

Fridrik THORDARSON

## OLD OSSETIC ACCENTUATION

*(Iranica Varia: Papers in Honor of Professor  
Ehsan Yarshater. Leiden, 1990)*

1. A little less than a century ago A. Meillet advanced a theory of the Old Iranian accentuation that continues to be the basis of vivid discussions among Iranists (MEILLET 1900). Meillet founded his theory upon a metrical analysis of the Gathic hymns, Iranian loanwords in Armenian and Persian data, but it was evidently meant to be valid for preliterate Proto-Iranian as a whole and common to the forerunners of all known Iranian languages (cf. Meillet: 270ff.). According to Meillet Proto-Iranian had developed an accentuation of the Latin type: an expiratory stress falls on the penultima if it is long but on the antepenultima if the penultima is short. The question was later debated with special reference to Sogdian by Gauthiot, who repeated Meillet's theory in all essentials (GAUTHIOT 1914-23: 29ff.; s. also GAUTHIOT 1918: Iff.).

In a study published in 1925 Kuryłowicz tried to show, as it seems with solid arguments, that in a number of cases the Gathic accent fell on the same syllable as in Vedic Sanskrit, i.e., although the nature of the accent had changed from musical tone (pitch) to dynamic accent (stress), the place of the accent agreed with that of Vedic; in other words, the Aryan (and Indo-European) rule of free accent was still operative in the Gathic dialect. Similar views had been expressed by Bartholomae forty years earlier (BARTHOLOMAE 1887). The same line of thought is endorsed by Beekes in his recent Gathic grammar (BEEKES 1988: 55ff.).

Later in his life Kuryłowicz renounced his theory of 1925. According to a new theory, propounded in a number of studies, preliterate Old Iranian had generalized an accentuation (stress) on the penultima (KURYŁOWICZ 1952: 1958: 369ff.; 1964; 1968: 194ff.; 1975). As to the question whether this system of accentuation is to be assumed for common Proto-Iranian Kuryłowicz was non-committal.

In 1942 Morgenstierne mentioned the possibility of Pashto retaining traces of the Vedic (Indo-Iranian) system of accentuation. He presented his

views on these matters in a fuller form in a couple of studies toward the end of his life (MORGENSTIERNE 1942: 95ff.; 1973; 1983). Both the existence of contrasting stress within the same derivational group (e.g. vestiges of the contrast between a barytone and an oxytone suffix *\*-aka-*, and change of stress within the paradigm of a class of adjectives (*sor* nom. sg. masc: *sārā* obl. sg. masc., *sarā* nom. sg. fem. etc. “cold” < *\*sarta-*)), as well as some isolated words, strongly support the assumption of the retention of Aryan accentuation into the period of separate Pashto development.

2. A corollary of Kuryłowicz’ second theory is the assumption of neutralization of vowel quantity in open final syllables (phonological merging of *\*-a* and *\*-ā* etc.). According to this view final syllables never carry the accent. This is supposed to be a preliterate development, common at least to the dialectal forerunners of Avestan and Old Persian.

In the Gathic texts all final vowels are written long; this applies to the anaptyctic vowels as well (*vadarē* “weapon” etc.). This feature has been ascribed by most scholars to liturgical recitation (see REICHEL 1909: 34) and cannot be adduced as evidence either for or against Kuryłowicz’ theory. This view is shared by Beekes (1988: 49ff.), according to whom all long final vowels were at some time shortened (as early as Gathic or later). In Late Avestan all final vowels are as a rule written long in monosyllables, short in polysyllables except *-ō* (JACKSON 1893: 7). This orthography probably reflects linguistic facts.

In the Old Persian orthography ancient (Aryan) final *-ā*, *-ī*, *-ū* are followed by *a*, *ya*, *va* respectively (*a*’, *iy*<sup>a</sup>, *uv*<sup>a</sup>). As the difference between initial and medial long and short *i*, *u* is only exceptionally represented in the script, the writing of final *i*, *u* as *iy*, *uv* has little evidential weight. The Old Persian way of writing the final vowels has been interpreted as a purely graphic matter, *’*, *y*, *v* being used as *matres lectionis* (KENT 1952: 17ff.; BRANDENSTEIN-MAYRHOFFER 1964: 28ff.; and in particular HINZ 1973: 24 ff.). Hoffmann, on the other hand, who has treated the whole question thoroughly in a recent study, argues in favour of a linguistic interpretation (HOFFMANN 1976: 92ff.; cf. MEILLET-BENVENISTE 1931: 91 ff., where the arguments for a linguistic reality are examined).

The retention of ancient final *\*-a*, *\*-ā* as two distinct vowel phonemes is well attested in various East Iranian languages (MORGENSTIERNE o.c). In evidence of this the *a*-umlaut of the Pamir languages may be adduced. In Shughni *-ā̃-* in an open syllable becomes *-ī-* (after nasals *-ū̃-*) if it is not followed by a syllable containing *ā*: *δīs* “10” < *\*dasa*, *mīd* “middle” < *\*madya-nūm* “name” < *\*nāma-*, *naŷjīd/naŷjād* “he/she came” < *\*niž-gat-ah/ā*; note

also the different developments before consonant clusters: *waxt* “8” < \**aštā*, but *δust* “hand” < \**dasta-* (MORGENSTIERNE 1975: 108ff.; PAXALINA 1983: 151 ff.; SOKOLOVA 1967: 49ff.). Cf. also Yazghulami *dūst* “hand”, but *mast* “moon, month” < \**māstā* (PAXALINA 1983: 112ff.; SOKOLOVA 1967: 81 ff.), Wakhi *xur* “donkey” < \**xara-*, but *-xar* in *moč-xar* “she-ass” < \**xarā* (PAXALINA 1983: 11 ff.), and Ishkashmi *xur* “donkey”, but *var* “door” < \**dwārā* (PAXALINA 1983: 56 ff.).

In Ossetic O.Ir. \**i* and \**ī*, \**ū* and \**ū* have merged in *i*, *u* respectively. This stage of development is retained by Digor; in Iron *i* and *u* have further merged in *ī* (THORDARSON 1989: 460). On the other hand, \**ǎ* and \**ā* have been retained as *æ* and *a* respectively (with some variations). In principle, final syllables in \**a*, \**ī*, \**ū* have been lost. Final \**ā* has been retained as *-æ* in the plural suffix *-tæ* (< \**tā*) in both Digor and Iron (the nominative). It is natural to derive the allative case suffix *-mæ* from \**hamā*, an (oxytone?) instrumental: all. sg. I., D. *bæx-mæ*, pl. D. *bæxtæ-mæ*, I. *bæxtæ-m* from *bæx* “horse”. In Digor we find two declensions: *-æ* < \**-ā*, vs. *-Ø* < \**-a(h)*. All nouns have been allocated to either the *-Ø* class or the *-æ* class; this allocation is arbitrary, without semantic content. In Iron the two declensions have merged in one. This development is purely morphological; the differences between the declensional classes have been abolished through a morphological process. Iron nouns in final *-æ* apparently go back to \**-aya-*: *zærdæ* “heart” < \**zṛdaya-*, *arfæ* “greetings, benediction” < \**āfraya-*, *ærtæ* “three” < *Øraya-*, *bæstæ* “place, country, village” < \**upastaya-*; *sædæ* “100” is not a genuine Iron word; the *-æ* of *dīuuæ* “two” (D. *duuæ*) has probably been retained for morphological reasons (to avoid a monosyllable), or in analogy with *ærtæ* “three”. I. *læxstæ*, D. *lixstæ* “prayer” is a plural of *læyz* “smooth (words)” > “prayers”. Other Iron words in final *-æ* seem to be loanwords, primarily borrowed from Kabardian. The development of \**-aya-* > *-æ* is apparently later than the Iron loss of *-æ* < \**-ā* as a morphological marker.

In monosyllables \**-ǎ* and \**-ā* are kept distinct: *ma* the prohibitive particle, *næ* the functionally unmarked negation; *mæ*, *næ*, *ia/æi*, *næ*, *uæ*, *sæ* the enclitic forms of the personal pronouns (the proclitic forms of the possessive pronouns) (see THORDARSON 1989: 459 ff., where more data will be found).

It is thus clear that Kuryłowicz’ view that quantity as a distinctive feature of final vowels has been neutralized cannot be upheld as far as Ossetic, Pashto and the Pamir languages are concerned. At least in the case of these languages the arguments against the possibility of stressed final vowels are not valid.

3. A great deal of research still needs to be done on the prosodic features of stress, pitch and juncture in Ossetic. The most thorough treatment of the subject is that of Abaev 1939 (reprinted in ABAEV 1949: 529ff.). The accent is a (weak)

expiratory stress. Word accent is subordinate to phrase accent. The flow of speech is divided into prosodic units, where the main stress falls on a single syllable; a secondary stress may fall on other syllables of the same unit. In principle, the first syllable of the unit is stressed if the vowel of that syllable is strong; if the vowel of the first syllable is weak, the second syllable is stressed. In Digor the stress may be retracted to a syllable further back if the preceding syllables have weak vowels. Recent Russian loanwords as a rule keep the accent of the donor language. Proper names are accentuated on the second syllable.

In Iron the following vowels are strong (Russ. *sil'nye*): /i u e o a/; /ɨ æ/ are weak (Russ. *slabye*) vowels<sup>2</sup>. In indigenous words /e/ is found only as the result of vowel contraction. In Digor /ɨ e o a/ are strong, /æ i u/ weak vowels.

This prosodic pattern is clearly an innovation, peculiar to Ossetic. It need not be old. But as both dialects follow the same basic pattern, it is probably earlier than the dialect split. It is natural to ascribe this innovation to influence from the neighbouring languages. As regards prosodic features Ossetic seems to belong to a linguistic area comprising the adjacent North East (Nakh) and South Caucasian languages (cf. DEETERS 1963: 30 ff.).

4. The question arises if there are any traces of an earlier accentuation pattern detectable in the modern language, e.g. in the form of umlaut or shortening or syncope of unstressed vowels. I have hinted at these questions in earlier studies (THORDARSON 1986a, b), but some additional remarks may not be out of place.

As a matter of fact, there exist several modes of word formation (suffixes, compound words) which involve vowel shift or vowel syncope in the preceding syllable. It is natural to explain these changes as due to stress. A few of these will be examined in the following. It goes without saying that accentuation features found to be the most appropriate explanation of vowel shift do not necessarily reflect the Indo-Iranian (or older) accentuation. Ossetic (or its forerunner) may easily have produced accent rules of its own. We must bear in mind that Ossetic-Alanic has developed outside the mainstream of the Iranian languages. This isolation has been favourable both to conservatism and to innovations that it does not share with its sister languages.

The following exposition is not meant to be exhaustive, and in most cases a more detailed treatment of the facts will be needed. For the sake of brevity references to other languages have been limited to a minimum.

#### 5. Vowel shift $a > \text{æ}$ :

(a). The plural suffix *-tæ* entails weakening (shortening) of  $a > \text{æ}$  in the preceding syllable: *mary* “bird”: *mærytæ*, *ars* “bear”: *ærsitæ/ærsitæ* (with a

svarabhakti vowel), *bælas/bælasæ* “tree”: *bælestæ*, *æydau* “custom”: *æydeuttæ* (with gemination of *t* after a sonant), *xæzar/xæzaræ* “house”: *xæzærttæ*, *fændag* “way”: *fændægtæ* (see the list in ABAEV 1964: 12ff; ISAEV 1966: 34ff.). There are some exceptions to this rule, but they can easily be explained as due to paradigmatic pressure: *bon* “day; capability”: *bontæ*. Derivatives in *-on* (< \*-āna-) frequently retain their vowel before the plural ending: *xæzar-on-tæ* “inmates of the house”, *æfsætt-on-tæ* “warriors” (*æfsad* “army”), *max-on-tæ* “our people”. There is also some fluctuation (dialectal, stylistic variation?): *cuanon/cauæinon* “hunter”: I. *cuanættæ* (MF), *cuanontæ* (NK 184), D. *cauæinontæ* (MF). Family (tribal) names in *-on* (partly also in *-an*) show *-ontæ* (*-antæ*): *Cærasontæ* (in the Os-Bæyatir cycle of legends), *Darezantæ* (the Amiran epic cycle), *Ræmon(a)tæ*, *Dælimontæ/Dæliumontæ* “subterranean spirits, goblins”, also *Pisilmontæ/Pusulmontæ* “the Moslems”, *Āristontæ/Kiristontæ* “the Christians”; – but *Irættæ/Irænttæ* “the (East) Ossetes”, *Digurættæ/Digorænttæ* “the Digors”, *Kæsgættæ* “the Kabardians”.

Final *-a* is retained: *ærra-ta* (*ærra* “mad, violent”), *cuyqæ/coqa-tæ* “Cherkeska” (a loanword), *magusa/magosa-tæ* “lazybones”, *mazura/mazora-tæ* “silent” (= *ma* + 3rd p. sg. subj.: “he shall not work/talk” used as nouns, cf. AXVLEDIANI 1963: 121).

In the suffixes *-æg*, *-ig/ug* the vowel is lost before the plural ending: *fīssæg/fīnsæg* “writer”: *fīšžitæ/fīnsgutæ*, *uæiig/uæiug* “giant”: *uæiguīta/uæigutæ*.

I. *i* = D. *e*, I. *u* = D. *o* are not affected: *xid/xed-tæ* “bridge”, *sug/sog-tæ* “fire-wood”; likewise I. *i* = D. *ī*: *æfsin/æfsinæ* “mistress of the house”: *æfsintæ*.

As a rule nouns containing *on*, *om* < *ān*, *ām* change their vowel to *æn*, *æm* before the plural ending (in I. with assimilation of *n* to the following *-t-*): *don* “water, river”: *dættæ/dænttæ*, nom “name”: *næmttæ* (D. *non*: *nænttæ*), *kuiroi/kuroinæ* “mill” (< \**kurān-yā*): *kuiṛættæ/kurænttæ*.

The narrowing of *ā* > *o* before nasals is not earlier than the 14th-15th centuries; in the mediaeval Alanic documents ancient *ān* is still written *an* (THORDARSON 1989: 460). This gives us a terminus ante quem for the weakening (shortening) of *a* > *æ* (*ā* > *ǎ*).

Besides Ossetic, *-t-* is found in Sogdian and Yaghnobi as a plural marker. There is general agreement that it goes back to Aryan (IE) \*-*tā*, a derivative suffix forming abstracts, frequently with the meaning collectivity, complexity (WACKERNAGEL-DEBRUNNER 1954: 616 ff.). In Vedic, derivatives in *-tā-* are as a rule accented on the syllable before the suffix: *devātā-* “divinity”, *janātā-* “assemblage of people”; occasionally they keep the accent of the primary word: *avīratā-* “want of sons” (RV *avīra-*). In Greek derivatives in *-tā-* are largely oxytone: *genetē* “birth, origin”, *aūtē* “cry”, *biotē* “life”. Beekes (1988: 60, 67)

argues, on the basis of graphical phenomena, for an Avestan accent agreeing with the Greek. According to Kuryłowicz' theories of the Indo-European accent derivatives in *\*-tā* were originally oxytone (KURYŁOWICZ 1958: 66ff.; 1935: 199 and 213ff). If this holds good – a question which cannot be decided here – it is permissible to suggest that the Old Iranian ancestor of Ossetic (and Avestan?), in contrast to Old Indo-Aryan, retained the Indo-European accentuation of *\*-tā*- well into Alanic times.

(b). The suffix of the ordinal numbers *-æm* (< *\*-ama-*) causes vowel weakening in the preceding syllable: *æstæm* “eighth”: *ast*, *faræstæm* “ninth”: *farast*, *fænzæm* “fifth”: *fonz*. This indicates accentuation of the ancient penultima. The corresponding Vedic ordinals are oxytone: *saptamá-* “seventh” etc., and this is no doubt the original accentuation (the starting point a thematization of *\*septem*, *\*dek'em*). Accordingly an accent shift from the ultima to the penultima has taken place at some stage of development. The extended suffix *-æimag* (D., in part also I.) < *\*-mayāka-* (Sogd. *-myk*) has the same effects as the simple suffix: *fænzæimag* “fifth” etc.

(c). *-on* < *\*-āna-* is found in numerous denominative and (more rarely) verbal nouns. As an adjectival suffix it has become extremely productive in the modern language and is used for forming adjectives from Russian loanwords: *demokraton* Russ. “*demokratičeskij*”. In verbal nouns (participles) it seems not to affect the vowel of the preceding syllable: *uarzon* “beloved” (*uarzin* “to love”), *baron* “forgiving, kind-hearted” (*barin* “to forgive”) etc. As a denominative suffix it causes vowel weakening in a number of words which apparently belong to ancient or traditional vocabulary:

D. *æsson* “a Balkar, Balkarian”: *Asi/Assi* “Balkaria, the Balkars”, *Nærtan* “belonging to, characteristic of the Narts; wonderful”: *Nart* “a race of mythological heroes”, *bælcon* “traveller”: *balc/balci* “travel, expedition”, *ræston* “right”: *rast* “straight, honest”, *xæxxon/xuænxon* “mountain” (adj.): *xox/xonx* (< *\*xwanx-*) “mountain” (subst.), *kælmon* “of a snake”: *kalm* “snake”. But also: *uaton* “ill, bedridden”: *uat* “bed”, *fandagon* “traveller”: *fændag* “way”, *maxon* “our”: *max* “we”, *simaxon/sumaxon* “your”: *simax/sumax* “you”, *xæzaron* “domestic”: *xæzar/xæzaræ* “house, home”, *arvon* “heavenly”: *arv* “heaven”, but also *ærvon*. Syncope is found in *Kæsgon* “(a) Kabardian”: *Kæscæg* “Kabarda, the Kabardians”, but *Mæqqælon* “(an) Ingush”: *Mæqqæl* “(the country of) the Ingush”.

In the Vedic participles in *-āna-* the accent is either final or initial (WACKERNAGEL-DEBRUNNER 1954: 275ff). In Ossetic, verbal nouns in *-on* are rare (ABAEV 1964: 50; AXVLEDIANI 1963: 136ff.), but as far as they go they suggest initial stress. In nominal derivatives the Vedic accent varies: *samānā-* “common”: *samá-*, but *tákavāna-* “rapid” (probably a proper name): *táku-*, etc.

The Ossetic data are equivocal, but seem to show accentuation of the suffix (the penultima). Connections outside Aryan are uncertain (WACKERNAGEL-DEBRUNNER 1954: 277 ff.).

(d). The I. suffix *-ag* is the equivalent of two different D. suffixes: *-ag* < *\*-āka-* and *-agæ* < *\*-ākā-*. The latter suffix forms verbal nouns denoting a permanent characteristic: *uaiag/uaiagæ* “quick, a racer”: *uaiin* “to run”, *nuazag/niuazagæ*: “drunkard”: *nuazin* “to drink”, *tærsag/tærsagæ* “coward”: *tærsin* “to fear”, etc. It seems not to affect the vowel of the preceding syllable.

I., D. *-ag* is equivocal as to its influence on the preceding vocalism. It forms adjectives with a wide range of meanings (AXVLEDIANI 1963: 101 ff., 135ff.; ABAEV 1964: 85ff.). In a great number of words that relate to traditional culture or institutions and that it is natural to ascribe to the ancient layers of the vocabulary, vowel shift takes place.

Thus from *kusart/kosart* “slaughter of an animal in honour of a guest” we have *kusærtag/kosærttag* “sacrificial animal” (regarding the meaning and the etymology see BENVENISTE 1959:37ff). Other examples: I. *amættag* “victim, prey” < *\*amærttag*: *amarin* (pret. part. *amard*) “to kill”. – *baizættag* “posterity” from *baizad*, pret. part. of *bazaiin/izaiun* “to remain”. – *zættag* “auf das Gebären sich beziehend, die gebären soll” (MF), e.g. *fæccag zættag* “relating to the first calving of the cow”, from *zad*, pret. part. of *zaiin/zaiun* “to give birth to”. – *færssag* “on the side, strange, foreign”: *fars* “side”. – *tæssag* “dangerous”: *tas* “fear”, *tasin* “to stoop, bend”; but *tasag/tasagæ* “flexible”.

On the other hand we have: *artag* “fuel”: *art* “fire”, I. *xoxag* adj. of *xox* “mountain”, but D. *xuænxag*: *xonx* (but also *xonxag*), I. *moiag* “bridegroom”: *moi/moinæ* “husband”, and numerous others.

A suffix *\*-yāka-* is seen in *bairag* “foal”: *\*bār-* “to ride on horseback”, I. *doinag* adj. of *don* “water, river”, *kæroinag* “at the end, distant”: *kæron* “end”, *xæzairag* “domestic”: *xæzar/xæzaræ* “house”, *gailag* “calf”: *gal* “bull” (a loanword), etc., without vowel shift.

In contradistinction to Ossetic, Vedic nouns in *-āka-* are rare. The accent is variable: *pīnāka-* “staff”, *śyāmāka-* “a kind of millet”, *pavākā-* “pure”, cf. also *asmākam*, *yušmākam*, pers. pron. 1st and 2nd p. gen. pl., so that a direct comparison is hardly possible.

(e). A suffix *-c-*, *-ʒ-* < *\*-ti* forms abstracts from verbal stems. As a rule *a* in the presuffixal syllable shifts to *æ*: *bærc/bærcæ* “measure”: *barin* “to measure”, *zæic/zæicæ* “posterity”: *zaiin* “to give birth to”, *nimæc/nimæcæ* “number, reckoning”: *nimaiin* “to count”, I. *ærʒ-* in abl. sg. *ærʒæi* “by nature”: I. *arin* “to give birth to”.

Simplicia in *-ti-* are mostly oxytone in the RV (WACKERNAGEL-DEBRUNNER 1954: 631 ff.), and this is no doubt the original accentuation.

From the D. forms it appears that at some stage of development the derivatives in *-c/ʒ(i)* have been transferred to the *æ-* (< \**ā-*) declension (cf. THORDARSON 1989: 459).

(f). *-æŋ* < \**-ana-* forms verbal nouns with the meaning “capability, destination, instrument”. It is homonymous, and probably etymologically identical, with the dative ending. It does not affect a preceding *a*.

In Vedic deverbative abstracts in *-ana-* as a rule have the accent on the stem. Agent nouns and adjectives are only exceptionally accentuated on the penultima.

(g). *-æg* < \**-aka-* forms deverbative nouns, mostly present participles. As a rule it does not cause vowel schift in the preceding syllable; note however *cærdæg* “agile” from *card* “living” (pret. part. of *cæriŋ* “to live”).

Vedic adjectives in *-aka-* either keep the accent of the primary word or accentuate the ultima; diminutives are oxytone (LINDNER 1878: 129 ff.).

6. The facts described above cannot be explained within the framework of modern Ossetic prosody. The most adequate explanation is to assume that the vowel shift (shortening) *a* > *æ* was caused by a dynamic stress on the immediately following syllable. If this interpretation is correct, it bears witness to a prosodic system of free accent in some earlier phase of the history of the language (earlier than the narrowing of *ān*, *ām*, cf. supra 5a). The evidence indicates dynamic stress either on the ultima, the penultima or the antepenultima (or any syllable before the antepenultima). In (a) and (e) the stress fell on the ultima, in (b) and probably also in (c) and (d) on the penultima, in (f) and (g) on a syllable preceding the penultima (antepenultima?). The accent theory of Meillet and Gauthiot is not contradicted by (c), (d), (f) and (g) but is inconsistent with (a), (b) and (e). The Old Ossetic accent rules as they have been interpreted here are not compatible with Kuryłowicz’ views on the Old Iranian accent, nor is the retention of \**-ā* as *-æ*. The agreement with Old Indo-Aryan is incomplete. The final accent of (a) disagrees with Vedic but is in agreement with other IE languages and possibly Avestan. The accentuation of (b) is clearly an Ossetic innovation. The evidence of (c) and (d) is ambiguous. The presuffixal accentuation of (f) and (g) does not contradict Vedic. The final accent of (e) agrees with Vedic, but the suffix is unproductive, and the data therefore of limited range.

In these comments I have confined myself to only some of the Ossetic derivative suffixes. Lack of space does not permit me to treat other suffixes or types of word-formation. The nominal compounds, where vowel weakening in the first member is common, call especially for a closer investigation. But that will have to wait till a later study.

7. In previous studies I have tried to explain certain Ossetic nominal forms in *-g/gæ* by assuming an oxytone suffix *\*-akā́* and a syncope of the pretonic vowel (THORDARSON 1986a: 279; 1986b: 504ff). Thus I derived the gerund in *-gæ* from the oxytone instrumental of a verbal noun in *\*-aka-* (on the Iranian verbal nouns in *\*-aka-* s. BENVENISTE 1935: 111). In the same way I explained *čizg/kizgæ* “girl” and some other nouns, where we seemingly have a suffix *\*-k* (*\*-kā́*) (so AXVLEDIANI 1963: 112), as deriving from *\*kiz-akā́* etc. It is doubtful if a suffix *\*-ka-* (*\*-kā́*) was still productive in mediaeval Alanic and could be used for forming derivatives from Turkic loanwords.

To this it will possibly be objected that the syncope might quite as well have been brought about by stress on the antepenultima: *\*kánakā́* > *kængæ*, *\*kiz-akā́* > *kizgæ*. This would agree with Meillet’s and Gauthiot’s theory, but not with Kuryłowicz’ views (presuming that Alanic [Old Ossetic] still retained traces of the Aryan accentuation). But this explanation cannot be applied to the cases listed in 5 (a)-(g). We would thus have to assume two (chronologically) different stages in the development of the prehistoric Ossetic accentuation.

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Originally published in *Iz osetinskogo èposa*. Moscow etc. 1939. – See also ABAEV 1964: 10 ff.; H.W. BAILEY, “L’accento in osseto digoron”, in *Ricerca linguistica*, Rome 1950, pp. 58 ff.; I. GERSHEVITCH, “Iranian notes”, in *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1948, pp. 61 ff.; ISAEV 1966: 26ff.; AXVLEDIANI 1963: 49ff.; THORDARSON 1989: 466.

<sup>2</sup> I retain the English terms of ABAEV 1964. The duration of the strong vowels is probably longer than that of the weak ones.

(When nothing special is said, either Iron is meant or the dialect forms are identical. Where the oblique stroke (/) is used, the Iron form is placed before, the Digor form after the stroke.

For the sake of uniformity geminate stops are consequently written *tt* etc., even where this disagrees with the conventional orthography.)

#### ABBREVIATIONS

D = Digor; I = Iron; MF = Vs. F. MILLER: *Osetinsko-russko-nemeckij slovar’*. Pod redakcij i dopolnenijami A.A. Frejmana. I-III. Leningrad 1927-34. (Reimpression The Hague etc. 1972.); NK = *Nart kadžita*. Žæužiqæu 1946.

## REFERENCES

- ABAEV, V.I. 1949: *Osetinskij jazyk i fol'klor*. I. Moscow etc.
- , 1964. *A grammatical sketch of Ossetic*. Tr. Steven P. Hill. Bloomington, Indiana.
- AXVLEDIANI, G.S. (red.) 1963: *Grammatika osetinskogo jazyka*. I. Ordzhonikidze.
- BARTHOLOMAE, Chr. 1887: *Arische Forschungen*. III. Halle.
- BEEKES, R.S.P. 1988: *A grammar of Gatha Avestan*. Leiden etc.
- BENVENISTE, E. 1935: *Les infinitifs avestiques*. Paris.
- , 1959: *Études sur la langue ossète*. (Collection linguistique. LX.) Paris.
- BRANDENSTEIN, W. and MAYRHOFER, M. 1964: *Handbuch des Altpersischen*. Wiesbaden.
- DEETERS, G. 1963: Die kaukasischen Sprachen, in *Armenisch und kaukasische Sprachen* (Handbuch der Orientalistik, Abt. I, B. 7), pp. 1 ff. Leiden etc.
- GAUTHIOT, R. 1914-23: *Essai de grammaire sogdienne*. Pt. 1. Paris.
- , 1918: “De l’accent d’intensité iranien”, in *Mémoires de la Société de linguistique de Paris* 20, pp. 1 ff.
- HINZ, W. 1973: *Neue Wege im Altpersischen*. (Göttinger Orientforschungen, R. III, B. I.) Wiesbaden.
- HOFFMANN, K. 1976: “Zur altpersischen Schrift”, in *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik*. II, pp. 620ff. Wiesbaden.
- ISAEV, M.I. 1966: *Digorskij dialekt osetinskogo jazyka*. Moscow.
- JACKSON, A.V.W. 1892: *An Avesta grammar*. Stuttgart (reimpression Darmstadt 1968).
- KENT, R.G. 1952: *Old Persian*. (American Oriental Series, vol. 33.) New Haven, Connecticut.
- KURYŁOWICZ, J. 1925: *Traces de la place du ton en Gathique*. Paris.
- , 1935: *Études indoeuropéennes*. I. Krakau.
- , 1952: *Metrik und Sprachgeschichte*. (Prace językoznawcze. 83.) Wrocław etc.
- , 1958: *L’accentuation des langues indo-européennes*. 2<sup>e</sup> id. (Prace językoznawcze. 17.) Wrocław etc.
- , 1964: «L’accentuation en vieil iranien», in *Indo-Iranica. Mélanges présentés à Georg Morgenstierne à l’occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire*, pp. 103 ff. Wiesbaden.
- , *Indogermanische Grammatik*. II. *Akzent. Ablaut*. (Indogermanische Bibliothek. R. I.) Heidelberg.
- , 1975: “L’accent du mot en v. -iranien”, in *Monumentum H.S. Nyberg I* (Acta Iranica 4), Téhéran-Liège, pp. 499 ff.
- LINDNER, B. 1878: *Altindische Nominalbildung*. Jena.
- MEILLET, A. 1900: “La déclinaison et l’accent d’intensité en perse”, in *Journal asiatique*, NS, XV, pp. 251 ff. Paris.
- , and BENVENISTE, E. 1931: *Grammaire du vieux perse*. (Collection linguistique. XXXIV.) Paris.

- MORGENSTIERNE, G. 1942: "Archaisms and innovations in Pashto morphology", in *Norsk tidsskrift for sprogvidenskap* XII, pp. 88 ff. Oslo.
- , MORGENSTIERNE 1973: "Final *-a* and *-ā*", in *Irano-Dardica* (Beiträge zur Iranistik, B. 5), pp 108 ff. Wiesbaden.
- . 1983: "Bemerkungen zum Wort-Akzent in den Gathas und im Paschto", in *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 42, pp. 167ff. München.
- PAXALINA T.N. 1983: *Issledovanie po sravnitel'no-istoričeskoj fonetike pamirskix jazykov*. Moscow.
- Reichert. H. 1909: *Awestisches Elementarbuch*. (Indogermanische Bibliothek, R. I, B. 5.) Heidelberg.
- SOKOLOVA, V.S. 1967: *Genetičeskie otnošenija jazguljamskogo jazyka i šugnanskoj jazykovoju gruppy*. Leningrad.
- THORDARSON F. 1986a: "An Ossetic miscellany. Lexical marginalia", in *Kalyāṇamitrārāgaṇam*. Essays in honour of Nils Simonsson, pp. 277 ff. Oslo.
- , 1986b: "Ossetisch *uæxsk/usqæ* 'Schulter'", in *Studia Grammatica Iranica. Festschrift für Helmut Humbach*. (Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft, Beiheft, 13, NF), pp. 499 ff. Munich.
- , 1989: Ossetic, in *Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum*. Wiesbaden.
- WACKERNAGEL, J. and DEBRUNNER. A. 1954: *Altindische Grammatik. II.2: Die Nominalsuffixe*. Göttingen.