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The Indo-European Vocabulary of Exchange, Hospitality, and Intimacy
(The Origins of Greek ksénos, sún, phílos; Avestan xšnu-, xšanman-, etc.):
Contributions to Etymological Methodology

Martin Schwartz
University of California, Berkeley

In Section I I shall provide the evidence for a Proto-Indo-European base *kwen(-w)- 'to give one thing for another', with special attention to its role in the societal and religious vocabulary of ancient Greece and Iran. The elaboration of related etymological problems will then serve to illustrate two phenomena of general theoretical interest for genetic linguistics: parallel patterning of semantic courses (Section II) and "syntropy" (Section III).

I

The new etymon *kwen(-w)- explains the following forms:

*kwen-: (1) Hittite kuššan- 'requital, payment'; (2) Avestan xšanman- 'substitution' (in dative xšanmaine 'instead'); (3) Ossetic (a)xšan 'common, communal'; (4) Irish són 'exchange' (after ar 'for' = 'in exchange, in requital, instead'); *kwenw-, alternating with zero-grade */kwenw/ [kwenw-, kwen-]: (5) Gr. ksún (later sún) 'together with', ksúnos 'common'; (6) Gr. ksenw- (-w- indicated dialectically and epi-graphically) in kksenwos 'host/guest (Hom. etc.), stranger', ksenwion 'gift of hospitality', ksenwiai 'hospitality'; (7) Ir. root xšn- (Avestan present stems xšnuuaiaia-, kuxšnu-, desid. cixšnuia- '*to requite, provide hospitality' [!!!], nouns xšnut- 'requital', xšnaora- 'grace, gratification, gratitude, propitiation', etc.). Before focusing on (6) and (7), commentary on the items preceding is necessary.

In the greater majority of words from various languages for 'hire' as analyzed in Buck (1949:813 ¶11.77), i.e. Ital., Latv., Russ., Rum., Irish, and O/MHGerm., 'hire' is from 'to arrange, order, secure, fix, stipulate' (but Fr. engager 'hire' < gage, wage < Gmc. *wadja- 'pledge'). Hitt. kuššan- does not go with Germ. Heuer, Eng. hire as thought by Klingenschmitt (1980:150). The connection of Gr. koúion, koíon, kóion (*kouion) 'a pledge' (Hes.), Gortyn. enkoiótai 'money' given as security' with Lat. caúere 'to take care for, provide, order, stipulate, pledge, give surety, guarantee money' points to Gmc. *huz- or *hur- from PIE *kúH-s- or *kúH-r-, r. *kewH-'to be attentive, take care' (whence also Gr. koêô 'notice, hear', Goth. hausian, Eng. hear). (See further below, n. 7.)

Phonologically kuššan- < *kwsyin- is like kunanzi < *ghwnonti 'they smile'. Possibly kuššan- is a root-stem (neuter, after -n- stems), but may be haplographical < *kussanan-. I take kussata 'bride's price' n.pl, which otherwise would show a rare type of suffixation, from *kussanta (haplographical for *kussanata) in avoidance of homophony with a participial form of kus- 'to make trouble' (cf. also the uncertain hapax Lukusà- 'son-in-law').

For Av. xšanmaine Y. 29.9 the usual translation 'that I must put up with!' is unprecedented morphologically, and based on a comparison with Olnd. kšam- 'to endure' excluded by Pashto zyamal 'to endure' with voiced cluster (on which see Burrow [1954:5]). In Y. 29, the Bovine Soul requests a protector (stanzas 1-7). Good Intent declares that only one man has been found as suitable: 'Zarathushtra the Spitamid, who

† Remarks in the Addenda are noted as [A].
wishes to sing praises for us, o Mazda, and for Righteousness, so let us give him sweetness of speech' (st. 8b-c). In st. 9 the Bovine Soul answers: 'Then the Soul of the Bovine complained, "Thereby (you would give) for a xšaŋman an impotent support (rādem nū), the mightless speech of a feeble man, while I want someone mighty in force; when shall he ever be, he who will give him manual help?"'.

8b zaraθuštrō spatāmō / huuō nā mazā dašt ašaica
c cērēxētra stāvārīcēnhe / hišt hoi hudošām diišt vaxēsārahiiā
9a ḣaça gus uruwa raosta / *vā anaēsēm xšaṃmāne rādem
b vācim norās asūrahaia / vām *me vasaṃi isā.xšaOrīm
c kāda yauua huuō aŋhāt / vē hoi dadat zastauvaat auuō

The two stanzas are closely connected in structure (reflecting a conscious Gāthic artistry which will be noted again in III). In the same position in 8b2 and 9b2 a statement of granting, hoi (...) da-, whose object, voice (vāk-/vaxēsāra- etc.), is also represented in each stanza. This parallelism frames a series of contrasts: Z.'s desire vs. B.S.'s interests, the intangible vs. the tangible: specifically Righteousness (aš-ā-) and Good Intent vs. Force (xšaOrā-, cf. -xšaOrīa), thus contrast of Entities at the end of 8/gb2; mightlessness (an-aēsā-) vs. might (išā-); sweetness of voice vs. manual help (the reconciliation is seen e.g. in stanza 11c: 'May you, Ahura Mazda, give strength through Righteousness and Force in accordance with Good Intent'). Thus the Bovine Soul's complaint is that whereas it has asked for a powerful protector, it is assigned a mere poet-priest for a substitute, i.e. 'instead'; thus xšaŋman-, expectedly < Proto-Ir. xšan-man-, is something given for / in place of something else!

Gr. ksūn < *kwšnw- like lūkos 'wolf' < *wlkʷo-, perh. via *kwš-, as also kṣenw- < *kwšenw- with retrogressive dissimilation (cf. kṣiphos 'sword', Myc. *kwšsīpos in ge-si-pe-e, dual). From *ksuna (nom. pl.) developed apocopic ksun, cf. an(a), par(a), as per Holland (1977: 644 seq.) and prob. en(i); the apocope was completed by the synonymy of *ksūn(a) with *kon < *kom (= Lat. cum), which it replaced, leaving however the adj. koinōs < *kom/n-yō- 'common', the model for ksūnōs < *ksun-yō-. Further on ksun(-) below, II.

Now to Gr. ksenw- and Ir. xšnu-. Phonologically the etymon of xšnu- must have an initial labio-velar; this, and not xšn- < ġ(ḥ)n-, is shown by the reduplicative stems kuxšnu-, cixšnuša-, the latter contrasting neatly with zixšnāgha-, desid. of xšnā- (PIE *ğneO-), the root with which xšnu- was connected by Benveniste (1945: 47-50) and Kent (1953: 182). Thus Gr. ksenw-, Ir. xšnu- are reconciled by a PIE base */kwš(e)nw-. Semantically the Gr. is comparable with the Ir. (for which the gloss 'to please, to placate, to satisfy' has hitherto been deemed adequate) because they both refer to hospitality as well as to exchange/requital. This must be understood in connection with the independent demonstration by E. Benveniste (1969: 87-100) that Indo-European hospitality was characterized by an exchange of gifts between an alternating host and guest.

For the Greek, Benveniste (who left aside the problem of finding cognates of ksenw-) merely cited Herod. 3.39 (exchange of gifts between heads of state, i.e. the Persian [!] Cambyses and the Egyptian Amasis, institutes kseinē) and Iliad 6.215-233 (two opposing
warriors swap armor on battleground to renew their relationship as hereditary mutual kseīnoi; the obligation transcends personal and national interest). I add to the Homeric evidence Od. 1.311-318 and Od. 24.266-289 and esp. 311-314. Here the foregrounding of gift-exchange, against a background provision of lodging and food, as the virtual raison d'être of hospitality, together with the close linguistic connection of kseinos and ksenē with forms of amēbō 'exchange' (ll. 6.230-231, Od. 24.285-286 and Od. 1.318, and cf. mikesthai ksenēi Od. 24.314) and the fact that kseīnōs meant both 'guest' and 'host', suggest that kseīno- originally meant something like 'to exchange'!

For the Iranian, Benveniste only cited MPers mēhman, NPers. mihmān 'guest' from Olr. *maiΩman- (whose existence, I add, is supported by Pashto melme and Yazghulami miθmān 'id.') < r. maiθ- 'to exchange, to pair'. Much more proof exists in Avestan for Old Iranian hospitality as an institution of exchange.

It seems not to have been previously noted that Av. xšnu- often means 'to provide hospitality', as at HN 2.13 / Wish. Yt. 59; Purs. 49; Y. 51.12; Y. 46.1, 13, etc. The verb must originate in a root meaning 'to require', for the root-stem xšnut- means 'requisite' in the Gāthās, where it is followed by ašī- ('gī-') 'reward', both terms referring to eschatological compensations meted out to the good and the wicked.5 [Aa]

In both Gr. and Ir. *kwšenw- furnished the term for 'hospitality-gift'. The Gr., ksenwion, is well attested in Gr.: Hom. kseinion (alongside the later form ksenēion, like presēion; see Od. 9.365 ~ 9.370), and already in Mycenaean, at Knossos, spelled ke-se-nu-wi-ja etc. pl. adj. of textiles (as hospitality-gifts; cf. Od. 24.276-277). The Olr. equivalent is xšnut- 'requisite', in the Younger Avestan hospitality contexts Y. 60.2 and Purs. 39, formulaically paired with ašī- / *araita- 'reward' and followed by the appositional phrase, 'the welcomes (paiti.zaipti-) as compensations (viadā-')'. The term paiti.zaipti- (etym. 'acknowledgement') is glossed in Middle Persian as padritthi, padritthar 'reception', elaborated 'he gives abundantly of his property from piety', while the verb paiti.zan- Y. 29.11 (*to acknowledge') is glossed pād(d)šān kardān 'give a counter-gift (or reward)'. The actual granting of a gift to a departing guest so that he is properly xšnutā- is reflected at Y. 3.99.

In both Gr. and Ir. hospitality is protected by a special aspect of a well-known divinity, whose epithet is connected with a term for hospitality-gift (resp. Hom. kseinion, Av. ašī-); in each instance the god presides over consequences of respect or disrespect for the hospitality principle. In Homer it is Zeus Kseinios (Od. 9.266-271, ll. 13.623-627), whose Avestan equivalent I identify as Sraoša Ašīia 'Sraosha-associated-with-Reward' (see Y. 57.10, 14, 34 with Yt. 11.13 and cf. V. 9.40).

Both Gr. and Olr. use forms signifying intimacy and dearness alongside or in place of the derivatives of PIE *kwšenw- to indicate hospitality. In Homer the root kseinizō is followed by philēθ e.g. in ll. 3.207, Od. 14.322, but philēθ alone 'provide hospitality' e.g. ll. 6.15; Od. 17.69; 8.208; 5.135. The adj. philos is found with kseinos 'guest' e.g. Od. 19.190-191 bis, cf. Od. 1.313; note also the unique compd. philokseinos Od. 6.121 etc. (opp. kakokseinos Od. 20.376), ll. 6.15 etc., philos referring to the source or object of the affect. In Av. hospitality formulas we find, in addition to the verbs xšnu- and
paitizan-, frī- 'treat dearly, intimately', adj. friia-. Thus (friia-) frīa-
paitizanta- Y. 57.34, Yt. 15.36, and Yt. 13.147. In Yt. 13.50–51 the
Fravashis, i.e. Ancestor Spirits, ask, 'who will treat us intimately, who
will welcome us (kō frīnāt kō paiti-zanāt) with meat and clothes in
hand?' so that they may be properly xšnūta- (cf. also Yt. 13.156–159).
Finally the adj. friia- is a fixed epithet in friia- asti- = Olnk. priyā-
atithi- 'the dear guest' (> Skt. compd. priyātithi- 'guest').

In both archaic Gr. and OIr. both terms of hospitality (i.e. the
reflexes of *kwsenw- and the forms indicating intimacy) have cultic
application, and refer to a relationship of reciprocity between worship-
per and deity. In Mycenean, in the 'Pylus Olive Oil Tablets' *ksenwion
(ke-se-nu-wi-jo etc.) designates the fragrant oils offered to the goddess
Potnia (and perhaps the ancestor spirits, with di-pi-si-jo-i- = Dipsos'
'Thristy Ones' (thus Guthrie, Palmer, Bennett et al.), cf. the Av. passages
referring to the Fravashis cited above from Yt. 13). Cf. also the
Theoksinia, Apollo's festivals at Pellene (Chadwick). In Homer phila
dora are the hospitality gifts for the departing guest (e.g. 8.545, with
vb. philēō, and the guest, kseinos, said to be treated as next of kin,
also Od. 13.41; but the same phrase is used of cult offerings in Il. 24.
67–68, where Zeus declares Hector most dear philatatos to the gods
because he never failed to provide phila dora: the divine feast, the
drink offering, the savor of the sacrifice. In Avestan, xšnu- occurs
for 'to propitiate a god', as at Yt. 8.49, where we also have the typical
statement of reciprocity on the part of the god (Tishtriya); in Yt. 8.43,
Tishtriya was already said to be most potent when vastra-
xšnūta-, frīa-
paiti-zanata- 'worshipped, properly requited, treated as intimate, welcomed'.
Alone frī- (verb and root-stem) mean 'pray(er) to propitiate a god.' In
Y. 46 (for which the motifs of hospitality and reciprocity are central;
see Section III), st. 1–2, Zarathushtra says that since the community did
not grant him hospitality (xšnauś) i.e. as priest, he is too poor to propi-
itiate (xšnaosāi) Ahura Mazda, of whom he asks the support given by
one friend to another (frīiō frīiāi). [Aa]

P. Thieme (1939: 105–123) showed in detail that Old Indic cultic
procedure was based on hospitality customs (in passing, I note that we
have parallels to the Indic hospitality ritual [svāgata- and asana-, p. 107]
in Y. 19.32: Good Intent greets the righteous departed souls by asking
how their transition [*trip] was, and escorts them to a golden throne in
Ahura Mazda's House of Song). Later Thieme (1957: 90) suggested (on
grounds wholly independent from mine) that in ancient Iran cult was also
modeled after hospitality. Not only can this now be confirmed for Indi-
Iranian, but in view of the Greco-Iranian correspondences, it seems true for
the Proto-Indo-European situation.

The social changes accompanying the rise of polities and empires
resulted in the loss of the sense of reciprocity originally central to the
Greek and Iranian derivatives of kwsenw-. In Greek the forms in ksen-
expanded, via 'guest', the mg. 'strange, foreign'. In Iranian, where 'give
one thing for another' => 'require' => *give what is merited or expected =>
'please, placate' took place within OIr. (cf. Av. drāfā-, 'satisfied' replac-
ing xšnūta- with friia- and paiti-zanta- in Y. 57.14, the common collocation
of xšnūta- and 'unoffended'; abhīṣata-, anāzārata- etc.), it was only the last
mg. which survived into Middle Iranian (in Sogd. xšnāw-, MPers. šnāv-
< OIr. xšnāwaya-). [Cf. also OPers. xšnuta- 'pleased' (DNb 25).]
By "parallel patterning of semantic courses" I refer to the recurrence of discrete developments in meaning of an etymon, and, more interestingly, such a recurrence of developments in derivatives of one or more other etyma of similar basic signification but unrelated phonological shape. Each course may consist of a series of semantic developments. This parallelism helps map out the semantic terrain characteristic of a language group and provides a check against arbitrariness in assumptions of specific semantic evolutions.

Thus the derivation of Gr. ksūnos 'common' from PIE *kʷsən(w) (whence also Gr. ksēnωs) is supported by Ossetic (a lexically conservative Eastern Iranian Scythoid language of the Caucasus), which has xsān, āxsān 'common'; the independence of the evolution is indicated by ksūn as basis of ksūnos, and the difference in mg. between xsān and OIr. xshanmē. The latter is itself paralleled by Irish ar son (with ar equivalent to the Avestan dative), which also shows the connection of 'instead' with 'requisit' in Hitt. kuššan-, Av. xšnut-. While xšnut- and the verb xšnu- were used in reference to hospitality, their more general meanings, as those of allied forms which lack the hospitality reference, and the lack of the hospitality reference outside of Greek and Iranian, make it likely that the semantic overlap of xšnut-, xšnu- with ksēnωs [ksēnwion, ksenwīro etc.] is another instance of a parallel course for 'give one thing for another'.

The semantically similar root *mey- and its extended *meitH- (denom. <*meitéH?) 'to (ex)change' parallels the entire semantic course proposed for kʷsən-. From Proto-Indo-Iranian *maith- (OInd. méhtate 'changes, alternates', Av. maọa 'vacillation, uncertainty', Av. maōmā-'(to) pair') comes OIr. *maiōman- m. (acc. *maiōmānam 'guest', reflected in later West and East Iranian) and OInd. mithās 'together with', which precisely parallel ksēnωs, ksūn. From the idea of mutuality (Lat. mútuus <*moituos) may be explained 'common' (ksūnos, xsān), cf. Lat. (com)munis (*moini-), Goth. gamains id.: Lith. mainas 'exchange'. Av. xšnut- 'requisit' is paralleled by mačni- 'penalty' (textually, resp. Y. 31-9: ~ Y. 9, where also dāōra- 'gift'), and, as 'hospitality gift', by Goth. maipms 'gift (of exchange)', and finally Av. xšnaọtgra-, MPers. and Parth. asnōhr 'gratitude' is matched by Sicilian moitos.

Similarly the Greco-Iranian series posited for kʷsənw- is paralleled by the evidence assembled by Benveniste for the semantically similar *ghosti- 'compensation, equalization' appearing in Latin: ksēnωs 'host, guest, stranger': OSlav. gosti, Goth. gasts 'guest', Lat. hostis 'stranger' > 'enemy', hospeś 'host' (> also 'guest'); WMr. ḫšnōhr 'gratitude': Lat. (red)hostīre; Av. xšnuman-, ZorMPers. xnum 'offering of) propitiation'; Lat. hostia.

This casts doubt on the conventional etymology of OInd. ātithi-, Av. asti- 'guest': from r. at- 'to wander, pass, go' (OInd. ātati). Now 11r. 'guest' should not be a 'wanderer' but 'a partner in exchange', like its Ir. successor *maiōman-. The forms ātithi-, asti- should go back to a form with a laryngeal after the first dental, *Hvthi- expectedly resulting in OInd. *āthi- OIr. ast-, cf. OInd. pathibis, OIr. padhī-, OInd. duhitar-, OIr. dugear-, Gr. thugāteīr, etc. Moreover a suffix -thi- would be unexplained. Thus I propose PIr. *atHti- (with the common suffix -ti-), whence OInd. *ātithi- > ātithi-, with metathesis expectable
from the usual Grassmann patterns, and from associations with átati- and perhaps át- 'beyond a border'. [A3] It thereby becomes likely that átithi-, asti- be parallel to ksenwos, gosti- and mēchman etc. from the etymological viewpoint, but also from the morphological viewpoint: *ahThi- m. would be based on an abstract noun indicating an institution *ahTli- f. just like hospis, gosti etc. < gosti- m. (with atithipatí 'host' paralleling Lat. hospes, OSlav. gospodí < gosti-pe-ot-) < f. * gosti-, cf. *maïman- m. < maïman- n., and quite possibly ksenwos, with -e- vocalism indicating an underlying verbal noun (*ksenwos n.?).

The required evidence for PLIR. *ahH-, having a mg. similar to *kw السن(w)- and *mey(Th)- 'to alternate, vacillate', appears in OInd. vyath- 'to vacillate', for which I propose *vi-ath- (with vi- 'in different directions') against the usual connection with OInd. vithura-,

Goth. wipondanz 'to vacillate, shaking from side to side', PIE *wyetH-~*wey(Th)- 'winding, deviating', is shown by the lack of other PIE etyma in *wy- or *my-, *ny-, *ry- (similarly OInd. vyadh- [vyādhaya- etc., see Mayrhofer, KEW s.v.] 'to pierce' and vyā(n)y- 'make spacious', lacking any PIE etymon; I suggest resp. *vi-adh- to PIE *(E)edd- 'spitz, stechend' [Pokorny IEW 289] and PLIR. *wi-an(y)- [like nya(n)y]-adj., and/or < anč- 'to bend'; OIr. wi(y)anč- > OPers. winč- > MPers. wini- > guni-).

Further evidence for PIE *ActH- 'to alternate, to vacillate' (from which, in place of the alleged *at- 'gehen' would derive not only IIR. 'guest' but also OInd. átati- 'wanderers' as well as the Irish and Gothic words for 'year') may be seen through parallelism of the semantic course of *mey- etc.: OInd. átithi-, Av. asti- (partially homonymous with asta- 'dwelling' and ast- 'bone'); MPers. mēchod etc.;

Av. aTh- 'to harm', aThor, aThi- 'uncertainty, danger, injury, harm' (aThi- linked at Y. 32.16 and 48.9 to dudaeTh- 'doubtful, dangerous situation', glossed MPers. gumanīth 'doubt, uncertainty', thus confirming Benveniste [1966 294] on Gr. en dosei, deide, PIE dwe- 'to fear!'); Av. maeTh- 'instability', ONor. mein 'harm, injury!'; OInd. átati- 'wanderers', átya- *passing,swift', Lat. mēō 'wander, pass, move', further Gr. ameibō 'exchange', Lat. migrē 'wander, migrate' (*mey-gw-); Lat. annus, Goth. āpna- (*atn-o-): Sogdian and Shughni mēō 'day'.

Note that annus etc. < *goi is not supported by PIE *Hve- 'year', which is not from *Fey- 'to go' but rather *Aey- 'to allot' (*Ay-, not *Ey- > Gr. h-); cf. the parallels Lith. mėtas 'year, time'; Eng. tide, Germ. Zeit. tī 'age, years, days' < deAy- 'to distribute', Hitt. lammar 'time' < *nem- 'to assign', etc. For annus: mēēi Cf. Gr. hōra with mg. 'hour, day' as well as 'year'. Cf. also Eng. week, ONor. wika 'week; exchange of oarsman (nautical mile)', ONor. gífa-víx < 'exchange of gifts', Swed. vicka 'to be unsteady' < *wey-g/k- 'to vacillate'. Finally, Heb. šānâh, Aram. šantâ 'year': Heb. šānâh, Aram. šenā 'changed' provides a parallel from Semitic.

The use of parallels from another language group is often justifiable as an ancillary or heuristic aid. Thus the etymology of OInd. hnu- 'to deny, conceal, to atone for, make expiation, appease' which figures prominently among unsuccessful comparisons with Av. xšnu-, may now be explained as the cognate of ONor. gnú 'to rub', Gr. khnōs, khnōs 'powder, chaff, incrustations' and khnoe 'axle-box', for which I set up PIE *gnew- 'to rub'; cf. Bibl. Heb.
kipper 'atoned for, expiated, appeased', koņer 'atonement fee', Arab. kaffara 'concealed, denied God's existence, was ungrateful', kaffara 'concealed, atoned for, made expiation', Syr. kāpar 'rubbed off, wiped, deleted, denied, (ab)negated', and Accad. kāparu 'to wipe off, to rub; to cleanse, to trim, peel, or pare off, to polish', kuppuru 'to wipe off, to rub; to cleanse, to purify ritually (e.g. through sacrificial victims)' (von Soden).

Parallel semantic development provides an etymological solution in the instance of two words discussed in Sect. I, Gr. φίλος and OIr. fria- (Oln. priyá-) 'intimate, dear, beloved, friendly'. The Homeric and the OIr. (chiefly evidenced by Vedic) refer to one's own self, vital force, body and its parts, home and familiar personal objects, kin and wife (philē, priyā, nominal), friends and, as discussed above, the hospitality sphere (and its cultic projection); furthermore, due to the rise of the city and state entity as the chief force in social organization (as against individual relationships), in both Gr. and IIr. the word became limited to 'dear, friend(ly)'.

IIr. p/fria- and its cognates (which include Eng. friend) have been derived from a "preposition" *prei- ("preAi?") 'close by', cf. Lith. prię, prių 'by, at', OLat. pri, also prē 'before', Gallic arc- 'before, by', in view of *priyō- as denoting the intimate, the personal sphere of an individual; thus Scheller (1958: 122 sqq); Mezger (1965: 32-33 ) and Schwartz (1975: 207 w. n. 31). The etymology of φίλος, hitherto unknown, may now be given in completion of the parallelisms with priyā-. The formal analysis necessary a priori, *bhi-lo-, allows its identification as an adj. in -lo- from PIE bhi 'close, at hand', cf. Goth. bi, OHGerm. bij 'by, at', originally a post-position, and the Myc. comitative case-ending *-phi, productive in Hom. in sg. and pl. with nouns of various shapes.

The opposite of φίλος (philēō) is ekhthros 'hated, inimical' (ekhthairō 'to hate', etc.), from PIE *Egēhs-tro- 'external, extraneous, estranged, alien', adj. to *Egēhs, Gr. eks 'out(side)'. Clearly the opposition of the particles *bhi and *Egēhs indicates intimus vs. extraneus, close vs. distant. By the principle of parallelism of semantic patterning, applied with the rigor of symmetry, we would expect that IIr. dwīsta-, Oln. dvīstā-, Av. bhistā- etc., the precise semantic equivalent of Gr. ekhthros, should also have an etymon indicating the idea of being outside, distanced, alienated. It does: dwiśta- is the precise cognate of ONor. tvistr (PIE *dwis-to-s) 'separate', vb. tvistra 'to separate', MHGerm. twist 'quarrel', cf. Goth. twiss-stass 'standing apart', from PIE *dwis 'in two parts'. This Gmc.-IIr. etymology is supported by the connection I propose of Av. bhisīs- 'joint' with OEng. twisla 'confluence of two rivers' and related forms for bifurcation. The derivation of IIr. dwiśta- from PIE *dwey- 'to fear' (< 'fearful uncertainty', see above), which has been favored in recent literature, must now be abandoned.
In Iranian, the term xšnuta-, indicating reciprocity, had taken on an additional sense of 'pleased, placated' as already noted. With the additional close association of xšnuta- with friya-, xšnuta- became the canonical opposite of dwišta-, whose mg. included 'alienated' (> 'offended' = 'non-placated, mistreated').

The conceptual picture of archaic PIE society that emerges from our study is that of individuals centered in circles containing their close possessions, family, and friends; the outsider to these circles was viewed as a potential enemy. Alliances neutralizing or eliminating the potential threat were brought about by the rapprochement of the two circles, with each penetrating the border of the other by means of alternating presentation of dear possessions from within each circle of intimacy upon the reciprocative entry into the respective households. This was Indo-European hospitality.

By "syntropy" I mean change or creation brought about by the simultaneous interactions of various factors within and across different hierarchies and parameters of form and meaning; this may be seen in terms of the dynamics of the associative process taking place within a multidimensional network of mental data. This outlook provides a theoretical structural framework in which to analyze the effects of phenomena such as "attraction", "contamination", "word-play", etc.

One problem for the etymology of xšnu- has been the mg. 'to hear' found in Wlr.: OPers. ā-xšn(a)u-, MPers. āšnaw-, (a)šnaw-, Parth. (a)šnawa-. In terms of syntropic analysis we must start from the following items in the lexical network: (i) xšn(a)u- 'to require, reciprocate favorably, be hospitable, please!', (2) pres. stem srun(a)u- 'to hear, to obey', (3) (a) xšnā- 'to know', (b) *ā-xšnā- 'be aware of something' (cf. MPers āšnāg 'aware, familiar with'), and possibly (c) *pati-xšnā- = *pati-zan- 'welcome with tokens of hospitality'; cf. Av. paiti.xšnāta- = paiti-zanata- (both glossed MPers. padōrti 'received'), where -xšnāta- is from PIE *aHnō- and -zanta- its later analogical replacement. In OPers. we would have the following potential phonological (----) and semantic (-----) connections:

The chief factor in linking *xšn(a)u- and *srun(a)u- was OPers. *sunuyah... xšnuvah, the equivalent of the Avestan formula surunuiā... xšnuuiā 'may you hear and reciprocate favorably'(obj. yasna- 'liturgy, prayer'), Yt. 10.32, Y. 68.9. Here we would have an "irreversible binomial" (to use Prof. Malikel's term) with close phonological association and simultaneous close semantic association (hear/obey: reciprocate favorably). This would motivate the replacement of srun(a)u- (itself semantically overloaded, with additional mgs. 'sing' and 'make famous' in the causative and past participle) by xšn(a)u, which phonologically connected the semantically associable srun(a)u- and (a)xšnā- ('hear' being
commonly replaced by 'perceive'). The a- of a-xšna- then attached itself to xšn(a)- bringing about the formally distinct form a-xšn(a)y-, whence MPers. ašna-, ašnaw-, the latter passing into Parthian probably during the period of Sasanian rule.

Another problem for the history of PIE *kʷšenw-*, OIr. xšnu- is solved by a "syntropic" analysis: the fact that Vedic r. sā- (Śi-) 'to sharpen' also means 'to treat favorably; treat hospitably'. According to the view first proposed by Humbach (1952: 111-6) and independently taken up recently by Hollifield (1978: 175-76), each citing a personal communication by Karl Hoffmann, the second sense of sā- provides a parallel for a development of PIlr. r. kšnu- 'to sharpen' (Olnd. kšnauti; Ir. only hu-xšnut-, of a dagger) to 'treat favorably, hospitably'. Here is an interesting instance of the limitations of mechanically assigning probative value to a single instance of a putative non-serial semantic parallelism. In this case, doubt arises because the proposed development cannot be explained by culture-bound factors, nor by universal patterns of association: it is difficult to bridge the semantic gulf of 'sharpen' and 'treat hospitably', etc.; Humbach's putative intermediary 'strengthen' is indemonstrable and otherwise of little help.

Before proposing a different solution, a survey of the relevant occurrences of sā- is in order.

It would require a separate monograph to document and discuss the complexity in use of sā- in the poetic language of the RgVeda. Here only a crude summary of the chief data is possible. The vb. sā- often has as direct object the gods, usually with a request for reciprocity RV 8.67.7, 8.40.10 seq.), or the dir. obj. may be the worshipper rewarded by the god (3.24.4-5; 3.16.3; 10.12.4 etc.) or else the hymns and petitions themselves (8.24.3, 7.18.2, etc.). Clear hospitality imagery is found with regard to Agni: 7.42.4: When Agni is treated well in the dwelling of a rich man, a guest well pleased (aitthi-, su-pritā-) in the house, then he grants the clan's (house's) wishes. Since Fire, "Lord of the House", is kindled from Fire (1.12.6), we read šiṣṭhi (imperative) the Dear Guest, the Lord of the House . . . at his resting place', 6.16.42 etc. Conversely in return for his being made great with fuel, the "hosts" ask Agni to sā- them, 6.15.19.

While such passages provide perfect parallelism with the Av. xšnu-, with combination of hospitality with reciprocity, the use of sā- differs in that it frequently has an additional reference to actual sharpness, with comparison to pointed weapons. This double mg. 'treat favorably/sharpen' is found commonly of Agni with reference to his flames (tejas-, combined in the continuation of the last-cited verse with tigma- 'pointed weapon'), compared with blades (6.3.5), horns (5.9.5), teeth (10.43.3) sharpened to overcome evil. In the opening of 10.87, Agni is said to be sharpened (šiṣano) when kindled and invoked to grab the sorcerers, metal-toothed, with his flame; verse 24, Agni is addressed, 'burn the . . . sorcerers . . . I sharpen you (šiṣāmi) . . . with my prayer-thoughts; awaken, o inspired one!' Here sā- simultaneously refers to propitiation, sharpening, stoking, and stimulating.
However, the verb occurs with regard to the propitiatory "sharpening" of the weapons of other gods, esp. Indra, and of propitiation (offerings, hymns) in general. Quite commonly, too the god is asked to 'whet' the prayer itself or, e.g. 2.39.7: Ĩmā girō aśvīnā yuṣmāyangā ē kṣnētēnēva svādhitām samā sīṣthām 'O Aśvins, whet for us these praises of you as an axe with a whetstone!'

Alongside sā-, we find r. cud- 'to sharpen, whet, urge, propel', e.g. cōdāyāmi ca āyuḥā vācōabhī sam te sīṣāmi bṛhatmāṇā vāyāṃśi 'I "sharpen" your weapons with words, and I "whet" strengths (= sustenance) for you with sacred utterance'; 10.120.5. Cf. the alternation sā-, cud- in requests for divine "sharpening" of inspired hymns, e.g. cōdāva dhiyām (with simile 'blade of metal') 6.10.17, dhiyām . . . sīṣadhī 8.42.3, etc.

Another difference from the Iranian situation is the occurrence of both sā- and cud- with dir. obj. 'wealth' (rādhas-) sought from the gods, or simultaneously from the patrons (7.96.2 and 1.48.2 cud-; 7.18, 10.42.3 sā-, etc.). Conversely 'just him, i.e. Indra, do I whet (urge) to / for great wealth (in return for soma) for drinking' 8.67.7. Finally, note 8.4.15-16, in a prayer to Pūṣan, patron-god of hymnists: 'We choose for friendship Pūṣan of many treasures; may you, able, much invoked, facilitate, through the inspired hymn (dhiyā), the propulsion (tuje) of riches. Sharpen (sīṣṭhi) us like a knife in the hands, grant us wealth, o releaser! Through you are riches in cattle easy to obtain, when you propel (or advance, treat favorably: hīnō) a man; cf. also tuje-w. rāy-, 9.87.6. Here it may be seen that 'propel, speed forth' found for cud- (but not sā-) with dir. obj. 'wealth' or the petitioner would fit in well with the terms for 'to grant', etc.

[hi- 'propel' = 'treat with favor' commonly; cf. hītā- 'dear'.]

A syntropic analysis may now be suggested. Pllr. had the following: The r. *kśnu- 'to requisite', etc., whence the Ir. forms discussed above, including, via Pllr. *kṣnaudrā-, Av. xṣnaOra- 'grace, favor'; r. *kŚnu- 'to sharpen, whet, abrade', attested only in ava kṣṇāmi 'I efface, destroy' RV 10.23.2; pres. ptc. mid. kṣnūnā- AV 5.20.1; and Av. huxṣnutā- 'well sharpened', with *kṣnaudra-Oln. kṣnōtra- 'whetstone'; r. sā- 'to sharpen, whet, to abrade', represented both in Indic and Iranian (Pers. sāvač 'rubs' etc.), Pllr. *sāna- > Oln. sāna-, Pers. sān 'whetstone'; Pllr. r. cud- 'to whet, to sharpen, to stimulate, to impel', Oln. r. cud-, cf. Pers. āust 'agile' etc. (cf. also ONor. hvetia 'to sharpen, stir up', Goth. gahutjan 'to impel, whet', ONor. hvat 'quick, sharp'). The poor attestation of the verb r. *kśnu- in both branches indicates that its obsolescence in favor of sā- probably began in Pllr., attributable to the homonymy of *kśnu-.

It is the homonymy of the two roots kśnu- from which one must start in order to explain the development of sā. The acquisition by sā- of the meanings of *kśnu- in Indic would have begun in contexts where there was a semantic associability between the two homophonous verbs *kśnu-. A starting place may have been 'prayer' etc. as obj. of *kśnu-, cf. Av. yasna- as obj. (dir. or indir.) of xṣnu-. We have in AV 5.20.1 the attestation of kṣnūnāna- modifying vāc- 'voice' (of a war-drum).
'Sharp' i.e. 'cutting' with regard to the effectiveness of a prayer could be interpreted as incisive, or decisive (Arab. qāṭi' 'cutting, asserting decisively'). The simile would have been completed by the homonymy of *kšnautra- 'favor', 'whetstone'. Furthermore, the verb cud- meant not only 'sharpen, whet', which permitted its well-attested interchangeability with šā-, but also had the notion of 'further, favor, treat well' from 'push forth, propel', supported by the semantically parallel courses of hi- and tui-, and would also have wealth as dir. obj. (a usage not found for Av. xšnu-); thereby 'sharpen' would undergo a commensurate semantic expansion.

As concerns specifically the cult of the gods, the ritual centrality of Fire (Agni) had an important role in the Indic merger of *kšnu- as 'reciprocate, treat hospitably, propitiate cultically' and 'sharpen, whet' etc. Agni was the divine idealization of both guest (ātithi-) and host (gṛhāpāti-) and thus an optimal representation of the reciprocity of hospitality (cult) at the same time there was a close association between stoking and feeding the sacred flames, which was seen as whetting Agni's blades, horns etc.; in our texts precisely the same verb (ō/-sām/-ni-)šā- is used for 'stoking' and 'sharpening'. This would have set a precedent for the 'sharpening' of other gods, whereby their being offered food, drink, praise, etc. was conceived of as both stimulating them (i.e. making them active and/or urging them) and sharpening their weapons to combat evil. Probably Indra figured prominently in the transition, being the most important divinity of the RV, activated by Soma and wielding the vajra. A close association between Indra and Agni is indicated by their forming a compound divinity; note esp. 6.40.10-11, where the worshippers are exhorted to sharpen (śīśhī) each of the two, who pierce or split (bhid-) the eggs (brood) of the monster Śuṣaṇī.

The chief convergent semantic trajectories of the various relevant roots may be schematized as follows:

While the precise chronology of events is uncertain, it is clear that the Indic replacement of *kšnu- by šā- is due to the concerted operation of a variety of factors: (1) the homophony of the two roots *kšnu-; (2) the complexly manifold semantic associability between the various meanings of each root; (3) the expansion of šā- at the expense of
the synonymous *kšnu-; (4) the semantic overlap of cud- with kšnu and ṣā- as well as with kšnu-. It may also be noted that polysemy was an important aspect of the vatic tone of the RgVeda, valued as both an aesthetic and hierophantic quality, increasing the value of the hymn as a means of stimulating and strengthening the divinity addressed, and also increasing the professional hymnist - priest's merit of reward by his patron-host; this characteristic of the liturgical hymnic corpus, the most important context for the terminology involved, would have furthered the processes at issue (whose reflection in the everyday language cannot be determined).

The general interest of the development of *kšnu- and ṣā- in Indic is, apart from its illustration of syntropic operations, its presentation of an unusual phenomenon: the complete replacement of a lexical item not by its synonym, but by the homonym of its synonym.

A final illustration of syntropy, this time as reflected beyond the linguistic realm, in the realm of poetic organization, and in the oldest corpus of Iranian texts, Zarathustra's Gāthās:

As noted in section I, the Avestan canonical terms for the gifts of hospitality are xšnūt- and aši- (araēti-), as at Y. 60.2 and Purs. 39; at the same time they are the ordinary words rep. for 'requital' and 'reward'. They occur consecutively in the Gāthās for eschatological remunerations, but are immediately followed by hospitality motifs in Y. 51.9-16 and Y. 31.3-4; 19-22 (with 3-4/19 showing the same motif), which show sequential linear parallelism:

Y. 51.9: 'That requital (xšnūtam) which you will assign/create for both sides [good and evil] through your bright blazing fire and molten metal, to designate among creatures harm to the deceitful and benefit for the righteous'.

Y. 51.10: (Against the wicked opponents of Z.) 'I invoke Righteousness to come to me with Good Reward (ašī)'.

Y. 51.11: 'Who is an ally (uruwāta) to Z.? . . . Who is intent on the gift (magāi) from Good Mind?'

Y. 51.12: 'Not that bugger of a Kavi: at the Bridge of Winter he did not give hospitality to (xšnāš) Z., blocking his stay, even when his draft animals were trembling from wandering and from cold.'

Y. 51.13: 'The Kavi's soul will vex him at the Bridge of Judgement because of his deeds . . . '.

Y. 51.14: 'And the Karapans who mistreat cattle are not allies (uruwātha) and will be doomed to the "House of Deceit".'

Y. 51.15: 'But Z., who promised reward (mīzdām) to the generous patrons (magauabītā), will lead them into the House of Song.'

Y. 51.16: E.g. Vishtaspa, 'through the power of the gift (magahīa), via the paths of Good Mind.'

Y. 31.3: 'That requital (xšnūtam) through Righteousness and Fire, which you have created for both sides with your Spirit . . . declare it for us to know.'

Y. 31.4: 'When I call upon Righteousness, Mazda and the other Ahuras will be present, with Reward (ašī) . . . '.

Y. 31.19: 'That allotment (vidāta) for the good of the two sides through your bright-blazing Fire, o Ahura Mazda.'
Y. 31.20: 'Whoever comes to the aid of a righteous man, heavenly glory will be his future possession. But a long duration of darkness, bad food, and sounds of woe—to this state, o evil ones, will your conscience lead you for your deeds.'

Y. 31.21: (Ahura M. grants support to his ally, ururuath.)

Y. 31.22: The benefactor will become 'Ahura's best fed guest' (vāzištō anḥaiti astīs).

Moreover Y. 51.12 seq. is paralleled in linear sequence by Y. 46.11 seq.: Kavis and Karapans injure creatures; their souls will vex them at the Bridge of the Judge; they will be forever 'guests (astaištō in the House of Deceit'; those allied for the maga-gift will be in Ahura Mazda's abode, esp. Vishtaspa; praise of Spitamids and Haugvids, etc. Note that Y. 46.1-6 and 13 is specifically concerned with hospitality and reciprocity (xšnu-).

Zarathushtra linked together the disparate usages of xšnūt- and ašī-, i.e. as applied to hospitality and eschatology, by the fact that each usage was independently associated with houses; moreover both usages were connected by the relationship of social and religious principles:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Principles</th>
<th>Religious Principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gifts of Hospitality (xšnūt-, ašī-)</td>
<td>Eschatological Requital (xšnūt-, ašī-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Reception</td>
<td>Heavenly/Hellish Abodes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The conflation of the remunerations of hospitality with those of eschatology permitted Zarathushtra further to project events of his own experience, esp. as regards hospitality, into his eschatological vision; at the same time he could integrate his experience near a bridge with his notion of an eschatological bridge of crisis. One axis of symmetry was afforded by the requital/reciprocity model, and the other by Z.'s strict dualism. The combined picture gained from a comparison of Y. 31, Y. 51 and Y. 46 may be schematized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACT (OF GIVING)</th>
<th>REQUITAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kavi refuses Z. at Winter's Bridge</td>
<td>Kavi's soul condemned at Judge's Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishtaspa et al. grant Z. hospitality</td>
<td>will be best-fed guest(s) in A.M.'s House of Song in heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kavis et al. don't grant Z. hospitality</td>
<td>will eat bad food as guest(s) in the House of Deceit with sounds of woe in hell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It now emerges from the relationship of the three texts (which are from different sections of the Gāthās) that the entirety of the Gāthās forms a compositional unity. Here we find syntropy as an important factor in the poetic tours de force whereby Zarathustra achieved this end. As in the Vedic material discussed above, the exploitation of polysemy is a characteristic of archaic Indo-Iranian vatic technique. Here, as in a large range of poetry, the syntropy of linguistic (and paralinguistic) data, which begins unconsciously, becomes part of a process of artistic organization. [A4]

NOTES

1 The radically aberrant view of Insler (1975: 156) must be rejected. Insler rightly objected to seeing an inf. in xšānmānē, but his own reading *xšānā māne (sic) for *xšānām mānā is far-fetched: (1) the dangling clause 'I who have recognized . . .' is impossible; (2) the assumption that *māne is for *mānā and this for *manā is unsupportable; no help is furnished by Insler's interpretation of manā vistāiš Y. 46.19 (allegedly for *manā vistāiš, with *-ā - . . . -i- > -ā - . . . -i-), where moreover 'my possessions' makes less sense as part of an eschatological reward for a righteous man than the straightforward manā vistāiš 'things seen in the mind, envisioned in the plan'. (3) If *xšānānā were the older reading, one would expect the Pahl. translation to have recognized it as a form of 'to know'. Instead the Pahl. has āsad, which seems to reflect */hš*n-, cf. Bartholomae s.v. xšānmānē.

2 Possibly here one can compare typologically the contrast of the "upper" and "lower" Sephiroth in the hierophany of the Kabbalah.

3 Insler (1975: 182) strongly defends xšnūt- as 'satisfaction' "in the legalistic sense" (seeing the Gāthic eschatological terminology as chiefly derived from the legal sphere), for which he cites the oldest usage of Eng. satisfaction in the OED. The sentence cited there indicates that the goal of the satisfaction is the offended party, as is to be expected; in the Gāthic passages however Ahura Mazda (the party to be satisfied) gives or assigns the xšnūt- to the good and evil.

4 The term vāzištā- modifying asti- was shown conclusively by Humbach (1952: 24-27, 33-34) to mean 'most strengthened, best fed', [cognate of OInd. vāja- 'invigoration, prize']. I would add that the old positive of vāzištā- was važra-, OInd. vajrā- *'bloating, forcful' (> 'mace'), cf. OPers. važika- 'great, big' etc., ONor. vāk 'energetic', etc. Furthermore, vāzištā- as applied to the guest finds an important correlation in Ossetic: Dīgor iwāzāg, Iron wāzāg 'guest'! The latter attests another replacement for OIr. asti-.

5 Insler's translation of hnu- as 'to satisfy' is inaccurate; the mgs. 'deny, conceal, atone for' were conclusively demonstrated by Charpentier (1916: 96-105) and cf. J. Brough, Siddha-Bhārati, 1950, 1-5. The connection of hnu- with Ir. xšnu- is rejected on formal grounds (the velar attested in the Av. redup.) by Charpentier, 105, and recently by Hollifield (1978: 175-176), who also notes the discrepancy in mgs.; his own etymology, -n- infix from *ghew- 'to call', is insupportable semantically and formally (note Gr. pēpūmēnos, ēmpnūtō cannot be wholly separated from pnew- 'blow, inspire', anapneō etc.).
Av. snu in the Frahang-i Qīm is probably a corrupt, truncated form; the gloss sōgēndan 'to bring about benefit' suggests sās-, sāus- or the like < r. sav-.

6 Against Scheller (whose study is invaluable for the mg. of privá-, its cognates, and the parallelism with philos), it does not seem necessary to reconstruct a laryngeal base preA-. Gr. praus 'gentle, friendly' may be conn. w. prāos 'meadow', Lat. prāvus 'bent', with the same semantic course as Sogd. namē 'gentle', Lat. nemus 'meadow', Av. nam- etc. 'to bend'. Ir. pri-, GMC. fri- perh. *pri-A-, with the same verb marker as Hitt. newāh- etc.

7 Cf., in addition to the etymologies of Gr. akouō, Eng. hear, etc. < 'perceive', in Ir. Ormuri amar- 'hear' < 'take account of'.

8 Humbach (1952:11; 1956:70) not only takes Ir. xšnu- 'to treat well' but also 'to hear' (which he unconvincingly tries to demonstrate for an Av. form without ū-) from 'sharpen'; see against this already Gershevitch (1959:324).

9 Aspects of the parallelism of Y. 51 to Y. 46, with remarks on the contrasts along what I call the horizontal axis, and comments on the "ring-compositional style" of the texts, are found in Humbach (1952:20); the same article is particularly important for its recognition of the guest status of the professional priest.

ADDENDA

[1] The clearest contexts for xšnu- as 'provide hospitality' are
(1) Purisīniha 49: 'He who has not x.d (xšnaosta) nor will x.
(xšnauaiite) the righteous man coming to his door-post (aTâhua
with Humbach *Tâhua = Ond. Tâsû) [will not go to Paradise].'
(2) Hadost Nask 2.19 (of exempla of piety): 'x.ing (kuxšnuanô) the
righteous man coming from near and from far' (also Vištāsp Yašt
59, in connection with Vištâspa, who having put an end to
Zarathushtra's wanderings, is the host par excellence); for
'righteous man' (= 'Zoroastrian') cf. Y. 46. 5-6, where Zarathushtra,
in stating the rules of hospitality, distinguishes the deceitful from
the righteous, admonishing hosts to warn their families against
suspect guests; (3) Y. 51.12: 'He ... did not x. (xšnus)
Zarathushtra ... though his (Z.'s) draft beasts were trembling
from wandering and cold'.

The use of the middle voice with xšnu- in hospitality
contexts is connected with its status as a verb of reciprocity.

[2] Mayrhofer, IJ 4, 1960, 136-140 has reported, from cuneiform
materials from Nuzi and Alalakh, a number of apparent Aryan
personal names in -atti, which appears to be yet another
realization of PIlr. *atHtî-*'guest'. Thus Birjatti *Priya-atthi-
or the like), 'Philoxenos', cf. Ond. priyā- ātithi-, Av. fīīa- asti-',
and forms with first member of compd. the name of a god (*Mitra,
Asura, Sūrya, Indra), i.e. 'Having Mitra (etc.) as a guest'. This
may now be seen as a further reflection of hospitality as model
for cult.

[3] Ond. ātya (ātiya-) literally means 'by-passing' and is from
āti-, as was shown by Kuiper, IJ 4/4, 1960, 220 n. 10. This
further confirms the secondary association of átithi- (*átithit*) with both átati and áti-, and the parallelism of the semantic course of their root with that of mey-, which may be illustrated schematically as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIE <em>mey-(t-H-)</em> 'exchange'</th>
<th>PIE <em>Ae-,t-(H-)</em> 'to alternate'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OInd. nimáyate 'changes'</td>
<td>OInd. vyáthate 'vacillates'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sogd. etc. méé 'day'</td>
<td>Lat. annus etc. 'year'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat. méé 'pass, wander'</td>
<td>OInd. átati 'wanders', átya- 'by-passing'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONor. mein 'harm'</td>
<td>Av. áQi- 'harm'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPers. méhmén etc. 'guest'</td>
<td>Av. ásti- etc. 'guest'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other parallel courses may be schematized similarly, e.g.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIE <em>kwsen-(w-)</em> 'to exchange'</th>
<th>PIE <em>mey-(t-H-)</em> 'to exchange'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gr. kúndos, Oss. x̃án 'common'</td>
<td>Lat. communís 'common',</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr. kúsán 'together with'</td>
<td>mútuus 'shared'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPers. šnóhr 'grateful'</td>
<td>OInd. mithás 'together with'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av. x̃nút- 'requitil'</td>
<td>Sic. moítos 'gratitude'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr. kśénwos 'guest'</td>
<td>Av. maēni- 'penalty'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MPers. méhmán 'guest'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[4] The idea of heavenly reciprocity for earthly hospitality passed from the Gáthás (probably via digests and catechisms such as the Pûrûṣûñhã) into the Pahlavi literature; note esp. Some Sayings of Ādurû nthâdh, Son of Mâhrâspand 16 (PT 146): 'Give hospitable reception (padir bawaed) to the traveler so that they will receive you all the more here (on earth) and there (in heaven), for he who gives, gets, and with increase (profit, interest: wâxs) besides'. Here may even be seen a reflection of the "attenuated sort of potlatch" characterizing the archaic situation.
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