



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Avestan siiazd-, Sanskrit sedh-, Latin cedere

Lubotsky, A.M.; Hyllested, A.; Jørgensen, A.R.; Larsson, J.H.; Olander, T.

Citation

Lubotsky, A. M. (2004). Avestan siiazd-, Sanskrit sedh-, Latin cedere. In A. Hyllested, A. R. Jørgensen, J. H. Larsson, & T. Olander (Eds.), *Per aspera ad asteriscos: Studia Indogermanica in honorem Jens Elmegard Rasmussen sexagenarii Idibus Martiis anno MMIV* (pp. 322-332). Innsbruck: IBS. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/16238>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/16238>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Avestan *siiazd-*, Sanskrit *sedh-*, Latin *cēdere*

Alexander Lubotsky
Leiden University

1. There are only three forms which are currently attributed to the Avestan verb *siiazd-/sižd-* ‘to withdraw; to expel, banish’¹, viz. *-iia*-present participles act. *siždiiant-* (Yt 19.84), med. *siždiiamna-* (Y 32.4), and 3sg. subj. aor. act. *siiazdat* (Y 34.9).

Let us first look at the present, where the active participle seems to be transitive whereas the middle participle is intransitive:

Yt 19.84 *yaṭ imam daēnaṃ āstaota*
dušmainiiūm siždiiō ¹*daēnuu* ²*apašaunu*
so that he (= Kavi Vištāspa) pronounced for this religion, expelling the enemy, driving out the daēvas.

Y 32.4 *maīiā ... vaxšantē daēnuō. xūstā vaxhēuš siždiiamnā manayhō*
The mortals will increase the things agreeable to daēvas, withdrawing from good thinking.

The diathesis opposition in the present is unusual: Avestan *iia*-presents, just as their Sanskrit counterparts, are normally either active, or middle (cf. Kulikov 2001: 565). Kellens (1984: 36) mentions only six *iia*-presents where both voices are found, and, remarkably, the medial forms are in this case always the participles. Three verbs – *ah-* ‘to throw’, *jad-* ‘to ask’, *varz-* ‘to work, accomplish’ – are transitive in the active, and passive in the middle (participles ‘thrown’, ‘asked’, ‘accomplished’). Two verbs (*vaxš-* ‘to grow’ and *uruuī-* ‘to turn’) are intransitive both in the active and in the middle, the middle forms being hapaxes (Vr 12.5 *fraoirisimna*, Yt 4.8 *uzuxšiiamnō*), most probably of secondary origin.

It is clear that, if our interpretation of the forms is correct, *siiazd-* occupies a unique position. It does not belong to the group of the transitive verbs, since *siždiiamnā* ‘withdrawing’ is not passive and since the adjective *siždra-* ‘evasive,

¹ Bartholomae, Kellens 1984, 1995: 63, Mayrhofer EWAia: 655, Hoffmann & Forssman 1996.

² This is the text given by Hintze 1994: 353. Geldner edited *dušmainiiūm siždiiō daēnuuq* *apa.āšaunuq*. For the last two words cf. also Schindler 1982: 189, 208-9 and de Vaan 2002: 354f., who proposes to read ¹*daēnuō* ²*apašaunuaiia*.

shy (of animals)³ shows that the primary meaning of the root is 'to withdraw, flinch'. On the other hand, it is unparalleled that an intransitive middle *īia*-present would acquire a causative meaning simply by adding the active endings. These considerations make me believe that *siždiiō* stands for the causative participle **siiazdaiiō*, which is confirmed by the manuscript readings J10 *šoždaiiō* and D *šoždaiiō*⁴.

2. Now we can turn to the aorist. Y 34.9 *siiazdāt* has traditionally been translated intransitively ('will withdraw, retreat'), but the two latest translations of the Gāthās (Kellens & Pirart 1988, Humbach 1991 I), take the form as transitive, while interpreting *maš* as nom.sg. of the noun / adjective *maš-* 'a great (one), master, chieftain', cf.

Y 34.9 *aēibiō maš ašā siiazdāt yauuat ahmat aurunā xrafstrā*
... far from them a master shall chase away truths, as far from us as the
fierce beasts (are to be chased) (Humbach)
... le (mauvais) chef éloigne de ceux-là les Harmonies aussi loin que les in-
fects (dieux) fauves (les éloignent) de nous (Kellens-Pirart)

It seems to me that the transitive interpretation is more attractive because the wild beasts do not normally retreat from us, but must be chased away (we shall come across another argument in favor of this interpretation below). A combination of an intransitive *īia*-present and a transitive root aorist is also found with the root *vaxš-*: *uxšīiēiti* 'grows' vs. *vaxšt*, subj. *vaxšāt* 'made grow, increased'.⁵

3.1. There is one more form, which, in my opinion, belongs to the aorist of *siiazd-*, viz. GAv. (Y 48.7) *siiozdūm*, as it was edited by Geldner. Bartholomae in his dictionary opted for *siiozdūm*⁶, and this reading entered all subsequent publications, although Geldner's choice was most probably correct. Consider the variants given in Geldner's edition: *siiozdūm* J2; *siiaozdūm* J6, Jm1; *siaozdūm* P6; *siozdūm* J3; *siiaozdūm* J7, Jm2, Dh1, O2, S2, K10, L3; *siiaozdām* H1; *šiaozdām* L2; *šiaozdūm* L13, B2; *šiaozdūm* Jm3; *šiaozdām* K11, C1; *šiaozdām* Lb2; *siiozdūm* K5.4,

³ The word is spelled with *-i-* at Yt 8.36, and with *-ī-* at V 13.2. As indicated by de Vaan 2002: 166f., *-ī-* is the usual reading in front of *š*.

⁴ *š* sometimes appears in the mss. for *siī*, cf. H 1.17 *fraoirištaiti* for *fraoirisīitaiti*. Note further that the mss. J10 and D constitute an independent line of the ms. stemma, cf. Geldner, Prolegomena xlv-xlv, Hintze 1994: 57f.

When the manuscript of this article was finished, I saw that the same emendation had already been proposed by Pirart 1992: 109f.

⁵ Cf. also GAv. *xraodāt*, *xraodati* 3sg. subj. root aor. 'make afraid, vex' vs. Skt. *krūdhyati* 'be angry' (Humbach 1959: 56, fn. 65).

⁶ Thus already Westergaard, who based his edition on manuscript K5.

Pt4, Mf1.2, Jp1. According to the stemma of the mss. (cf. Geldner's Prolegomena), we can distinguish the following major groups:

I. Pahlavi-Sanskrit-Yasna:

1. Indian Pahlavi-Yasna: K5 *siiozdūm*, J2 *siiozdūm*;
2. Iranian Pahlavi-Yasna: Mf1, Pt4 *siiozdūm*;
3. Sanskrit-Yasna: J3 *siozdūm*;

II. Iranian Vīdēvdāt-Sāde: Mf2, Jp1, K4 *siiozdūm*;

III. Indian Vīdēvdāt-Sāde: Dh1, O2, S2, K10, L3 *siiaozdūm*; L2 *šiaozdām*;

IV. Indian Yasna-Sāde: K11, C1 *šiaozdām*; Lb2 *šiaozdām*;
H1 *siiaozdām*; J7 *siiaozdūm*; J6, Jm1 *siiaozdūm*;

Geldner's *siiozdūm* is attested only in J2, but *-z-* or *-š-* are found in several other groups of Indian mss. The *š*-variants must be due to the influence of the present *siždiiate*. Since the reading *siiozdūm* is practically restricted to the Iranian mss. and since it is more probable that a letter was omitted⁷, than that it was independently added in several manuscript groups, I believe that Geldner's choice is warranted. This is further confirmed by morphological and semantic considerations.

In Geldner's edition, the first line of Y 48.7 reads: *nī aēšmō nī diātām paiti ramam paiti siiozdūm*, which stands for */nī aišmah dyatām, paiti ramam syazdvam/*⁸. The form *paiti siiozdūm* can be interpreted as 2pl. aor. impv. middle of *siiazd-*⁹. The passage can be translated: 'Let fury be stopped¹⁰! Banish violence (ye who try to attach yourselves to good thought)! We do not know the exact bearing of the terms *aēšma-* and *rama-*¹¹, but they clearly refer to violence against the cow, the followers of Zarathustra being summoned to abolish cow sacrifices. From the semantic point of view, the transitive aorist of *siiazd-* perfectly suits the context. The middle has the so-called "self-beneficent" function, i.e. 'away from yourselves' or 'in your own interest'. The transitive meaning of this aorist imperative confirms the transitive interpretation of *siiazdāt*, discussed in § 2.

3.2. The reading *siiozdūm* / *syadvam*/, on the other hand, leads to insurmountable semantic difficulties. This form seems to be 2pl. impv. med. *īia*-pres. of *√sā-*, but what would this root mean? Bartholomae assumed the meaning 'wehren', but was unable to find an etymology. Therefore, Kuiper suggested to compare *siiozdūm* with Skt. *śīyate*, which not only means 'to fall out', but "in

⁷ Cf. for a parallel K5 *θbarō.dūm* (Y 29.1) vs. *θbarōzdūm* elsewhere.

⁸ Cf. Monna 1978: 73. The repeated preverbs must of course be deleted.

⁹ To be sure, we expect zero grade of the root in the root aorist middle, but there are various deviations from the pattern in Avestan (see Kellens 1984: 361f).

¹⁰ For *nī diātām* see Humbach 1991 II: 201.

¹¹ For these terms see Insler 1975: 288f., Humbach 1991 II: 201.

Zusammensetzung mit Präverbien hat es die allgemeine Bedeutung von lat. *cedere*, z.B. *atišyate* 'herauskommen aus, verlassen, discedere', *upašyate* 'hinzu-kommen, accedere'" (1939: 64 = 1997: 220). However, the usage referred to by Kuiper is only attested in later Vedic (JB) and is clearly secondary, the original meaning of *śi-* being 'to fall (down)'. Finally, according to the nowadays generally accepted analysis (Humbach, Insler, Kellens), *ṡā-* means 'to cut' and is cognate with Skt. *chā-* 'to skin'¹², but the translations are rather forced, cf. Humbach 1959: 'haut ein auf die Fesseln'; Humbach 1991 I: 'Chop up fury', Insler: 'Cut away cruelty!', Kellens & Pirart: 'Tranchez l'Entrave', and the function of the preverb *paiti* remains unclear. The grammar of Hoffmann & Forssman takes an intermediate position, postulating the meaning of the root as 'wehren' and still keeping the etymological connection with Skt. *chā-*.

Furthermore, the other forms of Av. *ṡā-* are doubtful, too. The only other finite form that has been attributed to this root¹³ is Y 31.18 *sāzdūm* / *sāzdvam* / as 2pl. impv. med. *s-*aor. Here again, the meaning does not really suit the context: the translations of *avā īš sāzdūm snaiθišā* 'Deshalb zerfetzt die Trughaften mit eurer Waffe' (Humbach 1959), 'Therefore cut these down with your weapon' (Insler 1975), or 'coupez de votre couteau ses (formules et ses leçons)' (Kellens & Pirart 1988) do not seem very appealing. In his new edition of the Gāthās, Humbach (1991) renders the passage differently: 'Teach them with (Your) weapon'¹⁴, thus taking *sāzdūm* as 2pl. impv. med. pres. of the root *sāh-* 'to teach'. This solution seems perfectly acceptable to me. Although in the Avesta this root is attested only in the active, its Vedic cognate *śās-* is freely used in both active and middle.

4. There is one more form in Gāthic that may belong to the aorist of *siiazd-*, viz. Y 32.16 *siias(-cī)*. The passage is extremely difficult and is often left untranslated:

hamēm taṭ vahištācī *yō ušruiiē siiascī dahmahiā*
xšaiias mazdā ahurā *yehiā mā aiθišcī duuaēdā*
hiiaṭ aēnanhē drəgunatō *āānū īšūāng anhaiiā*

The form *siias(-cī)* has never been explained in a satisfactory way¹⁵. From a formal point of view, *siias* can be 2/3sg. of the root aorist of *siiazd-*: **siiazd-s* or

¹² This etymology goes back to Walde & Pokorny II: 541, cf. Kuiper 1939: 63 = 1997: 219.

¹³ A possible derivative of this root is *°sāna-* at Yt 19.44 (...) *sānam* and Yt 13.136 *frakarastō, frasānahe*, for which see Cheung, forthcoming.

¹⁴ Thus already Altheim 1949: 264 ('Belehret sie durch die Waffe').

¹⁵ Insler 1975 takes it as an adj. from *si* 'lie', assuming that it stands for **siyas* or **sayas*, and translates the first line: 'This is equal to the best indeed (for him) who surely lies in the ... of the Wondrous One'.

**siiazd-t* regularly yield Av. *siias* (cf. 3sg. *s-*aor. act. *sas* 'to seem, please' < **sānd-s-t*, Beekes 1988: 102). There are no other verbal forms in the first two lines, and it is probable that *siias* is a verb.

5. Finally, in order to complete the dossier of the root *siiazd-*, let us look at F 25a (Klingenschmitt 695) *frasiiazjaiti*¹⁶ and A 3.13 *fraca siiazjaitiōi*¹⁷. Kuiper (1934: 237, cf. also Kellens 1984: 147) has proposed to emend F 25a *frasiiazjaiti* to **frasiiazjaitiēti*, so that we are probably dealing with a single causative formation. Bartholomae has set up a separate root (*fra-*)*syazg-* 'propellere', 'fort-, ver-jagen' for these forms, but this root has no secure parallels either in Iranian, or outside.¹⁸ The meaning of *frasiiazjaitiēti* is so close to that of *siiazd-* that Kuiper 1934: 236f. considered *siiazd-* and *siiazg-* parallel root enlargements. It is therefore tempting to consider *frasiiazjaitiēti* a corruption of **frasiiazdaitiēti*, a causative to *siiazd-*, which we have already postulated for Yt 19.84¹⁹.

6. To recapitulate, we can represent the averbo of Avestan *siiazd-* as follows:

present med. (intr.)	<i>siždhiamnā</i> 'withdrawing, flinching'
root aor.act. (trans.)	<i>siias</i> (?)
subj.	<i>siiazdat</i> 'will chase away, expel'
impv. med.	(<i>paiti</i>) <i>siiozdūm</i> 'banish!'
causative act.	* <i>frasiiazdaiti</i> , * <i>siiazdaiō</i> 'chase away'
[adj.]	<i>siždra-</i> 'evasive, shy'

Within Iranian, *siiazd-* has a probable cognate in Chor. *b-szy* 'to avoid' (Schwartz apud Henning & MacKenzie 33) < **apa-siždya-* (Samadi). Since Bartholomae GIP: 77, the root has been further connected with Skt. *śis-* 'to be left

¹⁶ Pahlavi translation *pr'c-spwčnyh* 'to push, drive forward'.

¹⁷ In the passage *aunaēzō* **dim pascaēta fraca xraosiiōi fraca siiazjaitiōi* 'without (committing) any sin, he may then shout at him and drive him forward'.

¹⁸ The often proposed connection with Skt. *śighrā-* adj. (VS+) 'quick, swift' (cf. Kellens 1984: 147 with ref.) is unattractive. Also Russ. *sigat* 'to jump' and OE *higian* 'to exert oneself, strive, hasten' can hardly be cognate. OE *higian* cannot be separated from Middle Dutch *higen*, Modern Dutch *hijgen* 'to pant', which seem to preserve the original meaning. The Russian word is only attested in the Southern and Western dialects, i.e. exactly in those dialects where *i* merged with *a* (< *e*) in pretonic position, and is likely to derive from **segati* (Lubotsky 1999: 76).

¹⁹ It is further remarkable that, whereas the cluster *zj* does not normally show variant readings in the manuscripts, in these two passages we do find many variants: in the Farhang, ms. M. reads *frasiiajaiti*; in the Afrīngān, Geldner gives in his critical apparatus F2, K36, W1 *siiazjaitiōi*, Lb5 *siiazjaitiōi*, K18, J15, P14 *saiiazjaitiōi*, L25 *frascat.zaiiōi*, Pt1, E1, Mb1.2, L11, O3 *frascit.zaiiōi*, Jm4 ... *t.zaiiōi*, L18 *fracat.zaiiōi* (*sci* appended sec.m.), K19, P13 *tfrascit.zaiiōi*, L18, O3 *frascit.zaiiōi*, deest J9, H2, L9.

over', but this etymology leaves the $-d^{(h)}$ - unaccounted for and is semantically not evident²⁰. Humbach (1991 II: 111) compared *siazd-* with Skt. *sédhati* 'to drive, chase away', albeit without any further comments. Mayrhofer (EWAia s.v. SEDH) did not take up this comparison, but Humbach's idea seems attractive to me. Let us try to seriously consider this etymological proposal.

First of all, the semantic match is perfect. Humbach has pointed to many parallels, cf. RV 8.23.13c *víśvéd agnīh prāti ráksāmsi sedhati* 'Agni chases all Rakṣases away', 6.47.29d *dūrād dāvīyo āpa sedha śātrūn* 'chase away the enemies farther than far!', 1.105.11c *té sedhanti pathó vṛkam* 'they chase the wolf off the path'. Secondly, Skt. *sedh-* is used with the same preverbs as *siazd-*, viz. *prāti*, *prā*, *āpa* (cf. Chor. **apa-siždya-*), although one can argue that these preverbs are only to be expected with a verb of such semantics. Thirdly, it is remarkable that in old Vedic texts, formations with zero grade of the root are clearly avoided: we find present *sédhati*, *iṣ-aor. sedhih*, pf. *siṣedhā*²¹, ŚB *niṣeddhī-*, *aniṣeddhī-*, possibly AVŚ 1.18.4 *goṣedhā-* 'kine-repelling'. The zero-grade is attested in the intensive *anuseṣidhat* (RV 1.23.15b), the attribution of which is not certain (see Schaefer 1994: 196f. for a discussion), and in *apasidhya* AVŚ 8.2.7. The *ta*-participle is found at ŚB 2.5.2.27 *niṣiddha-*, where it stands directly after *niṣeddhī-*, and otherwise only in the JB. Accordingly, it looks as if the zero-grade is secondary, which would be in conformity with the reconstruction **sazd^h*. It is conceivable that the Skt. present *sédhati* goes back to the subjunctive of the root aorist, which would account for the transitive meaning.

The only serious problem is that of the anlaut, since Iranian **s-* (from PIIr. **ṣ-*) and Sanskrit *s-* (apparently, from PIIr. **s-*) do not match. Nevertheless, I do not think that this fact is an insurmountable obstacle to the etymology. The loss of *-i-* in the initial cluster **s-* is not without parallels in Sanskrit, cf. *sūtra* 'thread', *sūnā-* 'basket' < **sū-*. Note further that word-initial *sy-* is unattested in Sanskrit.²²

In order to account for Skt. *s-* instead of expected **ṣ-*, we have to consider the fact that Sanskrit has a tendency towards a kind of "sibilant harmony". Initial **s-* often becomes *ś-*, if there is *ś* or *ṣ* in the root, cf. Skt. *śus-* 'to be dry' < **sus-*, *śvāsura-* 'father-in-law' < **svas^o*, *śmāsru-* 'beard' < **smas^o*, etc. (AiGr. I: 224). Klingenschmitt (1975: 77, fn. 3) has shown that also non-initial *-s-* can be assimilated to the initial *ś-*, cf. *śasā-* 'hare' < **śasa-*. In a root like **siazd^h*, it was hardly possible to assimilate *-ṣ-* to the initial *ś-*, because *-ṣ-* was "protected" by

the following dental *d^h*. Therefore, there was no other way to harmonize the sibilants than to change *ś-* to *s-*.²³

7. It thus seems reasonable to connect Skt. *sédhati* with Avestan *siazd-* and to reconstruct PIIr. **ṣiazd^h*.²⁴ A probable Indo-European cognate of this Indo-Iranian verb is Lat. *cedere* 'to move, withdraw'. The etymology connecting Av. *siazd-* with Lat. *cēdō* is already mentioned in Walde & Hofmann, who consider it doubtful, however, because the verb only means 'to move' in Plautus, and the meaning 'to withdraw' seems to be derived from the compounds *abscedō*, *concedō*, etc. Yet at the same time, Walde & Hofmann indicate that the meaning 'to withdraw' is already attested in Ennius and is no doubt old in *necesse*. The semantic objection is thus invalid.

Since we reconstruct PIIr. **ṣiazd^h* with *-d^h*, we must shortly discuss the development of PIE **ṣd^h* in Latin. Since Szemerényi 1952, it has become generally accepted that this cluster yields Latin *st* (cf., for instance, Meiser 1998: 119). Before that, the development of **ṣd^h* was considered uncertain²⁵, because next to the *-st*-reflex we also find *crēdō* < **kreṣd-* < **kred(s)-d^heh-* (Skt. *śradhdhā-*) and *audiō* < **auṣd-* (Gr. ἀ(φ)ισθέσθαι) with *-d-* and compensatory lengthening²⁶. Let us review the evidence usually given for the reflex *-st-*.

- (1) Lat. *hasta* 'shaft, spear' (OIr. *gat* 'osier, withe', Goth. *gazds* 'sting', OHG *gart* 'goad');

²³ We find a somewhat similar picture in the Vedic 'ruki' reflexes. There are several cases when *s* does not undergo 'ruki' if the next syllable contains *ṣ*, cf. *ānu-spaṣṭa-*; *ānu-sésidhat-*; 2sg. *sisakṣi* (vs. 3sg. *sīsakṣi*, 3sg. impv. *sīsakṣi*, 2pl. impv. *sīsakṣi*); *sū-snuṣa-*, etc., which points to dissimilation *s...ṣ* > *s...s*. On the other hand, we find compounds like *svabhiṣṭi-ṣumna-*, *vakṣane-sthā-*, *carṣani-sāh-*, where the second *s* does not undergo 'ruki'. It is clear that dissimilation would have seriously distorted words like **svabhiṣṭi-ṣumna-*. The solution was not to apply 'ruki' to the second member of the compound.

²⁴ This etymological analysis has as a consequence that Av. *apa.hiḍat* (Yt 19.56) cannot belong with Skt. *apa-sidh-*, as was suggested by Humbach 1972: 987 (cf. also Hintze 1994: 286f). In that publication, Humbach convincingly argued that the unexplained loss of *ṣ* in Av. *niṣhidaiti* 'to sit down' < **niṣ(h)ṣidaiti* is due to dissimilation. Both in Avestan and OP, the finite forms of the root *ṣhad-* are only attested with the preverb *ni*. Therefore, he wanted to separate *apa.hiḍat* from *niṣhidaiti*. It is conceivable, however, that at Yt 19.56 (*taṣ x^aarəno apatacat, taṣ x^aarəno apa.hiḍat*), *apa.hiḍat* is a nonce formation with the preverb *apa* replacing *ni* under influence of the preceding *apatacat*.

²⁵ Cf. Leumann (1926-28: 136): "Unaufgeklärt, weil nur durch ein paar umstrittene Etymologien zu fassen, ist die lautgesetzliche Vertretung und Entwicklung von idg. *-ṣdh-* *-dṣdh-* und *-ddh-* bzw. *-d^hdh-*".

²⁶ The third reflex, viz. *-ss-* in words like *iussus* < **(H)indh-to-*, which only occurs at a morpheme boundary, is likely to be of a younger date, since these words were most probably formed in Proto-Italic.

²⁰ On a higher level, it is conceivable that *siazd-* is related to Skt. *śis-* and further to *śīyate* 'fall out' (cf. Kuiper 1934: 236f).

²¹ RV 1.32.13a, for a discussion of this form see Gotō 1987: 327, fn. 793.

²² AVŚ *syēdu-* 'mucus' (12.1.30b), also spelled *sēdu-* in the mss., must no doubt be emended to *sēhu-* 'id.' on the basis of the parallel AVP passage (17.3.10b), which has *sehrār* in Kashmir, and *sehu* in Orissa.

- (2) Lat. *vastus* 'wide, immensely large' (OIr. *fota* 'long', *foṭ*, *ful* 'length');
 (3) Lat. *custōs* 'guard' (Got. *huzd* 'treasure', Gr. *κεύθω* 'to hide');
 (4) Lat. *aestus* 'heat', *aestas* 'summer' (Gr. *αἶθω*).

The first two words have limited distribution and are likely to be loan-words from a European substrate, which is further indicated by the variation in the vocalism (-a- in *hasta* vs. -o- in Umbr. *hostatu* 'hastatos', *anostatu* 'non hastatos', Lat. *vastus* vs. OIr. *foṭ*) and in the consonantism (cf. also OIr. *gas* 'twig' < *-st-). At what stage these words entered the language and in which form is unknown, but they are irrelevant to the fate of PIE *ǵdʰ in Latin.

The connection of *custōs* with the Germanic words for 'treasure' as well as its derivation from the IE root for 'to hide' seem very doubtful to me. Szemerényi's suggestion (1952: 45ff) to derive both Latin and Germanic words from PIE *k(e)uǵdʰo- 'palace, treasure house, treasure' on account of Avestan *°kaoǵda-* is also unattractive.²⁷

As for *aestus*, *aestas* (which at any rate is a different case, representing a reflex of *-dʰ-t-), I would rather assume that in **aessus*, **aessas*, the -t- of the suffix was restored.

8. We may conclude that PIE *ǵdʰ yields Latin *d* with compensatory lengthening²⁸ and that PIIr. *ǵaǵdʰ- is likely to be connected with Lat. *cēdere*. The PIE root must then be reconstructed as **ǵiesdʰ-*. The structure of this root is admittedly quite unusual and may point to a compound²⁹, but further analysis must be reserved for another occasion.

References

- AiGr I = J. Wackernagel, 1896: *Altindische Grammatik. Band I. Lautlehre*. Göttingen.
 Altheim, F., 1949: "Zarathustra als Dichter". – *Paideuma* 3 (Heft 6/7): 257-278.
 Bartholomae, C., 1904: *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Straßburg.
 Bartholomae, GIP = Chr. Bartholomae, 1895-1901: *Grundriß der iranischen Philologie*, ed. by W. Geiger und E. Kuhn. Band I,1. Straßburg.
 Beekes, R.S.P., 1988: *A grammar of Gatha-Avestan*. Leiden.
 Cheung, J., forthcoming: *Die Sprache*.
 Geldner, K.F., 1896: *Avesta, the sacred books of the Parsis*, ed. by Karl F. Geldner. Stuttgart.

²⁷ The Avestan word is only attested at Yt 5.128 as the second member of the compound *ašta.kaoǵda-*, interpreted by Szemerényi as 'with eight turrets'. The compound is an epithet of the hapax *pusā-*, traditionally glossed as 'diadem', but taken by Szemerényi to mean 'crown', more specifically, a Roman corona muralis.

²⁸ Since the sound law -ǵdʰ > -st- is seen as "eines der stärksten Argumente dafür, daß die uridg. Mediae Aspiratae im Italischen zunächst als stimmlose Spiranten fortgesetzt wurden" (Meiser 1998: 119), the whole theory must probably be abandoned.

²⁹ Cf. Skt. *m(iy)édha-*, Av. *miāzda-* m. 'sacrificial meal' < **miesdʰ(h)o-* vs. Av. *mīzda-*, etc. < **misdʰ(h)o-*.

- Gershevitch, I., 1959: *The Avestan hymn to Mithra*. Cambridge.
 Henning, W.B. & D.N. MacKenzie, 1971: *A fragment of a Khwarezmian dictionary*, ed. by D.N. MacKenzie. London.
 Hintze, A., 1994: *Der Zamyād-Yašt: Edition, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. Wiesbaden.
 Hoffmann, K., 1975: *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik*, ed. J. Narten. Band 1. Wiesbaden.
 Hoffmann, K., 1976: *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik*, ed. J. Narten. Band 2. Wiesbaden.
 Hoffmann, K. & B. Forssman, 1996: *Avestische Laut- und Flexionslehre*. Innsbruck.
 Humbach, H., 1959: *Die Gathas des Zarathustra*. Band I: Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung, Paraphrase. Heidelberg.
 Humbach, H., 1972: Review of M. Mayrhofer, Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen, Lfg. 23. *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 93: 987.
 Humbach, H., 1991 I: *The Gāthās of Zarathushtra and the other Old Avestan texts*, in collaboration with Josef Elfenbein and Prods O. Skjærvø. Part I: Introduction – Text and translation. Heidelberg.
 Humbach, H., 1991 II: idem. Part II: Commentary. Heidelberg.
 Insler, St., 1975: *The Gāthās of Zarathustra* [= *Acta Iranica* 8]. Leiden.
 Kellens, J., 1984: *Le verbe avestique*. Wiesbaden.
 Kellens, J. & E. Pirart, 1988: *Les textes vieil-avestiques. Volume I: Introduction, texte et traduction*. Wiesbaden.
 Kellens, J. & E. Pirart, 1990: *Les textes vieil-avestiques. Volume II: Répertoires grammaticaux et lexique*. Wiesbaden.
 Kellens, J. & E. Pirart, 1988: *Les textes vieil-avestiques. Volume III: Commentaire*. Wiesbaden.
 Klingenschmitt, G., 1968: *Farhang-i-Ōim. Edition und Kommentar*. Dissertation Erlangen.
 Klingenschmitt, G., 1975: "Altindisch *śásvat-*". – *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 33: 67-78.
 Kuiper, F.B.J., 1934: "Zur Geschichte der indoiranischen s-Präsentia". – *Acta Orientalia* 12: 190-360.
 Kuiper, F.B.J., 1939: "Indo-Iranica 11-20". – *Acta Orientalia* 17: 17-64.
 Kuiper, F.B.J., 1997: *Selected writings on Indian linguistics and philology*, Edited by A. Lubotsky, M.S. Oort and M. Witzel. Amsterdam / Atlanta.
 Kulikov, L., 2001: *The Vedic -ya-presents*. PhD dissertation. Leiden.
 Leumann, M., 1926-28: *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*. München.
 Lubotsky, A., 1999: "Vedic roots of the type *TERDʰ-". – *Studia indogermanica Lodziana* 2: 75-81.
 Mayrhofer, EWAia: Manfred Mayrhofer, 1986-96: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoiranischen*. Heidelberg.
 Meiser, G., 1998: *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*. Darmstadt.
 Monna, M.C., 1978: *The Gathas of Zarathustra. A reconstruction of the text*. Amsterdam.
 Narten, J., 1964: *Die sigmatischen Aoriste im Veda*. Wiesbaden.
 Narten, J., 1986: *Der Yasna Haptahāiti*. Wiesbaden.
 Pirart, E., 1992: *Kayān Yasn (Yasht 19.9-96). L'origine avestique des dynasties mythiques d'Iran*. Barcelona.
 Samadi, M., 1986: *Das chwarezmische Verbum*. Wiesbaden.
 Schaefer, Chr., 1994: *Das Intensivum im Vedischen*. Göttingen.

- Schindler, J., 1982: "Zum Nom. Sing. m. der *nt*-Partizipien im Jungavestischen". – E. Neu (ed.): *Gedenkschrift H. Kronasser (Investigationes philologicae et comparativae)*. Wiesbaden: 186-209.
- Szemerényi, O., 1952: "The development of the Indo-European mediae aspiratae in Latin and Italic" 1-3. – *Archivum Linguisticum* 4: 27-53.
- de Vaan, M., 2002: *The Avestan vowels*. PhD dissertation. Leiden.
- Walde, A. & J.B. Hofmann, 1938-1954: *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 3., neubearbeitete Auflage von J.B. Hofmann. Heidelberg.
- Walde, A. & J. Pokorny, 1927-1932: *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*, herausgegeben und bearbeitet von Julius Pokorny. Berlin / Leipzig.