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Since its finding in 1939, Karder’s Inscription of the Ka’be-ye Zardost (KKZ)\(^{(2)}\) has invited various discussions linguistic or religio-historical and much ingenuity has been spent in trying to solve the difficulties. Thus some of them have been solved,\(^{(3)}\) but some are not and sometimes strange miscalculations still prevail in their treatments.

KKZ begins with the wording: \(W \text{ NH kltyr ZY mgwpt yzd’n W shpwhry MLK’in KLK’ hwpstu’y W huk’mky HWYTNn.} \text{ i P-m PWN ZK sp’sy ZY-m}
\(PWN yzd’n W shpwhry MLK’in MLK’ klty — HWYTNt — ZK-m — BYDWN shpwhry MLK’in MLK’ PWN klk’n ZY yzd’n PWN BB’ W stly ’L stly gwyk ’L gwyk k’mstly PWN mgwstn k’mk’ly W p’ths’y (line 1)=ud ‘az Karder ‘i mowbed yazd’an ud Sābuhr ’sāhān ’sāh huparistā ud hukāmag HWYTNn (\(^{(niewšān)}\). u-m ’pad ’ān spās ’i-m ’pad yazd’an ud Sābuhr ’sāhān ’sāh ’kard — HWYTNt (\(^{(niewšād)}\) — ZK-m (\(=m\) ’kard Sābuhr ’sāhān ’sāh ’pad kardagan ’i yazd’an ’pad ’dar ud šahr ’ō šahr γyāg ’ō γyāg hāmsahr ’pad mowestān kāmgār ud pādíxšā (line 1).

In this prologue, there are two problematic words: one is HWYTN- and the other ZK-m.

\(^{(1)}\) In regard to HWYTN-: Two forms provided with respective phonetic complement -n and -t are here employed in distinction to KNrm where (lines 1 and 2) the only form HWYTN occurs for them both. HWYTN- is also attested in Nareshah’s Inscription MP at Pāykūlī Hu\(^{(4)}\) l. 2 = He\(^{(6)}\) l. 3 (HWYTNm), Hu 7 = He 8 (HWYTNt), Hu 9 = He 10 (HWYTNt), Hu 20 = He 21 (HWYTN), Hu 21 (HWYT\(<\) = He 22 (HWYT\(<\)N),\(^{(8)}\) Hu 29 (HWYT\(<\)N) = He 30 (HWYT\(<\)Nd) & HWYTN\(<\)d). As for these forms of Paikuli Inscription, it is not so difficult to acquire their morphological interpretation, but it is not so easy to acquire their semantic one, because in-numerable lacunae in the text prevent us from assuming the context.

HWYTN- came from hawwi, pa”el perfect 3rd pers. sg. masc. act. of HWH.
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In the Biblical Aramaic, the pa’el form was employed in the meaning ‘to
tell, to inform’ as was justly pointed out by E. Herzfeld, Paikuli (He), p. 184(1)
(item No. 357) who, however, said: ‘in a great number of instances it seems as
if this verb was employed for the simple auxiliary verb ‘to be’, ..... unless it
has the meaning ‘to consider, regard as, to take for’. Thus, he, for instance,
reads .....> ‘lmn’n MLK; HWYTNm W2-lmny phl <.... (He 3), .....> Arm-
innn 1’säh HWYTNm (†däinem) ut Armine phl <.... and translates ‘as (?) the king
of Armenia I regard (?) .....’ (p. 95). The uzwarization of HWYT- by dä-
istan, dän- and the interpretation of dänistan by ‘to regard (as)’ are both im-
probable, because Aramaic equivalent of dänistan is YD; YTN and dänistan
means ‘to know’ and not ‘to consider, regard as, to take for’. As I have
noticed, the Paikuli Inscription has a great number of lacunae preventing us
from grasping the contexts which seems to have led him, followed by the
translators else, to such a misinterpretation. There is no need to deviate from
the meaning ‘to tell, to proclaim, to announce’ expressed by the pa’el of
HWH. Of the above quoted text of KKZ, the first half from the beginning
to HWYTNm (†niwehän) should be translated: ‘And I proclaim, (I) Kardër, the
mowbed loyal servant of and loyal-willed to the gods and Šäbuhr, King of Kings.’
Ph. Gignoux(4) is right in taking HWYTNm as subjunctive 1st pers. sg. whereas
M. Back(9) unconvincingly emends it to HWYTNI (ppp.) and translates: ‘Und
ich, Kartir, der Mō(g)bed, erwies mich den Götttern und Šāpur, dem König
der König(e), ergeben und ‘guten Willens’.’ He wishes to uzwarize HWYT
by nimūdan ‘to show’, hence his translation of *HWYTNI by ‘ich .....’ er-
wies mich’. Likewise untenable is Chr. J. Brunner’s(10) interpretation of
HWYTNm as present participle in -an without giving its meaning. In these
circumstances the temptation becomes unavoidable to propose the reading of
HWYT by niwistan, niwēh- from Av. & OI. ni-vid- ‘to tell’. Accordingly
HWYTNm may be read †niwehän, subjunctive 1st pers. sg. and HWYTNI,
†niwehēd, imperative 3rd pers. sg. (‘man (who reads this Inscription) may tell!’) or 2nd
pers. pl. (‘you may tell!’), inserted as parenthesis. The device of the composer
of placing the predicate at the end of the sentence through a long, interven-
ing subjective elements, as well as his liking for parenthesis, invite his loose
and obscure style as is also met with in lines 11–13; see below, p. 54.

In KNRM, as I have mentioned above, the sole form HWYT stands
for HWYTNm and HWYTNI in KKZ. Most probably HWYT is †niwēh,
imperative 2nd pers. sg. ‘thou mayst tell!’(11), so that the text may be trans-
lated: 'And I (am) Kardër, the mowbed, ... (so) mayst thou tell (who will read this Inscription)!'. In both places in KNRm, HWYTN constitutes a parenthesis.

(2) In regard to ZK-m: Of the above quoted text, the second half from ;P-m PWN ZK sp'sy="'u-m 'pad 'an späs onwards has not been correctly understood, owing to the fact that ZK-m has been accepted off-hand as 'ān-am 'he (or that) . . . . me'. Generally the wording ZK-m ;BYDWN shpwhry . . . . PWN mgustin k'mk'ly W p'ths'y, taken as an independent sentence moved up from ZK-m, is translated: 'He (ZK=1 ḍān)12, Šābuhr, . . . . made me (=m=am) . . . . absolute and authoritative within the mow-estate.' But in order to attain such a translation, the original would rather be expressed by ;P-m (instead of ZK-m) ;BYDWN <ZK (or ;LH)> shpwhry . . . . PWN mgustin k'mk'ly W p'ths'y = 'u-m 'kard <'ān (or 'āy)> Šābuhr . . . . 'pad mouwestān kāmgar ud pādīxštā 'And he (or that) Šābuhr . . . . made me . . . . absolute and authoritative within the mow-estate.' From the contextual consideration, ZK-m should not be uzwarized off-hand by 'ān-am but rather by 'ā-m 'then me', correlating with the preceding ;P-m (='u-m) of ;P-m PWN ZK sp'sy . . . . Now translate: ;P-m PWN ZK sp'sy . . . . ZK-m . . . . k'mk'ly W p'ths'y 'And for the service which I had rendered to the gods and Šābuhr, King of Kings — you (or man) may tell! —, Šābuhr, King of Kings, made me absolute and authoritative within the mow-estate in the rites of the gods at court and (in) province after province, place after place in the whole empire.' ZK-m does not introduce a new trend of statement.

In Pahlavi, if the protasis introduced by ;MT='kā 'when', HT='agar 'if', etc. precedes, then the apodosis is introduced usually by ;DYN='ēg, '=-ā- or W='ud 'then'. But in a simple sentence too, these particles last mentioned are often used, of which ā-, for example, occurs in three instances: (1) When the sentence begins with ;P-m, -t, -s, etc. (='u-m, -t, -s, etc.) but the following part is lengthy, then the remaining part of the sentence is introduced by -m, -t, -s, etc. (=ā-m, -t, -s, etc.) taking up the foregoing enclitic pronoun -m, -t, -s, etc., like 'u-s hamāāg zamīg 'i-s 'abar rāḥ būd, ā-s *pērāvanātihād kard ud tārīghīt 'bē 'ēstād 'And he (the Wind) stirred up the whole soil which was in his way, and the darkness arose.'; (2) When a part of the sentence precedes first for emphasis, the remaining part is commenced with ā-m, -t, -s, etc., like 'ān ā Ohrmāz ḏ frāmūd ā-kā zamīg ud asmān ā-dār (1 'gīrēh), ā-m 'bē 'nē 'hilènèdē, 'That which Ohrmāzd ordered, saying 'Prop (sustain) the earth and sky',
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(then) I will not abandon.'; (3) When adverbial phrase of a sentence precedes, the remaining part begins with ā-m, -t, -š, etc., like ān čim rāy, ā-m wahīst ud gārdmān bē dah 'For that reason, (then) give me the paradise and garōd- mān.' Thus, the sentence üp-m PW BN ZK sp'sy . . . . ZK-m . . . . k'mk'ly W p'thš'y evidently pertains to the instance (1). ZK-m to be uzwarized by ā-m is also met with in KKZ lines 2, 8 and 13.

KKZ ll. 2–3: W ZNH ſndy ſtowy W kltk'n MH PW BN np'ty ZK-m KN gunk tly (3) ſhpwry MLK'n MLK; PW BN w'sptwtkn PKDW BN BYDW BN YK . . . . =ud ſen and ādur ud kardgān ēčè ā-m ſh gōnag<dar> (3) Šābuhr īťāhān īťāh ā-pad wāṣpuhrāgān īťāmār ākād īťū- . . . . 'And these many fires and rites which (are written) in (this) inscription, (then) to me in such various ways (3) Šābuhr, King of Kings, specially assigned, saying . . . .'. Evidently to the instance (2) belongs this sentence as well as KNRb ll. 5–6: (3) L ZN.H-c kltk'n l'dy čygun BN_sy kl'ty LZNH-c (6) l'dy plyn MH gunky ŤHW ZK-m MHWHYI YK-M M(D) Wst'hwty YHWZN= ēō ēt-n-iz kardgān rāy ēyōn ('andar šahr kir)it īm-iz (6) rāy parrōn ēčè gōnag īhā ā-m āgāhēnēd īkā-š āba r wistxstār bēh 'As for these rites too which are performed in the country, (then) to me do you reveal how they will become in the other world (viz. what rewards the rites will cultivate after death), for this very reason that I may become more confident about it.'(13)

KKZ ll. 7–8: . . . . W PW BN duš'lmyhy ZY 'uhrmzdy W yzd'n W NPSH (8) lub'n l'dy ZK-m BYN štry ptly g'sy W pthšly BN BYDW BN P-m g'sy W pthšly ZY wēl'n YHBWNt= . . . . ud ā-pad dūṣtāramēt ā Ohrmzd ud yzdān ud xwēs (8) ruwān rāy ā-m ā-pad šahr abārār gāh ud padixsār ākād ū-m gāh ud padixsār ī wuzurgān ādād . . . . , then (lit. and) in love toward Ohrmzd and the gods and for the sake of his own (8) soul, (then) he (Wahrām II) made my rank and dignity higher in the empire and gave me the rank and dignity of the Wuzurgān.' Back, op. cit., pp. 407–08, translates: 'Und aus Liebe zu Ahuramazda und zu den Götern und um seiner eigenen Seele willen erhöhte er im Reich meinen Rang und meine Würden. Er verlich mir da Rang und Würde des Hochadels (der Fürsten), . . . .' In either translation, is found the same expression 'he elevated my rank and dignity', but in case of mine it is an ergative expression originated from passive construction '(then) my (ZK-m= ā-m) rank and dignity was elevated (by him)' whereas in case of Back's, ZK-m was read ān-am and interpreted as pronomen agentis followed by enclitic pronoun, so also Chr. J. Brunner, op. cit., p. 63, who however differs.
from Back's only in his interpretation of 'xwêš ruwân rây by 'for the sake of my soul'. In favour of them both, Middle Persian would rather have it: 'u-š (Pišt, not ud) 'kard 'pad dôšâramih 'i Ohrmazd ud yazdân ud 'xwêš (8) ruwân rây 'i andar sahr abardar gâh ud padîxšar (<'i 'man') or 'u-m 'pad dôšâramih 'i Ohrmazd ud yazdân ud 'xwêš (8) ruwân rây 'â-m 'i andar sahr abardar gâh ud padîxšar 'kard. If my interpretation is right, the sentence KKZ ll. 7–8 may reasonably be reckoned as pertaining to the instance (3).

KKZ ll. 11–13: 'P-m PWN-c 'nyl'n-stry 'twry W mgwGBR: MH PWN stry ZY 'nyl'n YHWWN 'YK SWSY: W GBR: ZY MLK: MLK: YHMTWN — 'ndywyky štrdstn W swly'y stry (12) W MH MDM swly'y nsgy tylsyt štrdstn W kłky'y stry W MH MDM kłky'y nsgy kysy'y štrdstn W kptwy'k'y štr W MH MDM kptwy'y nsgy 'D pl'c 'L gld'kyd'y stry W 'lmyy stry W wîw'n W 'l'ny W bi'sh'n 'D pl'c 'L 'bn'n BB: ṣhpwhry MLK: MLK: PWN SWSY: W GBR: ZY NPŠH wltk'y W 'twlykhty W 'twyl'n klt'y — TMH-c-m PWN plm'n ZY MLK: MLK: ZK mgwGBR: W 'twry MH 'LH šty YHWWN ZK-c-m (13) MLK: ZK mgwGBR: W 'twry MH 'LH 'y YHWWN ZK-c-m BR: YNSBWN 'P-m L:WHL: L:NPŠH stry ŠBKWN HWHnd.= 'u-m 'pad-iz Anêrân-sahr âdur ud mow-1'mard 'ê 'pad sahr 'i Anêrân 'bûd 'kû 'asp ud 'mard 'i 'sâhân 'sâh 'rasît' — Andiyôk šahrstân ud Sûriyâ sahr (12) ud 'ê 'abar Sûriyâ nihang Tersasit šahrstân ud Kilikiyâ sahr ud 'ê 'abar Kilikiyâ nihang Kêšarîyô šahrstân ud Kappôdakiyô šahr ud 'ê 'abar Kappôdakiyô nihang 'tâ frâz 'ô Grêêkiyô šahr ud Arman šahr ud Warûcân ud Alân ud Balâsagan 'tâ frâz 'ô Alânân 'dar Šûbâhr 'sâhân 'sâh 'pad 'asp ud 'mard 'i 'xwêš wardag ud âdur-sâxt ud âwarân kard — 'ânôh-iz-am 'pad framan 'i 'sâhân (13) 'sâh 'ân mow-1'mard ud âdur 'ê 'tô šahr 'bûd 'â-m 'winnarih' kard. 'u-m 'nê 'hişt ziyân ud wardag kardan ud 'ê 'ôh 'kas wardag kard 'bûd 'ân-iz-am 'bê 'stad 'u-m 'abăz 'ô 'xwêš sahr 'hişt 'hênd. 'And by me in the Anêrân (Non-Iranian) provinces too the fires and mow-mârs that had been in the Anêrân provinces where the horses and men of King of Kings (Šûbâhr I) penetrated — provincial city Antiochia and the province Syria (12) and the peripheral territory adjacent to Syria, provincial city Tarsos, and the province Cilicia and the peripheral territory adjacent to Cilicia, and the province Cappadocia and the peripheral territory adjacent to Cappadocia until forward to the province Pontus, and the province Armenia and Georgia and Albania and Balasagûn until forward to the Gate of the Alânâs, Šûbâhr, King of Kings, by horses and men of his own captured and burnt by fire and devastated.
there too by me by the order of King of Kings (13) those mow-mards and fires that had belonged to those provinces, (then) by me were restored. And I did not allow to do harm and capture and what thus anyone had captured, them (not them too) I took away and I put (them) back in their own countries.'

Here is an apparently long period, in so far as the part from the beginning up to ZK-m <un'lsny> klty=ä-m <winnärišn> kard ('(then) by me were restored') is concerned; but virtually not so long, as it carries a lengthy parenthesis, constituted by the passage from Andiyok onwards to äwērān kard (in translation, from 'the provincial city Antiochia' onwards to 'devastated'). The parenthesis forced the composer to redundant passage ānōh-iz-am ... ėē 'ōy šahr ēbūd (in translation from 'there too by me' to 'that had belonged to those provinces') after the introductory wording from the beginning u-m 'pad-iz Anērān šahr to kū 'asp ud 'mard i šāhān šāh ērasīd (in translation from 'And by me in the Anērān provinces too' to 'where the horses and men of King of Kings penetrated'). The style compact of lengthy parenthesis and redundant repetition can be made more terse and legible, if we skip these digressions thus: u-m (iP-m) 'pad-iz Anērān-šahr ādur ud mow-mard ėē 'pad šahr i Anērān ēbūd kū 'asp ud 'mard i šāhān šāh ērasīd, a-m (ZK-m) <winnārīšn> kard. ... 'And by me in the Anērān provinces too, fires and mow-mards that had been in the Anērān provinces where the horses and men of King of Kings penetrated, (then) by me were restored. ...'. Now it becomes obvious that the text constitutes one closely-knit sentence, belonging to the instance (1) and that it should not be divided into several sentences by the interpunctions. The syntactical smoothness and unity of sense can hardly be acquired, when, for instance, Back, op. cit., pp. 422-28, translates: 'Und ebenso die Feuerheiligtümer und Magier in Anērān, die in den anerischen Ländern waren, wo hi di 'Röse und Männer' des Königs der Könige gelangt waren: zur Provinzhauptstadt Antiochia .... und zur Provinz Armenien. Auch Georgien, Albanien und Balasagan bis hin zum 'Tor der Alanen' wurden von Sapur, dem König der Könige, mit seinen 'Rössen und Männern' geschlagen (=erobert), und er liess sie plündern, brandschatzen und verwüsten. Auch dort von mir auf Befehl des Königs der Könige jene Magier und Feuerheiligtümer, die diesen Provinzen angehörten, (die wurden von mir) in die 'rechte Ordnung' gebracht. ....' He construes unconvincingly and loses sight of the context: the initial iP-m = u-m is translated, it seems, by 'Und ebenso' and ZK-m <un'lsny> klty by '(die wurden von mir) in die 'rechte
Ordnung’ gebracht.’ Unlike his interpretation, ‘u-m correlates with ZK-m (= 1ān-m). The composer of the Inscription inserted a longer parenthesis which forced him to resume the wording preceding the parenthesis again anaphorically after it. His loose and obscure writing is what we have noticed in the above quoted prologue announcement where the predicate verb ‘niwehan stands after the subject followed by its lengthy attribute. Otherwise, if it were read: ud ‘az Karder ‘niwehan ‘i mowbed yazdan ud Sabuhr ‘sahan ‘sah huparista ud hukāmag, not only the composer of KNRM but also many present day Iranists could easily understand the context. But the composer of KKZ was careful, when he wished to express ‘that (or them) by me’ by ZK-m, because he inserted ʾ like ZK-ʾ-m (= 1ān-iz-am), the particle ʾ here not for emphasis but for perhaps discrimination. See above, p. 53, l. 17, l. 26 and p. 54, l. 4.

At all stages, it is hard to escape the conclusion that, in the above quoted five passages (four from KKZ and one from KNRM), ZK-m from the contextual consideration corresponds to Pahlavi a-m ‘(then) me’. The rendering of ZK-m by ʾ-m does full justice to the context and the otherwise interpretation arouses syntactical difficulties, as I have shown above.

What then is likely to have caused this usage is the next problem, which can happily be solved by ZK-n attested in ŠKZ ll. 20–21. The text runs: ⟨1P-n⟩ MNSWT ⟨i⟩ MH MN hruw(⟨i⟩) ʾtry ʾMN ’nyl⟩n PWN ’dly(15) (21) HYTYW ZK-n BY⟨N ’yi⟩n-ʾtry BYN ḫrs . . . . TMH YTYBW(N)⟩=⟨1u-n⟩ ʾmar-dō ⟨m⟩ ʾṭe ‘az Hrōm⟨ā⟩ yi⟨g⟩ ʾsahr ⟨1az Anēr⟩ān ʾpad ṣdāl(15) (21) ʾānid ʾān ʾanda ⟨r Ėrān-śahr ʾandar Pārs . . . . ʾānōh ʾnišāšt⟩ ‘And by us, the people who were brought in fetters(16) from Romaean empire from Anērān, (then) by us in Ėrān-śahr, in Pārs . . . . there, were settled.’, viz. ‘And the people whom we brought as captive from Romaean Empire from Anērān, (then) by us in Ėrān-śahr in Pārs . . . . settled.’ Back, op. cit., pp. 324–26 translates: ‘Und die Menschen, die Wir aus dem römischen Reich, aus Anērān, verschleppten (=im Raub wegführten), die wurden von uns im Reich Ėrān, in der Persis, . . . . dort wurden sie angesiedelt.’ The correlativity between ;P-n (= ʾun) and ZK-n (= ʾān) escaped his attention so that ZK-n . . . . YTYBW(N) is rendered by ‘die (ZK = ʾān) wurden von uns (n) . . . . wurden sie angesiedelt.’ In our opinion, the sentence belongs to the instance (1). Here ZK-n is to be read by ʾā-n which the simple ZK = ʾān could also serve to represent. The composer of ŠKZ, in order to differentiate ʾā-n from ʾān, added the discriminative -n to ZK. The like addition can be met with in ḫēm (16) Hēm.
(abbreviation of Aramaic piler) = 'may wine' in distinction to  He  (abbrev. of Aramaic hinta) = 'gandum wheat'. And once ZK-n for 'a-n invented, ZK-followed by enclitic pronoun is liable to be taken as 'a-, whence arose the writing ZK-m for 'a-m: an abuse which would not have been caused by the composer of SKZ. In regard to the prehistory of the free usage of ZK, see below, n. (22). In his treatment of Pahlavi â-, Chr. J. Brunner, op. cit., p. 114, should have referred to this ZK-, taken by him, op. cit., p. 63 (referring to KKZ l. 1 and l. 8), as pronoun with its deixis somewhat more emphatic than that of L. LH = 'by.

At all stages, provided our theory about ZK-n and ZK-m is right, H. S. Nyberg's maintainance is not to be recommended, that takes Pahlavi -m, -t, -s, etc. as independent forms of the cas. obl. of the personal pronouns to be read respectively by âm, ât, âs(17), etc. ZK-n = 'a-n and ZK-m = 'a-m cannot recognize the short vowel a.

(3) In regard to L. PWN wély phlsty = 'nè 'pad wizâr pahrist (KKZ line 13): The etymology and the meaning of pahristan (<pari-hiz/-haez- with the metathesis -hr<-rh-) 'versari' are clear so that the difficulty rather lies in what is meant by wizâr. W. Hinz(18) translates the phrase by '(die Ketzer und Verderber die) sich nicht an den Kanon hielten' whereas Ph. Gignoux(19) renders it by '(les hérétiques et les destructeurs qui) n'étaient pas en expiation'. Middle Persian wizâr means usually 'separation; explanation'. In our opinion, therefore, the word looks so much like what it ought to be, viz. 'separation-register' in which only the properly qualified are entered. Accordingly, 'nè 'pad wizâr pahrist means '(those who) were not entered in the separation-register, or (those who) were unlisted in the separation-register'.

(4) In regard to the final -d in BYDWNd (KKZ line 8), HTYMWNd (KKZ 2, 7), YTYBWNd (KKZ 2, 10, 14): From the contextual consideration, the final -d can best be explained as an abbreviation writing for -ddy = yty = id. These forms, originally past passive participle, stand for present indicative 3rd person sg. passive, meaning respectively 'kird it has been made', 'âwišt 'it has been sealed', 'nisâyid 'it has been founded' (infinitive being nisâstan 'to found'). Chr. J. Brunner, op. cit., p. 264, takes them as third person 'imperfect' passive and shows his reading akiry only for BYDWNd. But the writing does not allow of the augment a-. To my mind, therefore, BYDWNd is to be identified with kylyty, kylyt, klty, for which see Ph. Gignoux, Glossaire, s. v.
(5) In regard to rad-passāg (KKZ lines 15, 16): ud ʰwasi rad-passāg (ltps'k) ʰgrift. . . . ʰu-m ʰyašt ʰpad ʰ án and ʰädur ʰi-m ʰpad ʰxwēš ʰxānag nišāst ʰhar gāh gāh ʰō gāh rad-passāg 1133 (16) ud ʰbud ʰpad ʰsāl rad-passāg 6798. ‘And many rad-passāg were introduced. . . . And I offered to those many Fires which I founded at my own charge, in every Gāhānbār (festival), from Gāhānbār to Gāhānbār, 1133 rad-passāg (16) and (thus) for one year occurred 6798 rad-passāg.’

For various interpretations of rad-passāg, see Back, op. cit., p. 510, Anm. 271. To my mind, rad-passāg < *ratu-pati-sāka- means ‘festival in which rad performs the ceremony’. rad < Av. *ratu- (*ratav- ) m. II (AirWb 1501) ‘Unter-priester (Helfer)’. Although in the case of lay-man but concerning perhaps ritual treatment, the tendency that the officials of lower rank take the place of those of higher rank can be seen already in the Achaemenid period. See Raymond A. Bowman, Aramaic Ritual Texts from Persepolis, Chicago 1970, Nos. 13 and 14 (pp. 85–87) which indicate that the sub-treasurer replaces treasurer. 