The etymology of Pahlavi and New Persian nihuftan—nihumb-

By G. Ito

So far as is known, two different etymologies have hitherto been proposed for nihuftan. P. Horn, Gr. d. np. Et., Nr. 1059, connects it with Skt. gup, while Fr. Müller, Kleine Mittheilungen, WZKM. 8(1894), 190, derives it from IE. *dhub-. This latter's viewpoint is also accepted by H. Hübschmann, Pers. St., p. 103. But H. S. Nyberg, Hilfsbuch d. Pehl., Gloss., p. 159, seems to admit their equal possibilities.

If Skt. gup- is a pseudo-root, as is maintained by Macdonell, Vedic Gram., p. 358, n. 13; p. 402, n. 2, and also by M. Leumann, Zur Stammbildung d. Verben im Indischen, IF. 57(1910), 220, the view of Horn is hardly sustainable. Otherwise, even if one connects Skt. gup- with Av. gufra- (Pahl. zufr), Gr. ρύη, Old Slav. župa- with K. Brugmann, Aksl. župa "Bezirk", IF. 11(1900), 111-21, it is impossible for this connection to explain the difficulties presented by Pahl. ąhuftan and its derivatives, any more than that of Müller.

These last forms which are very suggestive to our problem now under consideration have not been the subjects of sufficient studies up to this time. After long researches I should like to read ąhuftan meaning "reveal, show, expose, manifest". The contexts of the passages where it occurs are strongly in favour of our suggestion. Etymologically the word ąhuftan must be
attached to the same root with nihuftan, which can also be justified by the present stem -ٞکئو. We have here ahuftan—ähum— quite parallel to nihuftan—nihumb—.

In DkM. 77, 16; 112, 5; 636, 21) ahuftan appears in the expression rāz ahuftan “expose or reveal the secret”5). Almost the same idea is found in DkM. 634, 10); 645, 14); 327, 16. DkM. 645, 14, ḍvak ahuftan i Zartuxşt 'andar pur-nēvakih [u] biţisikih u ěihr-šnāsih u āpārik pēšāk-kirrōkih rāzīkihā u bavandakihā i 'pat dāṭik-dānişnihi̇h u mēnōk-vēnişnihi̇h šāyēt, “one (miracle was) the secret and complete revelation by Zartuxşt, in complete goodness, of his medical practice, diagnosing capacity of symptoms and other professional abilities, which he could do by his lawful knowledge and spiritual vision.”

Ibid., 327, 16, ahuftakih 'ō 'martōm bavandak [u] ākāsih u spurrkārihi̇h pati̇s—“the revelation to the mankind of the complete knowledge and perfect deeds is due to it.”

The abstract ahuftakih is attested also in DkM. 236, 3, 4, 6 and GrBd. 179, 15, both passages being very interesting. DkM. 236, 1-8 runs:

1. 1. ṣerōn amarakāniha kugōhrān āzātakān
   'hač nikonīh u nihuftakih u apādīkāh
   'ō ahuftakih u 'ulīh u paḍīkāh mat,
   zūsān6) u nisān

5. 'hač ahuftakih u 'ulīh u paḍīkāh
   'ō nihuftakih u nikonīh u apādīkāh mat
   'andar 'vēk ōţam;
   u amarakāniha zūsān6) u nisān
   'hač nihuftakih u nikonīh u apādīkāh

10. 'ō ahuftakih u 'ulīh u paḍīkāh <mat> kugōhrān āzātakān
In this passage ahuftakih offers contrast on the one hand (ll. 2-3, 12-13) to nikönih and on the other (ll. 5-6, 9-10) to nihuftakih, thereby making its meaning quite certain.7) GrBd. 179, 15, speaking of the great deeds (buzurg-kartarih) of Rašn as hamkār of Amurāt, says: Rašn menōk i rāstih i'ku 'en 'hān-ič i ahuftakih vinārt 'ēstēt, 'ēm menōk i rāstih rād 'ka 'dēvān vināskārān gēlāh dām 'nē marṇžēnd ruvān-ič <i> 'mārtōmān 'pat vinās tu kirpak rād āmārēnēt; ēgōn gōjēt 'ku dātēvar vičār 'drōg 'kunēt Rašn 'ōō gāsē 'nē 'vēnēt, Srōs ahrād garzet 'ku mē gēlāh tang 'ku 'rāstih 'ōō 'nē mehmān—"Rašn is the Spirit of Rectitude, that is, he takes charge of the exposition") for it is due to the Spirit of Rectitude that the demons and the evil-doers do not destroy the earthly creatures and that the souls of men are accounted for by their bad and good deeds; just as it is said: 'When the judge makes a false decree and Rašn does not see at that place, (then) Srōs, the righteous, complaints, saying: The world has become narrow for me, now that the justice is not resident there.'" In support of this interpretation, we may cite Mx. 2, (161-) 163, 'rōč i cāhārom Vizarš 'dev 'āvēt u ruvān i druvaṇān 'pat 'hān i 'vattar šnōr 'bandēt u 'pat hamēstārīh i Srōs ahrād 'nayēt 'tāk 'ō Çinēvar puhl, (163) 'adaš Rašn i rāst 'hān ruvān i druvaṇān 'pat druvaṇāh āskārāk 'kunēt—(Neryosang's translation, 163) "tato Ra'naḥ satyah tam ātmānam durgatimātam durgatya prakātam kurute." Cf. further DkM. 283, 8-10, 'hač 'hān anayr rošn rāstih mēnōk 'pat patvand 'hač dānakih [i] 'pat nērōk ažōnīkih [i] 'ō 'danistan.

In DkM. 309, 5-15, in which a comparison is made between the
mēnōk judge and the gētēh one, the cause of the difference between their judgements is explained thus: 'cē 'hān i mēnōk dātēvar 'pat mēnōk-vēnišnīh <'har> 'ō vēnišn rōsn u gētēh dātēvar 'nē 'har 'ō vēnišn āhuftak—"for in the case of the mēnōk judge, everything is clear (rōsn) to his eyes through his spiritual vision, while in the case of the gētēh judge, nothing is manifest (āhuftak) to his eyes." Āhuftak, here, is nothing but a synonym for rōsn.9)

Passive form āhumbihist is attested in DkM. 644, 7; Nāmāshā i Mānuščehr (NM.), i, 5, 7, (K35, f. 213, r. 3). DkM. 644, 7, 'kā Zartuxšt 'andar mān i Vistāsp dēn srūt 'čāšm padītāk 'ku āhum-bihist pat-īc pahān stōrān ṣtāxān mēnōk-īc i man mēhan urvāx-manīh—"when Zartuxšt chanted the religio(us hym)n(s) in the house of Vistāsp, it was plain to the eye that even by the large and small domestic animals and also by the spirit of fires of house and abode, was manifested joyfulness."10) Besides, we have DkM. 644, 9-10, harvisp pah u stōr u ṣtāxān <mēnōk> i gyāk <va> mīn urvāx-manīh 'sahist.11) In view of the very close correspondence of the texts we may say that 'sahist is here interpreted by the āhum-bihist two lines above.

NM. i, 5, 7, 'u-š lučašmīhā 'pat bōžīn i 'xeč uspurrik mēnīt, 'u-š nē mat 'ēstātan i passācak hamuskār 'apāč-nimūtār rād anētōnīh avīš 'nē āhum-bihist.

"And he (Zātspram) has thought (it) perfect owing to the prejudice in favour of his own authority. And on account of not having any suitable person come to him to be consulted with and giving explanation, its being not so was not revealed to him."12)

Besides DkM. 645, 14 above referred to, NM. ii, 5, 1(-2) (K 35, f. 226, r. 6) gives us the infinitive form āhuftan:—1. ...... 'hakar-ītān dānišn i druvis tayāft 'hāh, 'adāk-ītān ...... 'bē 'ō 'man āhuftan niyāpak 'būt 'hāh. (2. 'hakar-ītān 'ēn vičir pēš ētōn
Lastly we may add another two passages DkM. 669, 1 and 14, 18. DkM. 669, 1, āhumbišn i Yam-kart var, matan i martōm <u> gōspand hačač, apāč pur-[i] ravišniḥ i 'martōm u gōspand 'hač 'avēšān apērtar 'būtan—"the appearance of the var made by Yam, the coming out of men and cattle therefrom, and the much more re-increasing in number of men and cattle than they (were before)."

Ibid., 14, 18, reman u ālūtak i 'pat vinās ruvān 'kā 'apāč ṭapasēmāniḥ i mēnīšnik u apaxših(?) i goźišnik-ič 'hač vinās patīt i kunīšniḥ……, rās i 'hač dōšax" ĝyōn 'brit 'bavēt ĝyōn vimār-tan āhuft tan vimāriḥ 'ō bišišk druvist-pat ......, 'u-š tan 'hač vimāriḥ bēšažiḥ u 'apāč 'ō druvistih mat—"when he, whose soul is polluted and defiled by sin, is with the contrition by thought, with the (expression of) departing(?) from sin by word, and with the penitence by deed, (then) the passage leading to the hell will be so cut off, just as he whose body is afflicted with disease shows his bodily ailment to the physician and doctor and his body is cured of its disease and comes back to its healthy condition."

This amount of cited evidences is practically conclusive for the rightness of our interpretation of āhuftan and its derivatives. From the contexts the meaning is sufficiently clear. Āhuftan can be paraphrased by āškārakēnītan, paštakēnītan, rōšn kartan, and the like. That the reading āhuftan—āhumb—should be taken in preference to any other one is made certain from the parallel
And moreover, our interpretation of āhuftan can strongly be supported by three Turfan Middle Iranian forms. In M 36 R 22 we read 'bhw<m'>g'ni rāzān i vahi “die Offenbarer der Geheimnisse der Weisheit”15) and in T II D 126 I V 10 f. ēn 'b<hw>mysn ʾy dō bun uō ni<ϕ>γā<ϕ> zindaʾyān vahi uō dēnišn i man aṣ hān i pēsinīyān dēn frāydar uō vahi hēnd “diese meine Offenbarung der beiden Prinzipien und (meine) lebendigen Schriften, Weisheit und Wissen sind vorzüglicher und besser als die der früheren Religionen” (Mir Man. ii). M 219 R 10 offers 'bhwm+yhyd “wird offenbart” (ibid., ii). The texts leave no doubt as to the meaning of these MPT. forms which are to be read respectively aḏhumidityān, aḏhumīšn (cf. Pahl. āhumbišn) and aḏhumīhēd (cf. Pahl. āhumbiḥēt DkM. 112, 5, above referred to).16) They must go back to the same root with āhuftan—āhum-. With the reading and meaning thus established, we come to the etymology. Anyhow to look a privative in the initial Alef of āhuftan is morphologically impossible.17) As I have stated above, the present stem āhum- reveals its derivation from the same root with nihuftan—nihumb-. We have āhumbēt in parallel to nihumbēt (e.g., DkM. 671, 1; 773, 3); āhumbiḥist to nihumbiḥist (e.g., Zātspr. K 35, f. 250, r. 14); āhumbišn (cf. MPT. aḏhumīšn) to nihumbišn (e.g., DkM. 773, 3; Dd. K 35, f. 142, v. 7).

So far, at least, as nihuftan—nihumb- itself is concerned, it is semantically not impossible for it to go back to IE. *dhub- as is maintained by Fr. Müller and H. Hübschmann. But Pahl. āhuftan—āumb- and MPT. aḏhum- cut off the connection, *dhub- would fail to give the meaning of these forms. Nihuftan—nihumb- and āhuftan—āumb- are rather to be attached to IE’ *kup-. *kub- (*keu-p-, *keu-b- ) “bend, vault”, with which are connected Gr. κυφῶ; Germ. comm. *hupi- (> Gothic kups,
Anglo-Saxon hype [Engl. hip]; Old High Germ. huf; New High Germ. hüfte); Gr. κοῦβος; Lat. cubō. Its nasalized form *kumb- is found in Gr. κούβη, κόμβος; Lat. cumba-; Skt. kumbā-; Gaulish cumba-; Old Irish cum, cunnal; Celtic komb, komm; New High Germ. humpe, humpen; Anglo-Saxon hump, etc. So also MPT. ašhum-<*aši-kub-. From Indo-Iranian *kumbha- come Skt. kumbhā-; Av. xumba-; Pahl. xumb ( _हूँ); NPers. xm, xmb "a jar, a large vessel". Besides, the original meaning of IE. *kup-, *kub- is still retained in NPers. xft "bent, curved", xfgy "bending". Hence we may suppose a NPers. *xuftan "bend, curve", as against xuftan "sleep" <Av. xvap-. Also NPers. xm "bent, crooked" points, it seems, to the same root19) In these forms the usual alternation mb: m is abundantly met with. Our supposed etymology will easily explain ākhuftan (ašhum-) and nihuftan. ā-ku)b- (*aši-kub-) "stretch out" will lead to "be conspicuous">"reveal, show, manifest", and *ni-ku)b- "contract" will develop to "conceal". The contrast of meaning between Skt. ā-kuṇe-<*a-keu-k- and ni-kuṇe<*ni-keu-k- is far from what we might expect from ākhuftan and nihuftan,20) but that proves nothing, since the verbal prefix ā- and ni- can easily modify the root-meaning respectively to "reveal" and "conceal" in favour of our expectation.

NOTES

(1) Afterwards, P. Horn, GrIrPh., i.b, 126, rejects his own earlier view together with that of Fr. Müller, stating that the etymology of nihuftan is uncertain. Moreover, he says that the simple form kuftan-humb- meaning "conceal" is also attested. Similarly J. C. Tavadia, ŠnŠ., ii, 9 (p. 35), n. 4. This problem will be discussed below in note 17.

(2) IE. *dhup- is attested in Modern Norweg. and Swed. dyup, Old


(4) West, SBE. Vol. 47, pp. 60, 64, 75, reads *gušustan* which, however, requires *νικόνιχ*. In Pahl. for *gušustan* usually stands *višustan* *νικόνιχ*. From his reading it is quite clear that he does not look the present stem of *νικόνιχ* in *νικόνιχ*. Cf. note 14.

(5) M 36 R 22 finds here an exact parallel. See below note 15.

(6) *ziš*, NPers. *ziš* "violent, wicked, unmannerly".

(7) The tentative transposition of *nikóniχ* and *nihuštakih* in 1.2 in view of the word-order *nihuštakih* u *nikóniχ* in 1.9 is excluded, because we have the same word-order *nikóniχ* u *nihuštakih* in 1.13. To answer to this last line, 1.12 is supplied by me in correspondence to 1.3.

(8) See J. Darmesteter, *Zend Avesta*, ii, p. 321, where the passage *ti'ku 'en 'hán-īδ i āihuštakih vinārt ēstēt* is left untranslated without any comments.

(9) *Āhuštak* occurs also in Pahl. Vd. 8, 10 comm. See note 17.

(10) West, *op. cit.*. Vol. 47, p. 74, "when Zartůst chanted revelation in the abode of Vistāsp, it was manifest to the eye that it is danced to with joyfulness, both by the cattle and beasts of burden, and by the spirit of fires which are in the abode", is wrong. If I am not mistaken, he seems to read *yumbihīst*. But as far as is known, *yumb-* is attested simply or only with the prefix *ā*. For *man mēhan*, which he misreads *man miyān*, cf. Bartholomae, *op. cit.*., iii, 36, n. 3 and Tavadia, ZII. 8 (1931), 125-6.

(11) West, *loc. cit.*, translates, "There seemed a righteous joyfulness of all the cattle, beasts of burden, and fires of the place..." The text offers *āštā* which he reads *āštā*, identifying it with *akhraw*. But here
it is highly postulated to read \(<va>hîsh\), meaning "residence". \(\text{Vahi}\n<\text{Av. }"\text{vah- }"\text{weilen}"\), \(\text{AirWb. col. }1394\). \(\text{Gyâk }<\text{va}>hîsh\) will, then, correspond to man mîhan and give a better sense.

(12) West, \textit{op. cit.}, Vol. 18, p. 300, "Also with a kind regard for his own choice he has thought it (the former teaching) imperfect, and, on account of what was not attained by it—which was a re-explainer of the same good ideas provided—it is dissimilarity to it is not unnoticed", is wrong. He desperately misinterprets the text. Though his reading of \(\text{n} \text{m} \text{a} \text{n}\) is not given, the translation "unnoticed" betrays his taking the initial Alef for a privative.

(13) West, \textit{op. cit.}, Vol. 18, pp. 343-4, ". . . . if a knowledge should be rightly obtained by you, it should then have been needful for you to report unto me. . . . If this decree seemed so to you before. . . ., it was not well considered with those acquainted with religion, the wise and the high-priests, and not even reported", is wrong. To judge from his translation report, West seems to regard \(\text{n} \text{m} \text{a} \text{n}\) as a causative form of \(\text{a} \text{m} \text{n} \text{u} \text{t} \text{a} \text{n}-\text{a} \text{m} \text{n} \text{a} \text{v} \text{-"hear"}, but the Pahl. spelling does not allow this sort of identification.

(14) West, \textit{op. cit.}, Vol. 47, p. 108, translates, "the opening of the enclosure made by Yim, the coming of mankind and animals thence, and the complete progress of mankind and animals again, arising specially from them." From his translation, I cannot understand how he interprets \(\text{n} \text{m} \text{a} \text{n}\). Has he attached it to *gu\text{a}\text{f}u\text{t} \text{a} \text{n} or to *\text{y} \text{u} \text{m} \text{b} \text{i} \text{n} ? Cf. note 4.

(15) See above note 5.

(16) The reading with double \(\text{m} \text{m}\) is also possible.

(17) Hence ahu\text{f}u\text{t} \text{a} \text{k} "uncovered", Tavadia, Sn̄. ii, 9 (p. 85), n. 4, must be rejected. It is highly doubtful that the simple form hu\text{f}u\text{t} \text{a} \text{n}—hu\text{m} \text{b}—meaning "conceal" really occurs. See above note 1. It is true that we have Skt. kumb—(kumbatī, kumbayati), Pān. iii, 3. 105; Dhātup., "cover"; but that alone is not sufficient for justifying the supposed occurrence of Iran. *hu\text{f}u\text{t} \text{a} \text{n}—*hu\text{m} \text{b}—meaning "conceal".

(If the Skt. word is genuine, its meaning must be a transferred one.
The root-meaning "bend, vault" is found in Skt. kubjā- "crooked"). Although we are not interrupted to suppose a transferred meaning "cover" to *huftan- *hum-b in view of Skt. kumb-, another view is equally possible that we have here nothing to do with morphology, but only to do with transmission. When we think of the fact that the perpendicular stroke is often too apt to be carelessly treated by the scribes, it is, indeed, not unreasonable to suppose that the Wāw has fallen out before the Alef. No importance, therefore, should be attached to the absence of the initial Wāw, as it is to be regarded, against the view of Horn, i.e., as a scribal error. A glance at the various MSS. readings of nihumb- in Pahl. Vd. will sufficiently illustrate it. See Jamasp—Gandevia, Vendidad, 3, 19. 40 comm. (3); 4, 49; 5, 24 (2), 59; 6, 5 comm. (2), 35 comm.; 7, 19. The drop of the prefix ni- seems, here, to be partly due to the attraction by xumb ( _¬-¬), xumbak ( _¬¬), and partly due to the fact that it can easily be regarded as the final pleonastic stroke of the preceding word. The last possibility can also be applied to the suppression of the initial Wāw of nihuftan, the transmission of which is generally better, though exceptions are not lacking. e.g., Pn. 53 (Pahlavi Texts, p. 49, l. 5), MS. MK, JJ huftarih for nihuftarih. Cf. Jamasp—Gandevia, op cit., 3, 40 comm.; 9, 32 comm. So, in the case of (frā³) hambēt, Nirangištān, p. 165, l. 8, the supposed absence of the initial Wāw is more plausible. Only the huftak, Pahl. Vd., 8, 10 comm., where practically all MSS. read.... ** _¬¬-¬¬...** _¬¬¬¬, seems to require some different explanation. We may here, too, think of an erroneous suppression of the initial Wāw in ²¬¬, but the thing more probable is that we should look a different kind of clerical error: the copyists must have miswritten ²¬¬¬¬ for ²¬¬¬¬. From the word-order hamak... nēm ē... it seems more natural that these words should respectively be followed by a word of one and the

** DJE ²¬¬¬¬.

*** IM ²¬¬¬¬ for the last two words.
same idea rather than such of opposite one as āhuftak—<ni>huftak.
As to the covering and non-covering of a corpse when carried to dakhma, two different opinions are current: Pahl. Vd. 8, 10 comm., hamāk āhuftak 'nē 'baiṁ n nēm ē <ā>huftak 'nē 'baiṁ, so also Pers. Riv. Hormazyār, i, p. 115, ll. 11-12, b'yd īch hmē ḫuṣyd b'śd; ēh 'gr ḥmē ḫuṣyd n-b'śd. gn'hy gr'n b'śd; while Šnš. ii, 9, hamāk nīhuftak 'nē 'baiṁ n 'ce naśā-k-nilānith. Does the former opinion refer to some special cases as it is said by Tavadia, loc. cit.?


(19) Though etymologically undecided, it seems almost certain that Pahl. 𐭠𐭠𐭠 (its variant spelling 𐭠𐭠𪾗, see A. Pagliaro, Rendiconti, Ser. VI, vol. I, p. 586, n. 3, Pahl. Ps. hwhly; MPT. xuhr (W. Henning, BSOS. 9, 89); NPers. xwhl, xwhlgy, xwhlh have nothing to do with our *kup, *kub-. P. Horn, GrIrPh., i. b, 172, connects NPers. xwhl with Skt. vakrā-. So also Andreas–Barr, PehlPs., Glossar, p. 13). But this connection is hardly plausible. With Skt. vakrā- may rather be connected Pahl. 𐭠𐭠𐭠 = Pāz. vāhar, as done by R. C. Zaehner, BSOS. 9, 888 ff. Besides the passages he quotes, we have also NM. i. 3, 6, 8; 10, 4, 13; ii, 1, 6.

(20) The contrast of the original meaning between the two Skt. words, though in an exceedingly slight degree, seems still to be traceable.

Kyoto, Sept., 1941.