

Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft

Im Auftrage
des Münchener Sprachwissenschaftlichen
Studienkreises

herausgegeben von
Daniel Kölligan, Norbert Oettinger und Stefan Schaffner



Heft 76/1 – 2024 [2025]
J.H. Röll

Bibliografische Information Der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über: <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar

© 2025 Verlag J.H. Röll GmbH, Dettelbach

Alle Rechte vorbehalten. Vervielfältigungen aller Art, auch auszugsweise, bedürfen der Zustimmung des Verlages.
Gedruckt auf chlorfreiem, alterungsbeständigem Papier.
Gesamtherstellung: Verlag J.H. Röll GmbH

Printed in Germany
ISSN 0077-1910

Inhalt

GIULIO IMBERCIADORI

Rereading the Tocharian Reed: On B *karwa/o**,
A **kru* and the PIE root **k^hreuh_{2/3}-* ‘be(come) hollow’ 7

SERGIO NERI

Alb. *burrë* ‚(Ehe-)Mann‘: Ein etymologischer Versuch 39

NORBERT OETTINGER

Zu Form und Funktion des “*u*-Präsens”
im Anatolischen und Indogermanischen 97

MARTIN SCHWARTZ

√**ksen-*, **ksenu-*, √**ksn(e)u-*, √*xšn(a)u-*:
Indo-European Reciprocity and its Gathic Iconicity 111

MARTIN SCHWARTZ

√*ksen-, *ksenu-, √*ksn(e)u-, √xšn(a)u-: Indo-European Reciprocity and its Gathic Iconicity

Abstract: Avestan √xšna(u), conventionally translated as ‘to satisfy’ has lacked an etymology. It will be shown that this verb means *‘to reciprocate’ > ‘engage in a gift-exchange relationship in hospitality, patronage, or cult’. It corresponds in its underlying sense to the Archaic Greek noun *ksenwo-s, for which etymologies from words for ‘eating’, or attribution to a substrate language, must be rejected. The Avestan and Greek words will be connected via a Proto-Indo-European root *ksen pertaining to exchange and mutuality, for which further evidence will be provided. Cognates of the Avestan form within Indo-Iranian will be discussed, and the gestalt of the Old Avestan Yasna 46 will be set forth to illustrate how this hymn compositionally brings out the idea of exchange.

1.1 Over the course of several articles (Schwartz 1982, 1985, 1990, 2003) I set forth an etymological comparison of the Iranian root xšn(a)u and Greek *ξένυφος (> ξένος, ξένος), neither of which had a convincing etymology; I gave an account of their ultimate linguistic background, and discussed related words of their semantic field. It now must be preliminarily stressed that the Iranian root had been inadequately rendered ‘satisfy’ (which can mean variously ‘to be sufficient, satiate, redress so as to placate’, etc.), but instead specifies an action of reciprocity: most importantly an exchange of gifts or benefits, gratification of expectations, *quid pro quo* propitiation, and the relationship of hospitality/patronage and its parallel in *cultus*. The Greek nouns (and their derivatives), in the most archaic attestations, referred to either of the two parties in a hospitality or cultic equivalent, again involving the model of an exchange. The Irano-Greek semantic overlap points to an underlying term of reciprocity, verbal in the Iranian and nominal in the Greek.

2.1 As for the ultimate origin, I posit a Proto-Indo-European root **ksen*¹ ‘give one thing for another, exchange, be/put in mutuality’ for three words of previously obscure origin: Ossetic *æxsæn* (*xsæn*) ‘allgemein, gemeinschaftlich’ (V. Miller), in the middle (of) ‘(*positioned in a mutuality, bridging things which are in common’), cf. *æxsæny læg* ‘mediator, go-between’ (*læg* ‘man’), *æxsæny* ‘held in common, communal’, *æxsænad* ‘community’. In all of these the idea of mutuality (>commonality) rests on exchange.

2.2 Old Avestan *xšqnmānē* ‘instead, in substitution’: In Y 29.8-9, in which the Cow’s Soul complains against the divine entities’ finding Zarthustra as her protector and Their allotting ‘vocal sweetness’ to him, ‘who wishes to sing hymns of praise’ for them. (Y 28.9a”-c) ‘(Whereas) I wish for him who has vigorous power, I (am one who) have succeeded (in obtaining) (*rādām*) instead (*xšqnmānē*) someone vigorless, (and) the voice of a strengthless man; who will there ever be, who will give manual might?’. The clear set of contrasts, including the reported wishes (*vas-*) and the Cow’s Soul having gotten (*rādām*, verb, not noun) something else in place of what it wanted, supports ‘instead’ as translation of *xšqnmānē*, for which the usual translation ‘(that I have) to tolerate’, cf. Vedic root *kṣam*ⁱ, is contradicted by Pashto *zyaməl* ‘to tolerate’ reflecting an Indo-Iranian root with initial voiced cluster.² From *xšqnmānē* one obtains an Old Iranian noun /xšanman-/ ‘one thing in place of another, exchange’.³

2.3 Parallel to the dative *xšqnmānē* for exchange = ‘instead’ is Old Irish *ar son* ‘instead’, from *ar* ‘for’ and *son* ‘exchange’ < PIE **ksono-*. [Although most dictionaries for *ar son* define the phrase only as ‘for the

1 I now abandon my earlier reconstruction (in Schwartz 1982) of the root as having voiceless labiovelar initial.

2 See Burrow 1954: 5 in detail, with suggestion of a PIE etymon **/sgh-em/*.

3 The latest study of *xšqnmānē*, Garcia-Ramón 2009, operates with the assumption of an infinitive etymologically related to the Vedic root ‘to tolerate’.

sake of, on account of, because of’, the Dictionary of the Irish Language (digital version of the *Royal Irish Academy Dictionary of the Irish Language*, pp. R-S-341-2), gives the latter meanings after the entry’s first three definitions, for which it supplies numerous early attestations: (a) ‘Instead of, in place of’, and (b) ‘by way of, for, like’, and (c) in requital for, in return for’. The *Lexique étymologique de l’irlandais ancien*, R-S (1974), has under **1 son** m. “son, voix, mot” et “motif” compares, via ‘cause’, Welsh *hon* in *pa hon* “par quel moyen” as recalling the Irish phrase in its causal sense, and remarks that possibly therefore the Irish *son* brings together two words, one indigenous and the other borrowed from Latin *sonus* ‘sound’ (which, I add, is usually given as the source of *son* in *ar son*); it is, I conclude, an indigenous Celtic word which we find in the latter Irish phrase and its Welsh cognate, representing PIE **ksono-* ‘exchange’ > ‘substitution’ and ‘requital’.]

2.4 From the foregoing root **ksen* one may provisionally posit an **(e)u-* derivative expressing exchange- which yielded on the one hand the Greek noun **ξένφος* via *-o-* thematization from an underlying **ksénu-*), while on the other hand, by hysterokinetic (hysterodynamic) ablaut **ksneu-* yielded the Iranian root *xšn(a)u*, whose original velar initial is shown by the Avestan reduplicative stems *cixšnuša-* (contrast *zixšnāṅha-* from root *zanH*, Proto-Indo-European $\sqrt{*ḡneH_3}$ ‘to know’) and *kuxšnu-*.

3.1 Phonologically, in addition to the evidence provided by the Avestan reduplicative stems, affirmation of the original velar nature of the **k-* of PIE $\sqrt{*ksen}$ is provided by the Indo-European antiquity of Bartholomae’s Law. This antiquity is indicated by e.g. Iranian **wabža-* ‘wasp’ (Av. *vabžaka-*, Balochi *gvabz*) vis-à-vis forms in other IE languages, e.g. Old English *wæps/wæsp*, Latin *vespa* from PIE **web^h-s-* ‘weaving (a hive)’; the Iranian could hardly result from **wVsp-* remade by analogy with ‘to weave’ (which, apart from the Bartholomae’s Law relic Av. *ubdaēna-* ‘woven stuff’ is throughout Iranian from \sqrt{waf}). Thus our $\sqrt{*ksen}$ cannot be from PIE **g^hsen* <

√*g^hes* ‘to devour, eat’, as disproved by meticulous semantic analyses by Ioannou 2023: 164-194 (also Brill online publication), Section 6. (For the etymology from ‘devour, eat’ see also, unmentioned by Ioannou, Jackson 2014, 92-100, especially p. 94.). Although Ioannou, citing earlier publications of mine, affirms my √**ksen* ‘to exchange’, he still views as possible an ultimate connection with PIE **g^hesto-*, **g^hesor* ‘hand’; however, Bartholomae’s Law excludes **g^hsen* becoming **ksen* (Iranian **xšan*). It may be added that Ioannou’s exposition on proximity (intimacy, friendship) vs. outsidersness (enmity, hostility) in connection with the etymology discussed goes back in essence to Schwartz 1984: 194-195.

3.2 An account will now be suggested for the **(e)u-* nominal and verbal formations from the basic etymon PIE **ksen*. We may first observe the developments of the PIE root **d^heb^h* ‘(be) little, diminish, deceive, injure’ (with Iranian attesting ‘little’ in Avestan *daiβi-* ‘midget’, **-ra-* stem **dabra-* reflected in Armenian *pandoyr* ‘stupid’ < **pand-dabr* ‘of small counsel’, and ‘deceive’ shown e.g. by Old Avestan *dābāiieiti* ‘deceives’, Parthian *dab* ‘trick(y)’, etc): An **(e)u-* stem adjective is found (alongside the Iranian Caland’s forms **dabi-*, **dabra-*) in Hittite *tepu-*, oblique *tepau-* ‘small’, and Iranian has verb root *db(a)u* in Old Avestan *aipī dābāuuaiia-* ‘prattle (falsely)’ and *dābaoman-* ‘deception’, cf. Vedic *ádbhuta-* ‘undeceived’. Perhaps one should reconstruct **ksonu-*, weak grade **ksneu-*, and possessive **ksenu-o-*, cf. Greek adj. **astwós* (with loss of **w*) from the *-u-* stem for ‘city’; substantivizing accent retraction would give **ksénwo-*. A proterokinetic adj. **d^heb^hu-*: *d^hb^h-n-eu-* could have served as a model for **ksenu-* : **ksneu-*. However, we find PIE examples of nominal *-u-* stems beside *-u-* present stems, e.g. **terh₂u-* ‘overcome’ in Hittite *tarhu-*, Vedic thematic *tūrva-*) alongside Vedic *táru-* ‘power which overcomes’. Thus, we could have **ksenu-* (*-u-* stem noun) alongside (*ksenu-* (*-u-* present stem), whereby reanalysis as a “neo-root”.

4.1 The entire above series OAv. *xšqnmānē*, Irish (*ar*) *son*, and Oss. *æxsæn*, and also, with specific reference to hospitality, Av. √*xšn(a)u*

and Greek ξενφία, and further, with development to include hospitality/patronage/cult, was first brought together, essentially along the above lines, in Schwartz 1982 (with great detail), and further in Schwartz 1985, 1990, 2003. The whole series was appropriated by Cheung 2007: 457-460, with garbling of the format and semantic scenario which I had put forth (essentially as above), and inaccurate assignment of the entire group to exchange of gifts (between host and guest) whence: “to entertain, welcome [a guest], to thank, praise, etc.”. After the series of Iranian words, which begins with juxtaposition of Avestan *xšnu-* and *xšanmanai* (*sic*, reflecting Cheung’s appropriation of the Beekesian reconstruction I had used, as well as the meaning ‘instead’ I had assigned it), and ends with Oss. *æxsæn* and its derivatives.

4.2 Then Cheung comments: “On the etymology see Schwartz, Fs. H.P. Schmidt: 213f.; Schwartz 1990: 203. This root and its IE provenance postulated by Schwartz is problematic, as one needs to make several assumptions about their semantic development: It is a rather tall order to reconcile the meanings of Av. and Oss. through an unproven series of semantic shifts.” Cheung then gives us as etymon “*PIE *ksenu- ‘to exchange gifts (between guest and host)’?” Finally he lists “*IE COGNATES: Gr. ξένοϛ, (Ion. ξεῖνοϛ) ‘stranger, guest, host’, Old Irish *son* ‘in exchange’”. Cheung’s disorderly account of the comparisons I had, to which he brings a formalistic bias, gives the reader no idea that the Greek and Old Irish comparisons were made for the first time in my presentations. Moreover, he cites the Irish form wrongly; it should be *ar son* ‘instead’ (< ‘for an *exchange’). I had presented *ksenu- not as a verb (which would be uncanonical) but as a nominal-adjectival form. The institutional reference seen in the oldest attestations of ξένοϛ concerns not exchange of gifts “between guest and host”; it refers instead to an exchange initiated by the host and, ideally, continued by the former guest having become host to the former host in a second round of hospitality, and potentially further such rounds by descendants of the original ξένοι. Diachronically, the order of definitions should be

‘guest-friend’, i.e. ‘host/guest’, then ‘guest’, and finally ‘stranger’.⁴ He ignores the semantic parallels I had given in Schwartz 1985: 465-466, Schwartz 1990: 203, and Schwartz 2003: 214, where I mentioned *inter alia* Old Indic *mithāti, méthati*, ‘exchanges’, Latin *mūtō* ‘to (ex)change’, *mūtuus* ‘mutual, communal’ (cf. Avestan *miθβan/r-* ‘a pair’), Gothic *maidjan* ‘to exchange’; Old Norse *maipms* ‘gift’; Yazghulami *miθmən*, Pashto *melmə*, Middle Persian *mēhmān* ‘guest’, Persian *mēhmān*, ‘guest’, *mēhmānī* ‘hospitality’.⁵

5.1 Another problem with Cheung’s entry is that while he there lists “*xšanmanai*” (i.e. *xšqmənē*) with the meaning ‘instead’ to which I had assigned it, four pages earlier (p. 452) under **xšamH* ‘to be content with, bear, suffer, tolerate, resign oneself’, he has OAv. *xšam-* (*xšqm-*) in *xšqmənē*, while he notes that Pashto *zyam-* can be explained otherwise (from **gam*² ‘to press’), and the hapax OAv. *xšqmənē* “can be disputed”; and there is no cross-reference to *xšnau*².

6.1 A different problem is the etymon (Cheung: 456) *xšnau*¹ ‘to hear’ (< ‘to sharpen [the ears]’). The Avestan evidence for ‘sharpen’, *hu-xšnuta-* ‘well sharpened’, is corroborated by the Vedic root “*kṣṇav*” (*kṣṇu*) ‘to sharpen’ as per Cheung: 456, with PIE antecedent. The development ‘to hear’ < ‘sharpen’ is suspect. OPers. *ā-xšn(a)u-* ‘to hear’ is attested in a variety of forms, and comparable forms are found throughout the Middle and New Iranian languages of Iran. That the

4 The underlying order, and characteristically Indo-European semantic background in gift exchange (cf. Benveniste 1969: 87-100) are ignored by Beekes 1995: 635, who, as for cognates, only mentions the (phonologically irreconcilable) Lat. *hostiŕe* etc. and opines that the word may be pre-Greek.

5 Further examples of *‘exchange’ for hospitality are the Homeric use of ἀμοιβή and ἀμειβομένος; and in a series of Gathic stanzas (Y 46.11-14) concerning eschatological hospitality, Y 46.12c *hēm.aibī.mōist* (**maēθ-* ‘(ex)change’ cf. the aforementioned Yazghulami, Pashto, and Middle Persian words for ‘guest’); further Y 46.14d *hadəmōi minas* ‘minglest in the residence’ (cf. OInd. *√mīś* ‘to mix’) and similarly Hom. μίξεσθαι ξεινίη ‘to mingle in hospitality’.

many well-attested Manichean Middle Persian forms ʾšnw- show /āšn(a)u-/ ‘to hear, hearken, understand’ but Manichean Parthian ʿšnw- shows /əšn(a)u-/, cognates are missing in Central Asiatic Iranian languages, and the Old Persian word and New Iranian languages have (V)šn(V)u-, (V)šnVv- etc., which suggests that ā(x)šn(V)u- spread from Imperial Achaemenid or Sasanian Persia within Iran but not further eastward, and outside of Persia the prefix ā- was shortened. If the etymon is ultimately the same as √xšn(a)u (reflected in Old Persian xšnuta- DNb 26) ‘to reciprocate’, then the influence of the latter could have had a role in the non-Persian reduction/disappearance of the preverb, eventually affecting Persian.

6.2 Now, Avestan collocates *surunu-* ‘hear’ and *xšnu-* with object *yasna-* ‘liturgy’ in Y 68.9: *surunuītā nō yasnəm ... xšnuiītā nō yasnəm* (again at Yt 10.32, with *yasnahe* genitive instead of *yasnəm* accusative) ‘hear our liturgy, reciprocate our liturgy’. For Old Persian one would expect an inherited cognate phrase **čunuyā^h... xšnuyā^h*, in which the two phonologically similar words overlap semantically as ‘hearken’.

6.3 Under these circumstances **čunú-* would easily merge with *xšnu-*, whence MPers. and Parth. (*ā*)*šnu-* ‘hear, hearken’. Distinction of ‘hear, hearken, understand’ from ‘reciprocate’, especially in view of the *-ā-* of the present stem **xšnāwaya-* (Av. *xšnāuuaiia-*), would have taken place via influence of the preverb *ā* with root *xšnā* reflected in MPers. *āšnāg* ‘known’; note, with the alternate form of the latter root, √*zanH*, **āzanti-* ‘making known, telling’ in Parth. and Sogd. *āzand* ‘tale’.⁶ Semantically, cf. Ormuri *amar-* ‘to hear’ from root (*h*)*mar* ‘to make/take account’.

7.1 However, the Indo-Iranian root **kšn(a)u* ‘to sharpen’ which figures in Cheung’s etymology of OPers. *āxšn(a)u-* ‘to hear’ etc. is not irrelevant for the Indo-Iranian history of the Iranian root *xšn(a)u* referring to reciprocity. A reconstructed homophony of two Indo-

6 Cf. Bartholomae 1910: 559 s:v *xšnā-*, fn. 2, positing an apparent contamination of roots *xšnā* and *sru* lying behind MPers. *šnūtan* and Pers. *šunūdan* ‘to hear’.

Iranian roots $*k\check{s}n(a)u^1$ ‘sharpen’ and $*k\check{s}n(a)u^2$ ‘engage in the exchange institution manifested as hospitality and cult’ explains the odd fact that the Vedic root $\check{s}\bar{a}$ (=Iranian $\check{s}\bar{a}$) ‘whet, sharpen, rub’ is found in the latter meaning.

7.2 An interaction of the two homophonous verbs $\check{\surd}^*k\check{s}n(a)u$ within the prehistory of Iranian and Indic is reflected by the fact that $\check{\surd}k\check{s}n(a)u$ with meaning ‘sharpen’ is preserved in Iranian only in Av. *huxšnuta-* ‘well sharpened’ (of a spear), whereas $\check{\surd}^*k\check{s}n(a)u$ referring to institutional reciprocity (hospitality and cult) abounds in Avestan, but is not found in Vedic, in which $\check{\surd}k\check{s}n(a)u$ ‘whet’ etc. as a verb is limited to RV 10.23.2. *ava kṣṇāumi* ‘I efface’, the middle voice participle AV 5.20.1 *kṣṇuvāná-* ‘sharpened’ (of the voice of a war drum), and ŚB *kṣṇutá-*, -*kṣṇút* ptc. ‘whetted, sharpened’. The vacuum of the Vedic loss of $\check{\surd}k\check{s}n(a)u^2$ is filled by an expansion of $\check{\surd}\check{s}\bar{a}$.

7.3 A poetic trace of the old situation may perhaps be found in RV 2.39.7 *imā giró aśvīnā yuṣmavantīḥ kṣṇótreṇeva svádhitam saṃ śiśītham*: ‘O Aśvins, “sharpen” these praises of you as an axe with a whetstone’, where the vestigial *kṣṇótra-* ‘whetstone’ goes back to $*k\check{s}nautra-$, homophonous with the form which gave Av. *xšnaoθra-* ‘gratification, gratitude’. An old play on words ‘whetstone’ and ‘gratification’ could have developed in the form of the simile of the foregoing verse. In any event, *giró* ‘praises’ as object of the “sharpening” (which has many Vedic parallels with other objects referring to prayer) has an ultimate analog in Av. *xšnuiiā nō yasnəm* (above).

7.4 The expansion of the Vedic synonym of $\check{\surd}k\check{s}n(a)u$ ($= \check{\surd}^*k\check{s}n(a)u^2$), $\check{\surd}\check{s}\bar{a}$, to have the function of $\check{\surd}^*k\check{s}n(a)u^1$ in the cultic poetry of the Rig Veda may well have had its impetus in the hymnology of Agni, the god Fire. Agni was the *priyá- átithi-* ‘intimate guest’ (= Av. *friia- asti-*, epithet of Ātar ‘fire’) and, also as the hearth, a *grháspati-* ‘Lord of the House.’ Thus RV 6.16.42: ‘*śiśīthi* (imperative) the intimate guest, the Lord of the House’. Cf. RV 7.42.4: ‘When Agni is accorded well in the

dwelling of a rich man, a guest well treated as intimate (*átithi-*, *suprītá-*) in the house, then he grants the clan's (house's) wishes.⁷ Conversely, 6.15.19: in reciprocity for Agni being made great (= fed) with fuel, the "hosts" ask Agni to $\sqrt{sā}$ them. In addition, $\sqrt{sā}$, 'sharpen/treat hospitably', figures in reference to Agni's pointed flames, *téjas-* (6.15.19 seq., where also *tigmá-* 'pointed weapons'); Agni's flames are also compared in similar contexts to blades (6.3.5), horns (5.9.5), and teeth (10.43.3, cf. 10.87.1), "sharpened" against the enemy. Furthermore, (\emptyset /*sam-/ni*) + $\sqrt{sā}$ occurs for both the "sharpening" and stoking of Agni. Another divinity, Indra, characterized by his *vajra-*, a mace with projecting sharp studs or blades, is also a frequent object of $\sqrt{sā}$. In fact, he forms a double divinity with Agni; note especially 6.40.10-11, where the worshipper are exhorted to sharpen (*śiśīhi*) each of the two, who pierce or split the eggs (brood) of the monster Śuṣṇi. Thus it was probably from the cults of Agni and Indra that the expanded $\sqrt{sā}$ became applied to other gods.

7.5 The expanded $\sqrt{sā}$ in Vedic also brought about an expansion of the semantically similar $\sqrt{*č(a)ud}$ 'to sharpen, whet, wage, propel, promote', meanings inherited from Proto-Indo-European (as seen from

7 For *privá-/friia-* etc. and its Greek parallel *philos* etc. as denoting membership in an individual's private sphere and the gift-exchange institution as a means of admission thereto, see Schwartz 1982: 194-195. The word *friia-*, as alluded to above, when referring to a person, originally signified someone is a member of one's family, is given a functionally parallel status through the $\sqrt{xšn(a)u}$ process. The term is from PIE **preh₂i* / **prih₂*, indicating proximity, thus *friia-* < **prih₂ó-* like Archaic Greek *φίλος* from **bhi* '(near) by', and just as *friiō- friiāi* refers to the reciprocal relationship between two intimates, so too *φιλέων φιλέοντι* in Pindar, etc. (in context of poet-patron relationship). And just as eg. Homeric *φίλα* (*δῶρα*, of hospitality gifts), and *φιλότης* are associated with *ξενία*, so in Young Avestan *friθa-*, past passive participle of $\sqrt{frī}$ 'make intimate, propitiate', is found after *xšnūta-* Yt 8.43 (Tištriia), Yt 10.120 (Mithra), and, in the Gathas, just as *friia-* Y 46.2d *rafədrəm ... friiāi daidīt* is found in relationship to Y 46.1 *xšnaošāi*, so Y 43.14a-b *hiiaṭ ... friiāi ... daidīt ... rafəno* (= *rafədrəm*) is followed resumptively by Y 43.13d *cixšnušō* ($\sqrt{xšn(a)u}$).

Germanic *hwet-/hwat-* as reflected in Old Norse and Gothic). This verb is found alongside, or in alternation, with $\sqrt{s\bar{a}}$ in its various meanings, and object (reciprocated) wealth, sought from the gods and/or the patrons (= hosts), e.g. 7.96.2 and 1.48.2 vis-à-vis 10.42.3; and with Indra as object petitioned for reciprocity 8.67.7, cf. further 8.67.7. Finally, note especially 8.4.15-16, a prayer to Pūṣan (the patron god of hymnists), which elaborately attests the verbs $\sqrt{s\bar{a}}$ and $\sqrt{*č(a)ud}$ in their various meanings as to both the reciprocity institution and whetting/sharpening (and in addition the promotion/impulsion aspect of $\sqrt{*č(a)ud}$).

7.6 It is seen that the history of the Old Indic roots *kṣṇ(a)u* attests an interesting situation in which the meaning of one word, $\sqrt{*kṣṇ(a)u}$ ‘to engage in institutional reciprocity’, has its meaning subsumed within its homophone, $\sqrt{*kṣṇ(a)u}$ ‘to sharpen, whet’, whose merged meanings are then continued by what had once been the synonym of the latter, $\sqrt{s\bar{a}}$ *‘to sharpen, whet’, bringing about a semantic expansion of its erstwhile synonym $\sqrt{*č(a)ud}$.

7.7 Now, in the Archaic Greek data, where, in addition to $\xi\varepsilon(1)\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha$ as hospitality involving gift exchange, with Mycenaean **/ksénwion/* referring to textiles set aside as hospitality gifts (Knossos, cf. *Odyssey* 24.276-277) and votive gifts to a divinity (Pylos, oil consecrated to the goddess Potnia), cf. further the ceremonial “hospitality to the gods”, $\Theta\varepsilon\omicron\xi\varepsilon\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha$, so in Indo-Iranian.

7.8 The archaic Greek situation of hospitality practices paralleled by cult goes back to Indo-European, since it has its equivalent in Indo-Iranian, as evidenced not only by the foregoing Vedic details, but also by “Mitanni Aryan” and Avestan. As for the “Mitanni Aryan”, cuneiform materials from Nuzi and Alalakh have personal names in *-atti* ‘guest’ (cf. OInd. *átithi-*, Av. *asti-*): *Biryatti* ‘*Philoxenos*’ (**priya-* = OInd. *priyá-*), ‘to whom the guest is in intimate (near and dear)’, reflecting hospitality between human beings, and compounds in *-atti* whose first members are the name of a god (**Mitra*, **Asura*,

*Sūrya, *Indra) i.e. having *Mitra (etc.) as guest’, showing the hospitality model applied to cult.⁸

8.1 In Young Avestan, $\sqrt{xšn(a)u}$ occurs in clear hospitality contexts, e.g. *Pursišnīhā* 49: ‘He who has not treated hospitably (*xšnaoštā*) nor will treat hospitably (*xšnāuuaiieite*) the righteous man arriving at his door-posts (*aθāhhuuā* for **ātāhhuuā* = OInd. *ātāsu*) [will not go to Paradise]’. In the *Hadōxt Nask* 2.19, as an exemplum of piety, ‘treating hospitably (*kuxšnuuqñō*) the righteous man coming from near or from far’; similarly *Vištāsp Yašt* 59, concerning Zarathushtra’s host. The cultic applications of the hospitality model is clear in the Yashts from mentions of such divinities as Mithra, Tištriia, and Ahura Mazdā as being *xšnūta-*.

8.2 In the Gathas, as we shall see, Mazdā Ahura is also the object of $\sqrt{xšn(a)u}$. Here, however, the situation is more complicated than in the Young Avesta: Zarathushtra has reciprocal relationships with his patrons (who gift him benefits which include or are parallel to hospitality, in return for his granting them abiding fame and divine favor, including a paradisiac afterlife) and with Mazdā Ahura (to Whom he offers wide worship in return for Mazdā Ahura’s according him success in his mission, including wide patronage, as well as immortality in Paradise). Thereby, Zarathushtra is the intermediary between the worshippers and Mazdā Ahura, and effects, in return for the functional hospitality of the patron, the latter’s receiving afterlife hospitality in Paradise. In addition, the dualistic outlook of the Gathas extends to the hospitality imagery of individual eschatology, so that there are rewards for Zarathushtra’s allies (the righteous) in Mazdā Ahura’s House of Song (or, House of Good Mind), i.e. heaven, and punishments for Zarathushtra’s enemies (the wrongsomeness) in the House of Wrong (or, House of Worst Mind), i.e. hell.

8.3 The hospitality model for the afterlife is further shown by the soul’s getting vitalizing sustenance in the heavenly House and bad food in the

8 See Mayrhofer 1969: 138 *seq.*

hellish House, and in these contexts, the souls of the righteous and the wrongsomeness are explicitly called “guests” (*asti-*); for all these details see Y(asna)s 31.20-22; 46.11, 13-14; 49.10-11; 51.14-15; and specifically for the afterlife punishment for someone who did not give Zarathushtra hospitality (*nōiṭ xšnāuš*) when the latter was trembling from cold and travel fatigue, see 51.13-14, contrasting with patronly treatment (again *xšnāuš*), 46.13.⁹

8.4 In connection with the foregoing Gathic passages, it is relevant that at Y 51.9-10, in proximity to passages concerning benign and malign eschatological reciprocities respectively for Zarathushtra’s patrons/allies and his opponents, and also at Y 31.3-4 (cf Y 31.19-22), the terms for these requitals, *xšnūt-* and *aši-*, are independently found at the non-Gathic Y 60.2 with regard to hospitality gifts in a house: cf. *Pursišnāhā* 39 (*xšnūtīmca *arəitīmca*, where the latter represents a very conservative stress-variant /artīmca/ of *aši-* from */arti-/).

9.1 We now come to the iconicity of Y 46, in which the foregoing aspects of the reciprocity institution are at play. By “iconicity” I mean here that aspect of the poem’s compositional structure which renders a kind of illustrative analog to what is explicitly said, or implied, by the textual narration.¹⁰

9.2 Now, in addition to the above-specified passages of Y 46, which apply the details of ordinary hospitality to eschatology, the theme of ordinary hospitality and its obligations are given at Y 46.5-6,¹¹ the ring-compositional center of Y 46.2-10, the poem composed by Zarathushtra before he achieved sufficient patronage,¹² from which poem Zarathushtra built the present Y 46 (1-19) upon having obtained all his

9 The lack of hospitality took place on a bridge; the culprit is punished on the eschatological Bridge of the Selector, where he is adjudged to hell.

10 For further on iconicity in the Gathic poems, see Schwartz 2003: 245-248, with focus on the texts of self-referential representation of spatiality.

11 For the translation, see Ahmadi 2012.

12 Schwartz 2003: 232-239.

important patrons. The resulting ring-compositional structure of Y 46 consists of Y 46.1-9 and 11-19 forming pairs, which pairs concatenate concentrically, while the central stanza Y 46.10 concatenates with the flanking stanzas 9 and 11, and with the stanza-pairs 1-2 and 18-19.

9.3 Here are Y 46.1-2, 10, and 18-19:

- Y 46 1 a **kqm nəmōi zqm kuθrā nəmōi aiiēnī*
 b *pairī xʷaētēuš airiiamnasca dadaitī*
 c *nōiṭ mā xšnāuš yā vərəzēnā hēcā*
 d *naēdā daxiiēuš yōi sāstārō drəguuaṇtō*
 e *kaθā θβā mazdā xšnaosāi ahurā*
- 2 a *vaēdā taṭ yā ahmī mazdā anaēšō*
 b *mā kamnaṣsuuā hiiatcā kamnānā ahmī*
 c *gərəzōi tōi ā iṭ auuaēnā ahurā*
 d *rafədrēm caguuā hiiat friiō friiāi daidīṭ*
 e *āxsō vaṇhāuš aṣā ištīm manaṇhō*

Y 46.1 ‘To what land shall I wend? Where shall I go for pasturing? They exclude me from family and tribe; the community which I have joined has not $\sqrt{xšn(a)u}$ -d me, nor have those who are the wrongsome dictators of the land, (so) how shall I $\sqrt{xšn(a)u}$ Thee, O Mazdā Ahura?’

Y 46.2 ‘I know that here, O Mazdā, I am powerless through my having few cattle and few men. I complain to Thee; look at it, O Ahura, offering the support which an intimate would give an intimate (as Thou dost) take account of the power of Good Mind’¹³

13 I see two word plays in Y 46.1-2. Firstly, in Y 46.1, I take *nəmōi* in the first instance as infinitive of \sqrt{nam} ‘bend, divagate, wander, wend’, and in the second instance as dative of **nəma-* ‘pasture’, demonstrated by Humbach 1991 II: 175 from Young Avestan, Vedic, and Greek evidence. Secondly, in

- Y 46.10 a *yā vā mōi nā gənā vā mazdā ahurā*
 b *dāiiāṭ aṅhāuš yā tū vōistā vahištā*
 c *ašīm ašāi vohū xšaθrəm manayhā*
 d *yqscā haxšāi xšmāuuatəm vahmāi.ā*
 e *frō tāiš vīspāiš cinuuatō frafrā pərətūm*

Y 46.10 ‘Whoever, man or woman, O Mazdā Ahura, would give me the things of existence which Thou knowest are best—reward for Rightness, power through Good Mind—and all those shall I join together for the laudation of Your kind; with all those shall I cross the Selector’s Bridge.’¹⁴

- Y 46.18 a *yā maibiiā yaoš ahmāi ascīṭ*¹⁵ *vahištā*
 b *maxiiā^ā ištōiš vohū cōišəm manayhā*
 c *qstəṅg ahmāi yā nā^ā qstāi daidītā*
 d *mazdā ašā xšmākəm vārəm xšnaošəmnō*
 e *taṭ mōi xratāuš manayhascā vīciθəm*

46.18 ‘Whoever would, for me, deliver the things of vitality (or: vitalize the best things), to him do *I* promise [the best things] in my power with Good Mind, (but) hostilities [do I promise] to him who [would deliver us] unto hostility, O Mazdā(,) with Rightness(,) $\sqrt{xšn(a)u}$ -ing your wish. This is the decision of my intellect and my mind.’

- Y 46.19 a *yā mōi ašaṭ haiθīm hacā varəšaitī*
 b *zaraθuštrāi hiiṭ vasnā fərašō.təməm*
 c *ahmāi mīzdəm hanəṅtē parāhūm*

Y 46.2, I take the first *ahmī* as ‘in this (place), here’, and the second instance as ‘I am’, each having correlation in Y 46.1.

14 The positive promises of Y 46.10 are countered by punitive promises at Y 46.11, again with imagery of the Bridge.

15 I take *ascīṭ* from */az-čit/, with */az/ ‘I’ like the monosyllabic *azā* at Y 43.14 *azā sarədanā*; *az: *azəm* :: *tū*: *tuuəm*. See Appendix II.

d *manē.vistāiš maṭ vīspāiš gāuuā azī*
 e *tācīṭ mōi sqs tuuēm mazdā vaēdištō*

46.19 ‘Whoever, in accord with Rightness, would truly effect for me, (who am) Zarathushtra, that which is numinously most marvelous,¹⁶ to him who merits it, [do I promise] a prize of future existence, together with all (things/persons) known in the mind, the mated pregnant Cow.¹⁷ Thou, Mazdā, (art) most knowing; Thou proclaim(est) to me these very things.’

9.4 The two antipodal pairs of stanzas contain clear examples of reciprocity. In Y 46.1, the two occurrences of $\sqrt{xšn(a)u}$ refer to two cycles of reciprocity: the first refers to hospitality in terms of communal patronage, and the second to cult; without the first, Zarathushtra cannot fulfill his cultic relationship to Mazdā. The two cycles are resolved at Y46.18-19: In the latter stanza Zarathushtra declares the prize of future life to the patronly person who furthers the world-redeeming mission of Z., Mazdā’s priest. This elaborates Y 48.18, in which Zarathushtra promises requitals for the one who offers him vitality, as well as requitals for his enemies, the promised requitals fulfilling Zarathushtra’s hoped-for reciprocation to Mazdā.

9.5 Another reciprocal relationship is Y 46.2d (*rafəḍrēm caguuā hīiaṭ friiō friiāi (daidīt)*) ‘(offering the support which) an intimate friend

16 My translation ‘numinously marvelous’ proceeds from considerations in Lincoln: 1996 (on OPers. *vašna-*, its Indo-Iranian root etymology, and its equivalents in the Akkadian, Aramaic, and Elamite parallel texts) and 159-160 (on Gathic *vasnā* with *fraša-*). In view of the equivalents of OPers. *vašnā*, i.e. Akk. and Aram. ‘via the (protective) shade’ and Elam. ‘via the exertion/effort’ (both referring to Ahuramazdā), to which I add (to the older evidence for ‘will’) Parth. *wasnād* ‘on account of’ < *‘through the (motivating) will’, and finally also in view of the eschatological nuances of the Gathic formulae with *vasnā* and *fraša-* (alongside the creative nuances of the OPers. cognates), I render *vasnā* as ‘numinously’ = ‘via the divine *numen*’.

17 For *gāuuā azī* ‘mated pregnant cow’, see Schwartz 2003: 235-237.

would give to an intimate/friend. The reciprocal friend-to-friend relationship implied in Y 46.2 *friiō friiāi daidīt* has an opposite of sorts ring-compositionally at Y 46.18c *qstāṅg ahmāi yē nā qstāi daidītā* ‘hostilities to him who give us over to hostility’ (which within Y 46.18 has its own approximate contrast in ‘whoever would endow me with vitality’. The antipodal relationship between 46.2 2x *friia-* and Y 46.18 2x *qsta-* is itself an iconicity, illustrating the “diametrical” opposition between the two reciprocal pairs.

9.6 The oppositions within Y 46.18 are presented in what may be seen as an iconicity of syntax. The verb *cōiṣam* ‘I have promised’ does double duty as predicate of two interlocking contrastive object phrases, beginning respectively with *vahištā* ‘the best things’ and *qstāṅg* ‘hostilities’, each with the pivotal *daidītā* (1) ‘would bring about, establish’ ($\sqrt{*d^hā}$) with genitive *yaoš* (from *āiiu-* ‘vitality’) in phrase *yaoš dā-* = *yaoždā-* ‘to make energetic, render vital, redeem from the realm of impurity which characterizes death’ and (2) ‘give over to, consign to’ ($\sqrt{dā}$).¹⁸

9.7 The middle stanza, Y 46.10, is also an iconicity; it illustrates Zarathushtra as psychopomp *mediator* between those who give him the desired patronage and Mazda’s reward to them, as implied in the relationship between the outermost stanzas Y 46.1-2 and Y 46.18-19. The midmost line of the midmost stanza of Y 46.10 begins with *ašīm* ‘reward’, which condenses the poem’s theme of reciprocity.

10. With the foregoing final example of the iconicity of Y 46 as pertains to reciprocity, focused on $\sqrt{xšn(a)u}$, we come to the end of the intricate

18 See Schwartz 2003: 228-231. Note that Y 46.18a-c *maibiiā yaoš ... vahištā ... daidītā*, with intentional syntactic ambiguity, also = ‘would bring about for me the best things of vitality’; cf. ring-compositionally Y 46.10a-b *yē ... mōi ... dāiiāṅ aṅhāuš ... vahištā*, with *aṅhāuš* ‘of existence’ = *yaoš* ‘of vitality’. Cf. further Appendix II.

and intriguing story of the Proto-Indo-European etyma \sqrt{ksen} , $*ksenu-$, $\sqrt{*ksn(e)u-}$, and their reflexes in Indo-Iranian, Greek, etc.

APPENDIX I

The formal ring-compositional concatenations for the completed Y 46 include:

46.1 *xšnāuš*, *xšnaošāi* & 46.18 *xšnaošəmnō*; 46.2 *vaēdištō*; 46.2 *vanhəuš... ištīm manahō* & 46.18 *ištōiš vohū ... manahā*; 46.3 *vərzdāiš* & 46.16 *vardəmqm*; 46.3 *sənghāiš* & 46.17 *sənghānī*; 46.4 *(frō.)gā* & 46.16 and 46.17 *(huuō.)guuā*; 46.5 *vīcirō* & 46.15 *vīcāiiaθā*; 46.6 *paouruiā* & 46.15 *paouruiāiš*; 46.7 *(kəm)nā* & 46.13 *nā*; 46.8 *jasōiṭ* & 46.12 *(uz)jən*; 46.8 *paitiaogəṭ* & 46.12 *aojiaēšū*; 46.11 *cinuuatō pəratuš* & 46.10 *cinuuatō ... pəratūm*; 46.10 *(ašim) ašāi* & 46.9 *(ašā...) ašāi*; 46.9 & 46.11 *ašāi*. Y 46.10 *nā* & Y 46.2 *(kamnā)nā*; Y 46.10 *vōistā* & Y 46.2 *vaēdā*; Y 46.10 *dāiiaṭ* & Y 46.2 *daidiṭ*; Y 46.10 *haxšāi* & Y 46.1 *hēcā*; Y 46.10 *vōistā* & Y 46.19 *vaēdištō*; Y 46.10 *vahištā* & Y 46.19 *vahištā*; Y 46.10 *xšmāuuatəmqm* & Y 46.18 *xšmākəm*; Y 46.10 *vīspāiš* & Y 46.19 *vīspāiš*.

APPENDIX II

Confirmation of the interpretation of Y 46.18a'' *asciṭ*, the construction of Y 46.18a'-c'' *yaoš ... daidītā*, and the salience of $\sqrt{xšn(a)u}$ are seen from the charting of the compositional dependence of Y 43 on Y 46 remembered backwards. As for *cixšnušō*, note that *cixšnuša-* is again textually based on *xšnaošəmnō* via the systematic recyclings of Y 46 in Y 32, and of Y 46 *xšnāuš*, *xšnaošən* in Y 49, as will be shown by charts in a separate publication devoted to such systemic recyclings. For the general principle of bidirectional systematic recycling of words/cognates from one poem to another, see Schwartz 2002 [2006]: 54-64.

Y 46.19b' *zaraθuštrāi*

Y 43.16a'' *zaraθuštrō*

Y 46.18d'' *xšnaošəmnō*

Y 46.18d'' *xšnaošəmnō*

Y 46.18a” <i>ascīṭ</i>	Y 43.14d’ <i>azā</i>
Y 46.18a (<i>maibiiā</i>) <i>yaoš</i> (18c” <i>daidīā</i>)	Y 43.13 (c” <i>mōi dātā ...</i>) d’ <i>yaoš</i>
Y 46.17c” <i>səraošā</i>	Y 43.12d’ <i>səraošō</i>
Y 46.17b’ <i>nōiṭ</i>	Y 43.12b’ <i>nōiṭ</i>
Y 46.16d <i>vaḡhēuš manəḡhō</i>	Y 43.11b <i>vohū ... manəḡhā</i>
Y 46.16c” <i>ārmaitiš</i>	Y 43.10b’ <i>ārmaitī</i>
Y 46.16b” <i>usuuahī</i>	Y 43.9c” <i>vašī</i>
Y 46.15d” <i>paouruiiāiš</i>	Y 43.8a” <i>paouruuīm</i>
Y 46.14a’ <i>zaraθuštrā</i>	Y 43.7b <i>zaraθuštrō</i>
Y 46.13d” <i>vohū manəḡhā</i>	Y 43.7b <i>vohū ... manəḡhā</i>
Y 46.12e” <i>sastē</i>	Y 43.6d” <i>səḡḡhaitī</i>
Y 46.12c’ <i>ārmātōiš</i>	Y 43.6d” <i>ārmaitiš</i>
Y 46.11b’ <i>šīiaoθanāiš</i>	Y 43.5c’ <i>šīiaoθanā</i>
Y 46.10b’ <i>aḡhēuš</i>	Y 43.5b <i>aḡhēuš</i>
Y 46.9c” <i>ašauuanəḡm</i>	Y 43.4c” <i>ašāunaēcā</i>
Y 46.9c’ <i>spəḡntəm</i>	Y 43.3e” <i>spəḡntō</i>
Y 46.8e’ <i>dužjiiātōiš</i> , d” <i>hujjiiātōiš</i>	Y 43.2e” <i>darəḡgō.jiiātōiš</i>
Y 46.7b” <i>dīdarəšatā</i>	Y 43.2e” <i>dərəidiiāi</i>
Y 46.6 e” <i>dā</i>	Y 43.1d’ <i>dā</i>
Y 46.5a’ (<i>vā</i>) <i>xšaiiqs</i>	Y 43.1b’ <i>vasē.xšaiiqs</i> ¹⁹

[In the most recent of many charts of the above sort which I have published, I have provided a series of charts showing the diverse serial lexemic correlations between Y 46 and Y 32: “M. Schwartz, “*Yasnas 46 and 32: A Gathic Conforntation*”, in A. Cantera, E. Pirart and C. Redard (eds.), *Estudios Iranios y Turanios 6, ¿Habló Zarathustra? Homenaje a Jean Kellens a su 80o aniversario*, Girona 2024, 321-328.]

19 I thank Jost Gippert, Almut Hintze, and Stefan Zimmer for kind bibliographic support, and Alexander Nikolaev and Michael Weiss for invaluable substantive comments, for whose integration into my article I take full responsibility.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahmadi, Amir. "Religious regulations of hospitality in the Gathas (& 46.5 & 6)" *Studia Iranica* 41, 2012. 7-24.
- Bartholomae, Christian. *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1961.
- Beekes, Robert Stephen Paul, and Lucien van Beek. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. Brill: Leiden, 2010.
- Benveniste, Émile. *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*. Les Editions de Minuit, 1969.
- Burrow, Thomas. "Sanskrit Etymological Notes." *Sarūpa-Bharatī: Or The Homage of Indology, Being the Lakshman Sarup Memorial Volume*. Jagannath Agrawal (ed.), Hoshiarpur: Vishveshvaranand Institute, 1954. 3-11.
- Cheung, Johnny. *Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Verb*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- García-Ramón, José-Luis. "Infinitifs et abstraits verbaux en indo-iranien: v-av. *xšānmānē* et sa préhistoire" E. Pirart & X. Tremblay (eds.), *Zarathushtra entre l'Inde et l'Iran*. Études indo-iraniennes et indo-européennes offertes à Jean Kellens à l'occasion de son 65^e anniversaire. Wiesbaden: Reichert 2009 (Beiträge zur Iranistik 30). 79–93.
- Humbach, Helmut, J. H. Elfenbein, P.O. Skjærvø. *The Gathas of Zarathushtra and the Other Old Avestan Texts*. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1991.
- Ioannou, Georgios. "The sense of *ksénos* in Ancient Greek", *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 23:2 (2023), 164-194.
- Jackson, Peter. "Themes of Commensality in Indo-European Lore: A propos Greek ξένος and Proto-Germanic **etuna-*." *Munus amicitiae Norbert Oettinger a collegis et amicis dicatur*, Beech Stave Press, Ann Arbor 2014, 92-100.
- Lincoln, Bruce. "*Fraša-* and *vašna-*, Two Terms at the Intersection and Imperial Discourse." *Indogermanische Forschungen* 101, 1996: 147-167.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred. "Indo-Iranisches Sprachgut aus Alalah." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 4.2 (1960): 136-49.
- Schwartz, Martin. "The Indo-European Vocabulary of Exchange, Hospitality, and Intimacy." *Contributions to Etymological Methodology. Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 8 (1982), 188-204.
- Schwartz, Martin. "Scatology and Eschatology in Zoroaster. On the Paronomasia of Yasna 48.10". *Papers in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce*. Brill: Leiden 1985, 473-496.

Schwartz, Martin. "Hospitalities and Formalities (\sqrt{waz} , \sqrt{braz})." *Iranica Varia: Papers in Honor of Professor Ehsan Yarshater*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1990, 200-207.

Schwartz, Martin. "Gathic Compositional History, Y 29, and Bovine Symbolism." *Paitimāna: Essays in Iranian, Indo-European, and Indian Studies in Honor of Hanns-Peter Schmidt*. Siamak Adhami (ed.), Costa Mesa: Mazda 2003: 195-249.

Martin Schwartz
University of California, Berkeley
martz@berkeley.edu