

## ĀTAŠ-ZÖHR AND ĀB-ZÖHR

By MARY BOYCE

IN SEVERAL VERSES FROM the Manichaean Middle Persian hymn-cycle, the *Gōwišn ig grīw zīndag*,<sup>1</sup> the Light Self, or sum of the light elements in the world, speaks in the character both of the sacred fire of the Zoroastrians, and of the pure water revered by them. The editors of these verses pointed out<sup>2</sup> that the use of certain technical terms shows that the Manichaean author had an intimate knowledge of Zoroastrian ritual. The publication since then of further Zoroastrian works has established this fact even more plainly; for it is now apparent that the term *zōhr*, which occurs twice in the text, is used in fact for two separate Zoroastrian offerings, the offering to fire, the *ātaš-zōhr*, as well as that to water, the *āb-zōhr*.<sup>3</sup>

The *ātaš-zōhr*, though less prominent in Parsi ritual than the *āb-zōhr*, is well attested in Zoroastrian books and practice; and consists of placing on the sacred fire fat from a sacrificial animal. This oblation was regularly made to the Ātaš-Bahrām, and the written authorities give the following occasions for it: at the enthronement of the Ātaš-Bahrām and during the ritual of its maintenance;<sup>4</sup> at each of the six *gāhānbārs*;<sup>5</sup> at the *čahārom* (*čārom*) ceremony for the dead;<sup>6</sup> at the *hamāg-dēn* ceremony;<sup>7</sup> at expiatory ceremonies such as the *dwāzdah hōmast*;<sup>8</sup> in expiation for the sin of extinguishing a fire;<sup>9</sup> generally in expiation of a grievous sin;<sup>10</sup> and in thank-offering to Mithra for the birth of a son.<sup>11</sup>

In the Manichaean verses the *ātaš-zōhr* or fat-offering appears to be that made to the newly enthroned Ātaš-Bahrām. First (verse 1) the Living Spirit speaks generally: "I am the fire which Zoroaster built up, and which he bade the righteous build" (*an hēm ādur ī čīd zardrušt, u-š framād-um ō ahlawān čīdan*). Then (vv. 3-5) it passes to a specific moment: "From the seven consecrated, sweet-smelling fires bring me purified fuel. Bring clean firewood, and delicate and fragrant incense. Kindle me with knowledge, and give me clean *zōhr*." (*az haft ādur yaštāg ī hubodāg ō-m barēd, ō ādur, waxšan yōzdahr, emag ig pāk*

*āwarēd, ud bōy ig narm ud bōyāg. abrōzēd-um pad dānišn, u-m dayēd zōhr ī pāk.*) The mention here of seven consecrated fires gives the key to the passage. In the ritual for installing a new Ātaš-Bahrām, fire is first gathered from many sources,<sup>1</sup> and the single fire so created is prayed over, becoming thereby consecrated (*yaštāg*). Then a piece of fuel is kindled from this fire without actual contact with the flame, being held above it until ignited by the heat. From this piece of fuel another is kindled, and then another, seven times in all; and it is the seventh piece of fuel only, the flame being thus seven times purified (*yōzdahr*), which is "placed in the abode of fire. And dry fuel should be placed over it, and fat (*pīh*) of the *gōspand* and incense should be offered to it."<sup>2</sup> The ritual of the seven kindlings is still frequently carried out in Yazd, in the ceremony of *taš mas kartwun* "exalting the fire"; since the priests recite Avesta continually during it, the seven pieces of kindling are properly to be termed *yaštāg*, as in the Manichaean text. In the *Rivāyat* passage just cited the word *zōr* (< *zōhr*) is not actually used for the fat of the sheep; but in a parallel passage it is stated that "a male *gōspand* or a female *gōspand* not with young is proper for the offering of *zōr* to the Ātaš-Bahrām".<sup>3</sup>

The three things named in the first *Rivāyat* passage and in the Manichaean verses, namely fuel, incense, and *zōhr*, recur regularly in the Pahlavi texts, as needful also for the regular maintenance of the Ātaš-Bahrām. "Every day it should be tended in this manner so that it may not be extinguished."<sup>4</sup> In a list of "the four best things", revealed by Ōhrmazd to Zoroaster, the first is "worship of Ōhrmazd the Lord" (*yazišn ī Ōhrmazd ī xwadāy*), and the second is "giving to the fire fuel, incense, and *zōhr*" (*ātaxš ēzm, bōy ud zōhr dādan*).<sup>5</sup> In another text it is said that the fire in its bodily form requires of its servants *zōhr ud bōy ud ēzm*, just as they in turn expect from it in its spiritual form the destruction of demons.<sup>6</sup> The offering of *zōhr* was also a part of the special *gāhānbār* ritual. "During every *gāhānbār* . . . the *zōr* of the fat of a *gōspand* should be offered; fuel and frankincense should be continually offered, and they should (thus) maintain it [i.e. the Ātaš-Bahrām]."<sup>7</sup> According to the *Dēnkard*, in one of the lost *nasks* of the Avesta, the *Pājag*, injunctions were given "for slaughtering a sheep lawfully in the worship of the fires and waters (as) *zōhr* for the *gāhānbārs*, to aid the Mazdayasnians" (*abar gōspand dādihā pad ēzišn ī ātaxšān ud āhān zōhr ī gāhānbār mazdēsnañ hayyārīh rāy kuštan*).<sup>8</sup>

Another essential time for offering the *ātaš-zōhr* was the *čahārom* morning. "On the dawn of the fourth day, before passing the Činvat bridge, the soul goes to the court of King Bahrām the Victorious [i.e. the Ātaš-Bahrām] . . . If the fat of a *gōspand* is offered as *zōr* to the Ātaš-Bahrām, the soul passes away thence happily, and Ādar-Xwarrah and the other Amašaspands help it, and it goes to the different stations of heaven."<sup>9</sup> If there is no

<sup>1</sup> M 95 V 1-6; see Andreas and Henning, "Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan II" (*Sb. PAW*, 1933, VII, 319-20). The readings of v. 6 have since been emended by Henning; see *BSOAS*, XI, 1943, 217, n. 7.

<sup>2</sup> op. cit., 320, nn. 1, 2.

<sup>3</sup> The existence of these two kinds of *zōhr* was recognized by Darmesteter; see his admirable comments, *Zend-Avesta*, I, lxvi, II, 154 with n. 39, 254, n. 69. He appears to have found the term *ātaš-zōr* or *zōr-i ātaš* still known to the Parsis.

<sup>4</sup> See M. R. Unvala, *Dāvāb Hormazyār's Rivāyat* (Bombay, 1922), I, 75; tr. B. N. Dhabhar, *The Persian Rivāyats of Hormazyār Framarz and others* (Bombay, 1932), 69. In his translations Dhabhar always distinguishes between the *zōhr* of "holy water" and the *zōhr* of the fat-offering.

<sup>5</sup> D. M. Madan, *Dinkard* (Bombay, 1911), 682, l. 2 f.; B. T. Anklesaria, *Rivāyat-i Hēmit-i Ašvahištān I* (Bombay, 1962), 60 (Pursišn XVII, 15); B. N. Dhabhar, *The Epistles of Mānūschihar* (Bombay, 1912), 38 (Ep. I, Ch. VIII, 3); Unvala, op. cit., 74, 75; Dhabhar, *Persian Rivāyats*, 64, 66.

<sup>6</sup> Pahlavi of *Vendīdād VIII*, 22, see Spiegel, *Avesta*, I, 110, ll. 14-16; B. T. Anklesaria, *Pahlavi Vendīdād* (Bombay, 1949), 199; M. B. Davar, *Sāyast īz-Sāyast* (Bombay, 1912, printed but not generally published), 62-3 (Ch. XII, 5); Unvala, op. cit., I, 75, 162, 170, 264; Dhabhar, op. cit., 70, 175, 177, 264.

<sup>7</sup> P. K. Anklesaria, *The unedited portion of the Dādestān-i dīnik* (London thesis, 1958), 133 (Purs. 65), 167 f. (Purs. 87); tr. West, *SBE*, XVIII, 204-6, 250 f. (with *zōhr* rendered as "holy-water").

<sup>8</sup> Davar, *ŠnŠ*, 92 (Ch. XVI, 6); tr. West, *SBE*, V, 381; B. T. Anklesaria, *Zand-i Vohūman Yasn* (Bombay, 1957), 40 (Ch. V, 2), 62 (Ch. VII, 21); see West's note to his translation, *SBE*, V, 212.

<sup>9</sup> J. C. Tavadia, *ŠnŠ* (Hamburg, 1930), 102 with n. 9<sup>a</sup> (Ch. VII, 9).

<sup>10</sup> Davar, *ŠnŠ*, 92 (Ch. XVI, 6); Unvala, op. cit., I, 307; Dhabhar, op. cit., 292.

<sup>11</sup> Unvala, op. cit., II, 70-71; Dhabhar, op. cit., 436 (but see further p. 107 below).

<sup>1</sup> There are 16 basic categories of fires from which portions are to be gathered, but these may be multiplied many times over; see, e.g., Unvala, op. cit., I, 75; Dhabhar, op. cit., 69.

<sup>2</sup> Unvala, loc. cit.; Dhabhar, loc. cit.

<sup>3</sup> Unvala, op. cit., I, 76; Dhabhar, op. cit., 71.

<sup>4</sup> Unvala, op. cit., I, 75; Dhabhar, op. cit., 69.

<sup>5</sup> Dhabhar, *The Pahlavi Rivāyat accompanying the Dadistān-i Dīnik* (Bombay, 1913), Ch. VIII, p. 11; tr. West, *SBE*, XVIII, 417.

<sup>6</sup> A. Barthélémy, *Gujastak Abalish* (Paris, 1887), Ch. VI, 15 (Purs. 5), 22.

<sup>7</sup> Unvala, op. cit., I, 74; Dhabhar, *Persian Rivāyats*, 64.

<sup>8</sup> *Dk. M.*, 682, l. 2 f.; cited by Dhabhar, op. cit., 70, n. 13.

<sup>9</sup> Unvala, op. cit., I, 162, ll. 15-18; Dhabhar, op. cit., 177, section 17; cf. Unvala, I, 162, ll. 10-11; Dhabhar, 175, section 11.

Ātaš-Bahrām in the neighbourhood, the soul goes to the nearest sacred fire. The *zōhr* should then be given to this lesser fire "at the time when the *āfrīnagān* ceremony is performed".<sup>1</sup> For "in the Dāmdād (Nask) it is revealed that when the consciousness of men is severed, it goes . . . to the nearest fire. And it is fitting that the nearest fire to which it has come, become stronger." (*pad dāmdād paydāg ku bōy ī marđōmān, ka brīnēnd, be ō nazdīst ātaxš . . . šawēd. ud niyābag ku hān ī nazdīst ātaxš, ī-š be ōy awiš mad, zōromandar bawēd*).<sup>2</sup>

The Pahlavi texts thus show that *zōhr* is not offered only to an *Ātaš-Bahrām*; and the 17th-century traveller Gemelli, visiting what was evidently an *adarān* in Isfahan, recorded as follows: "Ascending six steps, they showed me in a Room adjoining to the temple their Fire which they fed with Wood, and sometimes burn on it the Fat of the Sheep's Tail."<sup>3</sup> In one Pahlavi text a blessing is invoked on all sacred fires, with the words "may they be ever-burning, ever with food [i.e. fuel], ever with *zōhr*" (*hamēšag-sōz, hamēšag-pihān, hamēšag-zōhr*);<sup>4</sup> and in another Pahlavi text<sup>5</sup> it is even implied that such offerings can be made to any "fire of Ōhrmazd", that is, any fire sacred or used for household purposes.<sup>6</sup> To make them is to propitiate Ardwahišt; but one should not put upon the fire fuel, incense, or *zōhr* which has been "robbed and stolen" (*dōzīdag ud appurdag*), or cook on it food taken by violence from others.

This warning carries the reminder that all these offerings cost money, and particularly the sacrificial animal necessary for the *zōhr*. Because of the greater devotion required in making this expenditure, the merit of a ceremony with *zōhr* (*pad zōhr*) is greater than one without. Thus it is said: "The *dāzādah hōmast* (compensates for) 100,000 (sins). For every one (performed) with *zōhr*, the merit is said to be a hundredfold. A *hādoxt* (compensates for) 2,000 *tanapuhr* (sins); with *zōhr* (the merit) becomes one hundredfold."<sup>7</sup>

In the *Dādestān-i dīnīg* relative costs are given of ceremonies with and without *zōhr*. In Pursisn 87 the ceremony of the *hamāg-dēn pad zōhr* is said to cost 400 dirhams, and to require 4 animals; "the *hamāg-dēn pad zōhr*, for which they take 4 'clean' *gōspand*, even as the *dastūrs* have taught; to each fire they give the *zōhr* from one sheep". (*hamāg-dēn ī pad zōhr, kē-š 4 gōspand ī pāk padīš girēnd, ēdōn čēdn dastwarān čāstag, harw ēwag ātaxš az ēwag gōspand ēwag zōhr dahēnd*).<sup>8</sup>

The question of cost made it natural that the usual offering should be a sheep or goat:<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Unvala, I, 264; Dhabhar, 264. In another *Rivāyat*, however, it is insisted that the fat-offering (*čarbi*) of the *čāhārom* is unavailing unless it is made to an *Ātaš-Bahrām*; see Unvala, I, 75; Dhabhar, 70.

<sup>2</sup> *ŠnŠ.*, XII, 5, ed. Davar, pp. 62-3; text with trans. *apud* Dhabhar, op. cit., 265, n. 1. A pun on *zōr* and *zōrmand* is found also in the Manichaean text (v. 6); and another parallel Manichaean passage with similar pun is cited by Henning, *BSOAS*, XI, 1943, 217, n. 7.

<sup>3</sup> J. F. Gemelli-Careri, *A Voyage Round the World* (1694), Ch. 7; Eng. version in Awnsham Churchill's *A Collection of Voyages and Travels* (London, 1704), Vol. 4, 143a; cited by Darmesteter, *ZA*, II, 254, n. 69.

<sup>4</sup> *Sūr Saxwan*, 6, see J. Asana, *Pahlavi texts*, 156, and J. C. Tavadia, *J. of K.R.Cama Or. Inst.*, No. 29, 1935, 60 for a textual note.

<sup>5</sup> *ŠnŠ.*, XV, 12 (Davar, p. 86).

<sup>6</sup> See West, *SBE*, V, 375, n. 2. From the general context, the injunctions given in *Dk.*, VIII, 37 (38), 9, about the need for cleanliness in offering *zōhr* to the fire refer to a priest making the offering to a household fire on behalf of the inmates; see Sanjana, XVI, p. 52 with trans., pp. 40-41.

<sup>7</sup> *ŠnŠ.*, XVI, 6 (Davar, p. 92; West, *SBE*, V, 381), and cf. *Zand-i Vohuman Yasn*, V, 3 (ed. B. T. Anklesaria, p. 40; West, *SBE*, V, 212).

<sup>8</sup> P. K. Anklesaria, thesis, p. 167 (Purs. 87.6); cited by Dhabhar, op. cit., 265, n. 1.

<sup>9</sup> As it was apparently, even for royal offerings, from Sasanian times. J. Duchesne-Guillemin (*Hommages à G. Dumézil, Collection Latomus*, XLV, 1960, 98-9) has suggested that it was this general use of the

but in his first letter to the congregation of Sirkān Manusčīhr writes<sup>1</sup> of the *zōhr* of donkey and pig being offered to the fire at the time of *gāhānbār*, and stresses that this *zōhr* is clean (*pāk*), and that only if too much is offered is there offence in the act (as overwhelming the fire). In a *Vendidād* passage the *zaoθra* of a cow is mentioned,<sup>2</sup> and in the *Rivāyats* the sacrifice of a cow is spoken of both for the *čāhārom*<sup>3</sup> and the parallel *gēti-kharid* ceremonies.<sup>4</sup> It appears to be only with the passage of centuries that Muslim convictions (about the uncleanness of ass and pig) and Hindu ones (about the extreme holiness of the cow) had their effect on Zoroastrians.<sup>5</sup> It was presumably the pressure of Muslim influence which caused Manusčīhr to write specifically of the first two creatures. Originally, it seems, any of the domestic animals, being all of the good creation, could be sacrificed to furnish the roast offering.<sup>6</sup>

In the passage just cited, Manusčīhr uses the expression *zōhr ī xar ud xūg*, and then goes on to write: *hān gōšt pad pākī wizirēnid pad be dādan ō gāhānbār* "that meat is to be adjudged clean for giving at the *gāhānbār*". Here *zōhr* and *gōšt* appear to be used interchangeably, that is, the term *zōhr* is used in this passage not only for the fat-offering to the fire, but also for the flesh-offering to the gods, symbolized by the *gōšōdā* (< *gāuš hušd*), still preserved vestigially in the Parsi ceremonial, but more traditionally in the Irani one. The animal sacrificed is regarded as being wholly given to the gods (hence the precise dedication of its different parts to particular deities);<sup>7</sup> but, as Strabo has recorded,<sup>8</sup> "they [i.e. the Persian priests] say that the god requires only the soul of the victim and nothing else", or, as it is seen on a more popular level, it is the smell of the offering only which

sheep for sacrifice which led to the term *gāv* "bull/cow" being used for "sheep" in the specialized expression *gōspand*, the smaller animal serving as an economical substitute for what had once been the chief sacrificial animal, whose name, however, continued in use. A more likely explanation is perhaps that the term *gōspenta* came to be generalized for all useful animals (cf. its application to the pig, n. 5 below), and then specialized again for the sheep as the most useful among them.

<sup>1</sup> *Epistle* I, VIII, 3 (ed. Dhabhar, p. 38).

<sup>2</sup> *Vd.*, VII, 77, on which see p. 105 below.

<sup>3</sup> See Unvala, op. cit., 156; Dhabhar, op. cit., 170.

<sup>4</sup> See Unvala, op. cit., 170; Dhabhar, op. cit., 178.

<sup>5</sup> John Ogilby in his *Asia* (London, 1673), 218b, writes as follows of the Parsis: "In point of Eating and Drinking, their Law hath given them great Privilege; but to avoid displeasing of the Benjans [i.e. the Hindus] amongst whom they live, and the Moors [i.e. the Muslims] under whose Jurisdiction they stand, they abstain from Wine . . . and Swines-flesh . . . They chiefly abstain from Cows or Ox-flesh, affirming that they will rather eat their Fathers or Mothers flesh; in which Point of Religion they agree with the Benjans." Anquetil du Perron, *Zend-Avesta*, II, 601, points out that it is only the dog, and creatures of Ahriman (such as rats, cats, snakes, wolves, frogs, etc.), which Zoroastrians are forbidden to eat. In *GBd.*, XXIV, 52 (ed. Anklesaria, 157; trans., 205), the flesh and fat of the pig are praised as wholesome; but in one of the *Rivāyats* (doubtless under the influence of Islam) a compromise is reached on this animal: "The pig is a creature of Bahman. It is a species of *gōspenta*, but, because it eats foul matter, its flesh should not be eaten. If a person binds it and gives it grass for food, then after the length of a year its flesh can be eaten" (Unvala, op. cit., I, 261; Dhabhar, op. cit., 260). It was this practice which Gemelli found among the Zoroastrians of Isfahan in the 17th century: "They . . . eat Swines Flesh, but it must be bred by themselves, and not have eaten any Thing unclean" (op. cit., 143b). Cow-sacrifice continued in the Yazd area down to the late 19th century (see a forthcoming article in *BSOAS*, XXX, 1, 1967); but the village Zoroastrians of Persia do not now eat beef, and would regard the flesh of pig or donkey as wholly unclean.

The sacrifice of horses is not recorded in the later Zoroastrian texts, but is frequently mentioned in the *Yasns*; it is also well-attested by western writers as a Persian custom, particularly as an offering to the sun-god: see e.g. Xenophon, *Anabasis*, IV, 5, 35.

<sup>7</sup> See *ŠnŠ.*, XI, 4-6 (ed. Davar, 59-60; tr. West, *SBE*, V, 335-8).

<sup>8</sup> *XV*, 3, 13.

ascends. Hence the full ritual of sacrifice requires that the meat be roasted;<sup>1</sup> and in Zoroastrian ceremonial a small portion of this roast flesh is ritually consumed by the priest during the appropriate *yazišn*. This portion of roast meat, and the roast meat in general, constitutes a *zöhr* to the gods. Present custom at least requires the sacrificer to bestow a fixed minimum of the offering upon the poor; of the rest a part is given to the priest, and the remainder is eaten in amity by those invited to share it.

The use of *zöhr* as a general term for the various offerings made from a blood-sacrifice is to be found also in the later Avestan texts. Thus in *Nirangistān*, Ch. 65, the question is put: "How many *zaöbra* should one bring from one sheep?" (*č[v]aiti[s] nā aēvahe pasvō zaöbrā barāt*),<sup>2</sup> to which the answer is "Four". Unfortunately the four *zaöbras* are not specified, and a Pahlavi gloss gives only three (apparently meat, fat, and the pomegranate plant,<sup>3</sup> of which the last is hardly relevant); but in another passage of the *Nirangistān* (Ch. 57-8) a threefold offering from the sacrificial animal is attested, namely the flesh, fat, and hide.<sup>4</sup> This threefold offering is still made at the *Mihragān* festival in one of the Yazdi villages.<sup>5</sup> In yet another *Nirangistān* passage<sup>6</sup> the man who offers the sacrifice is to take away a portion "from these offerings" (*aētābyō zaöbrābyō*, Pahl. *awēšān zōhrag*), after the officiating priest has first eaten of the flesh (*zaota gēuš . . . paoriyō frahgarōit*).

In an older part of the Avesta, namely the *Vendidad*,<sup>7</sup> it is enjoined that, in order to expiate a particular sin, a man is to slaughter 1,000 sheep, and from all of them he is to take the *afsmānīd* (and ?) *zaöbra*, and bring these to the fire (*hazayrēm anumayanam frāvinuyāt, vispanamca aētaešam pasvam afsmānīd zaöbra dōre . . . frabarōit*). (*afsmānīd* or *asmānīd* is a hapax of unknown meaning, which is discussed further below.)<sup>8</sup> After this<sup>9</sup> the penitent is to offer the fire dry fuel and sweet-smelling wood or herbs, that is to say, he seems required to perform the threefold offering to the fire of *zöhr* and wood and incense as found in the Pahlavi books and our Manichaean text. Next (following the same order as the Manichaean text) he is to perform the *āb-zöhr*, that is, to offer "1,000 *zaöbras* having *haoma*, having milk . . . mixed with the plant called pomegranate to the waters". (*hazayrēm zaöbranam haomavaitinam gaomavaitinam . . . hqm.irista aētayd urvarayd yā vaoče hadānā-patā aiwyō vahūbyō . . . frabarōit*.)<sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The practice of the roast offering with *ātaš-zöhr* provides a grim simile in *Vd.*, XVI, 17, where it is said that a man who has intercourse with a menstruous woman transgresses as greatly "as if he were to roast the body of his own son (and) bring the fat to the fire" (*yođōit puđrahe hvāzōtahe frā nažzam nasūm pačāi paui dōre uđm bavāi*), i.e. by this act he sins as terribly towards his potential issue as if deliberately sacrificing his own son. (On *nažzam pač-* "to roast" see Henning, *Sogdica*, p. 41 on 16.) The simile is evidently meant to emphasize through shock (like the Parsis' statement about rather eating their parents' than cow's flesh, see p. 103 above, n. 5). There is not the smallest justification for taking it as an indication of cannibalism among Zoroastrians (see G. Widengren, *Die Religionen Irans*, Stuttgart, 1965, 116, where the passage has been wholly misunderstood).

<sup>2</sup> See A. Waag, *Nirangistān* (Leipzig, 1941), 70.

<sup>3</sup> On the *hadānāparā* plant as "pomegranate" see Morgenstierne, *IFL*, II, 190, s.v. *alano*.

<sup>4</sup> See Waag, op. cit., 72. In *Dk.*, VIII, 28 (29), 11, also (in a passage deriving from the Avesta) the question of the amount of *zöhr* to be offered from one animal is considered (*čandih i zöhr i az ewag gōspanū*); see Sanjana, XVI, 19; West, *SBE*, XXXVII, 95.

<sup>5</sup> See p. 107 below.

<sup>6</sup> *N.*, Ch. 70-1 (Waag, p. 81).

<sup>7</sup> *Vd.*, XVIII, 70.

<sup>8</sup> See p. 108.

<sup>9</sup> *Vd.*, XVIII, 71.

<sup>10</sup> *Vd.*, XVIII, 72.

In another passage in the *Vendidad* it is said that if a cow has eaten the corpse of dog or man, neither her milk nor her flesh may be used for *zaöbra* for a year: *nōit payō fšuta zaöbre, nōit gēuš zaöbre barəsmaine paui.baire antarāt naēmāt yārə.drājō*.<sup>1</sup> The hapax *fšuta* is rendered by Pahl. *panir* "cheese". Bartholomae was inclined to regard this word as a gloss.<sup>2</sup> If it is left out of consideration, then it is natural to suppose the prohibition to mean that neither is the cow's milk to be used for libation (the *āb-zöhr*), nor her fat and flesh for the offering to fire (*ātaš-zöhr*) and to the gods.

In the *Yasna* and *Yašt*s the word *zaöbra* occurs many times, but often without attribute to define its meaning. When this is so defined, it is the liquid *zaöbra*, the libation, which is intended. This may, however, be because already at the time of the great *yašt*s the commoner use of *zaöbra* was for offerings from the blood-sacrifice, and so it was other *zaöbras* which needed definition. It certainly seems likely that in Avestan the meanings of fat-offering and flesh-offering are as old as that of libation, since one use of Skt. *hotrā* is for the offering of butter poured into the fire, and another is for burnt-offering in general. It is probably wrong, therefore, to seek a semantic development within Avestan for *zaöbra* from libation to the liquefying offering of fat, and thence to offering in general. It is more probable that all three meanings inhere in the Avestan word from the earliest times.

Blood-sacrifice is certainly abundantly attested in the *yašt*s; and it is moreover in this meaning that the word *zöhr* came to be borrowed, as *zoh*, into Armenian. Hübschmann<sup>3</sup> cites a passage from Elise to the effect that Yazdigird II "had many offerings (*zoh*) of white bulls and hairy goats made to the fire". Here the word could have the particular meaning of the fat-oblation. There are many other passages, however, especially in the Armenian Bible, where, as Benveniste<sup>4</sup> has shown, animal-sacrifice in its general sense is rendered by *zoh*, and the verb "to sacrifice" by *zohel*. It thus appears that the word *zöhr* was in regular use among the Parthians for the blood-sacrifice. The same usage is found among the Sogdians in the east, where the word *žōše*, derived from *zaöbra*,<sup>5</sup> (Budd. Sogd. *δr'wšyḥ*, Christ. Sogd. *fwšy*) is attested only in the sense of animal-sacrifice.<sup>6</sup> There is also an adjective *žōšečik* (*δr'wš'yčyk*) for the animal vowed to sacrifice.<sup>7</sup> The fact that the derivatives of *zaöbra* are attested in Sogdian and Armenian only for the blood-sacrifice, and not for libation, must be ascribed to the nature of the texts concerned, which deal with animal-offerings by Jews and Greeks, and Buddhist preachings against taking life.

Since the migrant Parsis were a tiny minority among the Hindus and Jains of Gujarat, it would not be strange if they had early been forced to abandon animal-sacrifice. There was a time in the 12th century when the practice must, one would think, actually have endangered their own lives, for King Kumārapāla ordained the death-penalty during his reign for breach of *ahimsā*. There is, however, evidence that they tenaciously continued the observance. In the 18th century Anquetil du Perron found the custom of a yearly sacrifice of a sheep to Mithra still observed, on the day Mihr of the month Mihr;<sup>8</sup> and the

<sup>1</sup> *Vd.*, VII, 77; on *paui.baire* see Benveniste, *Les infinitifs avestiques*, 46.

<sup>2</sup> *Air. Wb.*, 1029.

<sup>3</sup> *Arm. Gram.*, 151.

<sup>4</sup> See *JAs.*, 1964, 48 f.

<sup>5</sup> See I. Gershevitch, *JRAS*, 1946, 183.

<sup>6</sup> See Benveniste, *TSP*, glossary s.v.; O. Hansen, *Berliner Soghdische Texte*, I, glossary s.v.

<sup>7</sup> P 2, 540 (*TSP*, 27).

<sup>8</sup> op. cit., II, 577 (a horn from the Mithra sheep was necessary for the rites of the Spandarmad festival).

sacrifice of the *čahārom* sheep was then still regular. "Le quatrième jour, lorsque le Soleil paroît on fait l'*Afergan* à Dahman, et l'on met dans le feu de la graisse d'une brebis, que l'on mange ensuite à l'intention du mort. Cette brebis doit avoir au moins un an, ainsi que tous les animaux que l'on tue, que l'on mange, ou que l'on bénit."<sup>1</sup> The last sentence suggests a general practice of the consecrated sacrifice. Haug in the 19th century says<sup>2</sup> (presumably on priestly authority) that "formerly they used a piece of meat" instead of the symbolic lump of butter in the *Yasna* service; and also using the past tense, he says that "sacrificing animals was essential for the proper performance" of the *gāhānbār* ceremonies.<sup>3</sup> That an offering of fat from sheep or goat, called the *zōr*, had formerly been made to the sacred fire was still common knowledge among the Parsis at that time.<sup>4</sup>

In the present century it seems that only the *čahārom* offering persisted. Dhabhar, writing in the 1920's, says that special leave used to be given Parsis in certain towns of Gujarat to slaughter a goat only for this occasion, and that they were therefore known as *bokrā-kāpu* "killers of goats". He adds that the custom had then fallen into desuetude;<sup>5</sup> but a mobed-zade from Anklešwar<sup>6</sup> has told me that he can remember in his boyhood (i.e. in the 1930's) that, when a death occurred in a mobad family there, a white sheep or goat, which had been kept for the purpose and specially fed on *pāk* food, was killed on the third night, the fat offered at the *agiary* at dawn on the fourth day, and the flesh eaten by the mourners. The same practice was still observed in the early decades of this century by behdins in Surat.<sup>7</sup>

The Zoroastrians of Iran, living among Muslims, were under no pressure to end animal-sacrifice until close contact was established with their Parsi brethren in the late 19th century. Till then, animal-sacrifice, as required in the Avesta and Pahlavi books, and in the *Rivāyats*, appears to have been fully observed.<sup>8</sup> By now Parsi influence, and the climate of the 20th century, have begun to have their effect. The *čahārom* sheep is still regularly offered, however, and families who can afford it also sacrifice a sheep for the dead on the first *sirōze* and *sāl*. Animal-sacrifice is regularly made at the mountain-shrines, as a votive offering, a thank-offering, or in expiation of some offence. A sheep is still killed at many *gāhānbār* celebrations, which are then known as *gāhānbār-i gōštī*; and in the highly conservative villages of Sharifabad and Mazra' Kalantar almost every household still sacrifices a sheep at the *Jašn-i Mihrized*, the old *Mihragān*.<sup>9</sup> The vowing of a particular

<sup>1</sup> *ibid.*, II, 586-7; cf. Unvala, *op. cit.*, I, 76, 262; Dhabhar, *op. cit.*, 71, 262.

<sup>2</sup> M. Haug, *Essays on . . . the Parsis*, ed. E. W. West (2nd ed., London, 1878), 281.

<sup>3</sup> *ibid.*, 285.

<sup>4</sup> See S. D. Bharucha (who wrote in 1882) *apud* Tavadia, *ŠrŠ.*, 103 and IX s. *Rst.*

<sup>5</sup> Dhabhar, *op. cit.*, 261, n. 15.

<sup>6</sup> Mr. Peshotan Antia, now resident in London.

<sup>7</sup> Information from Miss Fringis Shapurji, now also of London, speaking of her grandparents' generation. No doubt more could still be learnt of ancient observances from the oldest generation of Parsis still living in the traditional Zoroastrian strongholds of Gujarat.

<sup>8</sup> Most of my information concerning Iranian observance was obtained while I was the guest in 1964 of Agha Rustam Noshirvan Belivani, the very able head of the Zoroastrian *anjoman* of the village of Sharifabad-i Ardekan, Yazd, to whom I am deeply indebted for generous hospitality, friendship, and help in countless ways. His brother-in-law, Dastur Khodadad Neryosangi, priest of Sharifabad and the adjoining villages, was also unfailingly helpful, and they both exerted themselves to instruct me in all that I sought to learn. To them, to their families, and to the Zoroastrian community of Sharifabad I owe a deep debt of gratitude.

This festival was observed with full rites in Yazd down to the second decade of the present century, and till later in many other Yazdi villages. It is hoped to write of it in detail elsewhere. According to Shirin-i Set Hakimi of Sharifabad, who is over 100 years old, the festival used still to be called *Mihragān* there in her girlhood. This name has now been revived among the Tehrani Zoroastrians.

animal, sometimes at birth, for a certain sacrifice is a usual practice, and not even a better-grown, fatter beast may be substituted when the time comes for the one so dedicated. The sacrificial animal is now designated by the Muslim word *qurbān*.

From these sacrifices the *ātaš-zōhr* of fat is only now regularly made in Mazra' Kalantar at the *Jašn-i Mihrized*. The ritual is for each house to kill the sheep at home, where the carcass is ceremonially roasted, on any of the five days of the festival (which lasts from the day Mihr of the month Mihr to the day Varahrām). The roasted carcass is then carried in a great bowl, usually head-high, to the *dar-i mihr*, together with the lump of fat from the sheep's tail, and the skin covering it all. The fat is put in a bowl set for the purpose in the *gāhānbār-xāne* or outer hall of the *dar-i mihr*, to be offered in due course to the sacred fire;<sup>1</sup> and the skin is stretched out in the courtyard.<sup>2</sup> Gradually as the festival advances the courtyard becomes covered with a variegated carpet of fleeces, white and black and speckled and chocolate brown. Thus the old threefold *zōhr* of the *Nirangistān* is still fully observed.

It is remarkable that this ancient offering survives in full only at the festival of Mithra; and that the animal-sacrifice to Mithra on the first day of his feast was still observed by the Parsis in the 18th century. From this one can argue either the great prominence of Mithra, or his particular cultic connection with animal-sacrifice. It is of some interest that the inner rites of the *Jašn-i Mihrized* are regarded as belonging particularly to men, and to young men at that—as it were to the warrior-group of the community.<sup>3</sup> In one of the *Rivāyats* it is further laid down that for three years after the birth of a son a man shall make an annual sacrifice in thank-offering to Mithra of a sheep on the day Dai-be-Mihr, that is, the day before the *Mihragān*.<sup>4</sup>

The only other time when the *ātaš-zōhr* is still made is at the *čahārom*, and this custom has now almost ceased, although the sheep is still regularly offered. The late practice in Sharifabad was as follows: some of the fat of the *čārom* sheep, with a paring from its horn, and a scrap of the wool, was pounded up with garlic and rue (*sir-u-sedōw*, two plants much used in ritual) and *būd-i nākōš*, a highly aromatic plant used only at time of death; and this was then taken to the priest to be placed on the sacred fire at dawn of the fourth day.<sup>5</sup>

There is one particular observance in the animal-sacrifice which merits description in connection with *zōhr*. When the sheep has been killed and the carcass is being made ready for the oven, great care is taken with the preparation of the *andom*.<sup>6</sup> Seven parts of the beast's inwards are needed: a long piece of the gut, and six small pieces from the heart, lungs, liver, kidneys, stomach, and caul (omentum). A slit is made in each of these six with a knife-point, and they are threaded one by one on the gut. The two ends of the gut are then tied together with seven knots. Each time he crosses the ends to form a new knot,

<sup>1</sup> Most of the fat-offering, which is made in such abundance at this time, is, however, rendered down by the *ātes-band* to provide *pāk* candles to burn by the sacred fire.

<sup>2</sup> In the very dry air of the Yazdi plain even a freshly flayed skin gives off almost no smell. Eventually the fleeces are sold for the benefit of the *dar-i mihr*.

<sup>3</sup> Dastur Khodadad Neryosangi of Sharifabad told me that, though he would not necessarily exclude women from these rites, they really had no part in them.

<sup>4</sup> Unvala, *op. cit.*, II, 70-71; Dhabhar, *op. cit.*, 436. According to Anquetil, II, 551, among the Parsis the father made this sacrifice to Mithra on the day Mihr, month Mihr, three years after the birth of a child (apparently boy or girl).

<sup>5</sup> Information from Khanom Piruza-i Noshiravan Belivani, wife of Dastur Khodadad.

<sup>6</sup> The word is presumably identical with Parth. *handām*, Pers. *andām* "limb, part".

the priest<sup>1</sup> recites a *Yatha ahu vairyo*, seven times in all. The *andom* is then ready, and is hung inside the carcase to roast. Afterwards this part of the sacrifice is laid upon the *drōn* (Irani *luwok*),<sup>2</sup> together with a little of the roast meat, as the *gošōdā*.<sup>3</sup> The offering on the *drōn* is referred to as *zōr* in one *Rivāyāt* passage.<sup>4</sup>

The nature of the *andom* leads one to connect this ritual with what is said by Strabo of the Magi, that when they sacrificed an animal to the gods, they laid on the fire a small portion of the omentum (ὄμωσ δὲ τοῦ ἐπίπλου τι μικρον τιθέασιν, ὡς λεγούσι τινες, ἐπὶ τὸ πῦρ).<sup>5</sup> It seems that in this ritual the omentum was roasted directly on the fire, as is still the Yazdi practice with the tongue of the sacrificial sheep.<sup>6</sup> In the light of Strabo's statement Darmesteter suggested<sup>7</sup> translating as omentum the unknown Avestan word in *Vd.*, XVIII, 70, which he read (with abundant MS justification) as *afsmānivā*.<sup>8</sup> The Pahlavi translation glosses the word, which appears to be a neuter plural, as a substantive, with the phrase *yaž antarə vərəδka as marəja*, meaning apparently "that which is between the kidneys, that is, the *marəja*".<sup>9</sup> Dr. Gershevitch points out,<sup>10</sup> however, that the word can as well be a thematically inflected feminine adjective, qualifying the neuter *zaōθra*, and that in this case it is one which occurs elsewhere in the Avesta as an adverb, *afsmānivaṇ*. This adverb is rendered by Bartholomae as "verszeilenweise", from *afsmān* "Verszeile".<sup>11</sup> It is, however, unlikely that in oral composition the divisions of verse are thought of as linear. One can therefore postulate rather a meaning for *afsmān* of "that which is joined (to another), a part, section", and for the adjective "having parts, sections". An expression "the *zaōθra* having parts" accords exactly with the *zōhr* of the *andom*.<sup>12</sup>

It should perhaps be emphasized that the animal-sacrifice and all its attendant rites are invested by the Zoroastrians with deep religious seriousness. It is sad that the old

<sup>1</sup> Formerly the sacrifice was always prepared by the priests. Now it is more usually prepared by behdins, but preferably by those who have undergone *nō-šwa*, i.e. the *barašnōm*. I first saw the full preparation of the *andom* in the hospitable house of Agha Dinyar Arghavani of Taft, to whom and to his brother I am much indebted for all the kindness and helpfulness they showed me on that occasion, the first *sāl* of their father's death.

<sup>2</sup> The Iranis now use the word *drōn* or *drin* only for liturgical texts.

<sup>3</sup> cf. Unvala, op. cit., I, 262; Dhabhar, op. cit., 262. There is some difference in practice between mobad and behdin, and between place and place, as to when the *andom* is prepared. According to Dastur Khodadad, in a mobad household the *andom* is (or was) prepared whenever an animal was sacrificed, whatever the occasion, though it was only at the *Mihragān* that the mobads gathered to partake of it communally. In Yazd and the surrounding villages the behdins prepared the *andom* for the *Mihragān*, and still do so for the *cārom*, *sirūze* and *sāl*. In Sharifabad and Mazra' Kalantar the behdins prepare it only for the *Mihragān*. All agree that the *andom* does not belong to sheep sacrificed at the mountain-shrines (where the flesh is usually seethed, not roasted; cf. Herodotus, I, 132).

<sup>4</sup> See Unvala, op. cit., II, 71 top; Dhabhar, op. cit., 436.

<sup>5</sup> XV, 3.13; Darmesteter, *ZA*, II, 254, n. 69, also compares Catullus' description of the sacrifice of the Magi: *natus ut accepto veneretur carmine divos, omentum in flamma pingue liquefaciens* "so that the son [as Magus] may venerate the gods, when the chant has been begun, melting the fat caul upon the flame" (Ode XC in the Oxford edition).

<sup>6</sup> It is hoped to describe elsewhere the ritual for the sheep's tongue.

<sup>7</sup> loc. cit.; the text is cited on p. 104 above.

<sup>8</sup> Bartholomae prefers the reading *afsmānivā*; see *Air. Wb.*, 221.

<sup>9</sup> See Spiegel, *Avesta*, I, 208, ll. 15-17; Anklesaria, *Pahl. Vd.*, 368; Bartholomae, *Air. Wb.*, 1147-8.

<sup>10</sup> In a written communication.

<sup>11</sup> *Air. Wb.*, 103.

<sup>12</sup> Dr. Gershevitch prefers a rather different explanation, namely that *afsmān* should mean (1) "tie, string" and (2) fig. "verse" (cf. Germ. *gebundene Rede* for "metrical form"); hence, from (2), *afsmānivaṇ* "vers(zeilen)weise, metrically", and from (1), *afsmānivā zaōθra* "strung oblations". For *andom* he then postulates a derivation from \**ham-tana* "strung together", with dissimilation of *n-n* to *n-m*; on the evidence for a noun \**tana* "string" see his *Av. Hymn to Mithra*, 279, n.

humane method of first stunning the beast<sup>1</sup> has been abandoned for the Muslim manner of slaughter; but this is how the animal would in any case now meet its end in Persia. Up to the moment of death, the sacrificial beast is tended with great care. No creature must ever be hungry or thirsty when it comes to die, and I seldom saw one frightened or apprehensive. The ritual requires that a bowl of clean water be offered it to drink, and a sweetmeat to eat. Water from the bowl is sprinkled on the ground around the animal; and then the sacrificer kisses the creature's left cheek before he slays it, in a gesture of brotherly contrition—for it too belongs to the good creation of Ōhrmazd. The Avesta to be recited at the time of sacrifice is given in one of the *Rivāyats*;<sup>2</sup> and it is essential that after death the tongue be cut out, and that a priest should recite the *drin-i hōm* over it, making it *yašte* (consecrated).<sup>3</sup> Otherwise every sheep which a man has killed will gather at the Činvāt bridge to accuse him.<sup>4</sup> According to *Nirangistān* 65, the older usage was for the *zōhr* of fat and flesh to be made with the recital of *Yasna haptanhāiti*. (This was presumably for an offering made outside the ritual of the *yasna* or *āfrīnagān* ceremonies.)<sup>5</sup>

The offering to the fire, made in this deeply reverent spirit, is invested doctrinally with a profound significance. The fat-offering from the sacrificial animal to the Ātaš-Varahrām is held to have a strengthening and healing power for the sacred fire, in some way analogous to the healing power for the resurrected human body of the fat of the sacrificial bull Haḍayans. At the end of the world, during the service (*yazišn*) for resurrecting the dead, Sošyāns and his helpers "kill the bull Haḍayans. From the fat of that bull and the white Hōm they make ambrosia, and they give (it) to all men, and all men become immortal" (*gāw i haḍayāns kušēnd. az pih i hān gāw ud hōm i spēd anōš wirāyēnd ud ō harwisp mardōm dahēnd, ud harwisp mardōm a-ōš bawēnd*).<sup>6</sup> An analogy between this act and the earthly *ātaš-zōhr* is drawn in the *Dādistān i dēnig*:<sup>7</sup> "the meritorious *zōr* which is given during the service to the Ātaš-Varahrām for a medicine, healingly, forms a likeness to the last *zōr* from the bull Haḍayans, which is given at the end of the world to the virtuous departed.

<sup>1</sup> See Benveniste, *JAs.*, 1964, p. 51 f.; the Muslim rite had already been adopted by the time of the *Rivāyats*, see Unvala, op. cit., I, 262; Dhabhar, 262.

<sup>2</sup> Unvala, op. cit., I, 261-2.

<sup>3</sup> The *drins* or *drōns*, the short liturgical texts used by the Irani priests, can be found in a small service-book in Avestan script, published in Bombay in A.V. 1280 by Rashid ibn Dastur Shahriyar, whose father was *dastir-mas* of Yazd when Manekji Limji Hataria arrived there in 1854. (His eldest brother, Dastur Namdar, had become holder of this office when Jackson visited the city in 1903.) Mobad Rashid was himself for years *ātes-band* of the (Irani) Dadiseth Agiary in Bombay. Liturgical instructions are given in his book, which is still in use in Iran, together with another in Arabic script, published subsequently (but without date) in Bombay by Kai Khusrāu-i Herbad Khodabakhsh-i Jamasp of Mobarake (one of the villages of Yazd).

<sup>4</sup> Or, according to the *Rivāyats*, Hōm will there accuse him on their behalf; see Unvala, I, 263-4; Dhabhar, 264; and cf. *Saddar Bundahiš*, Ch. 26, 4-5 (ed. Dhabhar, Bombay, 1909, p. 95). The persistence of the blood-sacrifice to Mithra, and the fact that Haoma is connected with the sacrificial animals, should perhaps lead to a yet further consideration of *Yt.*, X, 119-20, discussed in detail by I. Gershevitch, *The Avestan Hymn to Mithra* (Cambridge, 1959), 269-273. Despite the grammatical point made there, it seems possible that *zaōθranam fraqharāt* may well mean "eat of these offerings" rather than "drink of these libations". Fowls are still generally sacrificed in Iran as well as four-footed beasts, though only under pressure of poverty at the *Mihragān* itself. The same Avesta is to be recited, whether it is bird or animal that is offered: see Unvala, I, 261; Dhabhar, 262.

<sup>5</sup> See Waag, 70-71. The fact may perhaps explain the nature of the "long-armed offering" (*rātōiš daragō-bāzāus*) of *Y.*, XXXVIII, 5, unless, since the waters are there explicitly invoked, this refers rather to the *abzōhr*.

<sup>6</sup> *GBd.*, XXXIV, 23 (ed. B. T. Anklesaria, p. 226, trans., pp. 289-291).

<sup>7</sup> *Dd.*, XLVIII, 34, ed. P. K. Anklesaria (thesis), p. 102.4 f.

It mingles with the fire in men's bodies, and through it they become perfect and undying" (*zōr ī frēzwānīg ī darmān rāy bēšāzīnīdārīhā andar ō yazišn ō varahrān ātaxš dehīhēd . . . \*nišān<sup>1</sup> zanēd ō abardom zōr ī pad gēhān frazām az haḍayaš gāw be ō weh franāstār dehīhēd. ō ātaxš ī mardōmān tan gumēzihēd uš padīš bawēnd spurrigar ud amarg*). The *ātaxš-zōhr* is thus doctrinally significant. It is also plainly ancient. There is a foreign witness in Strabo, who, stating that it is especially to fire and water that the Persians made offerings, says: "To fire they offer sacrifice by adding dry wood without the bark and by placing soft fat (*πιμελή*) on top of it";<sup>2</sup> and the Avestan evidence suggests that the rite was already old when he recorded it.

It is often maintained that Zoroaster himself was opposed to animal-sacrifice; but there is no clear evidence to support this contention,<sup>3</sup> which the practice of his followers actively confutes. There is no reason why the offering of a righteous spirit should not be accompanied by tangible sacrifices, as the Jewish scriptures abundantly attest. It has indeed been said of the Jewish religion, ethical though it is, that sacrifice was bound up with it as breath is with life;<sup>4</sup> and this appears equally true of Iranian religion. Jesus did not oppose the traditional animal-sacrifices of the Jews, which were continued by his followers at least down to the time of Paul.<sup>5</sup> Similarly there is no good ground for supposing that Zoroaster sought to put an end to the established rituals of his people. His concern also was rather with spiritual and moral reform; and when in *Yasna*, XXXII, 8, he appears to condemn a sacrifice made by the sinful Yima, this was presumably in the spirit of Ben Sira: "The sacrifice of an unrighteous man is a mockery, and the oblations of the wicked are not acceptable."<sup>6</sup> To condemn the intention is not to condemn the act. Even with such a great and universal prophet as Zoroaster it is plainly a mistake to interpret his utterances too much in the light of later or alien cultures and practices.<sup>7</sup>

It is readily understandable why the *ātaxš-zōhr*, although ritually so significant, should have been gradually abandoned by the Parsis; but it is harder to explain why the other Persian offering mentioned by Strabo, the *āb-zōhr*, should have left so little trace in

<sup>1</sup> *nyš'n* is an emendation by the present writer for MS. *gyh'n*.

<sup>2</sup> Strabo, XV, 3, 14.

<sup>3</sup> The direct evidence consists of three Gathic verses. Of these, two (*Y.*, XXXII, 8 and 14) were characterized by Spiegel as unintelligible; and the third (*ibid.*, v. 12) is hardly more lucid. The indirect evidence adduced is that Zoroaster is never represented as making an animal-sacrifice, but only the *haoma*-offering; but this may well be because, among kings, heroes, and warrior-gods, Zoroaster is the only priest, and so alone (with Ahura Mazda) can himself perform the *yasna* ceremony. This ceremony itself, if later practice is to be trusted, involved an animal-sacrifice. Another argument sometimes advanced is that Zoroaster's general concern for the cow is incompatible with animal-sacrifice; but there is abundant imagery in the Jewish religion drawn from lamb and sheep and the good shepherd, without this conflicting with the sacrificial offering being made of lambs and sheep.

<sup>4</sup> H. Gressmann, *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, ed. F. M. Schiele and L. Zscharnak, IV, 1913, col. 959; cited by H. H. Rowley, "The Meaning of Sacrifice in the Old Testament", *Bull. of the John Rylands Library, Manchester*, XXXIII, 1950, 74-110.

<sup>5</sup> *Acts* xxi. 23 f.; the sacrifices were presumably continued by Jewish Christians, as by orthodox Jews, until the destruction of the Temple in A.D. 70.

<sup>6</sup> *Ecclesiasticus* xxxiv. 18 f. (xxx. 21-23); see Rowley, *op. cit.*, 102.

<sup>7</sup> The Parsi Zoroastrian tradition has been influenced for over 1,000 years by the Hindu culture of Gujarat, and the wonder is how staunchly it has nevertheless been maintained; but from the time of their settling in that hospitable land the Parsis had perforce to be reticent about their rituals of animal-sacrifice, and indeed to abandon the sacrifice of the cow. It is small wonder that by now they have come to regard these rituals as actually alien to their faith. A similar reluctance to accept the historical facts of animal-sacrifice is sometimes found among Christians.

their traditions, except in the *yasna* ceremony itself. In Iran the ritual of the "libation to the water" is still practised, under the name *ōwzūr*,<sup>1</sup> in the Zoroastrian villages of Yazd, although its manner differs somewhat from Strabo's description, according to which the libation was made near, not into the water. In Iran its manner is now as follows: a cow is milked by someone in a state of ritual purity, the milk being caught in a silver or copper bowl.<sup>2</sup> To this milk are added two things from the vegetable kingdom, usually rose-petals, fresh or dried, with leaves of *ōwīzan* (wild marjoram),<sup>3</sup> or some fruits of the *senjed* (oleander).<sup>4</sup> The bowl is then taken to the priest, who carries it to the bank of a stream, where he seats himself. In his left hand he holds the bowl, in his right a silver spoon. First he pours three spoonfuls from the bowl, one after the other, into the water, to symbolize good thoughts, words, and deeds. Then he begins the recital of the *drīn-i ōwzūr* (or *drōn-i ābzōr*), pouring as he recites single spoonfuls of the milk into the water. The recital of the Avesta takes about half an hour. At the end, the last of the libation is poured out in three pourings from the bowl itself, and then bowl and spoon are each in turn immersed in the running water, so that every drop of milk is carried away. The bowl and spoon are finally scoured with sand or fine earth from the stream-bank and rinsed again in the running water until they gleam.

This rite is performed for nearly every Zoroastrian household twice a year, in the "beloved" (*azīz*) months of Urdibehišt and Āzar. (Āzar is at present a spring month, corresponding to March-April; and the libation has a particular poetry then, with the fresh petals of roses, pink or yellow or brilliant red, floating on the milk.) During these months a variant of the ritual is sometimes performed by behdins themselves. Girls prepare a bowl of milk in the same way, and carry it round the village, pouring a little of the *ōwzūr* into every running stream, reciting while they do so some Avesta (usually from their own daily prayers).

*Āb-zōhr* is also performed by the priest as part of the three-day marriage-ceremony. The rite may further be performed at any other time at will. Its purpose is held to be to purify the waters, and to atone for any pollution caused them by the living or the dead. It is therefore often done specifically after death for the benefit of the departed soul (as is the rite of *taš mas kartwun* with respect to fire). Two cases are recalled in Sharifabad of Muslims (probably of *jadid* stock) who asked the dastur to perform the rite for them after death, when according to the custom of their religion their bodies would be washed in running water—the grossest pollution in Zoroastrian eyes.

In Sharifabad a libation is made also to the waters after every *āfrīnagān* ceremony. Milk is a ritual requirement for this (together with water and wine); and when the ceremony is over, bread is broken into the milk, some oleander-fruits are added, and the vessel (usually of glass) is carried to a stream by someone in a state of ritual purity, and poured into the water with the recital of one *yabā ahu vairyo* and one *ašām vohū*. This libation is

<sup>1</sup> Often corrupted by the villagers (who have a marked tendency to metathesis) to *ōwruz*. It is also sometimes called *rūz-i ōw*.

<sup>2</sup> Tin, enamel, and china are not considered *pāk*.

<sup>3</sup> The fragrant leaves of this plant, which grows freely on the Yazdi mountains, are much used in Zoroastrian ritual; see J. S. Sorushian, *Farhang-e Behdīnan*, 14, s.v. اروشن (the Kermani form).

<sup>4</sup> Elsewhere *senjed* is sometimes used for the jubebe-tree; but in the Yazdi area (as in most of Iran) it is applied to *Elaeagnus angustifolia orientalis*.

now called the *čom-i māhi* "food for the fishes" on analogy presumably with the *čom-i šwa* "food for the dog" which is always given after every ceremony.<sup>1</sup> A libation to the waters (or an offering to the fishes) is made daily by Dastur Khodadad in the Dastur's House of Sharifabad, a building set apart for religious purposes, which has a *qanāt* stream running beneath it.

One reason why the rite of *āb-zōhr* (outside the *yasna* ceremony) was abandoned in India appears to be that there it fell together with Hindu customs of offerings to the waters, and so came to be frowned upon as an alien practice by leaders of the Parsi community.<sup>2</sup> The *palli* ritual (observed by more conservative Parsi families down to the present century) may be held, however, to approximate to the behdin *ābzōr* of Iran. It consisted of casting a threefold offering, namely sweetballs (*palli*), coconut candy, and flowers, into the waters of river or sea. It was performed by women, and especially at the *Ābān Ardvīsūr Jašn*, on the day *Ābān* of the month *Ābān*, on which day a more general threefold offering, of coconuts, sugar, and flowers, was made by men also.<sup>3</sup> The character of these offerings was plainly affected by Hindu practices; but there is clear authority for the basic rite in Zoroastrian scripture, Avestan as well as Pahlavi. The actual term *āb-zōhr* renders, in Middle Persian, the Avestan phrase *āpe zaōhrā* "offering to the water".<sup>4</sup> The Middle Persian expression occurs in our Manichaean text, M 95 V, where the fifth verse runs as follows: *an hēm āb īg passazag ku-m āb zōhr dayād ku zōrmand bawān* "I am the Water which (is) fit<sup>5</sup> that you should give me 'the offering to the water', that I may become strong". The other Manichaean passage adduced,<sup>6</sup> from M 653, is similar, but there the term *zōhr* is used alone. It runs: *barēd zōhr ō āb u-š tad nērōg ku bawād zōrmand* "he carries to the water the offering, and gives it power so that it becomes strong".

The term also occurs, in corrupted form, in an Avesta MS, where before *Yasna*, LXIII, there stand the Middle Persian words *apzār bun*. On the basis of actual Parsi usage Darmesteter emended this to *āpzūr* (i.e. *ābzūr*) *bun* "The beginning of 'the offering to the Water'".<sup>7</sup> That part of the *yasna* which constitutes the *āb-zōhr* comprises the following *hā's*: LXIII-IV, the beginning of the *āb-zōhr*; LXV, the glorification of the goddess of the waters, Arēdvī Sūrā Anāhītā; LXVI-VII, the consecration of the *zōhr* to the *yazatas*, *fravašis*, and the various kinds of waters; LXVIII-LXIX, the offering of libation to the waters in general. This part of the ceremony follows the offering of the *gōšōdā* (*Y.*, VIII, 4) and the various blessings of the fire, during which presumably the *ātaš-zōhr* was formerly made. Thus in the *yasna* ceremony itself the *āb-zōhr* follows the *ātaš-zōhr*, as in all other recorded instances of the two rituals occurring together. Finally, when the whole *yasna*

<sup>1</sup> *čom*, literally "thing", is generally used for "food, meal". It is perhaps also analogy with the elaborate *čom-i šwa* that leads Dastur Khodadad to say that the *čom-i māhi* should properly be prepared from five things, namely milk, garlic, rue, rice, oleander-fruits, and bread. The behdins are usually content with three ingredients.

<sup>2</sup> See D. F. Karaka, *History of the Parsis* (London, 1884), I, 151.

<sup>3</sup> See K. N. Seervai and B. B. Patel, *Bombay Gazetteer*, IX, ii, 1899, 216, 230. Mrs. Dhun Anklesaria (wife of Dr. P. K. Anklesaria), of the behdin Vakil family of Surat, has told me that she can vaguely remember in her childhood offerings still being made to the waters in Surat at the time of the annual floods.

<sup>4</sup> Usually construed with the verb *bar-* or its derivatives; see, e.g., *Nirangistān*, 48 (ed. Waag, 109).

<sup>5</sup> It is a sin to offer the *ābzōhr* to polluted water: see *Vendīdād*, VII, 79 (with Pahl. trans., Spiegel, II, 101, bottom); and cf. *Dk.*, VIII, Ch. 43 (44), 41; Sanjana, XVI, 97; West, *SBE*, XXXVII, 159.

<sup>6</sup> See Henning, *BSOAS*, XI, 1, 1943, 217, n. 7 (q.v. for the odd form *rd*).

<sup>7</sup> See *ZA.*, I, 391; for such Middle Persian indications Darmesteter used the edition of the Avesta prepared by Tahmuras Dinshaw Anklesaria (Bombay, 1888); see op. cit., xc.

liturgy is completed, there takes place what in India is called the *zōr-melavvi*,<sup>1</sup> in Iran the *āb-zōr* itself. The *hāvan* containing the second pressing of the *parāhōm*, that is, a mixture of milk with the juice of the *haoma* and *urvarām* plants, infused with consecrated water, is taken by the *zōt* to the source from which the water for the *yasna* ritual had been drawn;<sup>2</sup> and there the *parāhōm* is poured into the water as *zōhr*, in three pourings, with the recitation of Avesta, including one *yaθa ahu vairyō* and one *ašəm vohū*.<sup>3</sup>

The *zōr-melavvi* was clearly analysed by Darmesteter in one of his penetrating notes.<sup>4</sup> He comments: "This water-*zōhr* is in fact identical with the *parāhōm* prepared during the *hōm-yašt*. . . . The *Nirangistān* spells this identity out: *hān ī parāhōm zōhrag-iz juddar nēst* 'the *parāhōm* is not other than the *zōhrag*'."<sup>5</sup> Haug, too, in his admirable analysis of the *yasna* ceremony, says clearly that the *Zōt* "pours the *Homa* juice and the milk [i.e. the *parāhōm*] out of the mortar into the well".<sup>6</sup> The understanding of the ritual has, however, since been confused by Modi,<sup>7</sup> who wrongly states that its purpose is "to unite the *zaōhra* or *zor* water with the original source of the water whence it was taken"; "this they do by pouring the water from the *Hāvanim* into the well". These mis-statements plainly have their origin in the Parsi definition of *zōhr*. According to this, when a part of the pure water taken from well or running stream<sup>8</sup> has been drawn off, with recitation of Avesta, into two cups called the *tašt-i zōhrbarān* (Av. *tašta zaōhrō.barana*), this water "becomes *zōr*";<sup>9</sup> whereas according to Iranian terminology it merely becomes "consecrated water" (*āb-i yašte*).<sup>10</sup> The Parsi usage appears anticipatory. It is this consecrated water which is to be used in libation (*zōhr*) for the *hōm* and the *barsom*. Thus in the *Dādīstān-i dēnīg* there is a reference to "the pure *hōm*, which is pressed out with four religious libations (*zōhr*) according to ritual" (*hān ī pāk hōm, ī pad IIII zōhr ī dēnīg nīrangīhā hunihēd*).<sup>11</sup> It is, moreover, evident that the cups which are called *zōhrbarān* are cups "for carrying libation" in general, and not reserved only for this consecrated water.<sup>12</sup> Thus in *Nirangistān* 66 it is asked: "How much fluid milk should one carry to running water?" (*čvat nā ape fra.tačatyāi xšaudrinqam paya ham paiti.barāl*); and the answer is "[as much] as two *zaōhra*-bearing cups [hold]" (*yaθa tašta zaōhrō.barana*).<sup>13</sup>

There are, moreover, other texts which bear out the statement in the *Nirangistān* that

<sup>1</sup> i.e. the placing or giving of the *zōr*.

<sup>2</sup> i.e. to the source of pure water nearest to the fire-temple. This is a purely practical matter. Any other source of pure water would be ritually as proper.

<sup>3</sup> See M. Haug, *Essays . . . on the Parsis*, 407; and cf. the Irani ritual of the *čom-i māhi*, above.

<sup>4</sup> *ZA.*, I, lxxxv (the transcriptions given in the above citation are the writer's, not Darmesteter's).

<sup>5</sup> *Nirangistān*, 68; ed. A. Waag, 78.

<sup>6</sup> loc. cit.; Haug does not himself give the source for his account, but Darmesteter (op. cit., I, lxxxiii, n. 1) supposes him to have relied on a Parsi priestly source similar to his own.

<sup>7</sup> J. J. Modi, *The Religious Ceremonies and Customs of the Parsees* (2nd ed., Bombay, 1937), 299-300, 309.

<sup>8</sup> In Iran the water is usually drawn from a stream, in India from a well.

<sup>9</sup> See Modi, op. cit., 298; Haug, op. cit., 397 (with, in both places, a description of the ritual); cf. Anquetil du Perron, op. cit., II, 534.

<sup>10</sup> The term *āb-i yašte* for water consecrated by recital of Avesta is also used by the Parsis; see Anquetil du Perron, op. cit., II, 540 f. (*l'eau leschiée*).

<sup>11</sup> *Dd.*, XLVIII, 30; ed. P. K. Anklesaria (thesis), 101, II, 10-11. West (*SBE*, XVIII, p. 170) gallantly managed with the traditional Parsi interpretation, translating *IIII zōhr* as "four applications of holy water"; but this is plainly forced.

<sup>12</sup> Darmesteter, *ZA.*, I, lxiv, states that at the *yasna* ceremony there are "un certain nombre de coupes ou de vases, qui reçoivent les libations ou *zaōhra*: on les appelait *zaōhrō-barana* ou *zōhr-barān*".

<sup>13</sup> ed. Waag, 109.

in the *Yasna* ceremony the term *zōhr* is used, not only for libation with consecrated water, but also for the offering of the *parāhōm* itself. Thus during the preparation of the *parāhōm* there is a threefold repetition of the *ye savištō*,<sup>1</sup> at which the priest thrice raises the cup containing the mixture of the filtered juice of *hōm* and *urvarām* with consecrated water; and this action is referred to in *Šāyest-nē-šāyest* in the following terms: *ye savištō III jār (y'wr) zōhr abar-dārišnīh* "(at) the *ye savištō* the *zōhr* is to be raised up three times".<sup>2</sup> There is further a *Rivāyat* passage<sup>3</sup> concerned with the validity of a *yasna* ceremony during which there is accidental defilement of the offering. With regard to the second part of the ceremony, this defilement is considered in three stages: one, "if something falls on the *hōm* and *urvarām* set ready for preparing the 'offering to the water' (*ābzōr*)" (*agar hōm va urvarām ke az jihat-i ābzōr<sup>4</sup> nihāde bāšad, čizi bar ān uftād*); two, if such a thing should happen "after the milk has been mixed with the *hōm*" (*pas az ān ke jum dar hōm āmixte*), that is, after the juice of the twigs has been expressed and mixed with the milk; three, "if something should fall into the *ābzōr*" (*agar čizi dar ābzōr uftād*), presumably, that is, if something should fall into the *parāhōm* as it is being carried as libation to the water.

It is striking that in this passage the element of consecrated water is not mentioned at all; and indeed it seems probable that this fourth element is present only as an infusion of the sap of the two plants, since the ingredients of the *ābzōhr* appear to be essentially three, offered in a triple pouring. This makes it at first sight all the more perplexing that in the *yasna* ritual the Parsis should have come to apply the term *zōhr* solely to this inessential element. It is, however, illuminating to find the converse usage in Iran. There a priest performing the *yasna ābzōr* (the *zōr-melavvi*) will speak of carrying to the water either the *farāhōm* or the *ōw-i yašte*, that is, on occasion he designates the whole libation as "consecrated water". The explanation of the two usages is evidently practical. Although the element of water appears doctrinally inessential, it is in fact quantitatively the chief ingredient. The dried *hōm* twigs and the *urvarām* yield only a small contribution, which colours and slightly flavours the consecrated water; and a few drops only of milk are added, the rest being used in libation to the *barsom*.<sup>5</sup> The working priests of the two communities acknowledge in their everyday usage this fact of the water's quantitative predominance, but in opposite ways.

There is yet another usage, attested in the *Dēnkard*,<sup>6</sup> whereby the pure water drawn for the *yasna* ritual is called in anticipation the *hōm-water* (*āb ī hōmīgān*). This expression evidently renders Avestan *haomyā āp* (also translated as *āb ī hōm*), which is usually interpreted as meaning the small quantity of pure (but not consecrated) water, from the same source as the *āb ī yašte*, which is also used in the pressing of the *hōm*.<sup>7</sup> This interpretation owes its existence, however, to Parsi usage, according to which one would expect the Avestan term for the *āb ī yašte* to be *zaoθra*. In fact, to judge from one of the three Avestan passages, *haomyā āp* is simply the Avestan term for the water used for the *parahaoma*,

<sup>1</sup> *Y.*, XXXIII, 11; see Modi, op. cit., 292; Haug, op. cit., 402; West, *SBE*, V, 357, n. 3.

<sup>2</sup> *ŠnS.*, XIII, 8 (Davar, p. 73).

<sup>3</sup> Unvala, op. cit., II, 24, l. 1 ff.; Dhabhar, op. cit., 410-11.

<sup>4</sup> Dhabhar's reading; *ān zōr*, Unvala.

<sup>5</sup> On this see p. 115 below.

<sup>6</sup> Ed. Madan, 624, 631; Sanjana, Vol. XIII, 63-5, Vol. XIV, 11-12; tr. West, *SBE*, XLVII, 47-8, 57.

<sup>7</sup> See Darmesteter, *ZA.*, I, 179, n. 5; Haug, op. cit., 400.

i.e. it includes the *āb ī yašte*; for in this passage<sup>1</sup> the priest honours the ingredients assembled for the *parahaoma*, namely the *haoma* itself, the *haomyā āp*, the milk, and the *hadānaēpatā* plant. This meaning for *haomyā āp* fits the other Avestan passages also,<sup>2</sup> and is borne out by the *Dēnkard* usage.

Although it is evident that water by itself can be used in libation,<sup>3</sup> especially in offering to the vegetable kingdom (as symbolizing rain), it is equally clear, from the Avesta and Pahlavi books, the *Rivāyats*, and present Irani usage, that water by itself is not offered as *zōhr* to water. The *ābzōr* of the *yasna* ceremony is identical with the *ābzōr* of the Irani villagers, in that it consists of milk blended with elements from plant-life. Milk is an essential and unvarying element, present not only in these two libations, but also in the libation made by the Persians to water according to Strabo.<sup>4</sup> In the *yasna* ceremony the *parāhōm* is prepared twice. The first preparation is drunk by the officiating priest (the *zōt*) during the recital of *Hā IX*; it is the second which provides the *āb-zōhr*.<sup>5</sup> The ritual has been analysed as designed in its first part to give strength to man, in its second to the waters and the natural world.<sup>6</sup> Milk for the ceremony is prepared by the serving priest (the *rāspī*) before the service begins.<sup>7</sup> But it is not brought to the table in front of the *zōt* (the *ālat-xwān*) until after the preparation of the first *parāhōm*, for which it is not an ingredient.<sup>8</sup> During the second part of the ceremony (*Hā IX* onwards) the *barsom*-twigs are laved with milk, and milk is poured into the mortar to form an ingredient of the second *parāhōm*.

This second *parāhōm*, of milk and the juice of *haoma* and one other nameless plant, is usually identified with the *zaoθra* referred to in the Avesta as "mixed with *haoma*, mixed with milk, mixed with pomegranate" (*zaoθra haomavaiti gaomavaiti hadānaēpatavaiti*). An offering explicitly composed of these three ingredients is mentioned only in connection with water. Thus apart from two passages in the *āb-zōhr* portion of the *Yasna* itself (*Y.*, 66.1,

<sup>1</sup> *Y.*, III, 3. At first sight this mention in the Avesta itself of the water in the *parahaoma* militates against the suggestion made above that it is an inessential element of the libation; but in fact the adjective *haomyā* does appear to indicate the subordinate function of the water, as a mere adjunct to the *haoma*.

<sup>2</sup> *Y.*, XXII, 2; *Vr.*, XI, 2.

<sup>3</sup> It is probable that the pure water poured on the ground before the animal-sacrifice (p. 109 above) is a form of libation. In Iran at the *āfrinagān* and other ceremonies pure water is always poured from a bowl on the ground in front of the offerings before the ceremony begins. This rite is essential.

<sup>4</sup> Strabo, XV, 3, 14 (according to which the other ingredients were oil and honey). The Parsis regularly use goat's milk for the *ābzōr*, the Iranis cow's milk; but according to *Nirangistān*, 67 (Waag, 110), milk from horse or cow, sheep or goat is licit.

<sup>5</sup> In Iran half the second preparation of *parāhōm* is taken to the water, and half is reserved, to be partaken of by any *pāk* Zoroastrian who wishes. This reserved portion is kept in a stoppered glass flask, the *farāhōm-dān*. In India part used to be "set apart for the requirements of the congregation", that is, to be administered to the dying or the newly-born (see Modi, op. cit., 306-7, with 307, n. 1; and cf. *Dk.*, VIII, 37 (38), 7; Sanjana, XVI, 52; West, *SBE*, XXXVII, 122). According to T. D. Anklesaria (apud Darmesteter, I, 441, n. 8) on other occasions some of the second *parāhōm* was drunk by whoever had paid for the ceremony, or by helpers, and any remaining after the *āb-zōhr* was poured over the roots of trees in the *dār-i mihr* garden.

<sup>6</sup> See Darmesteter, *ZA.*, I, lxxxv.

<sup>7</sup> On the ritual procuring of the milk see Darmesteter, op. cit., lxxv-vi; Modi, op. cit., 278-9.

<sup>8</sup> Thus when during the first part of the ceremony the priest recites *Hā XXIV*, 1-9, he omits from vv. 1 and 6 the words *imāncā gam jivyaṃ ašaya uzdatam* "and this milk rightfully set out", and so also when he comes to *Hā XXV*, 1; because in fact the milk (invoked with the other ingredients of the *parāhōm* in *Hā III*, 3) is not "set out" until the end of the first part of the ceremony (after *Hā VIII*). This fact is made clear by Modi in his analysis of the ceremony, but flatly contradicted by him (op. cit., 303) where he states that milk is added to the first infusion of *parāhōm*. Darmesteter too states that the two preparations of *parāhōm* are identical (op. cit., I, lxxxv). The clearest account of the ceremony in this respect is by Haug, who also describes in detail the lavings of the *barsom* with milk (op. cit., 404, bottom, ff.), on which see also A. Waag, *Nirangistān*, 117.

68.1) this threefold libation is mentioned elsewhere in the liturgy only with the "good waters" (*aiwyō vaṇuhibyō imā zaōhrā haomavaitiṣ gaomavaitiṣ haḍānāēpatavaitiṣ ašaya uzdātā āyese yešti*).<sup>1</sup> In *Y.*, 68.8, the link is partly explained, since there milk (and fat) is honoured "as making the waters flow, the plants grow" (*xšwiḍaēča āzūtayaēča yazamaidē taça. āpa uxšyaṭ.urvara*). The libation with milk is therefore doubtless in part to strengthen the waters, to make them *zōrmand*.

The expiatory use of the libation is attested in *Y.*, 68.1: "This shall we give thee, O daughter of Ahura [i.e. the Water], for averting (?) that injury which we have done thee. These *zaōhras*, mixed with *haoma*, with milk, with pomegranate, shall compensate thee, O daughter of Ahura" (*aētaṭ te ahurāne ahurahe aiṇhe avayam ḍamahi yaṭ θwā didviṣma. aēša zaōhra paiti.jamyāt tava ahurāne ahurahe haomavaiti gaomavaiti haḍānāēpatavaiti*).

In *Vendīdād*, XIV, 4, this libation to the waters is imposed as part of the penance for killing a water-animal (*udram . . . yim upāpam*): "10,000 *zaōhras* mixed with *haoma*, with milk, purified, filtered, purified by the instructed, filtered by the instructed, mixed with this plant which is called pomegranate, shall he deliver to the good waters . . . as atonement for his soul" (*baēvarā zaōhranqm haomavaitinqm gaomavaitinqm yaozdātānqm pairi.aṇharštanqm ḍahmō.yaozdātānqm ḍahmō. pairi.aṇharštanqm ḥqm.irista aētayd urvarayd yā vaoče haḍānāēpatā aiwyō vaṇuhibyō . . . urne čīθim nisirinvyāt*). An *āb-zōhr* as part of a general penance (which includes the *ātas-zōhr*) is imposed in *Vendīdād*, XVIII, 72.<sup>2</sup> The Avesta thus attests the same two purposes for the *āb-zōhr* ("strengthening" of the waters, and atonement) which are recognized by the Irani villagers today. There is a further interesting statement in the *Dēnkard*, derived from the Avesta, that *zōhr* should be offered to the nearest water by warriors on the eve of battle, as part of the sacred ceremonial of war (*zōhr-barišnih ī āb ī ḍ karezar gyāg nazd-tar*).<sup>3</sup> This *zōhr* appears to be the filtered *parahaoma*, with *yasna*.

The *Vendīdād* passages, like the similar *Yasna* ones, are concerned with ritual. It is probable that the *zaōhra* referred to frequently elsewhere in the Avesta as "mixed with *haoma*, mixed with milk" is in fact this same offering of three things, indicated more briefly in texts not primarily concerned with observance.<sup>4</sup> Under this briefer description too this *zaōhra* is connected with water, and deities of water or of cattle. Ardvī Sūrā Anāhitā herself asks for this libation in her worship (*Yt.*, V, 8); and it is this libation which Pāurva vows to bring her, a thousandfold, at the river Raṇha, if she rescue him (*hazagrām tē azəm zaōhranqm haomavaitinqm gaomavaitinqm yaozdātānqm pairi. aṇharštanqm barāni aoi apam yqm raṇham*: *Yt.*, V, 63). The same libation is offered to Tīstrya, the rain-god (*Yt.*, VIII, 15), and to the Moon (*Yt.*, VII, 6) and Druvāspa (*Yt.*, IX, 25), both linked with cattle. It is also offered to the sun (*Ny.*, I, 16) and Mithra (*Yt.*, X, 6).<sup>5</sup> It would be possible to explain this on the ground that Mithra (and hence the sun) "replenishes the water" and "makes the water flow" (*fraṭ.āpam, taṭ.āpam*: *Yt.*, X, 61);<sup>6</sup> but it is perhaps a mistake to

<sup>1</sup> *Y.*, XXII, 2, 21: cf. XXIV, 2; XXV, 2; *Vt.*, XI, 4.

<sup>2</sup> Cited on p. 104 above.

<sup>3</sup> *Dk.*, VIII, 25, 24; ed. Sanjana, Vol. XVI, 12; tr. West, *SBE*, XXXVII, 89.

<sup>4</sup> cf. the description of the *parāhōm* used for the *āb-zōhr* as "the *hōm* and milk" in Haug's account, derived from a Parsi source (p. 113 above).

<sup>5</sup> In several of these passages, as also in *Yt.*, V, 17, the libation is referred to as *haomayō gava*, which, though the form *haomayō* is variously explained, has evidently the same meaning as *haomavaiti gaomavaiti*. For a recent discussion, with references, see Gershevitch, op. cit., 163, 322.

<sup>6</sup> On these words see Gershevitch, op. cit., 210.

insist on an exclusive link between this libation and water. That such a link exists, as a fundamental concept, there can, however, be no doubt. It can, therefore, be safely assumed that when unspecified *zaōhras* are taken to water,<sup>1</sup> these are threefold *zaōhras* with milk and plants, just as when unspecified *zaōhras* are taken to fire, these can be understood as the fat-offering.<sup>2</sup>

In the Pahlavi texts the *āb-zōhr* is sometimes referred to as the pouring of *hōm* into the waters. This is readily understandable, since *haoma* regularly stands first among the ingredients of the libation, and gives its name to it as the *parahaoma*, *parāhōm*.<sup>3</sup> In one passage Zoroaster is represented as asking what acts are most beneficial for the soul. He receives the following answer: "Caring for the poor, and giving fodder to cattle, and carrying fuel to fire, and pouring *hōm* into water" (*drigūšān parwardan, ud wāstr ḍ gōspandān dādan, ud ēsm ḍ ātaxš burdan, ud hōm ḍ āb rixtan*).<sup>4</sup> It is then said that Zoroaster performed these tasks, including the last. "He brought *hōm* to water" (*hōm āward ḍ āb*).

In a much-quoted passage from the *Great Bundahišn*, Zoroaster is to pour the libation of *hōm* into three great rivers of the world, to purify them. Ahura Mazda says to the rivers: "I shall create one who will pour the libation of *hōm* into you and cleanse you again" (*be daham kē-t hōm-zōhr awiṣ rēzēd ud drist abāz konēd*).<sup>5</sup> It is then said that water which receives more libation than impure matter (*āb kē hixr kam ud zōhr wiṣ*) returns to its source in three years, whereas if the converse is true the time will be nine years. Plainly in this passage *hōm-zōhr* and *zōhr* are used as synonyms. In the parallel passage of the *Indian Bundahišn*<sup>6</sup> the word *zōhr* only is used, both in Ōhrmazd's promise and in the subsequent statement.

One can accordingly assume with confidence that it is the *hōm-zōhr*, or libation of *hōm*, which Gōpatshāh ceaselessly performs, according to the *Mēnōg ī Xrad*; "He sits continually on the shore of the sea, and performs the worship of the gods, and pours the libation ever into the sea. Through that libation-pouring, countless noxious creatures in the sea die; for if he did not perform that worshipping very often, and did not pour the libation into the sea, and those countless noxious creatures were not destroyed, then always when the rain rained, the noxious creatures would fall like the rain" (*hamvār pa daryāw bār nišined u yazešn ī yazdā hamē kuned u zōr ḍ zreh hamē rēzēd pa ā zōr-rēzašnī amar kharvastar āndar zreh bē mirend. ēi agar frehest ḍi ā yazešnigari nē kuned u ā zōr ḍ zreh nē rēzēd u ā amar kharvastar bē nē awasiheñd, aigin hamē [ka] vārā vāred kharvastar ēdum vāred čm vārā*).<sup>7</sup> In this passage *yazišn ī yazdān* and *yazišnigari* evidently refer to the *yasna* ritual, essential to the preparation of the *zōhr* of *hōm*. In *Nirangistān*, Ch. 69, it is indeed stated that for an offering to the water (*āb-zōhr*) the preliminary *yasna* ritual is essential.<sup>8</sup> This ritual is there called "[the offering] to the barsom" in the elliptical sentence:

<sup>1</sup> e.g. *N.*, 48. An animal may, however, also be sacrificed to the water; see e.g. *N.*, 67, 70-71; and cf. Strabo, XV, 3, 14.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. *N.*, 65.

<sup>3</sup> Thus the *hōm* which Vištāspa is represented as drinking in *Dk.*, VII (Sanjana, XIV, 32; West, *SBE*, XLVII, 71), is evidently the *parāhōm*.

<sup>4</sup> *Wizidagihā-yi Zōdspram*, XIX, 2-3, ed. B. T. Anklesaria (Bombay, 1964), 76; tr. West, *SBE*, XLVII, 154.

<sup>5</sup> *GBd.*, XI, ed. Anklesaria, 91, trans. p. 113. The phrase has hitherto been read *hwm W zōhr*, and translated as "hōm and zōhr".

<sup>6</sup> *Ind. Bd.*, Ch. XXI, 3-4 (West, *SBE*, V, 84).

<sup>7</sup> *MX.*, LXII, 35-6 (ed. West, 56-7).

<sup>8</sup> ed. Waag, 78-9 with note, 126.

*yō paiti ape baraiti, nōit̄ bōrasmaine*, Pahlavi trans. *kē abar ō āb barēd, nē ō barsom*, i.e. "who carries [the offering] to the water, not to the barsom". To this there is a gloss: *pēmišn pad āb be kunēnd, hān i pad barsom nē kunēnd* "they make a milk-offering for water, they do not make that for the barsom". This underlines the ritual significance of the laving of the barsom with milk during the ceremony of the second pressing of the haoma, which evidently constitutes a zōhr for the barsom.

It is evidently zōhr with yasna which again is meant in the statement that that land is happiest "in which they practise offering and worship" (*kē zōr u yazešn padaš kuneñd*).<sup>1</sup> There seems no possibility now of determining the age of the Irani rite of the unfiltered ābzōr without yasna; but probably this has long existed as a simple household libation beside the ritually elaborate one. It is speculative, but there is even a faint possibility that both rites are involved in a puzzling passage of the Šāyest-nē-šāyest, which is echoed in two Rivāyat passages. All three texts are concerned with what is to be done in a household immediately after a death. The Pahlavi passage runs: *ud zōhr-iz i stad ēstēd ud hān gyāg ēstēd zamānig be ō āb barišn. jīv-iz, jum, hamgōnag*: "And the zōhr too which has been taken, and stands in that place, straightway it is to be carried to the water. The milk (*jum*) too in the same way." *jīv* is written in Pahlavi letters, and glossed by *jum* in Avestan characters.<sup>2</sup> One of the Rivāyat passages is very close to the Pahlavi: *zōr [ke] girefte ast va jām be āb burdan*.<sup>3</sup> *jām* being a variant for *jum*,<sup>4</sup> this means "the zōr [which] has been taken, and the milk, to be carried to the water". The other Rivāyat passage lacks the reference to milk: *zōr ke girefte ast be āb bāyad burd* "the zōr which has been taken must be carried to the water".<sup>5</sup> The use of the words for "taken" in connection with the zōr has caused perplexity;<sup>6</sup> but it seems probable that the reference is to the old custom of administering some of the *parāhōm* reserved from the yasna ceremony to the dying.<sup>7</sup> This would have to be fetched from the fire-temple; and what was not used (only a few drops were required) was probably carried to water (it could not be taken back to the *dar-i mihr* from a house of death). The milk mentioned in the first two texts is, however, separate from this zōr; and possibly this refers to the household libation, to be made (as it still is) to the water on behalf of the departed spirit.

*Zaōhra* is thus attested in Zoroastrian writings and practice as an offering, various in kind (whether libation or oblation), and made on a variety of occasions: as a daily or an occasional ritual, in thank-offering, atonement, or simply worship; either given wholly to the deity, or partaken of also by those who offered it. The chief *zaōhras* were undoubtedly the flesh-offering to the gods, the fat-offering to the fire, and the threefold libation to water. All three evidently played a very important part in the religious life of the Zoroastrians, and the first and last still do so in the most conservative congregations of the community.

<sup>1</sup> *MX.*, V, 13; ed. West, 14.

<sup>2</sup> *ŠnS.*, II, 43; on *jīv/jum* as "milk" see Tavadia, 46, n. 43<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> Unvala, *D. Hormazdar's Rivāyat*, I, 122.6; Dhābhar, trans., 127.

<sup>4</sup> Tavadia, loc. cit.; Dhābhar, op. cit., 127, n. 13.

<sup>5</sup> Unvala, op. cit., I, 121.5; Dhābhar, op. cit., 127.

<sup>6</sup> Dhābhar translated *girefte* in both Rivāyat passages as "prepared"; Tavadia took the Pahlavi to mean "the consecrated water, which is taken out [from the water-pot]".

<sup>7</sup> See p. 115 above, n. 5; in Iran from at least the beginning of the present century *gōmēz* has been used instead: see A. V. W. Jackson, *Persia past and present* (New York, 1909), 387.

## IRANIAN \*DRAW- "TO LEAD ASTRAY"

By MARTIN SCHWARTZ

IN A FRAGMENT OF the Sogdian translation of the *Antirrheticus* of Evagrius Ponticus,<sup>1</sup> we encounter:

*mzprt šm'ry ptryt qy 'rdywt 't zwyrtt m'x dbtyq qw γw'n s'*

for which the original Syriac has:

*luqbal hušbā tama'a damšaddel umapne lan tūb lwāt hīlā*

Prof. Hansen translates, "Gegen den unreinen Gedanken, der uns verlockt(?) und uns wiederum zur Sünde lenkt".<sup>2</sup> In view of the one-to-one correspondence of all the other Sogdian words with the Syriac, there should be no reservation in equating the new word 'rdyw- with šaddel "beguile, entice, seduce", therefore "verlockt" is satisfactory; E. Benveniste affirms the identification and translates "appâter, enjôler, δελιάζειν".<sup>3</sup>

As regards an etymology of 'rdyw-, the canonical monosyllabic OIr. root can be obtained by deriving 'rd- from \*dr-;<sup>4</sup> we then have either \*draiwa- or (as will be shown) \*drawaya- for the underlying stem, and  $\sqrt{drai}$  or  $\sqrt{draw}$ .<sup>5</sup> There are no examples for the Sogdian outcome of \*-awaya-, but -yw- may be expected on the basis of the general rule \*-aCaya- > -ēC- (C = consonant). A direct antecedent \*drāwaya-, morphologically preferable to \*drawaya-, would yield \*'rd'w-,<sup>6</sup> but we may assume \*drāwaya- > \*drawaya- > 'rdēw- via the ancient sporadic shortening of ā before wā.<sup>7</sup> In form \*drāwaya- would be an "iterative" (30 Klasse), like *dābaya*- "deceive", Y., 43.6.

Of the two candidates for 'rdyw-, \*drai-wa- has nothing to recommend it, whereas there is solid evidence for \*drāwaya- in Parthian *drāw-*. This word was once thought to mean "scream", but, taking a lead from W. B. Henning's latest translation of *dr'w'ng* in *Huwīdagmān* I, 24b, as "deceptive",<sup>8</sup> we shall observe that *drāw-* means "deceive, seduce" in all its contexts. Thus, in a fragment of a Parthian-Sogdian glossary, 'šmg'n (d)'wng'n, glossed as *fn(y)*,<sup>9</sup> should now be translated "deceptive demons (of wrath)", as is borne out by the Sogdian, which should be restored as a derivative of the present stem *fnys-* "deceive". The verb *drāw-* also occurs, quite fittingly, in two allusions to "la séduction des Archontes";<sup>10</sup> I shall now re-translate the passages in accordance with the correct

<sup>1</sup> Published in O. Hansen, *Berliner sogdische Texte*, II (= *Abh. d. Ak. d. Wiss. u. d. Lit. Mainz*, 1954, Nr. 15), 829.

<sup>2</sup> Hansen, op. cit., 830.

<sup>3</sup> *JA*, 1955, 300.

<sup>4</sup> Parallel examples are B. 'rō'yšp- < Av. *drašpa*- "banner"; Man. 'rōyf etc. < \*drāfaya- "shine"; S. *rōnk* < *drang*- "fortified"; see I. Gershevitch, *A Grammar of Manichean Sogdian*, Oxford, 1954, § 439.

<sup>5</sup> Probably to be excluded also is \*drau-ya-; cf. Man. *bij-*, B. 'βz'y- < \*abi-žawya-, according to Gershevitch, op. cit., § 187.

<sup>6</sup> Gershevitch, § 546, and cf. § 574.

<sup>7</sup> For the shortening of ā before wā and the parallel shortening before ya, see W. B. Henning, *TFS*, 1947, 50, and Gershevitch, §§ 123-5. That there is only one example of *-āwaya-* > *-awaya-* should be viewed in the light of the rarity of *-āya-* > *-aya-* in pre-Sogdian verbs.

<sup>8</sup> *Apud* M. Boyce, *The Manichaean Hymn-Cycles in Parthian*, 1954, 68, 69, 186b.

<sup>9</sup> W. B. Henning, *Sogdica*, 1940, 24.

<sup>10</sup> For this myth and its variations, see F. Cumont, *Recherches sur le manichéisme*, Bruxelles, 1908, 54-60.