

Ladislav ZGUSTA

**TYPOLOGY OF ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARIES AND
V. I. ABAEV'S OSSETIC DICTIONARY**

(Studia Iranica et Alanica. Rome. 1998)

1. Introduction; the typologies of Malkiel and Reichmann. 2.1. Time depth. 2.2. Direction of analysis. 2.3. The range. 2.4. The "grand strategy". 2.5. Structure of the entry. 2.6. Breadth. 2.7. Scope. 2.8. Character. 2.9. The author's style and creed. 3. Conclusion.

1. One of the good results of the so strongly increased interest in the theory of lexicography is the concomitant increase in the study, frequently a comparative one, of existing dictionaries themselves. The logical development of any comparative studies is a typology of the studied objects, in this case of dictionaries. As we know from the typology of languages, it is not of much use to apply only one parameter of variation for the classification: two or more languages can be similar in one respect and different in another. Therefore, a useful method of typology consists in selecting a set of criteria or properties, or features, and observe whether they are present or absent in any member of the set of objects, or languages, studied. Sometimes it is useful to discern to what extent a property is present in a dictionary; although there is no terminological unity nor precision, it is useful in this case to talk about a parameter of variation.

While the first extensive attempt at a typology of dictionaries was undertaken by Lev Ščerba in his well known article of 1940 ("Opyt obščej teorii leksikografii"), the method of distinctive features was introduced by the outstanding Romance scholar Yakov Malkiel, in his article "Distinctive Features in Lexicography: A Typological Approach to Dictionaries Exemplified With Spanish" (MALKIEL 1958-59; 1959-60); a few years later, he returned to the topic, refining the features in his article "A Typological Classification of Dictionaries on the Basis of Distinctive Features" (MALKIEL 1962).

Professor Malkiel is a specialist in historical linguistics with a particular interest in morphology, derivation, word formation, lexicology, and etymology.

No wonder, then, that he applied his method to etymological dictionaries. His book, *Etymological Dictionaries: A Tentative Typology* (MALKIEL 1976), is based on the analysis of nearly 400 etymological and similar dictionaries and of many more etymological publications. The bulk of the works studied is concerned with the main Indo-European languages in general and with Romance languages in particular; but some dictionaries and publications on other languages, some of them as unrelated as Basque or Blackfoot, are also studied. He continues these studies in Malkiel 1990.

An even richer set of highly fine-grained criteria was developed by O. Reichmann and applied to German historical dictionaries, with excellent results (REICHMANN 1984). Another study by Reichmann develops a set of criterial features pertaining to the structure of entries in historical and period dictionaries, and uses them in a typological study of German period dictionaries (REICHMANN 1990).

The typological method of criterial features is so fruitful that I wish to apply it to the analysis of V. I. Abaev's *Historical and Etymological Dictionary of the Ossetic Language* (ABAEV 1958-1989). I chose for the purpose Malkiel's set of criteria, because they are broader in their application to extraneous material, they are specifically constructed for etymological dictionaries, and all of them are applicable to a single dictionary, not to a group.

Malkiel accepts the following eight main classificatory properties, or parameters: (1) time depth (what period of time is covered); (2) direction of analysis (backwards to the roots, or "down" through time); (3) range (how many languages are considered); (4) grand strategy (the overall organization of the dictionary); (5) tactical preferences (the favored structuring of the entry); (6) breadth (how much auxiliary, background, additional information); (7) scope (which layers of the lexicon are included); (8) character (the author's purpose and level of tone). In addition to these main parameters, there are yet four ancillary ones, namely (9) the intended durability of the dictionary, the centrality of its etymological commitment, the style of the etymological analysis, and the author's linguistic creed. Let us now perustrate the Ossetic Dictionary in light of these parameters.

2.1. The first of these is the *t i m e d e p t h*. In this respect, the Dictionary takes the longest stretch possible: the language of the headwords is contemporary Ossetic and the etymology goes back to the Indo-European roots (unless the word is borrowed from a non-I.-E. language). One can observe a certain development within the dictionary: at the beginning it is the Iranian etymon that is worked out in greatest detail, with cognates quoted from as many Iranian languages as possible. To this, the Sanskrit cognate was added;

the Indo-European root represented the rest of the I.-E. languages, from which the cognates were added only sparingly. For instance, the entry of *az/anz*¹ ‘year’ contains the cognates from Iranian languages such as Farsi, Kurdish, Parthian, Khoresmian, Pehlevi; Avestan, Old Persian; and from Sanskrit (I 95).

In the third and particularly in the fourth volume, the cognates from all the I.-E. languages are quoted in detail. E.g., the entry of *xæryn/xwærun* contains besides the Iranian cognates also references to Sanskrit, Norwegian, Armenian, Greek (IV 183).

The same policy is pursued with respect to borrowings: wherever it is possible, not only the immediate source, but also (in the case that the entryword is a “Wanderwort”) the ultimate source is indicated, if possible. E. g., the name of an epic heroin, *Agundæ*, is traced through Georgian, Khevsur and Abkhaz, to Farsi and Parthian cognates to the common source of all these borrowings, Gr. *ῥάκινθος*, ‘blue-bell’ and personal name.

2.2. The direction of analysis generally is one that goes back in time: from the modern language to the I.-E. root, broadly speaking. There are several particularly interesting features in this area that should be mentioned. First, already the way in which the author spells the headwords helps this “movement back in time”. The Iron dialect has strong palatalizations, absent in the Digor dialect. Thus, Digor *kizgæ*, Iron *čyzg* ‘girl, daughter’. (The reduction of the first and the loss of the second vowel [y=ə] do not interest us now.) The author developed an orthography² in which *č* is represented as palatalized *č̣*, *dž* as *đ*, etc. This undoubtedly historically oriented orthography makes a headword like *kyzg/kizgæ* possible: it is not only a practical means to keep the same alphabetical order for both dialects, but also a diachronic interpretation already in the headword. The same situation obtains with the labialization: in the same way as the reduction of a front vowel is accompanied by palatalization, the reduction of a back vowel is accompanied by labialization in the Iron dialect, indicated by a separate letter in the generally used spelling. The author indicates the labialization by a diacritic, so that he gets a unified headword again: *k_oyvd/kuvd* ‘prayer; ritual feast, usually with live sacrifices’. And since the diacritics do not count in the alphabetization, the sequence of the entries is given by the historical forms: e.g. *k_oysi/kusinæ* ‘ladle’; *k_oyst/kust* ‘work’; *č̣ysyl* ‘small; small amount’ (Digor has another word, *mingi, mink’i, mænk’æj*, hence no bar); *k_oyvd/kuvd* ‘festival’; *kyzg/kizgæ* ‘girl’. The historical orientation does not, however, prevail over facts: if there is a more modern pronunciation than the one indicated by the spelling of the headword, it is given in parentheses; e.g. *fædki (fæčči)* ‘skirt, flap or lap of a coat or dress’ (I 429). Nor does the his-

torical orientation cause the more archaic, Digor, forms to be quoted first, with the more recent Iron ones following: Iron is the basis of the main literary language, is taught in most schools, and has more speakers, so it stands first.

The spellings as devised by the author have a similar historical orientation in other points as well, e.g. in respect to the prothetic and other vowels, but we shall not go into all the details.

2.3. The parameter of *r a n g e* refers to the number of languages studied. It has already been said that there are several layers of comparisons: words of Iranian origin have all or most of the Middle and Modern Iranian cognates quoted (including, e.g., Khoresmian and Saka among the former, Kurdish among the latter); the cognates from the other I.-E. languages are quoted with increasing frequency. E.g., IV 183 *xæryn/xwærun* ‘scratch, itch, irritate’ has among the Iranian cognates the Parthian, Farsi, Kurdish and Pamir words, but also its cognates in Sanskrit, Greek, Norwegian, German. (See above, 2.1.)

Typologically more interesting is the treatment of borrowings. Some of them are simple: *adli/adili* ‘arshin’ is borrowed from Georgian *adli* ‘arshin [unit of measure]’. (I 29). Some non-Iranian words, however, have parallel forms in several Caucasian languages; e.g. *ag/ag(æ)* ‘cauldron’ has parallel forms in Ingush, Chechen, Avar, Adyghe, Rutul and other languages, so that while the ultimate source may be Turkic, the word must be considered a representative of the Caucasian linguistic area.

For *aendon* ‘steel’ [12], the author proposes an Indo-European etymology (to Skr. *saṃ-dhāna*, Iran. **han-dāna* ‘layer’ [in this case ‘a steel layer on iron’]; the etymology is supported by parallel semantic developments e.g. in Russian *u-klad* ‘steel’). A discussion of ancient methods in producing steel supports all these assumptions. However, there also is a discussion of the borrowings of this form (or its predecessor) into several Finno-Ugric languages (such as Komi and Udmurt) and into Caucasian languages, such as Ubykh and Ingush (I 157).

As the etymon of *wyrs/urs* ‘stallion’ is correctly indicated Iran. **v_ṛšan-* ‘male’, with a great number of cognates both Iranian and Indo-European (IV 124). However, the author does not fail to tell us that it also was borrowed into Finnish, Estonian, and Karelian (*varza*) and thence into the dialectal Russian *varža* ‘foal, colt’.

It is this crossing the boundaries of a linguistic family and pursuing areal connections that gives the dictionary a strong individual character.

2.4. By *g r a n d s t r a t e g y*, Malkiel understands the “total distribution of the corpus”. Ossetic is a living language, so the idea of a corpus does not apply. The selection of vocabulary is such that it corresponds to the histori-

cal character of the dictionary. Thus, archaic and obsolete expressions (particularly from the epos) are listed and so is contemporary basic vocabulary. Terms connected with modern life and technology are not avoided, but they have no entries of their own. So for instance the modern-life expression *særmagond sekretar* ‘personal secretary’ occurs, but only because a good illustrative context of the expletive *xædægaj* ‘oh’ contains it (IV 155); there is no headword *sekretar*, which is a reasonable policy for an etymological dictionary. The treatment of the meaning is also such that it prefers the historical aspects: e.g., the entry of *syrx/surx* ‘red’ has a page of illustrative contexts none of which exemplifies the modern political connotation (III 298 ff.).³

The entries are marshalled in the alphabetical sequence of the Iron forms of the headword. Knowledge of the Ossetic language is supposed, but difficult Digor forms are listed separately and cross-referred to the main entry: “*ǵæwagæ* see *qwag*”. Digor forms are given for their Iron counterparts even if they are different: *baryn* ‘understand’, in Digor, *lædærun* is more used”; or, e.g. *axæm/(wæxæn, awæxæn)* ‘such’ (I 89), with *awæxæn* and *wæxæn* lemmatized separately (I 87; IV 100).

2.5. Malkiel’s next parameter is what he calls *tactical preferences*, by which he means, broadly speaking, the favored structure of individual entries. The form of the headword has already been mentioned. There follow Russian equivalents and explanations, distributed into numbered sections in cases of stronger polysemy.⁴ Then follow transparent or semitransparent derivations and compounds, with their own Russian equivalents. (The non-transparent ones are lemmatized separately.) For instance, the entry *sag* ‘stag’ also gives *sag-læg* ‘stag’ + ‘man’ > ‘fine fellow; hero’; *sagartæn* ‘having life (*artæn*) like a stag’ > ‘girded up; well built (figure)’ etc. (III ii-16). The entry of *sær* ‘head’ also indicates many compounds, e.g. Dig. *anzisær* ‘New Year’ (< ‘head of year’), dig. *avdisær* ‘Monday’ (< ‘head of seven’); *systsær* ‘with lice on head’, *særægās* ‘alive, innocuous’, *særibar* ‘freedom’, etc. (III 73-76). Compounds like *k’æj-dzar* ‘covered with slabs’, *næw-dzar* ‘covered with sod’ are indicated in the entry of *car* ‘ceiling’ (I 289). Standing expressions abound, sometimes very specific in their application; e.g., in the entry of *amond* ‘luck, happiness’ we get, among others, *xorz amond dæ xaj* ‘good fortune is your lot’: this is said to be a wish expressed only to girls (I 81 f.).

There follow illustrative contexts, all of them translated into Russian. They are well selected to force the meaning. Sometimes they are the vehicle of the interpretation themselves. So, e.g., Miller’s older Ossetic dictionary (MILLER 1927–1934) gives the meaning of *æluton/ilæton*, *æluton* as ‘mythical food, stilling hunger forever’, however, the Digor context from the Nart epos,

bægænij sinon æluton funxæj æræværunçæ ‘they put a keg with beer brewed (as) aluton’, shows that already in the epos the meaning was quite concrete; passages like this add strongly to the historical dimension of the dictionary.

The illustrative contexts cannot display a great historical depth, given the recent date of Ossetic literacy. Probably the oldest extensive written source is the manuscript of a translation of the Gospel from 1820. The epos about the Narts is much older, of course, but it was not written down until the 19th century, having been handed down as oral literature. Interestingly, the number of the contexts quoted grows from volume to volume, partly because during the decades after 1959, new Ossetic writers started publishing. The lack of time depth excludes a chronological ordering of the senses in many cases. For instance, the senses of *aftid/afted*, *aftid*, *otid* are given as ‘empty; in vain, to no purpose; only’, but some collocations show that “the meaning ‘empty’ could arise from the meaning ‘only’” (I 33). This, however, is necessarily the case in dictionaries that have a great time depth within the contexts, such as, e.g., *The Oxford English Dictionary* (see ZGUSTA 1989).

On the whole, this part of the entry, while being of historical character by the excursus into the derivational and semantic history of words, can also function as a monolingual dictionary. About that later.

The next section of the entry contains the etymological reflections, and the last one the bibliographical references, unless they are quoted within the preceding section, because diverging opinions are discussed there.

This organization of the entry reflects well the intention of the author to combine the historical with the etymological study of the lexicon.

2.6. The parameter of breadth refers to various auxiliary and background information. Abaev’s dictionary has considerable breadth but the information cannot be called auxiliary. Perhaps even to consider it part of the background is not quite right, because the information offered concerns the extralinguistic, cultural context of the Ossetic language (and, by implication, of other languages of the High Caucasus). Hence, realia, ethnographic peculiarities, cultural notions, etc. are described in detail. For instance, *xædzar/xædzaræ* ‘house, saklyya [Caucasian mountain hut], dwelling, the main living area in a saklyya where a fire is burning’ (IV 159 f.): there is an explanatory gloss “the ferm belongs equally to the architectural, social, and economic registers” and then follow fourteen lines of descriptions (stemming from mid 19th cent. and slightly later) of the house, of the location of the chimney with its perpetually kept fire, the location of the stool for the oldest man in the family, the location of the various work areas, the location of the “treasury”, a room at the exclusive disposal of the oldest woman in the family, etc. All these things, areas, persons, rooms, are

named by the Ossetic terms (by now largely archaic). Similarly, the Ossetic festival *Saniba* (the culturally absorbed feast of the Trinity; < Georg. *Sameba*, from *sami* ‘three’; III 30 f.) is described in eighteen lines of an English text quoted from a British traveller in 1899–1902. Some such ethnographic information was collected by the author himself; for instance, the explanation of *sapp* (a sort of narrow terrace allowing agriculture even on a steep hill; III 31) was gained from an 84-year old man.⁵ For the description of the role of the *wæjyg/wæjug* (IV 68–71) in Ossetic folk demonology, the author uses reminiscences from his own boyhood (in the first decade of our century), as to how various mishaps were explained by old people as the result of the activities of one of those malevolent creatures.

It is particularly interesting that this constant consideration of culture and generally of the extralinguistic context is for the author an active element in his linguistic deliberations. So for instance: *sag* ‘deer’ is such an important element of Ossetic culture that it takes five pages (III 11–16) to deal with it. Its position in folklore, in proverbs, standing similes and metaphors, and its epithets are discussed. The circumstance that the stag was an important totem explains why the original word for it (cognate to Lat. *cervus* ‘stag’, Slav. *srъna* ‘deer’) was lost because of taboo and *sag* < Iran. **sākā* introduced. More than that; this word, its derivation, and its importance are then used to explain (in preference to other, competing etymologies) ethnonyms such as *Saka* and others. Of particular interest are cases like the following: *ævdiw/æwdew* ‘demon’ was explained as a compound that goes back to Iranian **āp-* ‘water’ and *daiva* ‘divinity’; thus ‘water divinity’ > ‘demon’. This etymology is perfectly possible, with all sound changes being regular, etc. However, Abaev finds (I 199) that there is no trace of a connection of *ævdiw* with water in culture and folklore; therefore, he prefers to derive the word from Iran. **hafta-daiva* ‘seven divinities’ and finds an argument in favor of it since in Ossetia there is a sanctuary called *Avd dzuary* ‘seven gods’. This ethnographic, or cultural, information is, therefore, an integral part of the author’s explanatory apparatus.

2.7. The next of Malkiel’s parameters is *s c o p e*: the “particular selection or assortment of material”. Some remarks that belong here have already been made: the selection of obsolete words relevant for antiquarian description, absence of modern borrowings, etc. It should also be mentioned that the names of the Narts, the heroes known from the old Ossetic (and Abkhaz) epos are listed and abundantly discussed. This is particularly important, because these names frequently have no Iranian etymology. So, e.g. *Soslan* (Nogai *suslā* ‘horrible’, III 138–140), *Xæmyc/Xæmic*, *Batradz* (both Mongolian) and others; the name of the Narts (*Nartæ*) itself goes to Mong. *nar-* ‘sun’. Therefore, the ety-

mology of the name *Sainæg* < *saw* ‘black’, *ajnæg* ‘rock, cliff’ is rejected (the ambience of the epos is the steppe and the sea, not the mountains) and a derivation from Mong. *sain* ‘famous’ is proposed. In the same way, the Iranian etymology of one of the Narts’ family, *Alægatae* (-*tæ* is the suffix of the plural) < **āryaka* is rejected in favor of a derivation from *læg* ‘man’, which is Caucasian. Thus, these names strengthen the non-Iranian component of the dictionary, supplying further cases of cultural and linguistic syncretism in the area. Quite apart from the etymologies themselves, the persons of those epic heroes, such as, e.g., *Syrdon/Sirdon* (III 207 f.) are compared with other epic traditions and persons, in the approach of Dumézil.

2.8. The last of Malkiel’s parameters is *character*: by this is meant the purpose the author pursued, and the level or tone of his discussions. As to the latter, the level certainly is scientific in the best sense of the word: sufficient exemplification has been given above. The tone is such that it does not terrify a reader who is not a professional linguist: there are few abbreviations, no terminological neologisms or monstrosities, and, most importantly, many explanations the professional does not necessarily need; for instance, *aguryn* ‘to seek’ is derived from *a* + *kuryn* with the explanation of the intervocalic voicing of the stop (I 36); *ænc* ‘*uxyn/ænc*’*oxun* ‘to guzzle, gulp’ is derived from *æmtuxyn*, with the assibilation (*t* > *c*) explained as regular in the position and the glottalization (*c* > *c*’) as caused by expressivity (I 152); etc.

This level of tone is in good harmony with the purpose of the dictionary. It would seem that besides the obvious purposes stated in the title, the dictionary also can function as a monolingual one.⁶ This can be seen in various areas. Firstly, the rich documentation by context is constructed so that the senses are forced for their contextual nuances, usually indicated by the translation; for instance, in the entry of *amajyn/amajun* ‘to pile, heap, stack (firewood, bricks [to build a wall], etc.); to erect, build; to plain, shave [e.g. wood]’, the context *fyngtæ samadtoj syğdæg moqotæj* forces the meaning ‘to cut, hew out tables from, etc.’ (I 49). Secondly, the rich indication of standing expressions and collocations, even with no or only weak semantic effects, belongs to the descriptive apparatus (admittedly not in the monolingual dictionary exclusively); e.g., in the entry of *afon/afonæ* ‘time, term’, there are the collocations *ucy afon* ‘in that time’, *afon u* ‘time (is)’ (as in “Time, gentlemen!”) – no semantic complications either, but it is good that they are given. Thirdly, and most importantly, the dictionary uses paradigmatic means for the description of meaning. They are, for instance, the indication of synonyms as in *styn/istun* 1. (in Digor) ‘stand’; synonyms *læwwun*, *æristun* (III 156); indication of antonyms as in *næwæg* ‘new’, antonym *zæronð* (II 176); of paronyms as in *amond* ‘luck, hap-

piness', in Digor also 'sympathy, compassion; sin' "(similar in meaning to *tæriġæd*)" (I 51.); of onomasiological relations, as in *annæ* 'other' "about a third person or object in enumeration, the second being referred to by *innæ* (I 54); by the delimitation of the *valeur* by giving the adjacent word in the semantic field, such as the contrast of *fædg/fædgæ* 1. 'custom' and *æġdaw* 'custom' the latter being more general, the former tending to be used in local, familial, and cult contexts (I 428); and by the introduction of onomasiological pockets within the alphabetic sequence of entries, such as the indication of the various parts of the house in the entry of *xædzar* 'house' (see above, 2.6) and in giving twelve different expressions for various dwellings (IV 161), or giving under *sajtan* 'devil' also *xæjraeg*, *iblis*, *dælimon*, *ævdiw* (all of them devils of various [linguistic] provenience; III 23).

Interestingly, such onomasiological pockets can be relevant for etymological decisions. For instance, *cyxt* 'cheese' must be compared with Chuvash *čăġăt* 'cheese'; the borrowing could have gone in either direction, but since other milk products have native Ossetic designations, a borrowing in Chuvash from Ossetic is more probable.

2.9. As far as Malkiel's ancillary criteria are concerned, the centrality of the etymological commitment is unimpeded by what has been said in 2.8. about the accretion of the characteristics of the monolingual dictionary. The durability of the dictionary also is beyond dispute: there will be no other native speaker of Ossetic born early enough to know the old culture firsthand who at the same time will be a trained, first class historical linguist and who will live long enough to spend so many decades over a dictionary. So what remains is the author's linguistic creed and the style of his etymological analyses.

One of the typical features of the style is that both the form and the meaning are equally taken into consideration; even if the sound correspondences are in good order, we need an example of a parallel semantic development. Thus, e.g. *ud* 'spirit' is derived from *wad* 'wind', with the semantic parallels of Lat. *animus* 'spirit', Gr. *ἄνεμος*; 'wind' and others (IV 7; see above, 2.5 n. 4); *æmbaryn* 'understand' is derived from Iran. **hama-* 'together' and **bar-* 'take, carry', with the parallel of French *comprendre* 'understand' < Lat. *com-prae-hendere* 'grasp' (in both senses of the English gloss). The semantic parallels are also used in more complicated cases of etymology, together with other principles. Oss. *dzwar/dziwaræ* has the senses 1. 'cross', 2. 'holy; divinity', 3. 'smallpox'. It is a borrowing from Georgian *džvari* 'cross' (itself probably borrowed from Iran. *zauθra* 'sacrifice'). The sequence of senses is a historical one: original Christianity was absorbed by indigenous culture and transformed into a pantheon of heathen divinities and the latter festivals, partly surviving to this

very day (see Zgusta 1987). The semantic development > ‘smallpox’ is explained by parallel cases of taboo: Mongolian *burxat* ‘gods’ > ‘smallpox’, Georgian *bat’onebi* ‘masters’ > ‘smallpox’. We have already mentioned that the author perceives language as embedded in or imbued with culture; vice versa, he exercises linguistic palaeontology by making conclusions concerning ancient culture from language. For instance, *adæm* is borrowed from Farsi, Turkic, or Arabic (the ultimate source is irrelevant), but does mean ‘people’, not ‘man’; the latter meaning is carried by the derivative *adæjmag*, hence the conclusion that in the time of the borrowing, the idea of the collective was primordial, the individualization coming only later.

The author’s “creed” appears to be historical linguistic, strongly influenced by ideas like “Wörter und Sachen” and by anthropological interpretations à la Lévi-Bruhl and Dumézil. A particularly interesting component of the author’s linguistic thought is traceable back to N.J.Marr (whose etymologies are quoted at the proper places). This is quite logical; let us not forget that Abaev is not only Marr’s disciple, but he was the only Soviet linguist who did not join the chorus of Marr’s condemnations, so vociferous after Stalin hurled his anathema on Marrism in 1950. Indeed, Abaev was therefore characterized by Pravda as a “nerazoruživšijsja marrist” (‘a Marrist who did not lay down his weapons’) – not a pleasant thing to happen in those days. Two remarks must be made in this connection. Marr who influenced Abaev was a still quite reasonable scholar, not the person who later maintained that all the words of all languages go back to exactly four syllables, *sal, ber, you, roš*. And second, given the extreme dislike Marr displayed, from the early ‘twenties’, for Indo-European studies, it is remarkable that an excellent work which fully embodies the spirit and standard of these studies, and one that strictly adheres to their (by now) traditional methods, is the last product of that school of thought, or of the group of young scholars around Marr, and may prove to be the most enduring one.

More specifically, the author’s “creed” has a strong component of Hugo Schuchardt’s teaching (fully accepted, not always with recognition, by Marr) on the importance of linguistic interference, of substrata, borrowings, and of “mixing of languages”, as it was called in those days. The way in which the Dictionary treats borrowings, with the same degree of care and detail as the Iranian elements, has its root in the author’s persuasion that Ossetic has two equivalent sources, one Iranian and one Caucasian.

3. To sum up, I shall not recapitulate the single points. It may suffice to say that the dictionary is highly original on several scores, above all by combining etymology cum history with a so-to-say monolingual functionality; by treating the native and the borrowed elements of the language equivalently; by ad-

mitting a strong antiquarian component of ethnographical and generally cultural character.

On the other hand, the typological analysis shows its usefulness in allowing a better understanding of a dictionary's composition. In future planning of etymological and similar dictionaries, it will be rationally possible to plan in advance the desired components of the future product.

REFERENCES

- ABAEV 1958–1989 = Vasilij Ivanovič Abaev, *Istoriko-ètimologičeskij slovar' osetinskogo jazyka*. Moskva-Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk. I 1958 [655 pp.]; II 1973 [448 pp.]; III 1979 [358 pp.]; IV 1989 [325 pp.].
- Encyclopedia = Franz Josef Hausmann/Oskar Reichmann/Herbert Ernst Wiegand/Ladislav Zgusta (eds.), *Wörterbücher – Dictionaries – Dictionnaires. An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter. I 1989; II 1990.
- HAUSMANN 1989 = Franz Josef Hausmann, "Wörterbuch-typologie". In: *Encyclopedia* I, pp. 868–981.
- MALKIEL 1958–59; 1959–60 = Yakov Malkiel, "Distinctive Features in Lexicography: A Typological Approach to Dictionaries Exemplified With Spanish". *Romance Philology* 12, 1958–1959; 366–399; 13, 1959–1960; 111–155.
- MALKIEL 1962 = Yakov Malkiel, "A Typological Classification of Dictionaries on the Basis of Distinctive Features". In: Fred W. Householder/Sol Saporta (eds.), *Problems in Lexicography*. Bloomington: Indiana University 1962. Pp. 3–24.
- MALKIEL 1976 = Yakov Malkiel, *Etymological Dictionaries; A Tentative Typology*. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press 1976.
- MALKIEL 1990 = Yakov Malkiel, "Das etymologische Wörterbuch von Informanten- und Corpus-sprachen". In: *Encyclopedia* II.
- MILLER 1927-1934 = Vsevolod F. Miller, *Osetinsko-russko-nemeckij slovar'*. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk. I 1927; II 1929; III 1934.
- REICHMANN 1984 = Oskar Reichmann, "Historische Lexikographie". In: W. Besch et al. (eds.), *Sprachgeschichte*, vol. I. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter 1984. Pp. 460–492.
- REICHMAN 1990 = Oskar Reichmann, "Das Sprachstadienwörterbuch I: Deutsch". In: *Encyclopedia* II.
- ŠČERBA 1940 = Lev Vladimirovič Ščerba, "Opyt Obščej teorii leksikografii". *Izvestija Akademii Nauk SSSR*, 1940, No. 3: 89–117.
- ZGUSTA 1987 = Ladislav Zgusta, *The Old Ossetic Inscription from the River Zelenčuk*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1987.
- ZGUSTA 1989 = Ladislav Zgusta, "The Oxford English Dictionary and Other Dictionaries (Aikakošyam)". *International Journal of Lexicography* 2, 1989: 188–230.

NOTES

¹ The two main dialects of Ossetic are Iron and Digor; the Digor form always follows the vertical bar. Iron is the basis of the literary language; Digor is in many respects more archaic.

² Historically, Ossetic was written in Arabic and Cyrillic. In the 'twenties, Roman script was introduced. In the late 'thirties, however, the Cyrillic script was re-introduced. Abaev writes all Ossetic words and sentences in Roman, with more differences from the general orthography than mentioned above. Some particularities of his spellings, such as the macrons, are left out in the present article.

³ Similarly: *klass* has no entry, but the entryword *ævzaryn* is exemplified, praeter alia, by *klasstæ fevzurstæncæ særmagond mulki fædbæel* 'classes appeared because of private property' (from *Surx Digoræ* ['Red Digoria'] a textbook from 1932-1936.)

⁴ In a few cases, there are also Latin equivalents; e.g., *ud/od* 'dux, duša [= spirit, soul], spiritus'. In this specific case, the Latin word *spiritus* derived from *spirare*, offers a semantic parallel to the entryword, whose etymon belongs to the Oss. *wad* 'wind'. Normally the Latin equivalents are given for religious (pagan) expressions or for generally numinous expressions.

⁵ Bilingual lexicographers will be interested in how expressions like this are translated when they occur in the illustrative contexts. They are not translated; the author explains them and then he inserts the original Ossetic word into the Russian translation, in a different font.

⁶ To be precise, as a quasi-bilingual dictionary: these are bilingual dictionaries that function as monolingual ones.