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The first opportunity to formulate the ideas analyzed in details in this article was against background of Sprachwissenschaftliches Kolloquium organized by Prof. Stefan Zimmer at the Institute for Linguistics of the Bonn University in December 1998. The first published version appeared as a chapter of the special monograph analyzing the systems of numerals in various language families (Blážek 1999: 234–45). Most particular chapters of this monograph were published as independent articles before the summary publication in the book (cf. the overview in Blážek 1999: 337 and further Blážek 1999 a-f). This strategy allowed to correct and revised the original versions or at least to supplement the references. The independent publication of the innovated version of Indo-European ‘six’ follows this ‘tradition’ and reacts to the most recent studies connected with this topic, especially Viredaz 1997. That is why the part devoted to the Indo-Iranian data playing a crucial role is most expanded. The second reason for the separate publication consists in the fact that ca. 55% of the book refer to the Indo-European numerals. This solution gives chance to divide the parts devoted to the numerals of the non-Indo-European and Indo-European languages and to complete the latter ones.

§1. The numeral “6” belongs to the most complex etymons in Indo-European lexicon, although it is apparently common to all branches of the Indo-European language family, with exception of the Anatolian branch where we know only the symbolic records of this numeral till the present time (there is a certain hope in analysis of the old Anatolian metrology). The attested forms can be projected into the following partial reconstructions, allowing their deeper analysis. Let us add that the symbol *K means an unspecified velar; the brackets [...] signalize an uncertain reconstruction; the brackets (...) indicate an alternative reconstruction.

Indo-Iranian:

*Ksweks “6” > Indo-Iranian *kšwacš is best preserved in Avestan xšuuaš, cf.
also \textit{xšuuažaiia} “six times” (Videvdat 8.17). The other forms represent various grades of simplification:

Indo-Aryan \[\text{*}[k]s(w)acś > \text{Old Indic āt /sas-} (-t as in\textit{vīt} < \text{*vīts} < \text{*wīkś}),\]

Aśokan (Kālsī rock inscription) loc. pl. \textit{saśu}, Palestinian Gypsy \textit{ṣas}, Kandi (Dardic) \textit{ṣa}, Shina \textit{ṣa(h)}, Kashmiri \textit{ṣē}, Western Pahari \textit{ṣāh} etc.

Indo-Aryan \[\text{*}[k]sacś > \text{*ksad} > \text{Pali \textit{cha}},\]


Indo-Iranian \[\text{*}[k]swacś > \text{Dardic *suvaś > Prasun uṣū, wusu, Shina ṣva, Wai­gali, Kati ṣū, Ashkun ṣu, Dameli ṣō, Wotapuri ṣō, Maiya ṣōh etc.},\]

Gypsy (European) \textit{ɕov} (< Dardic; cf. Viredaz 1997: 128); Parthian \textit{ṣwθ}, Pashto \textit{spáz}, Ormuri ṣū, Parachi \textit{xī / xu} (Viredaz 1997: 128 derived Ormuri & Parachi forms from a common protoform \[\text{*xšuwa resembling the Dardic counterparts more than the Iranian ones}).\]

Iranian dial. \[\text{*kwačś-} > \text{Sogdian (Christian) xwśw, (Buddhist)}\]

\textit{wṛwśw}, Yaghnobi \textit{uxś}, Yidgha \textit{uxšo}, Munjan \textit{āxša}, Shugni \textit{xōy}, Sanglechi-\textit{Ishkashimi xual}, Sarikoli \textit{xel}, Yazgulami \textit{xu(w)} etc.

\[\text{*Kṣuks-ton-} “6th” > \text{Iranian *xšuśta -} > \text{Avestan xštūua-} (cf. Hoffmann 1965: 254; \text{*u-vocalism after Avestan puxda- “5th”?; Szemerényi 1960: 77, fn. 46 re­constructed *xšvaśta -} > \text{xšaśtva -} > \text{xštūua-}; or from \text{*śta- as well as xšma- < \text{*šma-}, cf. Hoffmann & Forssman 1996: 103}).\]

\[\text{*Ksweks-ton(H₂)-} “6th” > \text{*ks(w)acś-t(H)a-} > \text{Old Indic (AV) sastha-}, Pali \textit{chaṭṭha}, Hindi \textit{chāṭṭhā} (*a-vocalism under the influence of Old Indic pakthā -“5th”).\]

\[\text{*Ksweks-mo-} “6th” > \text{*ks(w)acś-ma-} > \text{Pali chaṭṭhama}, Marathi \textit{chāṭham(a)}, Hindi \textit{chāṭwā; etc.; Khotanese kṣeiˈma, Buddha­stic Sogdian wṛšmy(k), Parthian}\]
pani(k)ti- "a group of five”) > Old Indic śaṣṭi, Pali saṭṭhi, Hindi sāṭh etc.; Iranian *xรว-ṣati > Avestan xšuwaštī-, Khotanese kṣaṣṭā, Khwarezmian ʾyc, Ossetic əxsai (*xsac / *xsaz), Ormuri šūṣtu, Pashto šēta, Parthian šēt, Zoroastrian Pahlavi and Modern Persian šast etc. With respect to the numeral "16" where the cluster *.š-~d..is convincingly demonstrated, there are no traces of -d- in the reflexes of the numeral “60”. It could be one of arguments for the possibility (i).


Anatolian:


(Eichner 1992: 83)

So far the real form of the numeral “6” in Anatolian is unknown. There are only hypothetical possibilities to interpret similar forms in some non-IE languages as probable borrowings from an Anatolian source:

(a) Hurrian šeeše “6” (graph. še-e-ši-e) (Wilhelm, Orientalia 61 [1992]: 134); there are several probable IE / Anatolian borrowings in Hurro–Urartean (Gamkrelidze & Ivanov 1984: 883). On the other hand, a borrowing from Akkadian ši/eššum “6” looks more convincingly (Neu 1989: 298, fn. 12).

(b) Kartvelian *eksšw- “6” has been compared with IE “6” beginning with F. Bopp (1847). Now it is generally accepted that *eksšw- represents a borrowing from some IE source (Klimov 1967: 308 and 1991: 331).

Considering that there are some mutual borrowings between Kartvelian and Anatolian (Gamkrelidze & Ivanov 1984: 897–898), the latter could belong to the candidates for the donor language - besides Armenian and Indo-Aryan or even Indo-Iranian. The Indo-Aryan / Iranian candidature can be supported by the exact correspondence in the initial cluster *Kšw- / *(-)kšw- and independently by the Kartvelian *o(š)xo- “4” (Klimov 1977: 162–163), remarkably corresponding exactly to Indo-Iranian *acta- (giving in dual “8”), reconstructed on the basis of Av ašti- “four fingers breadth” (Henning 1948: 69).

(c) Etruscan ša has been usually translated as “4” (cf. e.g. Bonfate 1983: 78–79), although there are serious arguments preferring that it means “6”, e.g. the lowest frequency of the numeral “6” in confrontation with “4” and “5” in various languages, corresponding with the lowest frequency of ša within the triad huθ, maχ, ša representing the numerals “4”, “5”, “6” regardless of the concrete values (Mańczak 1983: 103–05), or with the results of the statistical analysis of the age of death, documenting the correlation between the highest frequency of
death of quinquagenerians and the numeral *muvalχ*, hence “50”, while the second position occupied by sexagenerians indicates the value “60” for *sealχ*, the second most frequent numeral expressing age (Stoltenberg). On the other hand there is an important evidence supporting the identification of the value “4” with the numeral *hub*, cf. the witness of Stephanus Byzantius. Αὐτῇ (ἡ Αὔτικὴ Τετράπολις) πρῶτον ἐκκαλεῖτο Ἡττηνία (see OStir 1921: 34; cf. the discussion of Vetter, Sprache 8 [1962]: 133f). If we accept the meaning “6” for Etruscan *σα*, it is legitimate to think about possible relations to its Indo-European counterparts. It is evident that among the known forms there are no outstanding resemblances. And so independently on the interpretation of the Etruscan-Anatolian relations (cultural / areal / genetic) the unknown Anatolian forms offer a certain chance.

But there is also a possibility of an internal evidence, namely in Hittite metrology. There are the following length units: *gipessar* (“ell”) ≡ 2 *sekan-“span”*) = 12 *waksur*. It means that *waksur* represents one sixth of *sekan-*. On the other hand, the term *waksur* also served as a measure of capacity and even of time (Friedrich 1952: 110, 189, 242; Hoffner 1967: 57–58). This polyfunctionality would be natural, if *waksur* was derived from the numeral “6” or its fraction 1/6 (< *weKS-wr*?) as Latin *sextarius*.

These thoughts are tempting, but they remain on the level of mere speculations.

Armenian:

*swēκs “6” > *-hwec‘ > Armenian vec‘ (medially and in sandhi Armenian v can be derived from *sw, cf. Hamp 1978: 84–85; Viredaz 1997: 115 derived it from Sievers-Lindeman’s variant *suweKS*).

*swēκs-[d]kontH2 “60” >> Armenian *vat’sown* (Viredaz 1997: 116 mentioned the same cluster in owt’sown “80”); the numeral *veštasan “16” with the apparently different medial cluster reflects another development - Huld (1997: 129) derived it from a metathesized form *..wesk-dekam > *weš-decam > *weš-
Viredaz (1997: 137) proposed a corruption of the manuscript, offering the emendation *ξέστις < *ἐξέ-στις = Ionian-Attic ἐξά-στιχος. Concerning ξέστις “measure of capacity” and its correspondence to Latin sextārius — see Chantraine 3: 765.

*swek-to- “6th” > Dorian (Crete) fέκτος, Homeric etc. ἔκτος (the expected *-kst- should have resulted in *-χθ-).

*sweks-[d]kontH₂ > *sweksHkontH₂ > *wheksēkonta > ἕξηκοντα (Argive, Laconian) or ἕξηκοντα (the length from πέντηκοντα < *penkwHkontH₂ - see Kortlandt 1983: 98f).

(Chantraine 2: 353; Lejeune 1972: 134–135; Schwyzer 1939: 590, 592)

Illyrian (?):
*seks-to- > *sesto- > Sestus (personal name)
(Hamp 1961: 52)

Albanian:
*seks-ti- f. “6” > *sēs-tā > *g’yiaësta > gjashtë.

Venetic (?):
*sek-to- > *seko- + *-yō(n) > Se.g.tio ‘Sextius’ (personal name from the vase from Cadore).

(Lejeune 1974: 101, 142, 230; cf. also Szemerényi 1960: 77–78, fn. 48, who used the older transcription Se.x.tio. Viredaz 1997: 143–44 would prefer to see a Latin borrowing in this name, referring to other borrowed personal names derived from Latin ordinals: Qvartio, Kvito)

Italic:
*seks “6” > *seks > Latin sex, Oscan *sehs in sehсимбрия “born in the sixth month” < *seksembrios, cf. Latin September < *septumo-mēns-ri-.

*seks-to- “6th” > *seks-to- > Latin sextus, cf. the proper name Sestius, Oscan Σεστίες; Umbrian sestensasiarw (Ig. 3.2) “sextentariārum, bi-monthly”, i.e. “1/6-yearly” < *sekstent-āsia-som (Hamp 1978: 86). Meiser (1986: 170, fn. 2) mentions the remarkable Etruscan anthroponyms SESTCNA, -NEI, -NAL, SESUC-TUNA, -NAS, SESCATNA, borrowed from a source of the type of Latin Sextius (with a regular substitution of the gentilic suffix -ius by Etruscan -na), besides SEKSTALUS, SECTINAL or SECTUMINAS; the latter form represents a borrowing of *Sextimius formed after Septimius.

*sweks-[d]kēt(e)H₂ “60” > *sweks[e]genta > sexāginta (ā according to quadrāginta; i from uēginti).
(Coleman 1992: 395, 401, 411, 426)

Celtic:
*sweks “6” > *sweks > Old Irish sé h- (gen. sé N), cf. seiss-er “6 men” (-er < fer < *wīros), mór-fess-er “7 men” = “an increased six men” (cf. Old Indic
mahāpaṭkti- “seven verse line”, lit. “big five” - see Greene 1992: 517–518 < Watkins), Welsh chwe & chwech (< *swekse with *-e after *penkw’e), Cornish whe & whegh, Breton (Old) hue, (Middle) huech, (Modern) c’houec’h;

? Hispano-Celtic (Botorrita) ūnex (Eska 1989: 102–103; rejected by Meid 1993: 116–117); cf. Gaulish proper names Ūnēσ-τάσιον (Ptolemy, Geogr. 2.6.64), Suessiones (Caesar, BGall 2.3.4.) etc.

*sweks-o- “6th” > *sweksos > Gaulish (La Graufesenque) suexos (Vendryes, BSL 25 [1925]: 37; Meillet, BSL 29 [1928]: 34; Hirunuma 1988: 43 admitted a shortening from *suexetos).

*sweks-eto- “6th” > *sweksetos > Hispano-Celtic *suesset- (tribal name Suessetani - see Schmoll 1959: 48; he also quoted the personal name Setus derivable from Celtic *sextos < *sektos); Old Irish sessed; Welsh chweched besides *sweksametos > Cornish wheffes, Breton c’houec’hvet (remodelled after *sextametos “7th” and *dekametos “10th”).

*sweksu/a-[d]kont- “60” > *sweksu/a-kont- > *sessu/a-kont- > Old Irish sesca, gen. sescot & sescat, dat. sescait.


Germanic:

*seks “6” > *seχs > Gothic saihs, Crimean Gothic seis; Old Icelandic sex; Old Saxon sehs, ses, Old High German sehs etc.

*sek(s)-to- “6th” > *seχsta- > Gothic saihsta, Old Saxon sehsta/o, Old Icelandic sexti, Norwegian sekste etc., besides *seχta- > Old High German sēhto, Old Icelandic sétti (cf. sētt “Sechzahl”).


Balto-Slavic:

*[K]s[w]eks “6” > *[K]seš > *šeš > Lithuanian šeši, Latvian seši (Latvian -š- < *-sj-, cf. Stang 1966: 278); Yatvingian sziasz (Zinkevičius 1984: 18–18); Common Slavic *šesť (with the abstract suffix *-ti- or remodelled according to
*([K]s)uks-to- “6th” > *([K]š)ušta- > *uš(a)s = Old Prussian m. vschts & wuschts, f. uschtai, acc. vschtai. In u-, Pedersen, IF 5[1895]: 86 saw a prothetic vowel, reconstructing the starting point *š̂tas. Stang (1966: 279) admitted both the protoforms *uktos and *uktos, the latter with the dissimilative loss of expected *s-, while -š has been explain as the reflex of *-sj- expected in an unattested cardinal, cf. Lithuanian nom. f. šešios (Stang l.c.; Comrie 1992: 755)

*[K]s[w]eks-to- “6th” > Lithuanian šėštas, Latvian šestašs (derived from the cardinals); Old Church Slavonic šestu, Bulgarian šesti, Slovak šiesta, Czech šestý, Polabian seštu, Polish szósty, Russian šestój etc.

(Comrie 1992: 755; Smoczyński 1989: 73–77; Szemerényi 1960: 111 reconstructed the development *(k)seks “6” > Slavic **še and *(k)sektos “6th” > Slavic *šestu, thus demonstrating the influence of the ordinal on the remodelling of the cardinal)

Tocharian:

*s[w]eks “6” > Common Tocharian *šakas > A šák(k), B škas(s), škass-o, škās(s).

*s[w]eks-to- “6th” > Common Tocharian *šakastV > A šāst, B škaste & škāste.


§2. Reconstruction:

There are various attempts to reconstruct the original protoform. The following reconstructions represent the minimum (1) and the maximum (5) forms and their compromise (2) together with their laryngealistic (3) or lateral sibilant (4) reinterpretations:

(1) cardinal *weks vs. ordinal *ukso- (Szemerényi 1960: 78 with lit.; Beekes 1990: 255);

(2) *sweks (Brugmann 1892: 476 besides other possibilities; Mayrhofer 1986: 168 quoting also Sievers-Lindeman’s variant *suweks; Viredaz 1997: 112–50);

(3) *sHeks (Erhart 1970: 97–99);

(4) *sekⁿ > *swekⁿ (Gamkrelidze & Ivanov 1984: 845, 849);

(5) *ksweks (Hamp 1978: 87; cf. already Vaillant, BSL 44/2 [1947–48]: 129) or *ksweks (Fay 1910: 419)

§3. Etymology:

There are some rather outdated etymological attempts; their value is only historical:

(i) Stewart (1906: 242) derived the numeral “6” from the root *sekb- “to
overcome" etc. Semantically it is acceptable, but this solution does not explain the presence of *w at least in some dialects and the fact that the cluster *g's continues in Avestan ż, cf. vazānti “sie ziehen” vs. aor. uz-ushat “fahren”, and further Old Indic váhati “drives, rides, guides” vs. aor. conj. vakṣati, Greek (Pamphylian) fexéto “soll bringen” vs. aor. conj. (Cypriote) ἐφεξέ (Mayrhofer KEWA III: 178 and 1989: 9).

(ii) Fay (1910: 419) reconstructed *ksweks, but he based his analysis on the ordinal *kswekstho- < *ksu-eks-stHo- "co-ex-stans", cf. Greek ήτον "co-", Latin ex “out”. It was supposed to designate ‘the second thumb’. But the author himself admitted that ex originated from *eg's (cf. Greek Locr. ἐκθός).

Let us analyze the etymologies implied by the reconstructions collected in §2:

(a) Probably the most popular etymology derives the numeral “6” from the root *H₂weks- “to grow, increase” (Old Indic vakṣ- & ukṣ-, Avestan vaxš- & uxš-, Greek ἀέξω), consequently “6” = “the increase” after the first “hand” (Szemerényi 1960: 79, fn. 55; the first proponent of this solution was probably A. Nehring in his course given in Wintersemester 1928–29). Semantically it is fully acceptable, cf. e.g. Beja (Cushitic) asa-gwol/r “6” vs. gal/r “1” where asa-forms the numerals 6–9. Reinisch (1894: 7, § 145b) interpreted it as a participle of the verb as- "to be/become/go up". Similarly Dravidian *cārū “6” can be analyzed in *cāl-tu where *-tu is the neuter marker and the root proper corresponds with *cāl- “to be abundant, full, enough” (Andronov 1978: 245) or Umbundu (Bantu) epandu “6” vs. panda “to proceed, advance, approach” etc. (Hoffmann 1952–53: 65). But there are phonological problems. If we accept the Greek example, traces of the initial laryngeal *H₂- > Greek α- (Beekes 1969: 89) would be also expected in the case of the numeral “6” (**)α[ʃ]eξ?). Indo-Iranian and Balto-Slavic examples indicate unambiguously the satem reflexes of *-ks differing from the velar in *H₂weks-, orig. *H₂wegs-, cf. another apophonic grade *H₂eug- > Latin augeō, Gothic aukan, Lithuanian augtį etc. (Beekes 1969: 89). Both discrepancies imply an incompatibility of *(s)weks and *H₂weks- < *H₂wegs-.
if the development *sip-weks “one grows” > *swweks > *sweks is possible. But it cannot be proved. Maybe a better solution is the compound of *sêms / *sôms & *weks, reinterpreted as *sêm / *sôm & sweks “growing [up] all” = “6”. Finally, the demonstrative stem *so- could also represent the first member of the syntagm *s(o)-weks “that grows” or sim., but all these speculations remain doubtful.

(b) Erhart (1970: 97–99) reconstructed two basic variants which differ only in the order of their components:

*ks-H“e “3 x 2” and *H“e-ks “2 x 3”

supposing their mutual contamination or even a merger in their later development. A similar multiplicative principle is rather rare; a good example can be Yukaghir (Kolyma) ya’loi “3” vs. ma’lyiyalo “6” where the first component corresponds with malgyur “on both sides” (Tundra dialect) (Jochelson 1905: 113; Krejnovič 1982: 114–117). The weakest point of this elegant hypothesis is that the meaning “3” of the component *kes- is not attested.

(c) The lateral sibilant *s- hypothesized by Gamkrelidze & Ivanov 1984: 845, 849 on the basis of the fluctuation *sw/*s/*w opens an unexpected solution: a borrowing from a source related to North-West Caucasian (= Abkhazo-Adygean) *sôxcə > Abaza c-, Abxaz f-, Ubykh fə, Circassian xa “6” (Colorusso 1994: 17, #76). Let us mention that Nikolaev & Starostin (1994: 219) reconstructed *Χ“V. In this connection Kartvelian *eksw- “six” (Gamkrelidze & Ivanov 1984: 878) analyzed above should also be mentioned. It is probably a borrowing from an early Indo-European dialect (Klimov 1967: 308; Id. 1991: 331).

(d) Sometimes the most complex reconstruction *Ksweks raises fears by its monstrosity (Winter 1992a: 14). But there are further similar creatures among IE etymons, e.g. “tear”, “tongue” etc., successfully analyzable as original compounds. Let us try to analyze our *Ksweks in a similar way. Accepting the identification of the component *weks with the root *weks- “to grow” as discussed above (a), it is natural to seek the sense of the first component *Ks-.

Probably the first who speculated about “6” as the compoud “hand” & “increase”, was Merlingen (1958: 50, 67), reconstructing *xes-weks. His assumption, from the viewpoint of semantics undoubtedly plausible, was very sharply criticized (Szemerényi 1960: 79, fn. 55 “M’s extravagant assumptions are not helpful”; cf. also Nehring 1962: 129). Their criticism is certainly justified concerning the first component *xes- postulated by Merlingen. It is really a pure invention without any comparative etymological basis. The same can be said about his comparison of *xes- with Akkadian ḫamšu, ḫaššu etc. “5”. His last example - Hittite kessar “hand” - is more promising, although it cannot be derived from any *xes-. The generally accepted etymology connects Hittite kessar with Luwian issari, Lycian izri, Armenian jefn, Greek χείρ, Latin (h)ūr “hohle Hand”, Tocharian A tsar, B sar < *gh es-ř-öl and Old Indic hāsta-, Avestan zasta- etc. < *gʰes-to-. The hypothetical compound would have had the form *gʰ(es)-weks. If we accept the loss of the initial velar, a “compromise” protoform (2) appears. But there is also *K reconstructible in Indo-Iranian, Greek and perhaps Balto-Slavic (if the traces of the initial velar were not caused
1. by the influence of *k* of the preceding numeral *penk*e “5” in sandhi). The reduced group *g*s would really give Indo-Aryan *ks* and Greek ξ [κς], cf. Old Indic váhati “drives, rides, guides” : aor. conj. vakṣati and Greek (Pamphylian) ἐφέξετο “soll bringen” : aor. (Cypr.) ἑφέξε (KEWA III: 178). The situation in Iranian is more problematic. The initial cluster preserved in Av x只是一个 perhaps Greek ξ can probably reflect only *ks* (Beekes 1988: 79), while *ks* changes in Avestan ξ (Beekes 1997: 10). On the other hand, *gs* gives regularly Avestan ᾱ, cf. aor. uz-uuαζατ “fahren” (Mayrhofer 1989: 9; but secondary also ξ, e.g. vašata “er wird fahren” - see Hoffmann & Forssman 1996: 96). It is not accidental that ξ is practically absent in the initial position. Bartholomae (1904: 1717) quoted only ᾱgar- “to flow” - a variant of γαρ- id., besides ᾱναυu- & ᾱνu- “knee” with a variant (x)ᾱναuu- and ᾱναταr “knower” - a derivative of xᾱνα- “to get to know” - in both cases x- is prothetic before the cluster -ᾱνu- (Beekes 1997: 11). A similar tendency probably appears before the cluster (-)ᾱm-: xᾱmα- “euch” < *ᾱmα- (Hoffmann 1965: 254). The absence of the initial cluster *ᾱuυ* in confrontation with the well documented cluster xᾱuu would imply that also here x- is prothetic (cf. Viredaz 1997: 132 concerning the general rule *SC- > *xSC- in Avestan). Sometimes there could also have been two variants **ᾱvας & xᾱuuας and the latter has eliminated the former.

Finally, the assumed starting point *gs*-weκs could also have changed into *ksweκs continuing in (some) historical records, via palatal dissimilation through *gsweκs, in agreement with the rule not allowing the presence of the identical consonants in the same root / stem (Gamkrelidze & Ivanov 1984: 18, 96-98). The change *gs* > Avestan xᾱ (and Old Indic kς) is documented, cf. gah- “to eat” vs. reduplicated perf. jaxᾱ- (Hoffman & Forssman 1996: 234).

§4. External parallels:

There were also attempts to find external parallels. Some of them are discussed above (see the Anatolian section). They probably represent Indo-European borrowings in some neighboring languages. It remains to analyze the
playing a crucial role thanks to rich and diverse data, the following scenarios are plausible: (i) *g* slices via palatal dissimilation *g* slices > Indo-Iranian *kšvačš* > Iranian *xšwaš* and Indo-Aryan *(k)swards*; (ii) *g* slices > Indo-Iranian *pšvačš* > Iranian *žwačš* > Avestan *žuwāš* ~ *xšuwāš* (Hoffmann & Forssman 1996: 103 reject the development *kš* > Avestan *xš*, but the variants *kš*- ~ *xš*- also imply the variant *xš*- where *C* = *y*, cf. Hoffmann & Forssman 1996: 102-03; see also above); (iii) *g* slices > *sweks* > Indo-Iranian *swadš* assimilated in *svačš* > Iranian *xšwaš* (with the prothetic *x*- in agreement with the rule *kš*- > *xš*- , see above) and Indo-Aryan *(s)vaš* . These solutions are ordered according to degressive probability.
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