

Achtung!

Dies ist eine Internet-Sonderausgabe des Beitrags zur
grammatischen und syntaktischen Analyse der altossetischen Inschrift vom Zelenčuk
von Jost Gippert und Sonja Fritz (1986).

Sie sollte nicht zitiert werden. Zitate sind der
Originalausgabe in Ladislav Zgusta,

The Old Ossetic Inscription from the River Zelenčuk,

Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1987, 39–41
zu entnehmen.

Attention!

This is a special internet edition of the contribution to the
grammatical and syntactical analysis of the Old Ossetic inscription from the river Zelenčuk
by Jost Gippert and Sonja Fritz (1986).

It should not be quoted as such. For quotations, please refer to the
original edition in Ladislav Zgusta,

The Old Ossetic Inscription from the River Zelenčuk,

Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1987, 39–41.

3.2.7.3. Yet another interpretation was proposed by Jost Gippert and Sonja Gippert-Fritz (private communication of March 3, 1986). They develop two basic ideas: First, they assume that the series of names pertains to members of a single family, with the son of one generation being referred to once more as the father of the next generation. Therefore, they accept the emendations Πακαθα(ρ)η in

line 13 and A(v)παλανη in line 16. In addition to this, they take Χοβσηστορη as one name, in this case in the genitive. The name of Saχir's son must, then, be identical with that of Pakathar's father, i.e. Xovsistor. In this way, they get the following reading:

Saχir's son (Xovsistor) (and)
 Xovsistor's son Pakathar (and)
 Pakatha(r)'s son Anpalan (and)
 A(n)palan's son Lakan's stele.

The assumption is that the first reference to Xovsistor (in the nominative case) was lost by haplography, i.e. that it was erroneously omitted by the writer of the inscription (because of the immediately following genitive of the same name). Naturally, a haplographic omission of nine letters is not an easily accepted assumption, particularly when we know from line 7 that our lapidarian writer re-read his text and added the originally omitted two letters ρτ where they belonged. That, however, is a minor matter, one could argue that he did not correct the omissions in Πακαθα(ρ)η (line 13) and in A(v)παλανη (line 16) – that is, if omissions they are. In any case, he certainly did not correct N(ι)κόλαος (line 4). Be all this as it may, a haplography deleting a whole name is difficult assumption.

The interpretation of Jost Gippert and Sonja Gippert-Fritz has the advantage that *läqwän* 'young man, boy' is also attested as an Ossetic personal name, whereas in the case of *läg* 'man' such a usage as personal name is not attested.

As to the syntax, the two scholars develop their second basic idea, which is similar to that of Alborov (see above, 3.2.5.2: 'singular form with a plural, collective value'). But whereas Alborov took λακανη as genitive sing, with the value of genitive plural of the general noun ('young man's' >) 'young men's', G. & G.-F. assume λακανη to be a name of one of the deceased persons and 'Gruppenflexion' to be the construction of the passage. That is, the stele, τζηρθε, belongs to the four men who are mentioned as sons, i.e. Χοθσηστορ (omitted by haplography), Πακαθαρ, Ανπαλαν, and Λακαν-η but only the last of these names has the form of the genitive, whose syntactic function, however, pertains to all four of them.

This interpretation is quite possible: coordinated, symmetrical colligations (or syntactically bound groups of words) can show gruppenflexion. However, I find the resulting construction too hard: there would be five genitives and three nominatives in the text (one nomi-

native being, however, omitted); out of these five genitives, one would have to be understood as parallel not with the other genitives, but with the nominatives. I find the construction too difficult; admittedly, it is a possible one, nevertheless.