Avestan siiazd-, Sanskrit sedh-, Latin cedere

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

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

Alexander Lubotsky
Leiden University

1. There are only three forms which are currently attributed to the Avestan verb *siiaẑd-/ sīẑd-* 'to withdraw; to expel, banish'[1], viz. *-iia*-present participles act. *siẑdiiant-* (Yt 19.84), med. *sīẑdiiamna-* (Y 32.4), and 3sg. subj. aor. act. *siiaẑdaṭ* (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 imąm daēnąm āstaota*
  dušmainiium siẑdiiō ⁺daēuuą ⁺apašauuą[2]
  so that he (= Kavi Vīštāspa) pronounced for this religion, expelling the enemy, driving out the daēvas.

Y 32.4 *mašiiā ... vaxšəṇtē daēuuō.ẓuštā vaŋhōuš sīẑdiiamnā manaŋhō*
  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', *varẑ-* 'to work, accomplish' – are transitive in the active, and passive in the middle (participles 'thrown', 'asked', 'accomplished'). Two verbs (*vaxš-* 'to grow' and *uruuis-* 'to turn') are intransitive both in the active and in the middle, the middle forms being hapaxes (Vr 12.5 *fraoirisimna*, Yt 4.8 *uẓuxšiiamnō*), most probably of secondary origin.

It is clear that, if our interpretation of the forms is correct, *siiaẑd-* occupies a unique position. It does not belong to the group of the transitive verbs, since *sīẑdiiamnā* 'withdrawing' is not passive and since the adjective *sīẑdra-* '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 siẑdiiō daēuuąn apa.ašauuąn*. For the last two words cf. also Schindler 1982: 189, 208-9 and de Vaan 2002: 354f., who proposes to read *⁺daēuuō ⁺apašāuuaiią*.

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 *iia*-present would acquire a causative meaning simply by adding the active endings. These considerations make me believe that *siẓdiiō* stands for the causative participle *+siiaẓdaiiō*, which is confirmed by the manuscript readings J10 *šoẓdaiiō* and D *šoẓdaiiō*[4].

2. Now we can turn to the aorist. Y 34.9 *siiaẓdat* 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 *maz*- 'a great (one), master, chieftain', cf.

Y 34.9 *aēibiiō maš ašā siiaẓdat   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 infects (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 *iia*-present and a transitive root aorist is also found with the root *vaxš*-: *uxšiieiti* 'grows' vs. *vaxšt*, subj. *vaxšat* 'made grow, increased'.[5]

3.1. There is one more form, which, in my opinion, belongs to the aorist of *siiaẓd*-, viz. GAv. (Y 48.7) *siiōẓdūm*, as it was edited by Geldner. Bartholomae in his dictionary opted for *siiōdūm*[6], and this reading entered all subsequent publications, although Geldner's choice was most probably correct. Consider the variants given in Geldner's edition: *siiōẓdūm* J2; *siiaoẓdūm* J6, Jm1; *siaoẓdūm* P6; *siōždūm* J3; *siiaoždūm* J7, Jm2, Dh1, O2, S2, K10, L3; *siiaožḍəm* H1; *šiiaoždōm* L2; *šiiaoẓdūm* L13, B2; *šiiaoždūm* Jm3; *šiiaoẓḍəm* K11, C1; *siiaoẓḍəm* Lb2; *siiōdūm* 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 *ž*.

[4] *š* sometimes appears in the mss. for *sii*, cf. H 1.17 *fraoirišaiti* for *fraoirisiiaiti*. Note further that the mss. J10 and D constitute an independent line of the ms. stemma, cf. Geldner, Prolegomena xliv-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. *xraodat*, *xraodatī* 3sg. subj. root aor. 'make afraid, vex' vs. Skt. *krúdhyati* '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 *siiōdūm*, J2 *siiōẓdūm*;
2. Iranian Pahlavi-Yasna: Mf1, Pt4 *siiōdūm*;
3. Sanskrit-Yasna: J3 *sīōždūm*;

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

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

IV. Indian Yasna-Sāde: K11, C1 *šiiaoẓḍəm*; Lb2 *šiiaoẓḍəm*;
                          H1 *siiaoždəm*; J7 *siiaoždūm*; J6, Jm1 *siiaoẓdūm*;

Geldner's *siiōẓdūm* is attested only in J2, but -*ẓ*- or -*ž*- are found in several other groups of Indian mss. The *ž*-variants must be due to the influence of the present *siẓdiiate*. Since the reading *siiōdūm* is practically restricted to the Iranian mss. and since it is more probable that a letter was omitted[7], 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 aēšəmō nī diiātąm paitī rəməm paitī siiōẓdūm*, which stands for /*nī aišmah dyātām, pati ramam syaẓdvam*/[8]. The form *paitī siiōẓdūm* can be interpreted as 2pl. aor. impv. middle of *siiaẓd*-.[9] The passage can be translated: 'Let fury be stopped[10]! Banish violence (ye who try to attach yourselves to good thought)!' We do not know the exact bearing of the terms *aēšma*- and *rəma*-[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 *siiaẓd*- perfectly suits the context. The middle has the so-called "self-beneficient" function, i.e. 'away from yourselves' or 'in your own interest'. The transitive meaning of this aorist imperative confirms the transitive interpretation of *siiaẓdat*, discussed in § 2.

3.2. The reading *siiōdūm* /*syadvam*/, on the other hand, leads to insurmountable semantic difficulties. This form seems to be 2pl. impv. med. *iia*-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 *siiōdūm* with Skt. *sīyate*, which not only means 'to fall out', but "in

___

[7] Cf. for a parallel K5 *ϑβarō.dūm* (Y 29.1) vs. *ϑβarōždūm* 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 diiātąm* 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. *cēdere*, z.B. *atisīyate* 'herauskommen aus, verlassen, discedere', *upasīyate* 'hinzukommen, 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 *sī-* being 'to fall (down)'. Finally, according to the nowadays generally accepted analysis (Humbach, Insler, Kellens), √*sā-* 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 *paitī* 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. √*sā-* are doubtful, too. The only other finite form that has been attributed to this root[13] 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 *aϑā 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(-cīṭ)*. The passage is extremely difficult and is often left untranslated:

> *hamə̄m taṭ vahištācīṭ*   *yō ušuruiiē siiascīṭ dahmahiiā*
> *xšaiiąs mazdā ahurā*   *yehiiā mā aiϑiścīṭ duuaēϑā*
> *hiiaṭ aēnaŋhē drəguuatō*   *ə̄ə̄ānū iśiiə̄ŋg aŋhaiiā*

The form *siias(-cīṭ)* has never been explained in a satisfactory way[15]. 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 *(...)sānəm* and Yt 13.136 *frakərəstō.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. *sąs* '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 siiazjaiiōiṭ*[17]. Kuiper (1934: 237, cf. also Kellens 1984: 147) has proposed to emend F 25a *frasiiazjaiti* to †*frasiiazjaiieiti*, so that we are probably dealing with a single causative formation. Bartholomae has set up a separate root *(fra-)syazg-* 'propellere', 'fort-, verjagen' for these forms, but this root has no secure parallels either in Iranian, or outside.[18] The meaning of *frasiiazjaiieiti* is so close to that of *siiazd-* that Kuiper 1934: 236f. considered *siiazd-* and *siiazg-* parallel root enlargements. It is therefore tempting to consider *frasiiazjaiieiti* a corruption of †*frasiiazdaiieiti*, a causative to *siiazd-*, which we have already postulated for Yt 19.84[19].

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

present med. (intr.)	*siždiiamnā* 'withdrawing, flinching'
root aor.act. (trans.)	*siias* (?)
subj.	*siiazdaṭ* 'will chase away, expel'
impv. med.	*(paitī) siiōzdūm* 'banish!'
causative act.	†*frasiiazdaiiati*, †*siiazdaiiō* 'chase away'
[adj.	*siždra-* 'evasive, shy']

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

---

[16] Pahlavi translation *pr'c-spwcšnyh* 'to push, drive forward'.

[17] In the passage *auuaēžō* †*dim pascaēta fraca xraosiiōiṭ fraca siiazjaiiōiṭ* 'without (committing) any sin, he may then shout at him and drive him forward'.

[18] The often proposed connection with Skt. *śīghrá-* adj. (VS+) 'quick, swift' (cf. Kellens 1984: 147 with ref.) is unattractive. Also Russ. *sigát'* 'to jump' and OE *hīgian* 'to exert oneself, strive, hasten' can hardly be cognate. OE *hīgian* cannot be separated from Middle Dutch *hīgen*, 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* (< *ę*) in pretonic position, and is likely to derive from *sęgati (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 *frasiiaδjaiti*; in the Afrīngān, Geldner gives in his critical apparatus F2, K36, W1 *siiazjaiiōiṭ*, Lb5 *siiazjiiōiṭ*, K18, J15, P14 *saiiazaiiōiṭ*, L25 *frascaṭ.zaiiōiṭ*, Pt1, E1, Mb1.2, L11, O3 *fracaṣciṭ.zaiiōiṭ*, Jm4 *...ṭ.zaiiōiṭ*, L18 *fracaṭ.zaiiōiṭ* (*sci* appended sec.m.), K19, P13 †*frasciṭ.zaiiōiṭ*, L18, O3 *fracasciti.jaiiōiṭ*, deest J9, H2, L9.

over', but this etymology leaves the *-d(h)-* unaccounted for and is semantically not evident[20]. Humbach (1991 II: 111) compared *siiazd-* 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 agníḥ práti rákṣāṃsi sedhati* 'Agni chases all Rakṣases away', 6.47.29d *dūrád dáviyo ápa sedha śátrūn* 'chase away the enemies farther than far!', 1.105.11c *té sedhanti pathó vŕkam* 'they chase the wolf off the path'. Secondly, Skt. *sedh-* is used with the same preverbs as *siiazd-*, viz. *práti, prá, ápa* (cf. Chor. **apa-siẓdya-*), 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*, is-aor. *sedhīḥ*, pf. *siṣedha*[21], ŚB *niṣeddhŕ-, aniṣeddhrá-*, possibly AVŚ 1.18.4 *goṣedhá-* 'kine-repelling'. The zero-grade is attested in the intensive *anuśéṣidhat* (RV 1.23.15b), the attribution of which is not certain (see Schaefer 1994: 196f. for a discussion), and in *apasídhya* AVŚ 8.2.7. The *ta*-participle is found at ŚB 2.5.2.27 *niṣiddha-*, where it stands directly after *niṣeddhŕ-*, and otherwise only in the JB. Accordingly, it looks as if the zero-grade is secondary, which would be in conformity with the reconstruction **sazdh-*. 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 **sí-* (from PIIr. **ćí-*) 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 **sí-* is not without parallels in Sanskrit, cf. *sútra-* 'thread', *sūnā́-* 'basket' < **siū-*. Note further that word-initial *sye-* is unattested in Sanskrit.[22]

In order to account for Skt. *s-* instead of expected **ś-*, 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. *śuṣ-* 'to be dry' < **suṣ-*, *śváśura-* 'father-in-law' < **svas°*, *śmáśru-* 'beard' < **smas°*, etc. (AiGr. I: 224). Klingenschmitt (1975: 77, fn. 3) has shown that also non-initial *-s-* can be assimilated to the initial *ś-*, cf. *śaśá-* 'hare' < **sasa-*. In a root like **síazdh-*, it was hardly possible to assimilate *-ẓ-* to the initial *ś-*, because *-ẓ-* was "protected" by

the following dental *dh*. 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 *siiazd-* and to reconstruct PIIr. **ćiazdh-*.[24] A probable Indo-European cognate of this Indo-Iranian verb is Lat. *cēdere* 'to move, withdraw'. The etymology connecting Av. *siiazd-* 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 *abscēdō, concēdō*, 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. **ćiazdh-* with *-dh-*, we must shortly discuss the development of PIE **zdh* 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 **zdh* was considered uncertain[25], because next to the *-st-*reflex we also find *crēdō* < **krezd-* < **kred(s)-dheh₁-* (Skt. *śraddhá-*) and *audiō* < **auizd-* (Gr. ἀ(ϝ)ισθέσθαι) with *-d-* and compensatory lengthening[26]. 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');

---

[20]   On a higher level, it is conceivable that *siiazd-* is related to Skt. *śiṣ-* and further to *śiyate* '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 *syédu-* 'mucus' (12.1.30b), also spelled *sédu-* in the mss., must no doubt be emended to *séhu-* 'id.' on the basis of the parallel AVP passage (17.3.10b), which has *sehrār* in Kashmir, and *sehur* in Orissa.

---

[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. *ánu-spaṣṭa-; anu-séṣidhat-*; 2sg. *siṣakṣi* (vs. 3sg. *síṣakti*, 3sg. impv. *síṣaktu*, 2pl. impv. *siṣakta*); *sú-snuṣa-*, etc., which points to dissimilation *ṣ...ṣ > s...ṣ*. On the other hand, we find compounds like *svabhiṣṭí-sumna-, vakṣaṇe-sthā́-, carṣaṇí-sáh-*, where the second *s* does not undergo 'ruki'. It is clear that dissimilation would have seriously distorted words like **svabhiṣṭí-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.hiδaṭ* (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 *ẓ* in Av. *niśhiδaiti* 'to sit down' < **niś(h)iẓdati* is due to dissimilation. Both in Avestan and OP, the finite forms of the root √*had-* are only attested with the preverb *ni*. Therefore, he wanted to separate *apa.hiδaṭ* from *niśhiδaiti*. It is conceivable, however, that at Yt 19.56 (*taṭ xᵛarənō apatacaṭ, taṭ xᵛarənō apa.hiδaṭ*), *apa.hiδaṭ* is a nonce formation with the preverb *apa* replacing *ni* under influence of the preceding *apatacaṭ*.

[25]   Cf. Leumann (1926-28: 136): "Unaufgeklärt, weil nur durch ein paar umstrittene Etymologien zu fassen, ist die lautgesetzliche Vertretung und Entwicklung von idg. *-zdh- -dzdh-* und *-ddh-* bzw. *-dᶻdh-*".

[26]   The third reflex, viz. *-ss-* in words like *iussus* < **(H)iudh-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.

(2) Lat. *vastus* 'wide, immensely large' (OIr. *fota* 'long', *fot, fut* 'length');

(3) Lat. *custōs* 'guard' (Got. *huzd* 'treasure', Gr. κεύθω 'to hide');

(4) Lat. *aestus* 'heat', *aestas* 'summer' (Gr. αἴθω).

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. *fot*) 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 *$*zd^h$* 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 *$*k(e)uzd^ho$*- 'palace, treasure house, treasure' on account of Avestan °*kaožda*- is also unattractive.[27]

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

8. We may conclude that PIE *$*zd^h$* yields Latin *d* with compensatory lengthening[28] and that PIIr. *$*ĉjazd^h$*- is likely to be connected with Lat. *cēdere*. The PIE root must then be reconstructed as *$*ĉiesd^h$*-. The structure of this root is admittedly quite unusual and may point to a compound[29], 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.

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-Ōīm. Edition und Kommentar.* Dissertation Erlangen.

Klingenschmitt, G., 1975: "Altindisch *śāśvat-*". – *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 *TERD^h-*". – *Studia indogermanica Lodziensia* 2: 75-81.

Mayrhofer, EWAia: Manfred Mayrhofer, 1986-96: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen.* 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 Haptaŋhāiti.* Wiesbaden.

Pirart, E., 1992: *Kayān Yasn (Yasht 19.9-96). L'origine avestique des dynasties mythiques d'Iran.* Barcelona.

Samadi, M., 1986 : *Das chwaresmische Verbum.* Wiesbaden.

Schaefer, Chr., 1994: *Das Intensivum im Vedischen.* Göttingen.

---

[27] The Avestan word is only attested at Yt 5.128 as the second member of the compound *ašta.kaožda*-, 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 -*zd^h*- > -*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. *miiazda*- m. 'sacrificial meal' < *$*miesd^h(h_1)o$*- vs. Av. *mižda*-, etc. < *$*misd^h(h_1)o$*-.

Schindler, J., 1982: "Zum Nom. Sing. m. der *nt*-Partizipien im Jungavestischen". – E.
    Neu (ed.): *Gedenkschrift H. Kronasser (Investigationes philologicae et comparativae)*. Wies-
    baden: 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., neubear-
    beitete 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.