**Appendix 1. Dating the Documents**

I will briefly discuss the date of the Qom documents here, a fundamental issue with significant implications for virtually every other aspect of the corpus, highlighting some underused evidence that reinforces the prevailing view that these documents use the “post-Yazdgerd [III] era,” rather than the regnal years of this ruler.

None of the Qom documents (at least as far as has been noticed) give any era for their dates.[[1]](#footnote-1) Philippe Gignoux, the first to attempt to identify this era, assumed that it must correspond to the regnal years of some Sasanian king, in line with the dating system, based on regnal years, that had been current under the Sasanians. In time he would argue that this corresponded to the regnal years of Yazdgerd III, commencing with the latter’s accession in 632 CE, before ultimately conceding that a “post-Yazdgerd [III] era, beginning with his death in 652” CE, was also possible.[[2]](#footnote-2) As is obvious from his translation of Berk. 67, where he gives the year 16 as corresponding to 667/8 CE, Weber has opted for the latter option, concluding that almost all the dates in the Qom documents should be assumed to be in this “post-Yazdgerd era,” commencing in 652 CE.

There seems little reason to doubt Weber on this point, and here I will simply present some evidence that further bolsters his case, from the *Tārīkh-e Qom* (*History of Qom*). This text, a local history focused on Qom, was initially written in Arabic by one Ḥasan b. Muḥammad al-Qummī in the late 10th century, and subsequently translated into New Persian in the 15th century; only this translation is extant.[[3]](#footnote-3) This *Tārīkh-e Qom* includes a direct discussion of the era in use in the region, part of an account of the cadastral surveys of Qom and its environs undertaken under the ʿAbbāsids:

…and that corresponds with the year [1]54 after the death of Yazdgerd [III]. And these dates have been used in Qom especially. The accounts [*ḥisāb*] of the [fiscal] administration [*dīwān*] and their [payment] deadlines [*ājāl*] was based on those, [and] in business [*muʿāmalāt*] like selling and buying, and other business engagements [*ʿuqūd-e muʿāmalāt*]; and in other cities these dates have not been in use.[[4]](#footnote-4)

While Weber is well aware of the *Tārīkh-e Qom*’s importance, and even indirectly cites this passage, he somewhat understates its significance, which does not merely lie in its assertion that Qom “had” an era whose years began with Yazdgerd III’s death.[[5]](#footnote-5) We are also told specifically how this calendar was used: for fiscal accounts; for establishing “deadlines,” presumably for the repayment of debts and taxes; and for “business, like selling and buying, and other business engagements.”[[6]](#footnote-6) The sheer capaciousness of these categories, in aggregate, is what is most obvious and important here; few, if any, of the dated Middle Persian documents from the Qom region deal with a matter that would fall distinctly outside of them.[[7]](#footnote-7)

While the usual caveats about trusting too much in late sources (and especially a single such source) certainly apply here, this passage is difficult to discount. Ḥasan b. Muḥammad al-Qummī’s deep and wide-ranging knowledge of Qom’s tax system, evident in the rest of his work (and probably stemming from his brother’s experience as the local tax official) also speaks in favor of the reliability of this information.[[8]](#footnote-8) Moreover, we know that the post-Yazdgerd era was in wider use than just the Qom region; although this apparently goes against what al-Qummī says, it does further underline the plausibility that the era of the Qom documents should be identified as this one.[[9]](#footnote-9) Weber has identified a common *ductus* (“B”) for the vast majority of the Qom documents, which have dates “rang[ing] from year 11 to 50”; given the full testimony of this passage, it does seem reasonable to assume that this entire group of documents (which includes all those examined in this article), is to be dated according to the post-Yazdgerd era, commencing in 652 CE.[[10]](#footnote-10)

**Appendix 2. The Middle Persian preposition <b->, *ba-*: A further indication of substantial contact with the Islamic administration?**

Here I will provide a brief word on an important feature of Berk. 34 and Berk. 154, whose importance for our understanding of the Qom region’s integration into the early Islamic state has not been discussed sufficiently. It has substantial implications for the origins of New Persian, and its relationship to Middle Persian, as well. This is the preposition *ba-* in Berk. 34’s *ba-ābādānīh*, “[land] under cultivation” and Berk. 154’s *ba-aband*, “without guarantee,” and also, by extension, in their analogues in other documents, as catalogued by Weber: e.g., *ba-dast* “in(to) the hand” (Berk. 81, Berk. 123, Berk. 211C), *ba-tazišn* [*ī sāl 11*], “in the course [of the year 11]” (Berk. 231), and *ba-asāyišn*, “in(to) the depot”(Berk. 37).[[11]](#footnote-11) These prepositional phrases are all spelled as one word, with an initial <b->. Although Weber initially read this <b-> as a “yet unknown heterogram” <B->, to be transcribed *andar*, he later changed his mind, reading it as “a late Middle Persian development of *pad* > *ba*, like in New Persian,” and, accordingly, to be transcribed *ba-*.[[12]](#footnote-12) This new reading, surely correct, has several important implications.

I will first address this preposition’s implications for historical linguistics—specifically, for the relationship between Middle and New Persian. A considerable amount of scholarly attention has been devoted to the history of the Middle Persian prepositions *pad*, with an array of meanings including, most prominently, “in, by, with,” and *ō*, with the more limited functions of marking indirect objects and direction toward (and, in Manichaean and Christian Middle Persian, direct objects) and especially the historical relationship of these two prepositions with New Persian *ba*, which would eventually fill the functions of both *pad* and *ō* in Middle Persian.[[13]](#footnote-13) According to the scholarly consensus, a preposition *ba* is a strictly New Persian phenomenon; and the emergence of a preposition *ba* filling any function beyond what Middle Persian *ō* had done (i.e., marking indirect object or direction), through at least the eleventh century, was apparently confined to New Persian in Arabic script.[[14]](#footnote-14) This consensus probably needs to be revised, given these occurrences of a preposition <b-> (probably pronounced *ba-*) alongside *pad* in the seventh-century Middle Persian documents from the Qom region, which, apparently, marked not only direction and indirect object, but also instrument and location (among other things).

A thorough review of this preposition’s occurrences in the Middle Persian documents (several of which remain unpublished), along with their relative and absolute chronology, should clarify matters further, but we can at least hypothesize that this reflects the influence of the common Arabic preposition *bi-*, “in, at, on, with, by, etc.” This would help to explain the rather sudden emergence of this preposition in the post-conquest period, as well as its explicit prefixation to the nouns it governs—an unparalleled practice in Middle Persian orthography, outside of Arameograms.[[15]](#footnote-15) Thus far only a limited impact from Arabic on the language of the documents has been noticed: a few attestations of words for specifically Islamic offices and institutions, like *amīr* and *mazgīt* (“mosque,” from Ar. *masjid*), along with, probably, as noted above, *gazīdag* (from Ar. *jizya*).[[16]](#footnote-16) Here we have a qualitatively more significant change to the Middle Persian language, extending to its prepositional inventory, which may indicate a more substantial level of early contact with Arabic speakers (and, accordingly, of integration into the early Islamic state) than the linguistic evidence had otherwise suggested.

**Appendix 3. Weber’s two editions of Berk. 67 and *gazīdag*: tax or snakebite?**

Here I will compare Weber’s 2013 and 2019 editions of Berk. 67, focusing in particular on their respective interpretations of the word *gazīdag* in l. 2. Both editions render the document’s first line in the same way.

2013 and 2019:

1. ZNE BYRH sp̅ndrmṭ QDM ŠNṬ XVI

1. *ēn* *māh Spandarmad abar sāl 16*

[1] This month *Spandarmad* [12th month] of the year 16 [667/8 CE].[[17]](#footnote-17)

They diverge significantly in their interpretation of the next three lines, however:

2013:

2. MN gcyṭk′ ml yzdʾnkrṭ XX-sl [?]

3. MN dlyk′ OL lwdšn [?] BBA-hndlcpṭ′

4. YHYTYWNṭ′ MN [?] [...]mṭ Y BBA-hndlcpṭ′

2. *az gazīdag mar Yazdāngird 20*-*s*[*atē*]*r* [?]

3. *az darīg ō rōyišn* [?] *dar-handarzbed*

4. *āwurd az* [?] [...]*mad ī dar-handarzbed*

[2] From the account of the poll-tax Yazdāngirdbrought [line 4] 20 staters [?] [3] From the estate assistant to the prospering [?] tax collector. [4] From [...]mad the tax collector.[[18]](#footnote-18)

2019:

2. MN gcyṭk′ ml dšnkrṭ zʾhl

3. MN dlyk′ OL lnzyṭ BBA hndlcpṭ′

4. [○] YHYTYWNṭn MN [ZK] zmʾn Y BBA hndlcpṭ′

2. *az gazīdag mar dašngird zahr*

3. *az darīg ō ranǰīd* *dar-handarzbed*

4. [○] *āwurdan az* [*ān*] *zamān ī dar-handarzbed*

[2] On account of having been bitten [or stung] an appropriate antidote [3] by an estate assistant to the chamberlain being troubled [since]. [4] To be brought in time [lit. from that time of the chamberlain].[[19]](#footnote-19)

These two editions differ radically in their interpretation of the word *gazīdag*, in particular: in 2013, it’s a “poll-tax,” and then in 2019 Weber revised the reading to “having been bitten [or stung].” Although, as I discuss in the main text, “poll-tax” is probably not quite correct, on a more fundamental level this word is far more likely to refer to a fiscal imposition of some kind than to a state of physical injury.

So, why a tax and not the result of a bite (or sting)? Some supporting evidence can be found in the word’s immediate context: *gazīdag* occurs as part of the larger phrase *az gazīdag mar. Mar* literally means “number,” but in its legal and documentary attestations the word typically refers to a certain “sum” or “amount” of money or material; “account” can often be an apt translation, when, for example, payments into or out of a certain *mar* are discussed.[[20]](#footnote-20) So, the literal sense of the phrase *az gazīdag mar* would be something like “from the sum of the *gazīdag*,” or “from the account of the *gazīdag*.” Although *az* … *mar* (and the synonymous *az mar ī*…) can function like English “on account of,” taking the idiomatic meaning “for the sake of” or “because of,” this sense is attested only very rarely and equivocally, if at all, among the Qom documents.[[21]](#footnote-21)

Hence, the first part of Weber’s “on account of having been bitten [or stung]” is at least questionable; for the Qom corpus, this would entail an unusual, if not unparalleled, use of the word *mar*. “Having been bitten [or stung]” as a translation of *gazīdag* presents even greater difficulties in this context. It is true that there is a verb *gazīdan*, “bite” or “sting”; and one can also make a past participle *gazīdag* from this stem, meaning “having been bitten [or stung].” But “having been bitten [or stung]” in the English phrase “on account of having been bitten [or stung]” is a gerund, not a participle: even if one went so far as to accept “on account of” as a translation for *az* … *mar*, *az gazīdag mar* would not mean “on account of having been bitten [or stung].”

Nor is Weber’s reinterpretation of line 2’s rather equivocal final word as *zahr*, “lit. ‘poison’ but here better ‘antidote’” sufficiently compelling to justify his new reading of *az gazīdag mar*. Asking the reader to accept that this word is to be construed not in its typical sense of “poison” but rather as its antonym, “antidote,” does not inspire confidence; the word is at least as likely to indicate some sum of grain or money, as Weber had initially thought in 2013.[[22]](#footnote-22) Weber’s reinterpretation of the word modifying *dar-handarzbed* (an official; this word’s meaning will be discussed further below)in l. 3 as *ranǰīd*, “troubled,” is somewhat more plausible, but this is hardly an indicator that the *dar-handarzbed* mentioned in the document has been physically injured, by a snake, scorpion, or otherwise, as Weber claims.[[23]](#footnote-23) This descriptor (whether it is to be read *ranǰīd*, “troubled,” or not) is applied to another official, an *ōstāndār*, in Berk. 159; and although Weber classifies both Berk. 159 and Berk. 67 as “documents on persons being troubled from some suffering,” Berk. 159 appears essentially to record a purchase of salt.[[24]](#footnote-24) There is no hint that the *ōstāndār* mentioned there experienced a physical injury or, indeed, any substantial “suffering” at all.

As an alternative to this new interpretation of *az* *gazīdag mar*, which assumes an atypical use for the word *mar*, “account,” strains Middle Persian syntax, and is, despite appearances to the contrary, all but unsupported by the broader context, it seems best to go back to Weber’s 2013 reading of the phrase, “from the account of the poll-tax”; though this requires some further refinement in its own right, it constitutes a substantially more promising point of departure.[[25]](#footnote-25)

**Appendix 4. Bibliographic Table of All Known Published Qom Documents, 2002–January 2024**

In the table below, I have listed all full published editions and translations of the Qom documents known to me, from 2002 through January 2024. I have only included page numbers where they would be especially helpful; in most cases, it is fairly straightforward to find a given document, provided that one has access to the publication in which it appears. Once it is available, I would encourage readers to consult Adam Benkato and Arash Zeini’s Open Archive of Middle Persian Documents, which will include bibliographic resources on Middle Persian documents that are substantially more comprehensive than this table, and that will be kept up to date. This table also supersedes the relevant section in the inventory of Middle Persian documents I put together for the Invisible East research programme website.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Shelfmark or reference number | Editions and Translations |
| Berk. 3 | Weber (2023) |
| Berk. 5 | Weber (2008a: 8-9) |
| Berk. 6 | Gignoux (2010: 98–9), Weber (2022b) |
| Berk. 8 | Gignoux (2013) |
| Berk. 9 | Gignoux (2013) |
| Berk. 10 | Gignoux (2010: 96–7) |
| Berk. 11 | Gignoux (2010: 54–7) |
| Berk. 13 | Gignoux (2013) |
| Berk. 15 | Gignoux (2009) |
| Berk. 16 | Gignoux (2010: 90–91), Weber (2022–23) |
| Berk. 20 | Gignoux (2008) |
| Berk. 21 | Weber (2021b) |
| Berk. 23 | Gignoux (2009) |
| Berk. 24 | Gignoux (2003: 81–2), Weber (2022a) |
| Berk. 26 | Gignoux (2013) |
| Berk. 27 | Gignoux (2008: 83–4), Weber (2007), Weber (2013) |
| Berk. 28 | Gignoux (2003: 87–8), Gignoux (2013) |
| Berk. 29 | Gignoux (2003: 84–5) |
| Berk. 30 | Gignoux (2003: 86), Gignoux (2009), Weber (2022b) |
| Berk. 32 | Gignoux (2003: 86–7), Gignoux (2010: 70–71), Weber (2014a), Weber (2022b) |
| Berk. 33A | Gignoux (2003: 80–81) |
| Berk. 33B | Gignoux (2010: 30–31), Weber (2014a) |
| Berk. 34 | Weber (2013), Weber (2021a) |
| Berk. 35 | Gignoux (2010: 22–3) |
| Berk. 37 | Weber (2016) |
| Berk. 38 | Gignoux (2002–2003) |
| Berk. 41 | Weber (2019a) |
| Berk. 42 | Gignoux (2010: 66–7) |
| Berk. 43A | Weber (2018), Gignoux (2019) |
| Berk. 43B | Weber (2018) |
| Berk. 43C | Weber (2018) |
| Berk. 43D | Weber (2018) |
| Berk. 43E | Weber (2018) |
| Berk. 46 | Weber (2015b) |
| Berk. 48 | Gignoux (2010: 60–62), Weber (2023) |
| Berk. 53 | Weber (2016) |
| Berk. 57 I | Weber (2019a) |
| Berk. 57 II | Weber (2019a) |
| Berk. 57 III | Weber (2019a) |
| Berk. 62 | Weber (2014a), Weber (2021a) |
| Berk. 63 | Gignoux (2010: 44–5) |
| Berk. 64 | Gignoux (2010: 108–109) |
| Berk. 65 | Gignoux (2019), Weber (2021b) |
| Berk. 66 | Gignoux (2009), Weber (2021a) |
| Berk. 67 | Weber (2013), Weber (2019a) |
| Berk. 68 | Gignoux (2010: 118–19) |
| Berk. 69 | Gignoux (2009) |
| Berk. 70 | Gignoux (2010: 104–105) |
| Berk. 71 | Gignoux (2010: 114–15), Weber (2022–23) |
| Berk. 74 | Gignoux (2019) |
| Berk. 76 | Gignoux (2010: 48–9) |
| Berk. 77 | Weber (2015a) |
| Berk. 79 | Gignoux (2010: 52–3) |
| Berk. 80 | Weber (2008a: 7), Gignoux (2010: 80–81), Weber (2014a) |
| Berk. 81 | Weber (2016) |
| Berk. 84 | Asefi (2023a) |
| Berk. 85 | Gignoux (2010: 106–107) |
| Berk. 86 | Asefi (2023a) |
| Berk. 87 | Asefi (2023a) |
| Berk. 88 | Weber (2022a) |
| Berk. 89 | Asefi (2023a) |
| Berk. 91 | Gignoux (2010: 102–103), Asefi (2023a) |
| Berk. 93 | Weber (2014b), Weber (2021a) |
| Berk. 95 | Gignoux (2010: 68–9), Weber (2014b), Weber (2021a), Weber (2023) |
| Berk. 97 | Weber (2015b) |
| Berk. 98 | Asefi (2023a) |
| Berk. 100 | Gignoux (2010: 82–3), Weber (2016) |
| Berk. 101 | Weber (2019b) |
| Berk. 104 | Gignoux (2010: 72–3) |
| Berk. 105 | Gignoux (2010: 28–9) |
| Berk. 106 | Gignoux (2010: 26–7), Weber (2014a), Weber (2023) |
| Berk. 107 | Weber (2019a) |
| Berk. 108 | Weber (2015b) |
| Berk. 109 | Weber (2016) |
| Berk. 110 | Gignoux (2010: 40–41) |
| Berk. 112 | Gignoux (2010: 24–5), Weber (2016) |
| Berk. 115 | Gignoux (2010: 50–51) |
| Berk. 119 | Gignoux (2010: 84–5) |
| Berk. 120 | Gignoux (2010: 86–7) |
| Berk. 122 | Gignoux (2010: 92–3) |
| Berk. 123 | Gignoux (2010: 54–5) |
| Berk. 125 | Weber (2022b) |
| Berk. 129 | Weber (2010), Šafiʿī (2023) |
| Berk. 137 | Gignoux (2010: 112–13) |
| Berk. 138 | Weber (2019a) |
| Berk. 139 | Gignoux (2010: 34–5) |
| Berk. 141 | Weber (2023) |
| Berk. 142 | Weber (2022a) |
| Berk. 143 | Weber (2023) |
| Berk. 148 | Gignoux (2010: 42–3), Weber (2022–23) |
| Berk. 149 | Weber (2015a) |
| Berk. 154 | Weber (2013), Weber (2022b) |
| Berk. 156 | Weber (2014a) |
| Berk. 158 | Gignoux (2010: 38–9) |
| Berk. 159 | Gignoux (2010: 100-101), Weber (2019a) |
| Berk. 160 | Gignoux (2010: 120–21) |
| Berk. 162 | Gignoux (2010: 94–5) |
| Berk. 165 | Gignoux (2010: 46–7) |
| Berk. 166 | Weber (2021b) |
| Berk. 168 | Weber (2021b) |
| Berk. 173B | Asefi (2023b) |
| Berk. 175B | Weber (2016) |
| Berk. 184 | Weber (2021b) |
| Berk. 186 | Weber (2016) |
| Berk. 187 | Weber (2014a), Weber (2021a) |
| Berk. 189 | Gignoux (2010: 58–9) |
| Berk. 191 | Asefi (2023a) |
| Berk. 198 | Gignoux (2010: 110), Weber (2016) |
| Berk. 205 | Gignoux (2010: 64-5) |
| Berk. 211W | Gignoux (2010: 110–12) |
| Berk. 212 | Weber (2010), Šafiʿī (2023) |
| Berk. 218B | Weber (2021b) |
| Berk. 219 | Gignoux (2009) |
| Berk. 220B | Gignoux (2010: 32–3), Weber (2014a) |
| Berk. 221 | Weber (2021b) |
| Berk. 222 | Weber (2021b) |
| Berk. 223 | Gignoux (2009) |
| Berk. 226 | Gignoux (2019), Weber (2021b) |
| Berk. 227 | Weber (2019b) |
| Berk. 228 | Gignoux (2019) |
| Berk. 229 (= Tehran H) | Weber (2008a: 180–81) |
| Berk. 230 (= Tehran I) | Weber (2008a: 182–3), Weber (2019a) |
| Berk. 231 | Weber (2017) |
| Berk. 233 | Gignoux (2010: 76–7), Weber (2022–23) |
| Berk. 234 | Gignoux (2010: 74–5), Weber (2022–23) |
| Berk. 235 | Gignoux (2010: 100–102) |
| Berk. 236 | Gignoux (2013) |
| Berk. 237 | Weber (2023) |
| Berk. 238 | Gignoux (2010: 78–9), Weber (2016), Weber (2022–23) |
| Berk. 244 | Weber (2021a) |
| Berk. 245 | Weber (2011) |
| Berk. 246 | Weber (2021b) |
| Berk. 247 | Gignoux (2010: 62–3), Weber (2019a) |
| Berk. 251 | Gignoux (2010: 36–7) |
| Berk. 255 | Gignoux (2010: 88–9), Weber (2016) |
| Berlin 1 | Weber (2008a), Weber (2022b) |
| Berlin 2 | Weber (2008a) |
| Berlin 3 | Weber (2008a) |
| Berlin 4 | Weber (2008a), Weber (2022a) |
| Berlin 5 | Weber (2008a), Weber (2022a) |
| Berlin 6 | Weber (2008a), Weber (2021b) |
| Berlin 7 | Weber (2008a), Weber (2021b), Weber (2023) |
| Berlin 8 | Weber (2008a), Weber (2021b) |
| Berlin 9 | Weber (2008a), Weber (2021b) |
| Berlin 10 | Weber (2008a), Weber (2019a) |
| Berlin 11 | Weber (2008a) |
| Berlin 12 | Weber (2008a), Weber (2021b) |
| Berlin 13 | Weber (2008a) |
| Berlin 14 | Weber (2008a), Weber (2021b) |
| Berlin 15 | Weber (2008a) |
| Berlin 16 | Weber (2008a), Gignoux (2010: 122–3), Weber (2016) |
| Berlin 17 | Weber (2008a) |
| Berlin 18 | Weber (2008a) |
| Berlin 19 | Weber (2008a) |
| Berlin 20 | Weber (2008a) |
| Berlin 21 | Weber (2008a) |
| Berlin 22 | Weber (2008a) |
| Berlin 23 | Weber (2008a) |
| Berlin 24 | Weber (2008a) |
| Berlin 25 | Weber (2008a) |
| Berlin 26 | Weber (2008a) |
| Berlin 27 | Weber (2008a) |
| Berlin 28 | Weber (2008a), Gignoux (2010: 124–5) |
| Berlin 29 | Weber (2008a) |
| Berlin 30 | Weber (2008a) |
| Berlin 31 | Weber (2008a) |
| Berlin 32 | Weber (2008a) |
| Berlin 33 | Weber (2008a) |
| Berlin 34 | Weber (2008a), Gignoux (2019), Weber (2019a) |
| Berlin 35 | Weber (2008a) |
| Berlin 36 | Weber (2008a), Weber (2019a) |
| Berlin 37 | Weber (2008a) |
| Berlin 38 | Weber (2008a), Weber (2016) |
| Berlin 39 | Weber (2008a) |
| Berlin 40 | Weber (2008a) |
| “Document 1” | Weber (2019c), Weber (2021a) |
| “Document 2” | Weber (2019c) |
| Ebrahimi | Asefi (2023b) |
| LA 1 | Weber (2008a) |
| LA 2 | Weber (2008a) |
| LA 3 | Weber (2008a) |
| LA 4 | Weber (2008a) |
| LA 5 | Weber (2008a), Gignoux (2010: 116–17) |
| LA 6 | Weber (2008a) |
| Tehran A | Weber (2008a) |
| Tehran B | Weber (2008a) |
| Tehran C | Weber (2008a) |
| Tehran D | Weber (2008a) |
| Tehran E | Weber (2008a) |
| Tehran F | Weber (2008a) |
| Tehran G | Weber (2008a) |
|  |  |
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