ashm. III, 168)
40	Выльых-чирьлих сьорадаган Тора ⁴²⁸	<i>Vilāχ-čērlēχ śuratakan Turā</i>	producer of all domestic animals	→ <i>Turā</i> ; 'giver of all domestic animals' (Magn. 62); ['livestock-creating God']
41	Чильберь тытса сүрень ыра	<i>Čēlpěr tītsa śüren irā</i>	leader on reins (leash)	['going good one, holding the reins']
42	Карда ктүсь	<i>Karta ķētūčē</i>	shepherd of the fence or hedge	'farmyard's shepherd' (Magn. 89 – this is the better translation)
43	Бывил-хирь сьорадаган Тора ⁴²⁹	<i>Īvāl χēr śuratakan Turā</i>	birther or creator of children (sons and daughters)	→ <i>Turā</i> ; 'children-giver' (Magn. 62, 88); ['children (sons-and- daughters)-creating God']
44	Хорсь сьорадаган Тора ⁴³⁰	<i>Xorś śuratakan Turā</i>	strength-giver	→ <i>Turā</i> ; (The meaning of <i>χorś</i> , <i>χuraś</i> is actually 'steel', cf. Ashm. XVI, 229); ['steel-creating God']
45	Пылак нараган	<i>Pīlak parakan</i>	sweet-giver	'name of a deity' Ashm. IX, 180; ⁴³¹ 'sweet-giver' (Magn. 64)

⁴²⁸ Magnitskiy remarks that the helpers of this are the ones mentioned above (Magn. 85) – see the footnotes belonging to the beings 25, 34, 35 of the the Bishev list. Here, however, it is indeed impossible to know which figures he means: the helpers of *Сьорт ктэнь Тора* or those listed as the helpers of *Тырбол' сьорадаган Тора*.

⁴²⁹ "Its helpers are the same as those of the above" remarks Magnitskiy (Magn. 85) cf. previous footnote.

⁴³⁰ Its helpers are the same as those of *Сьорт ктэнь Тора*, as well as those following in the list (Magn. 85-86) – in this case, it is clear that the following three beings are meant: *Пылак нараган*, *Андаран*, *Перегеть*.

⁴³¹ Ashmarin also has it in the form *pīlak paran* from another source (not from Magnitskiy).

46	Андаран	<i>Antaran</i>	lowerer	As <i>Xorś antaran toră</i> ‘strength or solidity lowerer’ (Magn. 63)
47	Перегеть	<i>Pereket</i>	–	↑; Magn. 62, as well as without meaning: Magn. 84, 91
48	Хорт сьорадаган Тора ⁴³²	<i>Xurt śura-takan Tură</i>	bee-giver	→ <i>Tură</i> ; Ashm. XVI, 234; Magn. 63; [‘bee-creating God’]
49	Ама пӳрень		giver of a mother (queen) to the bees	‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. I, 189); [‘gifter of the queen bee’] ⁴³³
50	Хумгаси	<i>Xumḡaśši</i>	waver	Ashm. XVI, 160; <i>tiră ~</i> : Magn. 64
51	Тӱр килли	<i>Tür kĕlli</i>	–	→ <i>Kĕlē</i> ; Ashm. XVI, 225-226; ‘spirit worship, its place; the most important <i>yĕrĕḡ</i> ’ (Magn. 78)
52	Чар пӳрень	<i>Čar püren</i>	–	cf. Ashm. X, 83; XV, 149; ⁴³⁴ ‘prohibition giver or determiner’ (Magn. 64); unknown <i>kiremet</i> (Magn. 90)
53	Хай пӳрень	<i>Hay püren</i>	–	Ashm. XVI, 6; ‘determiner of life, testator, donor’ (Magn. 64); unknown <i>kiremet</i> (Magn. 90)
54	Юларан паларан?	<i>Yularan palaran</i>	?	Ashm. IV, 317; ‘Collector of the remains of the sacrifice’ (Magn. 90) ⁴³⁵

⁴³² “Its helpers in the first group” remarks Magnitskiy (Magn. 86), which is, again, hard to interpret, as the beings are not grouped in this list.

⁴³³ The primary meaning of *ama* is ‘female, mother’, but in apiary, it means ‘queen bee’ and, as the previous being is also related to beekeeping, this translation seems justified.

⁴³⁴ See also: Maslovoy list № 56.

⁴³⁵ In the Bishev list, Magnitskiy only puts a question mark to the meanings of the compound, but in the Cheshlam list, he gives the meaning ‘the collector of the

55	Юлаш обышка	<i>Yulaš upaška</i>	freeing husband or old man	→ <i>Yulaš opaška</i>
	<i>Kiremets:</i>			
56	асла ыра	<i>aslă iră</i>	–	→ <i>İră</i> ; Ashm. II, 109-110; III, 64-65, ‘main guardian’ (Magn. 65); ‘main <i>kiremet</i> ’ (Magn. 89)
57	Асл амыже	<i>Aslă amăšĕ</i>	–	[‘Great one’s mother’] ⁴³⁶
58	Хаяр	<i>Xayar</i>	evil, angry	↑
59	Кардалуй	<i>Kartaluy</i>	place of a <i>kiremet</i>	‘name of a <i>kiremet</i> ’ (Ashm. VI, 115)
60	Ксинь киреметь	<i>Kěšĕn kiremet</i>	small <i>kiremet</i>	identical with the form <i>kěšĕn iră</i> (Ashm. VII, 308)
61	Терь ыра	<i>Tĕper iră</i>	guardian spirit of the clan or family	→ <i>Tipiri</i>
62	Урас пухты	<i>Uras puḫti</i>	lucky glance (luck has glanced)	‘name of a spirit’ (Ashm. II, 272); <i>uras</i> ‘luck’ (Zol. 248.)
63	Хирлэ сьыр киреметь амыже	<i>Xĕrlĕ-šĭr kiremet amăšĕ</i>	–	→ <i>Xĕrlĕ-šĭr</i> ; ‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. XVII, 52); [‘ <i>Xĕrlĕ-šĭr kiremet</i> ’s mother’]
64	Омыньчэ сүрэнъ	<i>Umănčĕ šüren</i>	near (or: next in line)	‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. III, 235); [‘going before him’]
65	Иньгеги	<i>Inkeki</i>	–	↑
66	Сьынгеръ	<i>Sinker</i>	–	↑

remains of the sacrifice’, which does not reflect the Chuvash original. In the first part of the compound *Yularan palaran*, Ashmarin sees the word *yula* ‘false accusation’, but he cannot interpret the second part as he regards both words as having an ablative ending (cf. Ashm. IV, 317). Starting from the structure *yula-ran palăr+an*, I suggest the meaning ‘recognisable from the false accusation’ or ‘known by the false accusation’. This interpretation might be supported by the being → *Yulavšă*, which is not problem-free, either.

⁴³⁶ In its complete form, it is certainly *aslă iră amăšĕ* ‘great good one’s mother’.

67	Идем перегечь	<i>Item perekečĕ</i>	–	→ <i>Pereket</i> ; ‘a deity in round VIII’ (Ashm. III, 153); ‘gifter to the threshing-yard’ (Magn. 68), ‘threshing-yard’s success’ (Magn. 89.); [‘threshing-yard’s gain’]
68	Авын сыхчи	<i>Avăn sīχĕi</i>	grain-barn’s guardian	↑
69	Сода видерень	<i>Sot viteren</i>	helper with selling	‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. XI, 209)
70	Сьол иньгеги	<i>Śul inkek</i>	misfortune on the road	→ <i>Śul</i> ; ‘misfortune on the road’ (Magn. 89)
71	Сьол сынгерь	<i>Śul sinker</i>	–	→ <i>Śul</i> ; ‘avorter of misfortune’ (Magn. 89); [‘misfortune on the road’]
72	Сьол хаяре	<i>Śul χayarĕ</i>	–	→ <i>Śul</i> ; Ashm. XII, 217; [‘bad one on the road’]
73	Сьол сүрень ыра	<i>Śul śüren iră</i>	good travel-companion	→ <i>Śul</i> ; Ashm. III, 65; XII, 303; ‘good travel-companion’ (Magn. 65); [‘good one going on the road’]
74	Малем хузя	<i>Malām-χuśa</i>	a one-time trader	↑ (as <i>Valēm-χuśa</i>) ; <i>Melēm-χuśa</i> ‘yĕrĕχ-spirit’ (Magn. 68)
75	Хузанда вырдан	<i>Xusanti vĭrtan</i>	resting (lying) in Kazan	‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. XVI, 238)
76	Свiэрэ вырдан	<i>Sĕvere vĭrtan</i>	resting (lying) in Sviyazh	Ashm. III, 64
77	Сумбура вырдан	<i>Sumpura vĭrtan</i>	found by the River Sumka (Sumbu)	[‘resting (lying) by the Sumbu’]
78	Клетърэ вырдан	<i>Kĕletri vĭrtan</i>	–	‘name of a deity’ Ashm. VII, 241 (<i>kĕlet</i> ‘shed, pantry’ /ibid./)
79	Миньгыш ту	<i>Minkĕš tu</i>	(<i>Minkĕš</i> – name of a village)	[‘Mount Minkeš’]

80	Шобаишкарда вырдан	<i>Šupaškarta vīrtan</i>	–	<i>Šupaškarta vīrtan irā</i> (Ashm. XVII, 224); [‘resting (lying) in Cheboksary’]
81	Пурь киле умыньчэ сүрень	<i>Pur kilē umēnčē sūren</i>	going in front of every yard	‘serving in front of every house’ (Magn. 90)
82	Валясься	<i>Valešše</i>	distributor	‘name of a deity (Ashm. V, 161); <i>Valešše parakan</i> ‘distributor’ (Magn. 83); ‘distributor of the sacri- fice’ (Magn. 90)
83	Омра опран	<i>Umra upran</i>	guardian of life	→ <i>Upram</i> ; ‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. III, 235)
84	Кебе киреметь амыш	<i>Kepe kiremet amāšē</i>	–	‘ <i>Kepe kiremet</i> ’s mother’
85	Кебе киреметь	<i>Kepe kiremet</i>	–	‘name of a <i>kiremet</i> ’ (Ashm. VI, 189); <i>Kepe kiremečē</i> ‘ <i>kiremet</i> of God who directs the fate of humankind’ (Magn. 64)

Cheshlam list (Magn. 87-90)

1	Тора	<i>Turā</i>	God	↑
2	Пулухсь	<i>Pülēχši</i>	archangel	↑
3	Тор амыже	<i>Turā amāšē</i>	Divine mother	→ <i>Turā</i> ; [‘God’s mother’]
4	Пигамбар	<i>Piχampar</i>	prophet	↑
5	Хирле съыр	<i>Xērle šīr</i>	Saint Nicholas	↑
6	Сьирь йыш	<i>Šēr yiš</i>	earth’s master	→ <i>Šēr</i> ; ‘earth’s lord’ (Ashm. XIII, 91); ‘earth’s family’ (Magn. 62)
7	Сьирь ашше	<i>Šēr aššē</i>	earth’s father	→ <i>Šēr</i> ; Ashm. XIII, 89; Magn. 62, 84
8	Сьирь амыже	<i>Šēr amāšē</i>	earth’s mother	→ <i>Šēr</i> ; Ashm. XIII, 89; Magn. 62, 84, 91

9	Сыррь шыв' кудегенъ	<i>Śēr šiv kēten</i>	earth and water's (or country's) shepherd or steward	→ <i>Śēr</i> ; Ashm. XIII, 100; Magn. 62, 84
10	Тувасси	<i>Tāvaśsi</i>	helper with all kinds of peasant work	→ <i>Etem turā</i> ; Ashm. XIV, 241; 'worker' (Magn. 62); 'doer (help)' (Magn. 85-86)
11	Тохтасси	<i>Tāχtaśsi</i>	prevents the Chuvash from wrongdoing, that is, stopper	Ashm. X, 11; 'guardian, preserver' (Magn. 62); helper of other deities (Magn. 88)
12	Ывыл-хирь сьорадаган Тора	<i>Īvāl-χēr śura- takan Turā</i>	children-giver	→ <i>Turā</i> ; Ashm. III, 48; 'giver of children (Magn. 62); 'children-birther or creator' (Magn. 85); ['children (son-daugh- ter)-creating God']
13	Ывыл-хирь сьорадаган сыхчи	<i>Īvāl-χēr śura- takan sīχči</i>	children's guardian	→ <i>Turā</i> ; ['children (son-daughter)-creating protector']
14	Моль сьорадаганъ Тора	<i>Mol śuratakan Turā</i>	God who gives wealth	→ <i>Turā</i> ; 'wealth-giver' (Magn. 63); 'wealth-gift- ing God' (Magn. 85)
15	Мол сыхчи	<i>Mol sīχči</i>	guardian of wealth (frugal)	['protector of property and wealth']
16	Мол нигис	<i>Mol nikēs</i>	wealth's foundation	→ <i>Nikēs</i>
17	Тыра бол сьорадаган Тора	<i>Tīr(ā)-pul(ā) śuratakan Turā</i>	giver of grain and all earthly gain	Ashm. XIV, 3, 6; 'giver of all kinds of grain' (Magn. 62); ['(all kinds of) grain-creating God']
18	Тыра бол нигис	<i>Tīr(ā)-pul(ā) nikēs</i>	grain's foundation	
19	Тыра бол сыхчи	<i>Tīr(ā)-pul(ā) sīχči</i>	grain's guardian	

20	Виссе тўрле вийлых чирьлих сьорадаган Тора	<i>Višše türle vilǎḡ-čěrlěḡ śuratakan Turā</i>	God giving (away) three kinds of livestock	[‘three kinds of live- stock-creating God’]
21	Выйлых чирлихъ нигис	<i>Vilǎḡ-čěrlěḡ nikēs</i>	livestock’s foundation	
22	Выйлых чирьлихъ сыхчи	<i>Vilǎḡ-čěrlěḡ sīḡči</i>	livestock’s guardian	
23	Тора съоли	<i>Turā śulě</i>	God’s road	→ <i>Śul</i> ; Ashm. XVI, 159
24	Хаяре	<i>Xayar(ě)</i>	–	↑; ‘bad, angry (as a <i>kiremet</i>)’ (Magn. 86)
25	Ингеке	<i>Inkek(ě)</i>	trouble, misfortune	↑
26	Сыхчи	<i>Sīḡči</i>	guard	↑; ‘guardian angel’ as the helper of other gods or spirits (Magn. 85, 86)
27	Квак хоппи	<i>Kāvak ḡuppi</i>	sky	↑
28	Съвере вырдаган ыра	<i>Sěvere vīrtan īrā</i>	saint who rests in the town of Sviyazh	Ashm. III, 64; cf. also Magn. 67, 87; [‘good one resting (lying) in Sviyazh’]
29	Хозанда вырдаган ыра	<i>Xusanti vīr- takan īrā</i>	saint who rests in Kazan	Ashm. XVI, 238; as well as: III, 65; V, 251; cf. also: Magn. 67, 87; [‘good one resting (lying) in Kazan’]
30	Кебе амыже	<i>Kepe amāšě</i>	tsarina of bees	→ <i>Kepe</i> ; [‘ <i>Kepe</i> ’s mother’]
31	Сыль аише	<i>Śil aššě</i>	wind’s father	→ <i>Śil</i>
32	Сыль амыже	<i>Śil amāšě</i>	wind’s mother	→ <i>Śil</i>
33	Силь хаяре	<i>Śil ḡayarě</i>	wind’s wrath	→ <i>Śil</i>
34	Силь ингеке	<i>Śil inkekě</i>	wind’s misfortune	→ <i>Śil</i> ; ‘wind’s punish- ment’ (Magn. 63)
35	Силь сынгере	<i>Śil sinkerě</i>	misfortune’s avertor	→ <i>Śil</i> ; ‘wind’s strength’ (Magn. 63); [‘wind’s trouble (damage)’]

36	Сыль сыхчи	<i>Śil sīχči</i>	protector from misfortune	→ <i>Śil</i> ; ‘wind’s guard’ (Magn. 63; this is the correct translation)
37	Силь съоначе	<i>Śil śunačē</i>	wind’s wings	→ <i>Śil</i>
38	Хвель аише	<i>Xěvel aššē</i>	Sun’s father	→ <i>Xěvel</i>
39	Хвель амыже	<i>Xěvel amāšē</i>	Sun’s mother	→ <i>Xěvel</i>
40	Сьирь був	<i>Śēr pāvē</i> (=śēr pu)	earthly vapour	‘spring morning mist’ (Ashm. XIII, 95); <i>śēr pu</i> ‘earthly evaporation (vapour)’ (Magn. 84)
41	Эрне ватти		week’s old one – it forgives the non-Christian Chuvash if they do any work on Friday	‘week’s old woman’ (Magn. 64)
42	Ингекъ суредегень	<i>Inkek śureteken</i>	leader of trouble, misfortune	→ <i>Inkek</i> ; ‘punishment producer’ (Magn. 64); [‘trouble, misfortune bearer’]
43	Чильберь тыдаган	<i>Čēlpēr tītakan</i>	keeper on reins (leash)	also: Magn. 64
44	Уй перегечь	<i>Uy perekeč</i>	gain from the field or meadow	→ <i>Pereket</i> ; ‘spirit who gifts gain to the field’ (Magn. 68, 85)
45	Идэмь перегечь	<i>Item perekeč</i>	threshing-yard’s success	→ <i>Pereket</i> ; ‘gifter to the threshing-yard’ (Magn. 68); and Magn. 86
46	Кыжыл перегечь	<i>Kāšāl perekeč</i>	stack’s success	→ <i>Pereket</i> ; ‘spirit who gifts gain to the pile of threshed grain’ (Magn. 68)
47	Киль перегечь	<i>Kil perekeč</i>	house’s success	‘gifter of the house’ (Magn. 68); [‘house gain’]
48	Сьол ингеке	<i>Śul inkeč</i>	misfortune on the road	→ <i>Śul</i> ; ‘misfortune on the road’ (Magn. 86); [‘misfortune of the road’]
49	Сьол сынгере	<i>Śul sinkerē</i>	avertor of misfortune	→ <i>Śul</i> ; as a <i>kiremet</i> (Magn. 86); [‘road’s trouble’]

50	<i>Карда кюдегенъ</i>	<i>Karta kēteken</i>	farmyard's shepherd	Ashm. VI, 113; <i>karta kētūšē</i> 'id.' Magn. 85
51	<i>Асла ыра</i>	<i>Aslā irā</i>	main <i>kiremet</i>	→ <i>Īrā</i> ; 'main guardian' (Magn. 65); as a <i>kiremet</i> (Magn. 86); ['great good one']
52	<i>Сумбурды</i>	<i>Sumpurti</i>	(name of a lake)	Ashm. XI, 182
53	<i>Ержерды ыра</i>	<i>Yēršerti irā</i>	<i>kiremet</i> of Martinov	AshmvV, 149; (Martinov village in Chuvash is <i>Yēršer</i>); ['the good one of Yersher']
54	<i>Йопсарды (киреметъ)</i>	<i>Yopsarti</i>	<i>kiremet</i> of Kazakov	Kazakov in Chuvash is <i>Yopsar</i>
55	<i>Шолдрары (киреметъ)</i>	<i>Šultrari</i>	<i>Kiremet</i> of the roads around the big forest	'name of a <i>kiremet</i> ' (Ashm. XVII, 220 – also in the same place: <i>šultrari irā</i> 'name of a deity')
56	<i>Моргарды бось</i>	<i>Mur karti puš</i>	head of Urazmetev [a place name]	'leader and protector of the animal cemetery' ⁴³⁷ where livestock died in an epidemic were buried' (Ashm. VIII, 272); ['head (leader) of the carrion-pit']
57	<i>Пыгыт пыган</i>	<i>Pikīt pākan</i>	overseer of the prayer of the Chuvash	Ashm. IX, 177; 'visible in the distance' (Magn. 84); see also: Bishev list № 20
58	<i>Хай тюрень</i>	<i>Hay püren</i>	unknown <i>kiremet</i>	Ashm. XVI, 6; 'determiner of life, testator, donor' (Magn. 64); without meaning: Magn. 86
59	<i>Чар тюрень</i>	<i>Čar püren</i>	unknown <i>kiremet</i>	Ashm. XV, 149; 'prohibition giver or determiner' (Magn. 64); without meaning: Magn. 86
60	<i>Хирт съорм</i>	<i>Xěrt-šort</i>	house spirit	↑

⁴³⁷ The Chuvash word *mur* means 'contagious disease' (cf. Ashm. VIII, 269).

61	Тур килли	<i>Tür-kĕlli</i> or <i>türkĕlli</i>	<i>kiremet</i> servant	→ <i>Kĕlē</i> ; ‘spirit worship, its place; the most important <i>yĕrĕĭ</i> ’ (Magn. 78)
62	Йырых	<i>Yĕrĕĭ</i>	<i>kiremet</i> servant	↑
63	Валясса барагань	<i>Valeśše</i> <i>parakan</i>	distributor of the sacrifice	Ashm. V, 161; ‘distributor’ (Magn. 83); <i>kiremet</i> (Magn. 87)
64	Ситъмение сидережень	<i>Šitmenne</i> <i>šitereken</i>	deliverer of the sacrifice (in case a sacrifice was omitted)	‘name of a spirit’ Ashm. XII, 185; ‘making up for lack’ (Magn. 83)
65	Поръ киле омынче сүрежень	<i>Pur kilĕ</i> <i>umĕnĕe</i> <i>šüreken</i>	serving in front of every house	‘going in front of every yard’ (Magn. 87)
66	Иоларан- Паларан	<i>Yularan</i> <i>palaran</i>	collector of the remains of the sacrifice	→ <i>Yulaš opāška</i> ; Ashm. IV, 317; without meaning: Magn. 86
67	Йырыс / Рыс тыдан	<i>Yārās</i> / <i>Rās</i> <i>titan</i>	transient luck (which passes from one pagan to another); guardian of the secret	<i>yārās</i> ‘secret’ (Ashm. V, 93); or <i>ārās</i> ‘luck’ ⁴³⁸ (Ashm. IV, 60); <i>rās titan</i> ‘name of an evil spirit’ (Ashm. X, 293 < Magn. 90); [‘secret-keeper / luck-keeper’]
	<i>Kiremets:</i>			
68	Лошкотпу	<i>Loškotri</i>	<i>kiremet</i> near Reshetnikovoy village ⁴³⁹	Ashm. VIII, 96
69	Ишплат	<i>Išplat</i>	<i>kiremet</i> near Verkhny Viselok village	Ashm. III, 163

⁴³⁸ Also the *ārāsĕ* form of this (*ārās* + third person sing. possessive suffix) as the name of a deity: Ashm. IV, 61.

⁴³⁹ The form *Loškot*, which cannot be found anywhere else, may be hiding the form *Pāškāt* – there is a meadow by this name, and also a ravine or gully by the name of *Pāškāt širmi* near Torkhan village.

Bayteryakov list (Magn. 91)⁴⁴⁰

1 ⁴⁴¹	<i>Торра пүлехсе</i>	<i>Turā pülēχsi</i>	–	→ <i>Pülēχšē</i>
2	<i>Херле-сира</i>	<i>Xērle-šīr</i>	–	↑
3	<i>Чон сюрадаган Торра</i>	<i>Čun šura- takan Turā</i>	–	→ <i>Turā</i> ; [‘soul-creating God’]
4	<i>Сют- тюнтене</i>	<i>Šut-tēnčē</i>	–	↑; ‘this world’s God’ (Magn. 63)
5	<i>Хвель ашиене</i>	<i>Xēvel aššē</i>	–	→ <i>Xēvel</i> ; ‘Sun’s father’ (Magn. 63, 89)
6	<i>Хвель амышине</i>	<i>Xēvel amāšē</i>	–	→ <i>Xēvel</i> ; ‘Sun’s mother’ (Magn. 63, 84, 89)
7	<i>Квак хуппине</i>	<i>Kāvak χuppi</i>	–	↑; ‘blinking or the opening of the sky’ (Magn. 63); ‘sky’ (Magn. 88); without meaning: Magn. 84
8	<i>Пугамбара</i>	<i>Piχampar</i>	–	↑; ‘prophet’ (Magn. 88); without meaning: Magn. 62, 84
9	<i>Хурбана</i>	<i>Xārpan</i>	god of the sacrifice	↑

⁴⁴⁰ In this list, Magnitskiy provides the names of gods and spirits with a dative suffix; I give the unsuffixed form in the second column of the table.

⁴⁴¹ This is how Magnitskiy gives the number, and says that at the time of the beer sacrifice, those who offer the sacrifice say the names of the deities one by one, holding their own cup of beer in their hands. In Magnitskiy’s description, the number is followed by “he says”. Thus, those lining up for the sacrifice, “the first one says: to God, to *Pülēχšē*; the second one says to *Xērle-šīr* ...”. We can see that sometimes, some names belonging together (such as Sun’s mother, Sun’s father) are said by different people (as they have different numbers), and at other times, the same person gets to invoke three or four names belonging together (such as earth’s father, earth’s mother, earth’s evaporation, earth’s trouble). The reason for this might be that the number of invoked deities may have been constant, whereas the number of people offering the sacrifice may not.

10	<i>Перекетэ, перекет аишине, перекет амышине</i>	<i>Pereket, pereket aššě, pereket amăšě</i>	–	↑
11	<i>Сют куль амине</i>	<i>Šută küľ ami</i>	bright lake's mother	→ <i>Šut tēnče</i> ;
12	<i>Силь аишине, силь амышине</i>	<i>Šil aššě, šil amăšě</i>	–	→ <i>Šil</i> ; 'wind's father, wind's mother' (Magn. 63, 84, 89)
13	<i>Силь синкерне, силь тытхане</i>	<i>Šil sinker, šil tītḡaně</i>	–	→ <i>Šil</i> ; <i>šil sinker</i> 'wind's strength' (Magn. 63); 'avertor of misfortune' (Magn. 89); <i>šil tītḡaně</i> (Ashm. XIV, 21) ⁴⁴²
14	<i>Сирь аишине, сирь амышине сирь пуне, сирь сехметне</i>	<i>Šēr aššě, šēr amăšě, šēr pu, šēr seḡmet</i>	(<i>šēr pu</i> .) 'earth's trunk' ⁴⁴³	→ <i>Šēr</i> ; <i>šēr aššě</i> 'earth's father' (Magn. 62, 84); <i>šēr amăšě</i> 'earth's mother' (Magn. 62, 84, 88); <i>šēr pu</i> 'earthly evaporation' (Magn. 84, 89); <i>šēr seḡmečě</i> (Ashm. XIII, 95; Paa. 133)

⁴⁴² The verb *tīt*- 'grab, take hold of, catch' and its derivatives are used in the case of diseases (some disease grabs the person), but it can also be found in the names of several spirits, for example *ārās tītan*, *pereket tītan*, *šēr-šiv tītan*.

⁴⁴³ Magnitskiy seems not to have recognised the suffixed form; therefore, he gave a different interpretation from other occurrences of the word.

2. Nikifor Pavlovich's Simbirsk list

1883-1884 (Ashmarin 1921) ⁴⁴⁴

Page 1

Prayers recited in case of harm inflicted upon humans by evil spirits

Prayer 1 ⁴⁴⁵

1 ⁴⁴⁶	<i>Tură</i>	God	↑
2	<i>Tură amășē</i>	God's mother	→ <i>Tură</i>
3	<i>Pülěχśē</i>	determiner	↑
4	<i>Pülěχśē amășē</i>	<i>Pülěχśē</i> 's mother	→ <i>Pülěχśē</i>
5	<i>Tură uměņče śūreken ĭr</i>	saint who leads the service before God ⁴⁴⁷	['Good One going before God']

⁴⁴⁴ I present the Chuvash data in the table by taking Ashmarin's corrections into consideration, leaving the tangled lower and upper-case letters as they were originally used.

⁴⁴⁵ Pavlovich's manuscript includes several different numberings. In addition to the page numbering of the manuscript notebook, the prayers used against harm inflicted by evil spirits are also numbered. This numbering goes from 1 to 12, with one number for each prayer, indicated by the heading "prayer + number" above the tables. The tables list the deities and spirits that are invoked in the given prayer. The same numbering is used in the Anthology, for example: Pav. 28 (prayer 12). The list of mythical beings invoked in these harm-averting prayers goes up to № 71 in the first column of the table, which was inserted by me. The second part of the manuscript includes prayers recited for grain crops and people. Here, Pavlovich introduced a different numbering, which goes from 1 to 33. The numbers do not refer to prayers but to the beings invoked or a small group thereof. Unlike the previous numbering, I put these numbers before the Chuvash names inside the tables.

⁴⁴⁶ The line appears in the prayer twice: once said in the dative case, indicating which god it is addressed to, then invoking these very gods. Here, I only present the nominative case forms.

⁴⁴⁷ This translation by Ashmarin is not accurate. In his dictionary (Ashm. XII, 303), this same *śūreken* form is translated as 'courier, messenger (Rus. *хозяин*)'; whereas the verb *śūre-* means 'go, travel, pass; live, be in some situation (etc.)', thus *śūreken* can be translated as 'going, walking, passing'.

Page 2

Prayer 2⁴⁴⁸

6	<i>Măn Tură</i>	great God	→ <i>Tură</i>
7	<i>Măn Tură Amăšě</i>	great God's mother	→ <i>Tură</i>
8	<i>Măn Pülěχšě</i>	great determiner	→ <i>Pülěχšě</i>
9	<i>Măn Pülěš' Amăšě</i>	great determiner's mother	→ <i>Pülěχšě</i>
10	<i>Măn Tură uměnce šüreken Măn Īră</i>	great saint who leads the service before the great God	['great Good One going before the great God']

Prayer 3

11	<i>Čun šuratan Tură</i>	soul-birthing God	→ <i>Tură</i>
12	<i>Čun šuratan Tură amăšě</i>	soul-birthing God's mother	→ <i>Tură</i>
13	<i>Čun šuratan Pülěχšě</i>	soul-birthing determiner	→ <i>Pülěχšě</i> ; ['soul-creating <i>Pülěχšě</i> ']
14	<i>Čun šuratan Pülěχšě Amăšě</i>	soul-birthing determiner's mother	→ <i>Pülěχšě</i> ; ['soul-creating <i>Pülěχšě</i> 's mother']
15	<i>Čun šuratan Tură uměnce šüreken Īră</i>	saint leading the service before soul-birthing God	['good one going before soul-creating God']

Page 3

Prayer 4

16	<i>Čun püren Turră</i>	soul-determining (or ordering) God	→ <i>Tură</i>
17	<i>Čun püren Tură Amăšě</i>	soul-ordering God's mother	→ <i>Tură</i>
18	<i>Čun püren Pülěχšě</i>	soul-ordering determiner	→ <i>Pülěχšě</i> ; ['soul-determining <i>Pülěχšě</i> ']
19	<i>Čun püren Pülěχšě Amăšě</i>	soul-ordering determiner's mother	→ <i>Pülěχšě</i> ; ['soul-determining <i>Pülěχšě</i> 's mother']

⁴⁴⁸ In this prayer, too, the names are in the dative case (which I do not indicate in my translation).

20	<i>Čun püren Tură uměnce šüreken Īră</i>	saint who leads the service before the soul-ordering God	[‘good one going before soul-determining God’]
----	--	--	--

Prayer 5

21	<i>Atam⁴⁴⁹ Tură</i>	Adam God	→ <i>Etem tură</i>
22	<i>Atam Tură amăšē</i>	Adam God’s mother	→ <i>Etem tură</i>
23	<i>Atam Pülěχšē</i>	determining Adam (besides God)	→ <i>Etem tură</i>
24	<i>Atam pülěχšē amăšē</i>	mother of determining Adam (besides God)	→ <i>Etem tură</i>
25	<i>Atam Tăvašši amăšē</i>	working (beside) Adam’s mother	→ <i>Etem tură</i> ; [‘Adam maker’s (worker’s) ⁴⁵⁰ mother’]
26	<i>Atam Tăvašši</i>	working (beside) Adam	→ <i>Etem tură</i> ; [‘Adam maker (worker)’]

Prayer 6

27	<i>Atam upraši</i>	protector beside Adam God	→ <i>Etem tură</i> ; [‘Adam protector’]
28	<i>Amašē, atam upraši</i>	protector beside Adam God’s mother	[‘Adam protector’s mother’]
29	<i>Čun sīχči amăšē</i>	soul guard’s mother	
30	<i>čun sīχči</i>	soul guard	
31	<i>Čun upram Īră amăšē</i>	soul-protecting Saint’s mother	[‘soul-protecting good one’s mother’]
32	<i>čun upram Īră</i> ⁴⁵¹	soul-protecting Saint	[‘soul-protecting good one’]

⁴⁴⁹ Ashmarin, probably following Pavlovich’s notation, uses the form *Adam* throughout the list, but *Atam* in his dictionary, which is the correct spelling.

⁴⁵⁰ S. N. Karamalov interprets it in his manuscript as ‘helping with the work’ (Ashmarin 1921, 33 /e/).

⁴⁵¹ Here and hereafter, I have retained the six dots from the original notebook and Ashmarin.

Prayer 7

33	<i>Tură Tala amăšě</i>	Most High God's ⁴⁵² mother	→ <i>Tură</i> ; ['God Debate's / Debate-God's ⁴⁵³ mother']
34	<i>Tură Tala</i>	great God	→ <i>Tură</i> ; ['God Debate / Debate-God']
35	<i>Tură Xayar amăšě</i>	divine wrath's mother	→ <i>Tură</i> ; ['God Bad One's mother']
36	<i>Tură Xayar</i>	divine wrath	→ <i>Tură</i> ; ['God Bad One']
37	<i>Vărsălă Xayar amăšě</i>	cursing bad one's mother	['cursing/enmity('s) bad one's mother']
38	<i>Vărsălă xayar</i>	cursing bad one	['cursing/enmity('s) bad one']

Prayer 8

39	<i>Yulavšă amăšě</i>	—	→ <i>Yulavšă</i>
40	<i>Yulavšă</i>	—	↑; ['slanderer (or plotter)']
41	<i>Tupavšă amăšě</i>	—	→ <i>Yulavšă</i> ; ['oath-taker's mother']
42	<i>Tupavšă</i>	—	→ <i>Yulavšă</i> ; ['oath-taker']

Prayer 9

43	<i>Piḡampar amăšě</i>	<i>Piḡampar</i> 's mother	→ <i>Piḡampar</i>
44	<i>Piḡampar</i>	—	↑

⁴⁵² Ashmarin identified the Chuvash word *Tala* with Arabic تعالى (Tatar *tägälä*) earlier (Ashmarin 1902, 119, 121) and also here (Ashmarin 1921, 31), but he did not include it in his 17-volume dictionary. He comments on *Tala Tură* that the Yadrin Chuvash already did not understand this word. This is how the strange and meaningless compound may have come about which can also be found in Magnitskiy (Magn. 115) in the form of *Торда Торры*, meaning 'God of the double or forked wagon-shaft' (Ashmarin 1921, 33). See also → *Tură*.

⁴⁵³ The Chuvash word *tav* means 'debate, quarrel', its derivatives are *tavlaš-* 'to debate, quarrel', *tavlă* 'debated, debatable'; *tavlă šěr* and *tal-šěr* (place name); *tal* (shortening of *tavlă*) 'debatable', *tala-* 'to debate'. Ashmarin's Arabic etymology (see previous footnote) may be correct, but the interpretation which I have proposed fits better in the list of god names in this series as well as in the text of the prayer.

Prayer 10

45	<i>Xārpan amāšē</i>	<i>Xārpan</i> 's mother	→ <i>Xārpan</i>
46	<i>Xārpan </i>	–	↑

Prayers against harm caused by falling on the ground

Prayer 11

47	<i>Šēr Turāš</i>	Earth god	→ <i>Šēr</i>
48	<i>šēr Turrāš amāšē</i>	Earth god's mother	→ <i>Šēr</i>
49	<i>šēr Pūlēχši</i>	earth's determiner	→ <i>Šēr</i> ; ['earth's <i>Pūlēχšē</i> ']
50	<i>šēr Pūlēχši amāšē</i>	earth's determiner's mother	→ <i>Šēr</i> ; ['earth's <i>Pūlēχšē</i> 's mother']
51	<i>Šēr aššē</i>	earth's father	→ <i>Šēr</i>
52	<i>šēr amāšē</i>	earth's mother	→ <i>Šēr</i>
53	<i>šēr kākri amāšē</i>	earth's breasts' mother	→ <i>Šēr</i>

Page 5

[continuation of Prayer 11]

54	<i>Šēr kākri</i>	earth's breasts	→ <i>Šēr</i>
55	<i>šērYiši amāšē</i>	earth's master's mother	→ <i>Šēr</i>
56	<i>šērYiši</i>	earth's master	→ <i>Šēr</i>
57	<i>šēr Xayar amāšē</i>	earth's bad one's mother	→ <i>Šēr</i>
58	<i>šēr xayar</i>	earth's bad one	→ <i>Šēr</i>
59	<i>šēr χārpan amāšē</i>	earth <i>Xārpan</i> 's mother	→ <i>Šēr</i>
60	<i>šēr χārpan</i> ' (sic!)	earth <i>Xārpan</i>	→ <i>Šēr</i>

Prayer in case of falling in water

Prayer 12

61	<i>Šiv Turri</i>	water's god	→ <i>Šiv</i>
62	<i>šiv turri amāšē</i>	water's god's mother	→ <i>Šiv</i>
63	<i>Šiv Pūlēχši</i>	water's determiner	→ <i>Šiv</i> ; ['water's <i>Pūlēχšē</i> ']

64	<i>šiv Pülěχsi amāšě</i>	water's determiner's mother	→ Šiv; ['water's Pülěχsé's mother']
65	<i>šiv aššě</i>	water's father	→ Šiv
66	<i>šiv amāšě</i>	water's mother	→ Šiv
67	<i>šiv turri uměnce šüreen Īră</i>	saint serving before the water's god	→ Šiv; ['good one going before the water's god']
68	<i>šiv šinči kělě amāšě</i>	mother of prayer on the water	→ Šiv; ['mother of kělě ⁴⁵⁴ on the water']
69	<i>šiv šinči kělě</i>	prayer on the water	→ Šiv; ['kělě on the water']
70	<i>šiv xayar amāšě</i>	water's bad one's mother	→ Šiv
71	<i>šiv xayarě</i>	water's bad one	→ Šiv

Page 6

Prayer for grain and man

72	1) <i>Tură</i>	God	↑
73	<i>pülěχšě</i>	determiner	↑
74	<i>Tură šulě amāšě</i>	God's road's (year's) mother	→ Šul; šulě: 'road' or 'year' (Ashmarin 1921, 34 /л/); Magn.: 'whip (scourge)'
75	<i>Tură šulě</i>	God's road (year)	→ Šul
76	<i>(Īră Tură šulě)⁴⁵⁵</i>	holy God's road (year)	['good God's road']

Page 7

77	2) <i>Tură uměnce šüreen Īră amāšě</i>	mother of Saint leading the service before God	['mother of Good One going before God']
78	<i>Tură umănci Īră</i>	Saint leading the service before God	→ Īră; ['Good One going before God']
79	3) <i>Kepě (sic!) amāšě</i>	Kaaba (stone)'s mother	→ Kepe
80	<i>Kepi (sic!)</i>	Kaaba (stone)	↑ (Kepe)

⁴⁵⁴ Contrary to Ashmarin, I would not translate the word *kělě* because, as a mythical being, its meaning is not simply 'prayer'.

⁴⁵⁵ Ashmarin regards this as a part of supplication and not an invocation.

81	4) <i>Šut tēnče amāšē</i>	bright (or light) world's mother	→ <i>Šut tēnče</i>
82	<i>šut tēnči</i>	bright (or light) world	→ <i>Šut tēnče</i>
83	5) <i>Šut šantalāk amāšē</i>	bright (or light) world's mother	→ <i>Šut tēnče</i>
84	<i>šut Šantalāk</i>	bright (or light) world	→ <i>Šut tēnče</i>
85	6) <i>Tēnče titakan Īrā amāšē</i>	mother of saint di- recting the world ⁴⁵⁶	[‘world-holding Good One’s mother’]
86	<i>tēnče titakan Īrā</i>	saint directing the world	→ <i>Ārās tītan</i> ; [‘world- holding Good One’]
87	7) <i>Šul šüren Īrā amāšē</i>	mother of saint going on the road	→ <i>Šul</i> ; [‘mother of good one going on the road’]
88	<i>šul šüren Īrā</i>	saint going on the road	[‘Good One going on the road’]
89	8) <i>Šer šiv tītan Īrā amāšē</i>	country-directing saint's mother	→ <i>Šer</i> ; [country (earth- water)-holding Good One’s mother]
90	<i>Šer šiv tītakan (tītan) Īrā</i>	country-directing saint	→ <i>Šer</i> ; [‘country (earth- water)-holding Good One’]
91	9) <i>Sēt kulte vīrtakan Īrā amāšē</i>	mother of saint rest- ing in Lake Milk	[‘mother of Good One rest- ing in Lake Milk’]
92	<i>Sēt kulte vīrtakan Īrā</i>	saint resting in Lake Milk ⁴⁵⁷	[‘good one resting in Lake Milk’]
93	10) <i>Šur χunta vīr- takan Īrā amāšē</i>	mother of saint rest- ing in <i>Šur χun</i> ⁴⁵⁸	[‘mother of Good One resting in the white <i>χun</i> ’]
94	<i>Šur χunta vīrtakan Īrā</i>	saint resting in <i>Šur χun</i>	[‘Good One resting in the white <i>χun</i> ’]
95	11) <i>Sar χunta vīr- takan Īrā amāšē</i>	mother of saint rest- ing in <i>Sar χun</i>	[‘mother of Good One resting in the yellow <i>χun</i> ’]

⁴⁵⁶ Here, Ashmarin translates the verb *tīt-* as meaning ‘lead, direct’ (Ashmarin 1921, 32), which is also a possible interpretation, but I have retained the original meaning of the word (‘to hold’), which also occurs in the names of other mythical creatures.

⁴⁵⁷ About Lake Milk: Mész. 59; Magnitskiy spells it with an initial *ś* and translates it as ‘bright’ (Magn. 64, 91).

⁴⁵⁸ *Šur χun* and *Sar χun* are some place-names (*šur* ‘white’; *sar* ‘yellow’), which cannot be identified (Ashmarin 1921, 35).

96	<i>sar χunta vīrtakan Īră</i>	saint resting in <i>sar χun</i>	['Good One resting in the yellow <i>χun</i> ']
97	12) <i>Xērlē šīrta vīrtakan Īră amāšē</i>	mother of saint resting on the red bank ⁴⁵⁹	['mother of Good One resting in <i>Xērlē šīr</i> ']
98	<i>χērlē šīrta vīrtakan Īră</i>	saint resting on the red bank	['Good One resting in <i>Xērlē šīr</i> ']
99	13) <i>Vālra vīrtakan Īră amāšē</i>	mother of saint resting in the River <i>Vilă</i> ⁴⁶⁰	['mother of Good One resting in <i>Văl</i> ']
100	<i>vālra vīrtakan Īră</i>	saint resting in the River <i>Vilă</i>	['good one resting in <i>Văl</i> ']
101	14) <i>Valēm χuša amāšē</i>	<i>Valēm χuša</i> 's mother	→ <i>Valēm χuša</i>
102	<i>Valēm χuša</i>	<i>Valēm χuša</i> ⁴⁶¹	↑
103	15) <i>Šurām (Šurām) puš amāšē</i>	daybreak's mother	
104	<i>Šurām (Šurām) puš</i>	daybreak ⁴⁶²	
105	16) <i>Kāntār amāšē</i>	midday's mother	

⁴⁵⁹ The 'red bank' is (also) the name of a deity → *Xērlē-šīr*.

⁴⁶⁰ According to Ashmarin, the word *Vālra* stands for the name of the river *Vil(a)* (1921, 32), which appears in the names of several villages (1921, 35; and even more data: Ashm. V, 198). Besides, it was recorded in several places in spirit names: Buin: *Vālăra vīrtsa kayan Īrăsem*, *Vălări Īră*; *Yal'chik*: *Vălăra vīrtan Īrăsem*; Pervomay: *vălăr Īră* (Ashm. V, 300); as the name of a *kiremet*: *Vilări*, and as the name of a spirit: *Vălări Īrăsem* (Ashm. V, 198). The name of the deity or spirit was recorded by Mil'kovič as early as in the 18th century (Mil.: Nik. I, 499), as the most significant one of bad deities and *kiremet*s, and his data was also adopted by Fuks (1840, 126). According to Magnitskiy, the main deity of the Chuvash who had migrated from Kazan and Simbirsk to Belebeyev was *varlī izrem* (described by Menšov), which is the same as *Vilri Īr'zam* ['the good ones of *vil*'] (Magn. 68). Paasonen gives a completely different interpretation: *vălăra-vīrdan* 'some spirit, "a saint who had died in battle and was taken to paradise"; *vălă* 'fugitive' (Paa. 200).

⁴⁶¹ "Name of a holy spring in Bilyar", writes Nikifor Pavlovich in a footnote (Pav.: Ashmarin 1921, 32).

⁴⁶² Supposing we accept Ashmarin's correction and read it as *šuram* instead of Pavlovich's *suram*.

106	<i>Kăntăr</i>	midday	
107	17) <i>Xěvel amășě</i>	Sun's mother	→ <i>Xěvel</i>
108	<i>xěvel śunačě</i>	Sun's wings	→ <i>Xěvel</i>
109	18) <i>Śil amășě</i>	wind's mother	→ <i>Śil</i>
110	<i>śil śunačě</i>	wind's wings	→ <i>Śil</i>
111	19) <i>Tăvăl amășě</i>	storm's mother	
112	<i>tăvăl śunačě</i>	storm's wings	
113	20) <i>Tăm amășě</i>	frost's mother	
114	<i>tăm xayarě</i>	frost's ⁴⁶³ bad one	→ <i>Xayar</i>
115	21) <i>Silăm (sivlăm) amășě</i>	dew's mother	
116	<i>silăm xayarě</i>	dew's bad one	
117	22) <i>Tětre amășě</i>	fog's mother	
118	<i>tětre xayarě</i>	fog's bad one	
119	23) <i>Ășă imășě</i> (sic!)	warmth's mother	
120	<i>ășă xayarě</i>	warmth's bad one	

Page 9

121	24) <i>Ărša amășě</i>	dry fog's ⁴⁶⁴ mother	
122	<i>ărša xayarě</i>	dry fog's bad one	
123	25) <i>Śüreken iră amășě</i>	going saint's mother	→ <i>İră</i> ; ['going good one's mother']
124	<i>şüreken iră</i>	going saint	→ <i>İră</i> ; ['going good one']

⁴⁶³ *Tum xayar* is a well-recorded disease name: 'anger from freezing' [obviously a wrong translation] (Zol. 178, 180); 'cold fever' (Mész. 332; an incantation is also provided); 'tetanus-like disease' (Paa. 172). The connection of *tăm* 'frost' (Paa. 165; Ashm. XIV, 264) and *tum* is not quite clear (about this also: Ashmarin 1921, 35).

⁴⁶⁴ Ashmarin gives the following translation of the Chuvash word *ărša*: 'мгла', meaning 'fog, foggy dimness; darkness, dimness', and he adds as an explanation that it is a weather phenomenon when very fine dust falls from the sky, which makes the seeds of grain stick together (Ashmarin 1921, 35). When it appears, it can be assumed that there will be no rain for another two or three weeks. Paasonen gives the meaning: 'powdery mildew, fog, which makes the grain rust' (Paa. 14). See also: *ărša* '1. heat, fata morgana, dry fog during the ripening of rye; 2. [grain] rust' (Ashm. IV, 62).

125	26) Čělpěr tütakan iră amăšě	rein-holding saint's mother	[‘rein-holding good one's mother’]
126	čělpěr tütakan iră ...	rein-holding saint	[‘rein-holding good one’]
127	27) Kăvak xuppi amăšě	celestial door's mother	→ Kăvak xuppi
128	kăvak xuppi amăšě ⁴⁶⁵	celestial door	↑
129	28) Kəpală kučan iră amăšě ⁴⁶⁵	mother of saint opening the door of Kaaba	[‘Kepe's door opening good one's mother’]
130	– Īrri amăšě ⁴⁶⁵	– the Saint (himself)	[‘Good One of (Kepe's door opener)’]
131	29) Aslači amăšě	Thunder-god's mother	→ Aslati
132	aslačiyě amăšě ⁴⁶⁵	Thunder-god	↑ (Aslati)
133	30) Śišēm amăšě	lightning's mother	→ Śišēm
134	śišēm śunačě	lightning's wings	→ Śišēm
135	śišēm uměncě śürek- en iră amăšě ⁴⁶⁵	saint serving before the lightning	→ Śišēm; [‘good one going before the lightning’]
136	31) Śavśa (sic!) śil amăšě	whirlwind's mother	
137	śavra śil xayarě amăšě ⁴⁶⁵	whirlwind's bad one	
138	32) Śavra śil killi ⁴⁶⁶ amăšě	whirlwind's prayer's mother	[‘whirlwind's kělě's mother’]
139	– kělĭ amăšě ⁴⁶⁵	– its prayer (itself)	[‘whirlwind's kělě’]
140	33) Śavra śilpe śüre- ken śunatlă Īră amăšě ⁴⁶⁵	winged Saint flying in the whirlwind	[‘winged Good One going ⁴⁶⁷ with the whirlwind’]

⁴⁶⁵ Ashmarin corrects it to *Kepe alăkě* ušan (1921, 36).

⁴⁶⁶ Ashmarin corrects it to *kělĭ* (1921, 29).

⁴⁶⁷ In this case, Ashmarin gives the Chuvash word *śüreken* as meaning ‘flying’, whereas in the other cases, as meaning ‘serving, performer of service’.

3. Shevle's list

1907 (Ashm. III, 66-67)

Round I

Shevle	Latin transliteration	Notes ⁴⁶⁸
1. Таса нѣр турă	<i>Tasa pěr tură</i>	→ <i>Tură</i> ; 'pure one God'
2. Пүлѣхçĕ	<i>Pülëχśĕ</i>	↑
3. Тур-Амѣш	<i>Tură-Amăšĕ</i>	→ <i>Tură</i> ; 'God's mother'
4. Пихампар	<i>Piχampar</i>	↑
5. Хѣрлѣ-Çыр	<i>Xërlë-Šïr</i>	↑
6. Çĕр-Йыш	<i>Šër-Yiř</i>	→ <i>Šër</i> ; 'earth's master'
7. Çĕр-Ашшĕ	<i>Šër-Ařšĕ</i>	→ <i>Šër</i> ; 'earth's father'
8. Çĕр-Амѣш	<i>Šër-Amăšĕ</i>	→ <i>Šër</i> ; 'earth's mother'
9. Çĕр Сулу	<i>Šër-Sulu</i>	→ <i>Šër</i> ; 'earth's harm (?)'

Round II

1. Ывăл-хĕр çуратакан турă	<i>Īvāl-χĕr śuratakan tură</i>	→ <i>Tură</i> ; 'son-daughter-creating God'
2. Ывăл-хĕр çуратакан амѣш	<i>Īvāl-χĕr śuratakan amăšĕ (aměš)</i>	→ <i>Tură</i> ; 'son-daughter-creator's mother'
3. Ывăл-хĕр çуратакан Пүлѣхçи	<i>Īvāl-χĕr śuratakan Pülëχśi</i>	→ <i>Pülëχśĕ</i> ; 'son-daughter-creator's Pülëχśĕ'
4. Хунхаççи	<i>Xunχaśśi</i>	(→ MagnMa.49) ⁴⁶⁹
5. Хумхаççи	<i>Xumχaśśi</i>	(→ MagnMa. 50) ⁴⁷⁰
6. Вĕри хĕвелтен сыхлакани	<i>Vĕri χĕvelten sıχlakani</i>	'protector from the hot sun'
7. Çил- ашшĕ	<i>Šil-ařšĕ</i>	→ <i>Šil</i> ; 'wind's father'
8. Çил-амѣш	<i>Šil-amăšĕ</i>	→ <i>Šil</i> ; 'wind's mother'
9. Тăвăл çил çүретекеңи	<i>Tăvāl šil šüretekeni</i>	'stormy wind bearer (carrier)'

⁴⁶⁸ As neither Shevle nor Ashmarin, who published his manuscript, provided meanings, I do not put the translations suggested by me into square brackets in this box, as they are not alternatives to existing interpretations.

⁴⁶⁹ Similar form: Magnitskiy's Maslovoy list № 49.

⁴⁷⁰ Similar form: Magnitskiy's Maslovoy list № 50.

Round III

1. Тыр-пул суратакан турă	<i>Tir-pul śuratakan tură</i>	→ <i>Tură</i> ; ‘all kinds of grain-creating God’
2. Тыр-пул суратакан амăш	<i>Tir-pul śuratakan amăšĕ</i>	‘all kinds of grain-creator’s mother’
3. Тыр-пул суратакан Пӗлӗхӗш	<i>Tir-pul śuratakan Pŭlēxši</i>	‘all kinds of grain-creator’s <i>Pŭlēxšĕ</i> ’
4. Вьльӑх-чӗрлӗх суратакан турă	<i>Vilăx-čĕrlĕx śuratakan tură</i>	→ <i>Tură</i> ; ‘all kinds of livestock-creating God’
5. Вьльӑх-чӗрлӗх суратакан амăш	<i>Vilăx-čĕrlĕx śuratakan tură amăšĕ</i>	‘all kinds of livestock-creator’s mother’
6. Вьльӑх-чӗрлӗх суратакан Пӗлӗхӗш	<i>Vilăx-čĕrlĕx śuratakan Pŭlēxši</i>	‘all kinds of livestock-creator’s <i>Pŭlēxšĕ</i> ’
7. Вӗлле хурт суратакан турă	<i>Vĕlle χurt śuratakan tură</i>	‘hiveful of bee-creating God’
8. Вӗлле хурт суратакан амăш	<i>Vĕlle χurt śuratakan amăšĕ</i>	‘hiveful of bee-creator’s mother’
9. Пӗлӗхӗш	<i>Pŭlēxši</i>	↑; [this must be <i>Vĕlle χurt śuratakan Pŭlēxši</i> ‘hiveful of bee-creator’s <i>Pŭlēxšĕ</i> ’] ⁴⁷¹

Round IV

1. Хăмла хăпартакан турă	<i>Xămla χăpartakan tură</i>	‘hop-raising (growing) God’
2. Хусанта аслă алăкра ыртакан ырă	<i>Xusanta aslă alăkra vĭrtakan ĭră</i>	→ <i>Īră</i> ; ‘good one resting in the great gate of Kazan’
3. Сӗвере ыртакан ырă	<i>Sĕvere vĭrtakan ĭră</i>	→ <i>Īră</i> ; ‘good one resting in Sviyazh’
4. Шупашкарта ыртакан ырă	<i>Šupaškarta vĭrtakan ĭră</i>	→ <i>Īră</i> ; ‘good one resting in Cheboksary’
5. Аслă (илӗ кив) киремет	<i>Aslă (ilĕ kiv) kiremet</i>	→ <i>Kiremet</i> ; ‘great <i>kiremet</i> ’

⁴⁷¹ This is suggested by the fact that all the preceding data follow the same pattern (grain-creating God, its mother, its *Pŭlēxšĕ*; livestock-creating God, its mother, its *Pŭlēxšĕ*), as well as by *Pŭlēxšĕ* having a third person singular possessive suffix.

6. Аслă Киремет Аишĕ	<i>Aslă Kiremet Aššĕ</i>	→ <i>Kiremet</i> ; ‘great <i>kiremet</i> ’s father’
7. Аслă Киремет Амĕш	<i>Aslă Kiremet Amăšĕ</i>	→ <i>Kiremet</i> ; ‘great <i>kiremet</i> ’s mother’
8. Аслă Киремет хайарĕ	<i>Aslă Kiremet xayarĕ</i>	→ <i>Kiremet</i> ; ‘great <i>kiremet</i> ’s bad one’
9. Тӱр кĕлли	<i>Tür kĕlli</i>	→ <i>Kĕlē</i>

Round V

1. Çĕнĕ киремет	<i>Šĕnĕ kiremet</i>	‘new <i>kiremet</i> ’
2. Çĕнĕ киремет аишĕ	<i>Šĕnĕ kiremet aššĕ</i>	‘new <i>kiremet</i> ’s father’
3. Çĕнĕ киремет амĕш	<i>Šĕnĕ kiremet amăšĕ</i>	‘new <i>kiremet</i> ’s mother’
4. Çĕнĕ киремет хайарĕ	<i>Šĕnĕ kiremet xayarĕ</i>	‘new <i>kiremet</i> ’s bad one’
5. Çил çунач	<i>Šil šunač</i>	→ <i>Šil</i> ; ‘wind’ <i>s</i> wings’
6. Çил хайар	<i>Šil xayar</i>	→ <i>Šil</i> ; ‘wind’ <i>s</i> bad one’
7. Хĕвел аишĕ	<i>Xĕvel aššĕ</i>	→ <i>Xĕvel</i> ; ‘Sun’ <i>s</i> father’
8. Хĕвел амĕш	<i>Xĕvel amăšĕ</i>	→ <i>Xĕvel</i> ; ‘Sun’ <i>s</i> mother’
9. Хĕвел çунач	<i>Xĕvel šunač</i>	→ <i>Xĕvel</i> ; ‘Sun’ <i>s</i> wings’

Round VI

1. Çĕр-шу кĕтен	<i>Šĕr-šu kĕten</i>	→ <i>Šĕr</i> ; ‘country’ <i>s</i> (earth-water’ <i>s</i>) guardian’
2. Уй пăхакан	<i>Uy păxakan</i>	‘observer or watcher of the field or meadow’
3. Шыв вăтăш	<i>Šĭv-vătăš</i>	→ <i>Vutăš</i> ; ‘water <i>vutăš</i> ’
4. Итем сыхчи	<i>Item siχči</i>	‘threshing-yard’ <i>s</i> protector’
5. Хĕрт-Сурт	<i>Xĕrt-Šurt</i>	↑
6. Турă умĕнче çӳрекен	<i>Tură umĕnče šüreken</i>	‘the one going before God’
7. Хĕрлĕ-Çыр ырри	<i>Xĕrlĕ-Šĭr ĭrri</i>	‘ <i>Xĕrlĕ-Šĭr</i> ’ <i>s</i> good one’
8. Кĕлĕ алăк умĕнче тăракан	<i>Kĕlē alăk umĕnče tărăkan</i>	→ <i>Kĕlē</i> ; ‘the one standing in front of <i>Kĕlē</i> ’ <i>s</i> door’
9. Кĕлĕ алăк уçакан	<i>Kĕlē alăk uşakan</i>	→ <i>Kĕlē</i> ; ‘the one opening <i>Kĕlē</i> ’ <i>s</i> door’

Round VII

1. <i>Хыçалти Аслă ырă</i>	<i>Xišalti Aslă iră</i>	‘great good one (behind)’ ⁴⁷²
2. <i>Йӹпсарти ырă</i>	<i>Yupsarti iră</i>	‘good one of Yupsar’ (Yupsar is the name of a village: Ashm. IV, 349)
3. <i>Шултрари ырă</i>	<i>Šultrari iră</i>	‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. XII, 220); <i>Šultrari</i> ‘name of a <i>kiremet</i> ’ (Ashm. XII, 220.); cf. MagnCh. 55.
4. <i>Уй пуçёнчи ырă</i>	<i>Uy pušėnči iră</i>	‘name of a deity’ (Ashm. III, 168); <i>Uy puš</i> is the name of a village or, in another place, of a clearing (ibid.) ⁴⁷³
5. <i>Кив масар</i>	<i>Kiv masar</i>	‘old cemetery’
6. <i>Аслă-Вупкăн</i>	<i>Aslă-Vupkăn</i>	→ <i>Vupkăn</i> ; ‘great <i>vupkăn</i> ’
7. <i>Арçӹри</i>	<i>Aršuri</i>	↑ (<i>Ar-šuri</i>)
8. <i>Йăхăх (yărăx?)</i>	<i>Yăxăx (Yărăx?)</i>	↑ (<i>Yěrěx?</i>)
9. <i>Турă-Сӹлу</i>	<i>Tură-Sulu</i>	→ <i>Tură</i> ; ‘divine harm (?)’

Round VIII

1. <i>Чӗлпӗр тытакан</i>	<i>Čělpěr tītakan</i>	‘keeper on reins’ (see also: MagnMa. 57; MagnCh. 43 and čělpěr tītša šüren iră MagnBi. 41)
2. <i>Итем перекечӗ</i>	<i>Item perekečě</i>	‘threshing yard’s gain’
3. <i>Уй перекечӗ</i>	<i>Uy perekečě</i>	‘meadow’s or field’s gain’
4. <i>Перекем амӗш</i>	<i>Pereket amăšě</i>	‘gain’s mother’
5. <i>Перекем ашшӗ</i>	<i>Pereket aššě</i>	‘gain’s father’

⁴⁷² The word *xišalti* ‘after, behind’ appears in several toponyms, for example *Xišalti uy* ‘name of a meadow or field around Urmaevoy village’; *Xišalti vărman* ‘name of a forest’ (Ashm. XVI, 165). The name of the mythical being probably also refers to such a place, which must have meant a particular place to the given community and may have been the name of a *kiremet*.

⁴⁷³ This form can be the name of a *kiremet*, derived from the name of a village, in which case it means ‘good one of *Uy puš*’, but it also means ‘meadow’s head’s (leader’s) good one’.

6. <i>Перекек паракан</i>	<i>Pereket parakan</i>	‘gain-giver’
7. <i>Шултра алапа шыв ăssa килекен</i>	<i>Šultra alapa šiv āssa kileken</i>	(?)
8. <i>Тăваççi</i>	<i>Tāvaśši</i>	‘worker’; (see also: Mag- nMa. 12; MagnBi. 28, MagnCh. 10)
9. <i>Тăтхаççi</i>	<i>Tātḡaśši</i>	‘guardian’