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A Middle Iranian Word Denoting an Office-Holder

JOST GIPPERT

Preliminaries

In contrast to the Indic branch of Indo-Iranian, which abounds in textual materials representing its early stages (Vedic and, later, Classical Sanskrit), Old Iranian is much poorer with respect to its written legacy, the whole corpus of the Avesta and the Old Persian inscriptions together barely exceeding the size of the Rgveda Samhitā alone.¹ For investigations into the prehistory of Iranian, we are therefore dependent on materials from later periods (Middle and, to some extent, even Modern Iranian), too, as well as data from the so-called “Nebenüberlieferungen” in languages such as Armenian and Georgian. In the following contribution, I shall deal with a Middle Iranian term denoting a sort of office-holder, with a view to its distribution across the languages concerned and its possible etymological sources.

Middle Persian pasānīg ‘follower, attendant, courtier’

In his dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian, Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst (2004:284) provides a M(iddle) P(ersian) lemma “pś’nyg [pasānīg]” with the meaning given as ‘follower, attendant, courtier’. The only attestation quoted there (and the only one available so far) is from the Berlin Turfan fragment M3, which contains the plural form pś’nyg’n in the narrative on “Mani’s last journey” or his “last audience with King Vahrām I,” edited first by F. W. K. Müller (1904:80–2) in a roman transcription of the time, then by C. Salemann (1908:3) in a Hebrew transliteration, and lastly, in a romanized transliteration, by W. B. Henning (1942:949–50 = 1977:89–90) and M. Boyce (1975:44–5). For easy reference, the passage in question (ll. 4–16 of the recto of M3)² is rendered in an up-to-date roman transcription in Table 1, together with Henning’s translation (1942:950–51 = 1977:91–2).

¹The actual figures as deducible from the TITUS corpora (titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/texte2.htm#ved and #iran) is 159,114 words for the RVS vs. 22,607 Old Persian words and 143,267 Avestan words, the latter figure including restored repeated formulas. My thanks are due to Alexander Lubotsky, who has contributed tremendously to the TITUS database.

²The manuscript is lost today; however, a black-and-white scan of a photograph is available at http://turfan.bbaw.de/dta/m/images/m0003_recto.jpg.
As the text shows, the translation chosen by Henning (‘courtier’) is not compelling as it stands, given that the persons in question might also have been guardians, gatekeepers, or the like; and Henning did not provide any further argumentation for his translation. In contrast to this, ‘Gefolgsleute’ as proposed by Müller (1904:80) as well as Salemann’s ‘gefolgsman’ were obviously motivated by etymological reasoning, indicated in the latter’s glossary by pointing to *pasang*-words in the Georgian Acts of Pilate. Besides the form *pasanik*-i and *pasenak*-i denoting a “leibwächter,” with further reference to the Georgian–Russian–French dictionary of 1840 by D. Čubinašvili, which contains a lemma *pasekani* translated as ‘adjudant’ (sic!; Tchoubinof 1840:397). Marr himself had discussed the Georgian terms in an article of 1906, which was devoted to the “Armenian words in the Georgian Acts of Pilate.” Besides the form *pasenaki* occurring in the text he was dealing with (see below), he also noted the appearance of *pasaniki* and *pasanigi* along with secondary orthographic variants such as *pasang*- and misspellings such as *hasanig*- in the Life of St. Nino, i.e., the legend of the conversion of Georgia to Christianity (Marr 1906:27 with n. 8).3 Quoting the 18th-century lexicographer Sulxan-Saba Orbeliani, who had noted *pasenaki* with the meaning ‘*cinašemdgomeli*’ denoting a servant ‘standing in front’,*

---

3 The actual source of the information on the Life of St. Nino and the terms occurring in it was probably Wardrop 1903:28 n. 1 (see below).

4 According to the edition of Orbeliani 1965:618, ms. B of the dictionary has *cinaš mdegi* instead (with the same meaning) and mentions *pasanigi* as an additional lemma. In another dictionary of D. Čubinašvili’s, he provides
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Marr proposed deriving the words under discussion from N(ew) P(ersian) pās ‘guard, night watch, guardian’ (‘straża, noćnaja straża, strażnik’), and pāsān ‘guardian’ (‘stražnik’), with further reference to Armenian pahnak (< *pahanak) and pahnord (beside pahanord) ‘id.’ (Marr 1906:28). We have thus arrived at two quite divergent interpretations of the words under consideration, one being based upon NP (= MP) pās ‘guard, watch’ and one on MP pas ‘after, behind’; the latter proposal, which stands in remarkable contrast to Orbeliani’s servant ‘standing in front’, was given concrete expression by M. Andronikašvili, who pointed to the derivative MP pasēn ‘following’, NP pastin ‘after’ (1966:262).

Given the two mutually exclusive proposals and also the divergent spellings of the Georgian forms, it seems worthwhile investigating their textual basis in more detail.

2.1 Georgian pasenak-i

All textual occurrences of the stem pasenak- that can be adduced so far are restricted to the Old Georgian version of the apocryphal Acta (or Gesta) Pilati, also known as the Gospel of Nicodemus, where we find a total of 14 attestations in the nominative, genitive, dative, and ergative cases. Contrasting the Georgian text with the existing Greek, Armenian, and Latin versions, we note that it regularly matches the Gk. term κούρσωρ, in its turn reflecting Latin cursor, and the Armenian nowirak, which denotes a ‘messenger’; all these terms deviate remarkably from the meanings so far proposed for pasenak-.

Only the second Greek recension comes closer to them, in using ὑπηρέτης ‘servant, attendant’ throughout; however, the Georgian text is much closer to the first Greek recension (and the Latin and Armenian versions) than to the second one. For easy convenience, the interplay of the five versions is illustrated with the first three occurrences contrasted in Table 2.6

| I. “Pilate called one pasenakhi and said to him: ‘Go and bring Jesus here in peace.’” |
| Georgian moucoda pilate ertsa pasenaks da hrkua mas: “mived da mšwdobit šemoi ˙qvane isu.” |
| Greek A προσκαλεσάµενος δὲ ὁ Πιλάτος τὸν κούρσωρα λέγει αὐτù: µετὰ ἐπιεικείας ἀχθήτω ὁ ῾Ιησοùς. |
| Latin Advocans autem Pilatus cursorem dicit ei: Cum moderatione adducatur Iesus. |
| Armenian Koˇ sec Pilatos znowirak, ew asè. hezowt eamb mtc ¯e Yisows. |
| Greek B Ἕκβαλὼν οâν ὁ Πιλάτος τὸ µανδύλιον αὐτοà δίδωκεν ἑνὶ τîν ὑπηρετîν αὐτοà λέγων: Ἀπελθε καὶ δε‹ξον τû ᾿Ιησοù καὶ εἰπὲ αὐτù: |

The same is true for the Coptic and Syriac versions (Revillout 1913 and Rahmani 1904), which are modeled exactly on the Greek text. The Palestino-Aramaic fragment (cf. Schulthess 1905:114–6) does not contain the passages in question; the Slavonic versions are too late to be considered here. Cf. Izydorczyk and Dubois 1997:30–40 for a survey of the “eastern” versions.

The Georgian text is quoted after the edition of Kurcik 1985:78–9; the first Greek and the Latin texts after Tischendorf 1876:217–8 and 338–9; the Armenian text after Tayeci 1898:314; and the text of the second Greek recension (“m1–m2”) after Gounelle 2008:172ff. (cf. also Tischendorf 1876:288–9).

the meaning ‘megis cinaic mlomyi xelzoxiani, mandatur’, i.e. ‘bailiff (lit. staff-holder) standing in front of the king, representative’ (Čubinov 1887:1006). Note that Rayfield (2006:1650) gives the meanings ‘standing by; servant; courtier’ for cinaicmlomyini.

5The same is true for the Greek text. The Palestino-Aramaic fragment (cf. Schulthess 1905:114–6) does not contain the passages in question; the Slavonic versions are too late to be considered here. Cf. Izydorczyk and Dubois 1997:30–40 for a survey of the “eastern” versions.

6The Georgian text is quoted after the edition of Kurcik 1985:78–9; the first Greek and the Latin texts after Tischendorf 1876:217–8 and 338–9; the Armenian text after Tayeci 1898:314; and the text of the second Greek recension (“m1–m2”) after Gounelle 2008:172ff. (cf. also Tischendorf 1876:288–9).
II. “And when the ḫaṣenakī went there, he saw and recognized Jesus and bowed before him . . .”

Georgian da vitar mivida Ḫaṣenakī igi, ixila da icna iesu, da taqwanis-sca mas . . .

Greek A ἐκδώς δὲ ὁ κούρσωρ καὶ γνωρίσας αὐτὸν προσεκύνησεν . . .

Latin Exiens vero cursor et agnoscentis eum adoravit . . .

Armenian Իբրեվ եվրուս ժուտ Յուրթեթիս կանջ կուրեն տուն Ուհուն պրոսեկաներ տունուտ . . .

Greek B ὅπερ ἰδόντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ µεγάλως ἀγανακτήσαντες ἀλίθων πρὸς τὸν Πιλάτον, γογγύζοντες κατ’ αὐτοὺς: Πῶς τοσάτης τιµᾶς τὸν ᾿Ιησοῦν ἠξίωσε; . . .

III. “But the Jews, when they saw what the Ḫaṣenakī did, shouted at Pilate (and) said: ‘Why did you not order him to be brought by a sepekhaci but by a Ḫaṣenakī?’ For when the Ḫaṣenakī saw him, he bowed before him . . .”

Georgian xolo huriata mat vitar ixiles, ray igi Ḧaṣenakī man, ḥagadebodes pilates mimart, itjodes: “rad ara sepek.aci ha Ḫaṣenakī man, taqwanisca mas . . .

Greek A ἱδόντες δὲ οἱ ᾿Ιουδαῖοι ὃ ἐποίησεν ὁ κούρσωρ, κατέκραξαν τὸν Πιλάτου λέγοντες: διατί ὑπὸ πραίκων αὐτὸν οὐκ ἐκέλευσας εἰσελθεῖν ἀλλ᾿ ὑπὸ κούρσωρ; καὶ γάρ ὁ κούρσωρ θεασάµενος αὐτὸν προσεκύνησε . . .

Latin Videntes autem Iudaei quod fecit cursor, clamaverunt adversus Pilatum dicentes: Cur eum sub praeconis voce non ingredi fecisti, sed per cursor? nam et cursor videns eum adoravit illum . . .

Armenian Ew ibrew zayn tesin hr ¯eayk ¯e, zor arar nowirakn, ałałakec in Piłatosi ew asen. nd¯e r dahˇ caw oˇ c mowcer i nerk . . .

Greek B ὃπερ ἰδόντες οἱ ᾿Εβραῖοι καὶ µεγάλως ἀγανακτήσαντες ἠλθον πρὸς τὸν Πιλάτον, γογγύζοντες κατ’ αὐτούς: Πῶς τοσαύτης τιµᾶς τὸν ᾿Ιησοῦν ἠξίωσε; . . .

Table 2. From the Acta Pilati.

The most remarkable feature of the text passages quoted is the explicit contrast between Ḫaṣenakī (~ κούρσωρ = cursor and nowirak) and sepekhaci (~ πραίκων = praeeco and dahic). Etymologically, the latter term must have meant something like a ‘royal man’ (Rayfield 2006:1180 indicates ‘courtier, royal servant’), which is not quite what Lat. praeeco or Armenian dahic seem to cover, the first being usually translated as ‘herald’ and the second as ‘ὑπηρέτης’, ‘βασανίστης’, ‘carnifex’, or ‘tortor’ (Awetik, Siwrm¯elean, and Awgerean 1836: 592). Nevertheless, it is clear from the context that for the Georgian translator, a Ḫaṣenakī
was in a lower position than a sepekaci, which means that he was probably not a ‘courtier’ but rather someone ‘standing behind’. The connection with MP pasên ‘following’ (only attested in the formulaic tan-i pasên denoting the ‘ultimate form of existence . . . after the current cycle of millennia’,11 lit. the ‘body afterwards’) thus remains conceivable, all the more since the Georgian word shows no noteworthy variation in the nineteen manuscripts containing the Acta Pilati:12 the voicing of the stem-final consonant (> pasenagi) noted for four manuscripts of the 15th–18th centuries13 is a common phenomenon of the period in question.14

2.2 Georgian pasanik-ı

In contrast to the Georgian version of the Acta Pilati, which must be a translation from a model hitherto undetermined,15 the legend of the “Conversion of Georgia” (Mokevay Kartlisay) containing the Life of St. Nino, the “apostle” of the Georgians, is usually regarded as an autochthonous hagiographical work.16 Among its various narratives, it contains a legend of the Christ’s tunic being transferred to the Jewish community of Mtskheta after the crucifixion. Different from the Biblical passages concerning the crucifixion and its circumstances including the casting of lots for the tunic,17 the legend not only provides the names of two of the persons involved, viz. one Elioz from Mtskheta (who took the tunic) and one Longinos from Kars, but also uses the term pasanik-ı to denote the man that nailed the Christ to the cross, who is simply one of the στρατιîται in the NT (Georg. erisaganta or erisa ḫacta “army men” in Mt. 27:27; Lk. 23:36; Jo. 19:2; stratiîτta in Mk. 15:16). The passage in question, which is basically identical in both recensions of the “Conversion” (of Ṣaṭberdi and Čelişi, 10th and 13th century, respectively), is synoptically arranged in Table III with its adaptation by Leontî Mroveli (11th c.) in the Georgian Chronicle, Kartlis Cxovreba, which uses the same term in the given context, and with two metaphrastic versions from the 13th c., which replace it by mtarvali ‘tormentor’; in addition, the Table includes the passage from the 13th c. Armenian adaptation of Kartlis Cxovreba, the so-called Patmowt ’ın vnac’ (‘History of the Georgians’), which provides the only attestation of pasanik in Armenian.18

Gippert 1993:52–7 on the etymology of the Armenian term and its equivalents in Georgian; the basic meaning proposed there is (German) ‘Scherge’, i.e. ‘henchman, bum-bailiff’.

10Thus Nyberg 1974:100; MacKenzie (1971:66) only gives ‘final, last’ for pasen.

11Cf. Kurckije 1985:7–9 on the witnesses of the text; the basic manuscript is Sin. georg. 78 (written 1031 AD).


14The proposal by Marr (1906:29) that the Georgian text was translated, if not directly from Greek, via an Armenian text as the “immediate model” (“nposredstvennyam podlinnikom”), cannot be argued for on the basis of pasenaki, as Georgian possessed enough Iranian loanwords that were not borrowed via Armenian; cf. Gippert 1993 passim.


16Mt. 27:35; Lk. 23:34; Jo. 19:24.

17The text passage is quoted as follows: for the two recensions of the “Conversion” (Mokc. A and Mokc. B), from Abulaże 1965:128; for Leontî Mroveli’s adaptation in Kartlis Cxovreba (K.Cx.), from Quxzîvi 1953:99; for the Patmowt ’ın vnac’ (Patm.Vr.), from Abulaże 1971:52 and 70.
Mokc. A xolo dedasa missa vitarca esna gmay, odes pasanikman žuara zeda samšualsa
dasca kueries miêedisay ierusalêmns . . .

Mokc. B xolo dedasa elioziessa esma gmay ierusalemit mcxetad, odes-igi pasanikman žuara zeda samšualsa
dasca kueries miêedisay golgota</> . . .

“But (when) the mother of Elioz heard the noise (from Jerusalem to Mtskheta) when the pasanik-i struck the smith's hammer upon the nail on the cross in Jerusalem (/Golgotha) . . .”

K.Cx. xolo odes damsualses upali da pasanikman kueries dahkra samšuala, aka dedasa
elioziessa esma . . .

“But when they nailed the Lord and the pasanik-i struck upon the nails with the hammer, the mother of Elioz heard it . . .”

Patm.Vr. ew ert'cal' dipec'an aworn xačelowt'can: Ew ibrew pasanikn pdneac' zbewriter, zmayr Eliosi ndostoyc' masn margaréowt'can, or i nma . . .

“And when they arrived, they came in time for the day of the crucifixion. And when the pasanik struck the hammer, the mother of Ełios was incited by the portion of prophecy that was in her . . .”

Nino A djęsa mas da žamsa, odes žuars-acues meupe usžulota mat da miamtxwa kueries
lusmarsa qelta mat sauploita boromana mtraspaman adgilsa golgotisasa, masve žamsa miiciaqurta gulisata dedisa elioziis sa mcxetas . . .

“But at the time of the crucifixion, when the tormentor struck the nail on the hands of the Lord, at that time it came to the ears of the mother of Elioz . . .”

Nino B xolo mas žamsa žuar-cumisasa, odes lusmara b'kra kueries mtraspaman qelta zeda
uplisata, žamsa mas miiciaqurta elioziis dedisa . . .

Table 3. From the Life of St. Nino and its adaptations.
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With the stem ˙pasenak occurring in just the oldest manuscript of the Chronicle that is available (ms. A), the assumption that this word and the ˙pasenaki of the Acta Pilati are basically identical gains ground indeed; and remarkably enough, the variants appearing in the Kartlis Cxovreba had been proposed to be “probably corruptions of the word pasenaki, i.e. royal officer for executing justice, executioner” by O. Wardrop even before the “Queen Anna” manuscript was discovered (1903:28 n. 1). However, there is still a difference in meaning, the executioner of the crucifixion being anything but a ‘cursor’, and the two versions of the “Conversion” as well as the form pasanik appearing in the 13th-century Armenian Patmowt-iwm vrac’ greatly antedate ms. A of the Chronicle, which means that the ˙pasenaki of the latter witness may well have intruded secondarily under influence of the Acta Pilati. It is therefore suitable to look for further evidence outside of the Georgian tradition to determine the interrelationship of the terms.

3 Syriac pasāniqā

Basing himself on Müller’s editio princeps of the fragment M3 (1904) and Marr’s treatise of 1906 (see above), P. Peeters (1946:90–1 = 1951:140–1) proposed to identify the Syriac term pasāniq (stat. emph. pasāniqā) occurring four times in the Syriac vita of Mar Abā, a catholicos of the Persian church (540–552), to be identical with MP pasānig, pl. pasānigan ‘Gefolgsleute’ and, further, Georgian equivalents appearing “de forme mal fixée” as “pasanaki, pasanigi (hasanigi), pasenaki.” Considering the form of the latter, he proposed “gardien de la chambre” to be the original meaning of the word, which he regarded as consisting of “pah ‘gardien’ et géorg. senaki (= armén. abbreviation: ‘chambre’)” (Peeters 1946:91 n. 60 = 1951:140 n. 3). This proposal, which erroneously presupposes an ezafe-construction (quasi *paḥ-ısēnak), was rejected soon afterwards by A. Maricq (1955:276 n. 1) who stated that the formation of the Iranian word was clear enough, consisting of “pas + suffix ḍēn.”

To determine the true meaning of Syr. pasāniqā, it is necessary to study the four attestations in more detail. In all these cases, the pasāniqā is sent out by the Sasanian king to the catholicos who is accused by the Magi; cf. Table 4 contrasting a transliteration of the Syriac text passages with the German translation by O. Braun (1915:198 and 216), which leaves the term in question open.20


19Cf. Gippert 1993:225 for a similar confusion of true compounds and ezāfe-constructions in Iranianisms in another work of Peeters’.

20The Syriac text passages are found in Bedjan 1895:230 and 266. Other terms that were left open in Braun’s translation are HRPDKA (3 × p. 211; lezd/‘lprēk’, lrpēl/iwptk ‘p. 35 n. 2), which has long been identified with Arm. hraparak < M.Iran. *fra-pādaka “court place” (Gippert 1993:266 and 272 with n. 11 after Nyberg 1931:217), and DZ-DGW (5 × p. 210 and 1 × p. 215, always in apposition with a personal name; see below).
Da sie nun den König der Könige sehr bedrängten, ließ dieser dem Seligen durch den PSNIK’ DRWSPN melden, er möge vor dem Môpêtân Môpêt, jenem PSNIK’, und den ihn anklagenden Magiern sich verantworten.”

Der Katholikos erhob mutig seine Stimme und sprach . . .


Nachdem (dieser) fortgegangen war, wirkte zuletzt Gott auf den König der Könige ein und man redete ihm zu, daß er befahl, den Seligen von der Kette zu lösen.”

Table 4. From the Vita of Mar Abâ.

It is clear from these contexts that the function of the pasānīqā was quite similar to that of the pasenakī of the Acta Pilati, both being sent out as a messenger by the king or governor to an accused person, whereas the pasanīkī of St. Nino’s legend plays quite different a role. In this context, the attribute DRWSPN occurring in §14 of the Syriac vita gains importance. Braun, building upon Labourt: ‘directeur des prisons’, ‘δεσµοφύλαξ’, which implies that the initial D is the ezāfe-like “relative particle” and RWSPN, a misspelling for rūzβān ‘executor’; in contrast to this, Peeters (1946:91 with n. 62 = 1951:141 with n. 1) proposed reading a distinct word rwspn here, which might mean ‘la garde du jour’. However, the latter word has been established on the basis of a scholion to Judith 5:28, where it refers to Gk. θύρις ‘window’, to mean something like ‘grid, latticework’, a meaning that does not match well with the

---

21According to Bedjan (1895:266 n. 1), the word is spelled ṣnyq’ here.

22‘executor’ in Brockelmann 1928:723a s.v. rūzβān, who compares NP rūzβān as appearing in Firdowsi’s Šāhnāme (see below). The Syriac word occurs, e.g., in the legend of Mar Pethion (Corluy 1888:36).

23Cf. Schröter 1870:511 and 522; Brockelmann 1928:737a s.v. rūzβānā: ‘saepthum’.
context in the vita of Mar Abä if we do not want to take ‘grid’ (or ‘window’) as a secondary expression for a prison.

We may thus return to the assumption that the rwspn in the vita actually meant a rwzbn, i.e., an ‘executioner’ or the like. If so, the question remains in what relation the term stood to the pasānīqā it was attributed to via the “relative particle.” If pasānīqā meant some kind of messenger (as elaborated above), the “relativized” attribute might be taken to be either an indication of a superior sending him (‘the P. of the R.’) or an appositional explication of his office (‘the P. acting as a R.’). The latter solution seems more probable on the basis of the following assumptions.

For rūzbân, the NP equivalent of Syr. rūzbānā ‘executioner’ is not at all the only meaning that has been established; the range further extends from a ‘footman’ and a ‘mace-bearer’ via a ‘protector, patron’ up to a ‘porter, especially at the royal gates’ (cf. Steingass 1982:593 s.v. rozbân), and the latter meaning seems to prevail at least in Firdausî’s Šahnāme.

If we consider the meaning established for MP pasānīg in the Manichaean context, the latter notion comes strikingly close to this, which may mean that we have the common ground here for the combination of Syr. pasānīqā and rūzbân in the vita of Mar Abä. And if so, we also arrive at a solution for the question of how Georg. ṣasaniki and ṣasenaḵi might correlate: a porter of the royal gates might just as well have been sent out as a messenger as acted as a tormentor. The meaning ‘courtier’, though, seems no longer sustainable.

4 Conclusions

The question remains whether the two Georgian terms are identical etymologically and what their etymological basis is. Standing as they are, both terms may well derive from both MIr. pas ‘behind, after’ and MP pās ‘guard, watch’. In the latter case, we must emphasize that the word is clearly distinguishable with respect to the Persian branch, given that it differs strongly from its N.-W. Iranian equivalent, Parth. pahr, which is reflected, inter alia, in Arm. pahrak and Georgian ṣadag- (for the latter words cf. Gippert 1993:341–4).

24 Compare the misspelling rwdbn occurring two times in the legend of St. Phusik (Bedjan 1891:299; Braun 1915:73). If Syr. rwspn reflects MP rūz(b)ānag ‘window’ (MacKenzie 1971:72), the internal consonant cluster must have been the same anyway (cf. the spelling pāspān for MP pāsban quoted in Horn 1893:62 no. 274). The question whether there is an etymological connection of the two terms must be left open here.

25 A similar interpretation suggests itself for another word that was left open in Braun’s translation of the vita of Mar Abä, viz. Z’DGW occurring 3× in §27 (p. 210) and once in §36 (p. 215). In all these cases, it is attributed via the “relative” D to a certain “(Ferrûchdâd) Hôrmîzd.” It is conceivable that we have the MP word jādâg-gū(w) denoting a sort of ‘advocate’ here, which also rendered Georg. ṣadago and (in a more archaic form) Arm. jatar (for the latter words cf. Gippert 1993:341–4).

26 Cf. Wolff 1935:448b s.v. rūzbân, who provides 16 attestations in the sense of ‘Türhüter, Trabant’ and one in the sense of ‘(Heer-)Führer’.


28 Cf. Ritter 1986:310 and Gippert 1993:56; cf. also Arm. pamlakk and pamlard mentioned by Marr (see above).
pasanīg is a strong indication against this derivation, and the word formation would remain unclear.\(^29\)

In contrast to this, a derivation from pas ‘behind’ seems more promising, the ‘porter’ being denoted as the person ‘behind’ the door (or ‘behind’ his superior). From the perspective of word formation, this is straightforward for Georg. pasenaki, as this may be based upon the adjective pasēn as indicated above. For MP pasanīg, Georg. pasani, and Syr. pasaniqā, we should accept A. Maricq’s proposal of seeing a formation with a suffix -ānik- here (see above), for which MP bayanīg ‘divine’ from bay ‘god’ (cf. Durkin-Meisterernst 2004:120) or Parth. šabānīg ‘nightly’ from šab ‘night’\(^30\) may serve as a parallel, even though their basis is a noun, not an adverb. As Georgian pasenaki can in no way be regarded as a secondary deformation of pasani, we are thus still left with two different formations from the same basis, with the same meaning—a constellation that may well be explained by assuming a dialectal doublet within Middle Persian or between Middle Persian and Parthian (or another Middle Iranian language).
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