



Zoroastrian "b#j" and "dr#n"--I

Mary Boyce; Firoze Kotwal

Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, Vol. 34, No. 1.
(1971), pp. 56-73.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0041-977X%281971%2934%3A1%3C56%3AZ%22A%22%3E2.0.CO%3B2-P>

Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London is currently published by School of Oriental and African Studies.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/soas.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

The JSTOR Archive is a trusted digital repository providing for long-term preservation and access to leading academic journals and scholarly literature from around the world. The Archive is supported by libraries, scholarly societies, publishers, and foundations. It is an initiative of JSTOR, a not-for-profit organization with a mission to help the scholarly community take advantage of advances in technology. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ZOROASTRIAN *BĀJ* AND *DRŌN*—I

By MARY BOYCE and FIROZE KOTWAL

The word *bāj* (older *wāj*) has been an important part of Zoroastrian religious vocabulary from at least Sasanian times ; and the act of ' taking the *bāj* ' is so general and significant that in a Jewish-Persian text the Zoroastrians are distinguished thereby from those of other faiths : *gabragān abā bāj-stānīh-ešān* ' the Zoroastrians with their taking the *bāj* '.¹ Down the centuries the word has acquired additional meanings ; but the range of its usages in older times was already so wide that E. W. West, working on the Pahlavi texts, applied for an interpretation of them to Tehmuras D. Anklesaria. This Anklesaria admirably provided, in a letter which he himself subsequently published among the appendixes to the Gujarati translation of the first part of the *Dādestān ī dīnīg*, made by him in collaboration with S. D. Bharucha.² This was the pioneer treatment of the term.

In the Pahlavi books the word is spelt *w'c*, which can represent either Middle Persian *wāz* (cf. Man. MP *w'c/w'z*) or Parthian *wāj*. In the Persian *Rivāyats* it is written in various ways, i.e. *wāj*, *wāž*, *bāj*, *bāž*, and, rarely, *bāz*. In the *Šāhnāma* the only form used is *bāž*. The spoken form *bāj* is that generally current among Zoroastrians to-day. In the present article two transcribed forms have been adopted, namely *wāj* for Pahlavi, and *bāj* for later usage. In contemporary Parsi speech the meanings of *bāj* are so many that Anklesaria was led to suppose that there were in fact two words involved, one representing Pahl. *wāj*, and the other deriving from Sanskrit *vāja* ' (sacrificial) food '. He set down the various usages in considerable detail, but without any particular order. Later Bharucha offered a rather less full but more systematic analysis of the uses of the word, to which he attributed four related meanings.³ The material was made more generally accessible to Western scholars by Jivanji J. Modi,⁴ whose account is admirably detailed, but less systematic than Bharucha's. Modi too thought that two words were concerned, but instead of Skt. *vāja* he postulated (tentatively) NP *bāj* ' tribute ' as the second one.⁵ A further study of the word, based on Anklesaria's but with useful amplifications, was made by Homi F. Chacha in the notes to his edition of *Guzastag Abāliš* ⁶ ; and Jehangir C. Tavadia offered independently a number of precise observations on details of usage in the Pahlavi books.⁷

¹ See D. N. MacKenzie, ' An early Jewish-Persian argument ', *BSOAS*, xxxi, 2, 1968, 260 (fol. 6v., 5) ; and cf. Firdausī, *Šāhnāma*, Tehran ed., 1934-6, vii, p. 1820, l. 214.

² See their *Dādestān-i dīnī*, Bombay, 1926, 48-54.

³ See his *Rististān yāne gujarelā Jarathōstīo-nī kriyāo-nū varṇan*, Bombay, 1917 (written 1882), 440 ff.

⁴ See his *Religious ceremonies and customs of the Parsis*, Bombay, 1922, second ed., 1937, 333 ff.

⁵ op. cit. ; in this he was followed by J. Duchesne-Guillemin, *La religion de l'Iran ancien*, Paris, 1962, p. 104, n. 1.

⁶ Bombay, 1936, 50-3.

⁷ See his edition of *Šāyast nē-šāyast*, Hamburg, 1930, *passim* ; and his article ' Ordeal in *Yasna hā 8* ', *Dinshah Irani memorial volume*, Bombay, 1948, 2-19.

The authors of the present article think that it can be shown that all meanings of the term *bāj*, however varied, derive ultimately from Pahl. *wāj*; and they hope to be able to establish the primary religious significance of the word and to trace its secondary developments, together with those of the associated term *drōn*.⁸

The primary meaning of Zor. *wāj* appears to be simply 'word, speech', deriving from Old Iranian *wāk-*; and this is the sense which the term *wāz* has regularly in the Man. MP texts. Here, however, there occurs an expression, *wāzāfrīd*, in which *wāz* has a more specialized significance, since the compound means 'created by the divine word'. This specialized sense is found with the simple term in Zoroastrian usage, as is exemplified in the following passage: *az abastāg gyāg-ē paydāg ku Zardušt pēš Ohrmazd nišast uš wāj hamē xwast* 'It is revealed by a passage of the Avesta that Zoroaster was seated before Ohrmazd and was learning His Word by heart'.⁹ As a term for the sacred word *wāj* can be used synonymously with *abastāg* itself (see further below). It can also be regarded as an equivalent of Avestan *mąθra*, of which the Pahlavi derivative, *mānsr*, is of relatively rare occurrence.¹⁰

The further specialized significance of *wāj*, which appears peculiar to Zoroastrianism, is that of a 'particular essential formula'¹¹ which precedes, accompanies, or follows an action. These formulae are invariably in Avestan, and when spoken both before and after something done they hedge the act around with the power of holy utterance. Most recurring actions, whether of daily life or daily worship, need and have their enfolding *bāj*; and once the initial *bāj* has been spoken nothing else may properly be said, except the Avestan texts (if any) prescribed to accompany that action, until the concluding *bāj* has been uttered. Thus in the case of religious rites there may be three *bāj* (or *mąθra*), initial, accompanying, and closing, whereas for most secular acts there are only two, initial and closing, between which there should be silence. The term *nīrang* (which with its range of meanings also deserves renewed study) is sometimes used as a synonym for an initial or accompanying *bāj*. When there is an accompanying *bāj*, no word of Avestan other than what is prescribed may be spoken between the framing *bāj*; and in no circumstances may any action be performed between such *bāj* other than that which they are designed to protect.¹²

⁸ Notes for the present article were made in 1966, when F. Kotwal was studying in London, and the authors were accordingly able to discuss the subject in detail and at length. Writing the article devolved subsequently on M. Boyce, but there was full consultation at this stage also, by letter. We remain indebted to our friend the late Dr. Peshotan K. Anklesaria, who on hearing of our interest most generously sent us in London a copy of his great-uncle's translation of part I of the *Dd*.

⁹ See Firoze M. P. Kotwal, *The supplementary texts to the Šāyest nē-šāyest*, Copenhagen, 1969, 56-7 (= *Šnš.*, xv.1).

¹⁰ On the development in Ossetic of related *wāxš* and other derivatives of *wāk-* see I. Gershevitch, 'Word and spirit in Ossetic', *BSOAS*, xvii, 3, 1955, 478-89; and further E. Benveniste, *Études sur la langue ossète*, Paris, 1959, 133-7.

¹¹ Tavadia, *Dinshah Irani memorial volume*, 2.

¹² See, e.g. *Šnš.* (ed. Tavadia), iv.3.

In the Persian *Rivāyats* the initial *bāj* is simply termed *bāj*, and the final one is sometimes specified as the *bāj-i bīrūn* or 'outer *bāj*'. The other technical terms used in connexion with framing *bāj* are as follows :

	PAHLAVI	PERSIAN	GUJARATI
to take the (initial) <i>bāj</i>	<i>wāj griftan</i>	<i>bāj giriftan</i> <i>bāj setāndan</i>	<i>bāj levī</i> <i>bāj dharvī</i>
taking the <i>bāj</i>	<i>wāj-gīrišnīh</i>		<i>bāj levānū kārya</i> <i>bāj dharāman</i>
to have and hold the <i>bāj</i> (during the action)	<i>wāj dāstan</i>	<i>bāj dāstan</i>	<i>bāj rākhvī</i>
to say the closing <i>bāj</i> , to leave the <i>bāj</i>	<i>wāj be guftan</i> ¹³	<i>bāj hištan</i> <i>bāj guzārdan</i>	<i>bāj mukvī</i>

It must have been the framing *bāj* of daily life which chiefly caught the attention of alien observers, and which caused Zoroastrians to be considered the people of the *bāj*. These daily *bāj* are moreover the simplest to define and describe. They appear to derive, however, from liturgical ones, and so for a systematic study of the word it seems best to begin by considering its more complex uses in the religious services. For these we shall be considering mainly the *pāw-mahal* rituals, i.e. those that are performed in a 'pure place', namely the *yazišn-gāh* of a fire-temple.

In religious (as in secular) observance *bāj* only accompanies actions, i.e. in this case rituals. (The recitation of holy texts, such as one of the *yašts*, requires no enclosing *bāj*, since this is only utterance, which has its own power and needs no further protection.) When the ritual is a simple one, it has its distinctive framing *bāj*; but in a long service there are framing *bāj* for the whole observance, and other *bāj* within it. These often appear to be initiatory rather than framing, since the rite is adequately protected by the liturgy as a whole. The purpose of these initiatory *bāj* seems to be to strengthen the efficacy of the particular piece of ritual which follows.

The basic Zoroastrian religious rite is untying and retying the *kustī*. This is performed with ablutions (*pādyāb-kustī*) before every religious ceremony (or unbroken series of ceremonies), and simply (*kustī bastan*) directly afterwards. As an independent action it has its framing *bāj*. The initial one, taken before the *kustī* is untied, is *xšnaoθra ahurahe mazdā, ašəm vohū, and kēm nā mazdā* ¹⁴; and the closing one, said after the *kustī* has been retied with its accompanying *bāj*, is the confession of faith, *jasa mē avanhe mazdā*.¹⁵

¹³ With the loss of force of *bē* in Persian the Pahlavi idiom is sometimes rendered by circumlocutions; e.g. M. R. Unvala, *Dārāb Hormazyār's Rivāyat*, Bombay, 1922 (hereafter abbreviated as MU), I, 604.13-14: *bāj giriftan . . . va dīgar bāre bāj guftan* 'to take the *bāj* . . . and to say the *bāj* again (i.e. leave it)'.

¹⁴ The short prayer known thus by its opening words is made up of Y, XLVI.7, Y, XLIV.16, Vd., viii.21, and Y, XLIX.10; see Modi, op. cit., p. 180, n. 1.

¹⁵ This prayer consists of the four opening words given here, followed by Y, XII.9.

Pādyāb-kustī precedes, naturally, the preparations for the *yasna*, called in India the *paraṅṇā*. These preparations involve a series of ritual actions, some of which are performed independently outside the precinct of the service (the *pāvi*), and have accordingly their own framing *bāj*. Thus when the *rāspī* or serving priest cuts the leaf for the *barsam*-tie, and the twig from the pomegranate tree, he says before and after each action *xš. a. m., a. v.* The same prayers are used as the opening *bāj* for milking the goat; but this action has an accompanying *bāj*; and its closing one is *yaθā ahū vairyō*, twice, and the lesser *šnūman* (dedication) to Gēuš Tašan and Gēuš Urvan.¹⁶

Before the *rāspī* begins consecrating the vessels within the *pāvi*, he takes the same initial *bāj* of *xš. a. m., a. v.* Among the framing *bāj* taken and left during the course of the preparatory ceremony is that for tying the *barsam*, which is, initially, *a. v. 3* (i.e. *a. v.* recited thrice), *fravarāne . . . frasastayaēca*¹⁷; and, finally, *y. a. v. 2, yasnəmča . . . āfrīnāmi, ahurahe mazdā raēvatō x^oarəmanhatō*.¹⁸ For preparing the *hōm*-juice the initial *bāj*, called the ‘*bāj* of the *varas*’ is *a. v. 3, fravarāne . . .*, and the lesser *šnūman* of the *fravaši* of Zoroaster¹⁹; and this *bāj* is not left till the end of the ceremony, with *y. a. v. 2*, and again the same *šnūman*.²⁰ After this the *rāspī* goes out of the *pāvi*, and leaves the *bāj* of the whole ceremony with *a. v. 1, ahmāi raēšča, hazarəm, jasa mē avanhe mazdā, kərfə muzd*, and the ritual of *kustī bastan*.²¹

The *yasna* itself is necessarily solemnized by two priests. It has a very simple framing *bāj*, namely one *ašəm vohū*, said independently by each priest before entering and after leaving the *pāvi*. Within the ceremony, as within the *paraṅṇā*, there are a number of particular *bāj*. Apart from these there occurs repeatedly—16 times in the *yasna* (if one includes the preliminaries) and many more in the *Visperad*—an exchange of *bāj* between the two priests. This takes place most often between *hās*, and usually precedes, directly or indirectly, a new piece of ritual. In this context Pahl. *wāj* is rendered by Bulsara as ‘the formula for opening a sacred function’,²² or as ‘the recital of the initial service’.²³ The exchange is made in the following way: the *zōt*, or celebrating priest, looking steadily at the *rāspī*, says: *yaθā ahū vairyō zaotā frā mē mrūtē*. As he does so he salutes his fellow-priest with a grave gesture of his right hand to the forehead (his left holds the *barsam*). The *rāspī*, returning his gaze, salutes him again, usually with both hands to the forehead, and replies *yaθā ahū vairyō yō zaotā frā mē*

¹⁶ See T. D. Anklesaria, *Yazishna bā nīrang*, Bombay, 1888, reprinted 1957, 4–5.

¹⁷ T.D.A., op. cit., 9.

¹⁸ T.D.A., 10–11.

¹⁹ T.D.A., 12.

²⁰ T.D.A., 23.

²¹ *ibid.*, where only the introductory words of these prayers are given, as here. Together this group of prayers forms the end of a number of final *bāj*, and can be found therefore (e.g. at the end of the *Srōš bāj*) in any *Xorda Avesta*. The words which follow *jasa mē avanhe mazdā* in this set of prayers are not those of Y, XII.9. For the Pahlavi of the whole group (including the final ‘*Pazand kərfə muzd*’) see B. N. Dhabhar (ed.), *Zand-i Khūrtak Avistāk*, Bombay, 1927, 10–11 (= *Srōš wāj*, 9–10), (tr.), Bombay, 1963, 17.

²² See his *Aērpatastān and Nīrangastān*, Bombay, 1915, 120 *et passim*.

²³ *ibid.*, 121 *et passim*.

mrūtē, with emphasis on the *yō* ; whereat the *zōt*, still looking full into his eyes, salutes him once more and responds *aθā ratuš ašātēti hačā frā ašava vīdvā mraotū*.²⁴

By this threefold recitation (as appears from the Pahlavi books and current usage) the *zōt* ' gives ' the *bāj* (*wāj deh-*) to the *rāspī*, who ' takes ' it (*wāj gīr-*) and returns it to him. The purpose of the exchange appears to be to strengthen, at certain important stages in the service, the union (*paivand*) between the two priests, through the interchange of sacred words and the steady regard which they fix upon one another, so that their full ritual power ('*amal*') may be concentrated in order to make more effective the rite about to be performed.²⁵

The exchange of *bāj*, having this purpose, has no particular connexion with the liturgy. In almost every instance in the *yasna* both *zōt* and *rāspī* recite together before and after the *bāj*-formula, so that there is no question of the exchange marking the transfer of the ' holy word ' from one to the other. There occur, however, some variants in the formula, but it is difficult to establish a precise significance for these. Four times in the *yasna* the exchange is made without the first sentence of the *zōt*'s, so that it begins with the *yaθā ahū vairyō yō zaotā* . . . of the *rāspī*. These instances occur in *hā* VII and VIII (on which see further below), and at the end of *hā* XXVI and LXV. In *hā* XV the exchange again contains only two sentences, but here it is the *zōt*, who has been reciting alone, who speaks first, and this time he says : *yaθā ahū vairyō yō ātarvaxšō frā mē mrūtē*, to which the *rāspī* responds with the third sentence of the formula (*aθā ratuš* . . .).

In the many exchanges of *bāj* in the *Visperad* the double formula of this second type is much commoner than the triple one, and most sections end with it ; here the term *ātarvaxšō* occurs more frequently than *zaotā*, although sometimes the double formula is repeated, first with *ātarvaxšō* and then with *zaotā*.²⁶ The terms *sraošāvarəzō* and *frabarətō* also occur once each in the double formula, both times during the last part of the service (which is a repetition of *Y*, III–VIII, with minor changes).²⁷ Both terms have their special justification in this part of the *Visperad*. The sentence with *yō zaotā* is always said by the *rāspī*, that with *yō ātarvaxšō* etc. by the *zōt*, so that the repetition of the double exchange tends to be distributed to *zōt-rāspī-rāspī-zōt*.

It is evidently the usages of the *Visperad* which are dealt with in the following highly condensed passage of the *Nirangestān*, where the commentator gives the *bāj*-formula with *frabartar* instead of *zaotar*, evidently a former variant, in this other ' greater service ' (*yašt ī meh*), as the *yasna* is termed also : *pad ān [yašt] ī meh qzasča dužāθrəmča, āfrīnāmi, ašəm vohū 3, yaθā ahū vairyō yō frabarata [sic] frā mē mrūtē, zōt ašəm vohū ēwaq-ē, rāspīg wāj gīrišn. ahurəm mazdqm tā āča*

²⁴ See T.D.A., op. cit., 29, 36, 69, 103, 122–3, 130, 159, 178, 288, 296, 306, 318. On this dialogic form of the *ahunvar* see J. Darmesteter, *Le Zend-Avesta*, I, 163–4.

²⁵ Occasionally the exchange appears to mark the conclusion of a piece of ritual, in which case it has presumably rather the protective function of a final *bāj*.

²⁶ e.g., T.D.A., 376.

²⁷ T.D.A., 408 (*sraošāvarəzō*) and 416 (*frabarətō*).

manō mat[a] āča yazamaide.²⁸ The Avestan words *qzasča dužāθrəmča* are key-ones from the end of *Y*, VIII. The *a. v.* 3, followed by the *bāj*-formula, belong to *Vr.*, iii (which is set in the middle of *Y*, XI). The next *a. v.* 1 does not accord with present Shahanshahi practice, but what follows does, since the *rāspī*, having taken his part in the elaborate *wāj-gīrišnīh* at the end of *Vr.*, iii,²⁹ then joins the *zōt* in reciting *ahurəm mazdām* . . . i.e. the opening words of *Vr.*, iv.

In some services a number of priests recite together with the *rāspī*. On such occasions they do not recite in unison, but must come together at certain fixed points, among them the exchange of *bāj*. Thus in the *Nīrangestān* it is enjoined : *ka zōt wāj-gīrišnīh mad, ē-š be pāyīšn tā hamāg frāz rasēd* ‘ When the *zōt* comes to the taking of *bāj*, then he must stop until all reach that point ’.³⁰ For although the exchange of *bāj* is independent of the subject-matter of the liturgy, it is an essential part of the religious services, without which they are invalid. ‘ If (the *zōt*) omits a *bāj*-taking, unless this *bāj*-taking is made by him, for so long his worship is not (valid). If the *zōt* omits a *bāj*-taking, then he must return to take (that) *bāj*, and then the liturgy from that point onward must all be repeated by him ’ (*ka wāj-gīrišnīh be hilēd, be ka-š wāj-gīrišnīh padīš andar āyēd, tā-š yazišn nē bawēd. ka zōt wāj-gīrišnīh-ēw be hišt, ē-š wāj abāz gīrišn, ē-š az ān frāz abastāg hamāg abāz rasišn*).³¹ Further, if when a *zōt* has the *bāj* (*wāj dārēd*) he vitiates it in some minor way, ‘ then he must leave the *bāj* and must take the *bāj* again, and it is so for him as if (he starts) from the beginning ’ (*ē-š wāj be gōwišn, u-š wāj abāz gīrišn, u-š ēdōn bawēd čēon az bunīh*).³² And if a *bāj* comes to the *rāspī* (as in *Y*, xv) when otherwise he is silent, then he must be duly careful to limit his utterance strictly to the formula : ‘ A *bāj* comes to him (the *rāspī*), and he must take the *bāj*, and must stop at the Avesta of the *zōt* ’ (*wājaq-ē-š be rasēd, u-š wāj gīrišn, u-š ō abastāg ī zōt ēstišn*).³³

Since the *wāj-gīrišnīh* of the religious services is so important, there are naturally a number of references to it in the *Rivāyats*. Thus in Jasā’s *Rivāyat* the following passage occurs with relation to the consecration service for *nīrang* : ‘ . . . and then the *rāspī* should go to the place of the *sraošāvarəzam* [*sic*] and recite *haomanəm uzdātangəm* (= *Vr.*, ix) up to the taking of the *bāj* (*wāj-gīrišnī*) at the end of the *Hōmāst* (= *Y*, xxv, *Vr.*, xi), when the *rāspī* should recite *yaθā ahū vairiyō yō zaotā* . . . and the *zōt* at *aθā ratuš* should gaze at the *nīrang*, and at *ašātčēt* should gaze at the water, and thus they recite the conclu-

²⁸ See D. P. Sanjana (ed.), *Nīrangistan*, Bombay, 1894, fol. 153v., 5–13 ; S. J. Bulsara (tr.), *Aērpatastān and Nīrangastān*, 382.

²⁹ T.D.A., 353 (where the *wāj* is exchanged seven times, the double formula being repeated with variations on *zaotā* and *ātarəvaxšō*, and some other brief Avestan sentences being said in between).

³⁰ *Nīr.*, 56r.–56v.

³¹ *Nīr.*, 56r., 9 f.; cf. *Nīr.*, 55v., 11 (*xšnūman wizārišnīh ayāb wāj-gīrišnīh* ‘ omitting the dedication or taking of *bāj*’) and further the *Rivāyats*, MU, II, 26.6, Dhabhar, 412 (if the *zōt wāj kam u biš be kunad*, the *yasna* is vitiated).

³² *Nīr.*, 31r., 3 f.; cf. *Šnš.*, x.15 (with Tavadia’s note, p. 132, n.).

³³ *Nīr.*, 56v., 2.

sion (of *Hōmāst*)'.³⁴ So in this piece of ritual the power gained through the exchange of looks between the two priests during the first part of the formula is concentrated immediately by the *zōt* on the objects to be sanctified.

Part of the liturgy of the *yasna* is repeated in various 'lesser services' (*yašt ī keh*) which are solemnized by only one priest; and where the *bāj*-formula occurs in these sections, it is duly recited by him. There are passages in the *Nīrangestān* which deal with the question of how this should be done. Thus there is an abridged form of the *yasna* which consists of the rituals and their accompanying Avesta only (the purely liturgical portions of the service being omitted). This has to be performed by a priest who needs efficacy or 'amal for the celebration of great services, such as *Vendīdād* or *Nīrangdīm*. Since the *wāj-gīrišnīh* is connected with ritual, it is very much part of this abridged *yasna*, and the manner of its recital by a single priest appears to be discussed in the following rather perplexing passage: *pad yašt ī keh ka wāj be gōwēd, āfrī[nā]mi vīspayā drvatō stōiš, ašəm vohū 3, aiwyō vanhubyō, ahurahe mazdā raēvatō x^varən[an]hatō, xšnaoθra yasnāčā tā frasastayaēča, u-š wāj frāz gīrišn yaθā ahū vairyō zaotā frā mē mrūtē aθā ratuš ašātēt hača frā ašava vidvā mraotu*.³⁵ The first Avestan words here (*āfrīnāmi* . . .) occur at the end of *Y*, VIII, and constitute as it were a closing *bāj* for the *drōn-čāšnī* (hence, presumably, 'when he leaves the *bāj*'). Three *ašəm vohū* are recited at the beginning of *hā* IX, and are followed by the *šnūman* (here that of Ohrmazd is given). The relevance of the words *aiwyō vanhubyō* is not, however, apparent. There comes then, it seems, the exchange of *bāj* which marks the beginning of the rites of the *hōm-čāšnī*; and it is enjoined that in this *yašt ī keh* a single celebrant should take the *bāj* here with only the first and third parts of the formula, the middle sentence assigned in the *yašt ī meh* to the *rāspī* being omitted. Elsewhere the authorities differ on this point. The following appears to be a highly condensed account of the abridged *yasna* from the moment that the priest takes the opening *bāj* (i.e., *a. v.* 1) before entering the *pāvi* down to the exchange of *bāj* which concludes the preliminaries of the service³⁶: *u-š wāj gīrišn. u-š ašəm vohū 3 be gōwišn u-š abāz ō gāh ī ātaxš. gāh pad pādyaḅ be kunišn. u-š abāz ō gāh ī zōtān šawišn. u-š dast ul barsam nihišn. u-š ašəm vohū 3, fravarāne, aziš šnūman, abāz ōšmārišn u-š wāj-gīrišnīh pad yašt ī keh. Afarg guft ē yaθā ahū vairyō yō zaotā pad ān ī meh* 'And he should take the *bāj*. And he should recite 3 *a. v.* And he should return to the place of the fire.³⁷ He should lave the place with consecrated water. And he should return to the place of the *zōt*. And he should lay his hand on the *barsam*. And he should repeat 3 *a. v.*,³⁸ *fravarāne*,³⁹ and the *šnūman* of it.⁴⁰ And he should take the *bāj*

³⁴ MU, I, 593.9-11, Dhabhar, 368 (with some amplifications for clarity).

³⁵ *Nīr.*, 152v., 7-153r.; Bulsara, 380 f., with notes.

³⁶ *Nīr.*, 59r., 4-13, Bulsara, transl., 127. The liturgy of the unabridged *yasna* which is recited during and between these rituals fills pp. 3-36 of T.D.A.'s *Yazishna bā nīrang*.

³⁷ 'Return', because he has already, on entering the *pāvi*, offered incense to the fire.

³⁸ At the end of *Y*, 0.2, see T.D.A., 34.

³⁹ *Y*, 0.3.

⁴⁰ i.e. the Avestan dedication which follows the *fravarāne*, as distinct from the Pazand dedication of the introduction (*dībāča*) to the service.

as in the lesser service. Afarg has said, be it noted : *yaθā ahū vairiyō yō zaotā* (is to be said) as in the greater service'. Thus Afarg appears to have held that even in this abbreviated form of the greater service a *rāspī* should be present to share its celebration with the *zōt*. This remains the invariable practice among the Shahanshahis.

The term *yašt ī keh* includes the very important 'minor' service whose liturgy consists of *hā* III–VIII of the *yasna*, with certain modifications.⁴¹ In the *yasna* itself the consecration then takes place of the *drōn*. This word derives from Av. *draonah* 'portion, possession', whose ritual significance, attested in *Y*, XXXIII.8, and *Y*, XI.4, was to designate the 'portion' offered, through consecration, to the divine beings. In *Y*, XI, the word is used of the portion of the animal-sacrifice set apart for the *yazad* *Hōm*⁴²; but Pahlavi *drōn* is used only of the offering of unleavened wheaten bread, made into thin round cakes.⁴³ With this, in the *yasna*, is consecrated regularly some butter, which represents the animal kingdom and is referred to therefore by a term which included in the past the flesh-offering, namely *gōšodāg*, < Av. *gaoš.hudā* 'the beneficent cow'. The *zōt* of the *yasna* makes *čāšnī* of both foods during *hā* VIII, i.e. he partakes of them ritually after consecration. It is possible that formerly, when the service was a *yašt pad gōspand*, i.e. with animal-sacrifice, and the priest made *čāšnī* of the *gōšodāg* during *hā* XXXVII,⁴⁴ bread was the only offering partaken of during *hā* VIII. This and the rituals accompanying *hā* VIII in the 'lesser service' (see below) may have favoured the restriction of the term *drōn* to bread alone. Bread was moreover evidently the staff of life for the Iranians of old, for whom 'to eat' was 'to eat bread' (*nān xwardan*), and it retains something of ancient sanctity still in Muslim Iran. As man's staple food it provided fittingly the standard portion to be offered to the divine beings also.

During the *yasna* itself *čāšnī* is made also of the *parāhōm*, in which the essence of the pounded *hōm* and pomegranate twigs is mingled with milk and water. In the 'lesser service', although *hōm* is lacking, the same groups of things are offered, namely bread and *gōšodāg*, water and either fruits or herbs. This minor service thus also blesses those things which man consumes, and which are vital to his life on earth; and its liturgy contains, as *hā* v.1, the opening words of *hā* XXXVII, *iθā āaṭ yazamaidē . . .*: 'Thus then we worship Ahura Mazda, who created cattle and order (*aša*), created waters and good plants, created light and earth and all things good'. These words of praise and thanksgiving appear originally to have preceded the *čāšnī* of the *gōšodāg* (made in connexion with the *ātaš-zōhr*). Spoken in *hā* v of the *yasna*, they form an initial *bāj* for the *drōn čāšnī* of *hā* VIII. In the 'lesser service' similarly they form such a

⁴¹ See K. F. Geldner, *GIP*, II, 9, with n. 9.

⁴² See Boyce, 'Haoma, priest of the sacrifice', in M. Boyce and I. Gershevitch (ed.), *W. B. Henning memorial volume*, London, 1970, 70.

⁴³ For a detailed Pahlavi description of the *drōn* and its significance see Kaikhusro Dastur Jamaspji Jamasp Asa, 'On the symbolism of the *darūn*', *Dastur Hoshang memorial volume*, Bombay, 1917, 201–5.

⁴⁴ See Boyce, art. cit., 68–9.

bāj for the multiple *čāšnī* made then by the single celebrant, also during *hā VIII*. The priest on this occasion makes five ritual tastings, and in four out of five he partakes of the consecrated bread. The service is accordingly regularly termed the *yašt ī drōn*, or, more briefly, simply *drōn*; and to solemnize it is *drōn yaštan*. More rarely the expression *gōšodāg yaštan* is used; and in Parsi priestly parlance the liturgy of *hā III–VIII* is referred to as the *gošodo bhan̄tar*.⁴⁵

The *yašt ī drōn* is an act of worship and thanksgiving which can be dedicated to any of the *yazads*. Its liturgy and ritual are invariable except for the dedication, the number of *drōn* offered, and the number of twigs in the *barsam*. In one particular form it must be solemnized by a priest to provide himself with ‘*amal*’ to officiate at any other service whatsoever. In this form the service is celebrated with five twigs in the *barsam*, and is accordingly familiarly known to the Parsi priests as *parj-tāy*, whereas the Iranis call it *yašt-i barsam*. It is always dedicated to Ohrmazd the Lord, and His *šnūman* is followed by that of the *yazad* of the day and his associates. With this comparatively long dedication the service lasts just under half an hour. Since it is necessarily so regularly and frequently performed it is probably this particular ceremony which is referred to in the *Nīrangestān* as the *drōn pādrōzag* ‘the daily *drōn*’.⁴⁶

The other *yašt ī drōn* which is most commonly celebrated is that with the *šnūman* of *Srōš*, at which service six *drōns* are consecrated. This service should be solemnized in every one of the five *gāhs* during the three days following a death; and it is presumably because the *yašt ī drōn* is so frequently celebrated with this *šnūman* that *hā III–VIII* of the *yasna* came to be called simply the *Srōš drōn*. This term occurs in headings in liturgical manuscripts,⁴⁷ and is used in the Persian *Rivāyats*.⁴⁸

The *yašt ī drōn* has, exceptionally, no opening *bāj*; but, as we have seen, there is internally an important initial *bāj* to the rite of *čāšnī*, to which most of the liturgy forms an introduction. The *čāšnī* comes, however, almost at the end of the service, and is followed by only a few Avestan sentences, after which there is an elaborate closing *bāj* to defend the rite. This is as follows: *a. v. 4, y. a. v. 2, Y, VIII.5–8, a. v. 3, y. a. v. 2, yasnəmčā . . . āfrīnāmi*, the *šnūman* of the service, *a. v. 3, y. a. v. 2, yasnəmčā . . . āfrīnāmi*, the *šnūman* of the service, *a. v. 1, ahmāi raēšča . . . kərfo muzd, kustī bastan, jasa mē awanhe mazdā 3, mazdayasnō ahmi mazdayasnō . . . āstūtiš*, *a. v. 1*.⁴⁹

Since the *yašt ī drōn* is essentially an act of blessing upon and thanksgiving for man’s food, it is not surprising that this service should be celebrated also as a solemn *bāj* for eating (*bāj ī nān xwardan*, or briefly *bāj ī nān*); for consuming, in

⁴⁵ The term *bhan̄tar* is used by the Parsis for the liturgy as distinct from the ritual (*kriyā*).

⁴⁶ *Nīr.*, 168r., 9; see Tavadia, *Dinshah Irani memorial volume*, 2.

⁴⁷ See J. Darmesteter, *Le Zend-Avesta*, I, 49.

⁴⁸ See, e.g., MU, I, 25 f., Dhabhar, 411. On further occasions for the celebration of the *yašt ī drōn* with the *šnūman* of *Srōš*, and for the use of the term *Srōš drōn* for the actual bread consecrated in the service, see part II of the present article, *BSOAS*, xxxiv, 2, 1971.

⁴⁹ For the final prayers of this *bāj* see in part above, p. 59, n. 21. The closing words are taken from Y, XII.8–9.

purity and thankfulness, the good gifts of the Creator is for Zoroastrians something of a sacrament. When the *drōn yašt* is used in this way, it is celebrated simply with the *šnūman* of Ohrmazd the Lord, and with this shorter dedication it takes about a quarter of an hour to perform. The whole ceremony, including the ritual *čāšnī*, constitutes the initial *bāj ī nān*, after which the celebrant eats his ordinary meal in silence. Then, having rinsed mouth and hands, he leaves his *bāj* with the regular final *bāj* of the service. Nowadays the *drōn yašt* is used as a *bāj ī nān* only by *pāw-mahal* priests who have the highest 'amal, and who are keeping their ritual purity and power intact. For them it is obligatory, and they must celebrate it before anything whatsoever passes their lips. Because, as a *bāj*, the service has the *šnūman* of Ohrmazd alone, in India it is called specifically the *Dādār-Hormazd-nī bāj*. In the Pahlavi books it is referred to even in this case simply as *drōn*; and in one passage it is said that only if he is ill may a highly-qualified priest (*herbad ī gāhān-srūd*) take so much as a drink of water with a briefer *bāj*. If he enjoys health and strength, this would be a sin.⁵⁰

Although it is not stated, it may be assumed that the just Virāz was a priest; and he duly consecrates the *drōn* before eating, and partaking of the *mang*; *drōn yašt ud ruwānīgān ayādēnīd ud xwarišn xward . . . u-š ān . . . may ud mang be xward ud hušyārīhā wāj be guft* 'He consecrated the *drōn* and remembered the rites for the departed, and ate the food . . . and drank the wine and *mang*, and while still conscious left the *bāj*'.⁵¹

Priests keeping the highest purity necessarily celebrate the *Dādār-Hormazd-nī bāj* several times a day. Apart from the *šnūman*, however, this service is essentially the same as any other *yašt ī drōn*; and if these priests have an obligation to solemnize the service with a different dedication, (such as, e.g., that of Srōš) they may use this observance instead as their *bāj ī nān*. Since, then, the *drōn yašt* with any *šnūman* may be used as a *bāj* for eating, and the ceremony is commonly and regularly performed for this purpose, it is readily comprehensible that the Parsi priests should have come in time to refer to the *drōn* ceremony in general (and not only when used in this specialized way) as *bāj*, retaining the word *drōn* (in the form *darūn*) only for the bread itself. An intermediate stage appears in the *Rivāyats*, where the expression *wāj-drōn* occurs in a question sent from India.⁵² In Iran, on the contrary, the term *drōn* (or *drīn*) has been kept for the service, whereas the bread consecrated in it is generally termed *luwōg*.⁵³ A divergence in terminology has thus developed between the two communities:

	PAHLAVI	IRANI	PARSI
the bread consecrated	<i>drōn</i>	<i>luwōg</i>	<i>darūn</i>
the service of consecration	<i>yašt ī drōn</i>	<i>drōn (drīn)</i>	<i>bāj</i>

⁵⁰ *Dādestān ī dīnīg* (ed. T. D. Anklesaria, Bombay, no date), *Purs.* lxxviii.7-9.

⁵¹ *Ardā Virāf nāmag* (ed. H. Jamaspji Asa and M. Haug, Bombay and London, 1872), ii.28,31.

⁵² See the *Rivāyat* of Shapur Bharuchi, MU, I, 33.18, Dhabhar, 32.

⁵³ In the *Rivāyats* the term *luwōg* is used for additional bread consecrated at the service (for the purposes of general communion or participation in the rite), and not for the *drōn* itself. See

The Irani priests, however, still use the term *drōn* for the bread for technical purposes⁵⁴; and learned Parsi priests are familiar with the expression *yašt ī drōn* from manuscripts.

The Parsi use of the term *bāj* for the *yašt ī drōn* has led to a number of secondary developments. The anniversary of a death is observed with the solemnization of a *drōn yašt* with the *šnūman* of Ardā Fravaš. In Iran this day is referred to as the *rōz-i sālgār*, or *sāl-rōz*, an expression which in daily speech is reduced simply to *sāl*; but in India the anniversary is called the *bāj*-day of the deceased, or more briefly, his *bāj*. Food is prepared in the home for the service (including the *drōn* and other ritual offerings), and is then taken to the Dar-i Mihr; and this pure 'food for the *bāj*' has gradually come to be known itself, through abbreviation, as *bāj*. Thus the priests speak of *bāj kādhvī* 'to take out the *bāj*', i.e. the offerings from the vessel in which they have been brought. Moreover, every family has special vessels kept for use on such holy days; and the 'vessel for the *bāj* of So-and-so' has in turn been abbreviated to 'So-and-so's *bāj*'. It is thus possible for a woman to prepare *bāj* (food) and take it in a *bāj* (vessel) to the fire-temple for the *bāj* (ceremony) to be solemnized on the *bāj* (day) of one of her departed relatives.⁵⁵ These colloquial usages, although thus extended, are perfectly clear to the speakers in conjunction with the acts and things to which they refer. In Iran, where the term *bāj* is never used with reference to tangible objects, separate expressions exist for each of the above four usages. It seems natural, however, that the Gujarati-speaking Parsis, using Persian largely as a religious language, should develop such extensions of meaning more readily than the Iranis, for whom it remained their mother tongue. A relic of older usage survives, however, in Parsi popular idiom, with the expression 'to celebrate the *darūn-bāj*', i.e. to observe the death ceremonies. (To ask if a man has made provision for his *darūn-bājnū kādhvū* is the equivalent of inquiring whether he has provided for his funeral expenses.)

An older derivative from *bāj* in the sense of 'sacred utterance' is *bājgvr*, which appears to have been used on occasion for a priest as distinct from a layman.⁵⁶ The word also had and has the sense of a practising priest, that is, one engaged in celebrating the religious ceremonies, who therefore regularly 'takes the *bāj*' for them.⁵⁷ (A similar usage with *drōn* is to be found in Pahlavi, where *drōn-yaz* 'one who consecrates the *drōn*' appears to have been used as a

Dhabhar, p. 168 with n. 9, 169, 177, 178. The *luwōg* were probably then as now made of leavened flour. Nowadays *luwōg* is the popular term for the *drōn* also, which at present in Iran likewise contains leaven.

⁵⁴ i.e. for distinguishing the marked breads (*drōn*) from the unmarked ones (*frasast*), see Kotwal, *The supplementary texts to the Šāyest nē-šāyest*, 142, s.v. *frasast*. For Irani *behdīns* the term *drōn* now only signifies the service.

⁵⁵ All these usages are recorded by Modi, op. cit., 335 ff. It was the use of *bāj* for the food-offerings which led both Anklesaria and himself to seek a second word, other than Pahl. *wāj*, to account for this meaning.

⁵⁶ See the *Rivāyats*, MU, I, 33.14, Dhabhar, 31 with n. 10.

⁵⁷ See, e.g., MU, I, 316.8, 9, Dhabhar, 301. The Avestan pr. n. *Maθravāka*, belonging to a professional priest, had presumably something of the same connotation.

general term for all practising priests.⁵⁸) In Parsi usage the word *bājgīr* is synonymous with *yōždāsragar*, which designates the fully qualified celebrant of major services. Moreover, since the liturgy of the *yašt ī drōn* is almost identical with that of *Y, III–VIII*, and the *drōn* is consecrated during this part of the major service also, when the name *drōn yašt* was replaced by *bāj* in India, this section of the *yasna* itself (called, as we have seen, the *Srōš drōn* in old manuscripts) came to be termed the *bāj-dharnā* ‘offering of the *bāj*’. In the *Visperad* these *hās* are recited before *Vr., i*, and again, with minor changes, at the end of the service; and in this connexion they are accordingly termed the initial and final *bāj-dharnā*. They occur also necessarily in the other major ceremonies of *Vendīdād* and *Nīrangdīn*. Since the *bāj-dharnā* thus forms a part of all the ‘inner’ liturgical services, this term came to be used for all religious acts solemnized within the fire-temple, as distinct from those which can be celebrated outside, i.e. for all *pāw-mahal* ceremonies. *Bājgīr* and *bāj-dharnā* are thus both elevated words. Yet because the *drōn yašt* itself is a minor service, the slightly pejorative term of *bājyo* has evolved for a priest who has not become *marātib*, or fully qualified, and so may only perform the lesser ceremonies.

All Parsi extensions of the meaning of *bāj* thus derive from the use of the *drōn yašt* as a *bāj ī nān xwardan*; and to this practice we must now recur. By ancient observance, attested in the Pahlavi books, a *drōn yašt* may be shared by several persons as their *bāj*. (The maximum number who may so share it is currently held to be eight.) This custom is now maintained only among priests with the highest ritual purity who are *ham-qalām*, ‘of the same word’, who have, that is, the same ritual power through celebrating exactly the same religious services. Supposing there to be four such priests together at a fire-temple, the *bāj* is shared as follows: one priest, acting as *zōt*, celebrates the *drōn yašt* alone up to the end of *Y, VI*. He then summons the other three by striking some implement against a vessel; and they go to another *pāvi* or *pāvis* and each separately takes his own initial *bāj*, namely, *a. v. 1*, the lesser *šnūman* of Ohrmazd (or other *yzad*), *ašaya panāh bād ašaone, a. v. 1*. Then all three enter the *pāvi* of the *zōt*, and together give him the *bāj* at the beginning of *hā VII*. This consists, as we have seen, of the second two phrases only of the *bāj*-formula. The three priests accordingly recite together the *rāspī*’s phrase *yaθā ahū vairyō yō zaotā . . .*, and the *zōt* takes the *bāj* from them with *aθā ratuš . . .*. In a Pahlavi passage it is enjoined: ‘Until the voice of the *rāspīs* subsides the *zōt* should not pronounce *aθā ratuš*’ (*tā wāng ī rāspīgān be nišvīnēd zōt aθā ratuš nē kunišn*).⁵⁹ After this all four recite *hā VII* together, the *rāspīs*

⁵⁸ See J. M. Jamasp-Asana (ed.), *The Pahlavi texts*, II, Bombay, 1913, 157.10, transl., J. C. Tavadia, ‘*Sūr saxvan*’, *Journal of the K.R. Cama Oriental Institute*, 29, 1935, 45. (Tavadia, op. cit., 19, takes *drōn-yaz* to be a particular term, for those priests who had solemnized the *drōn yašt* before the feast; but since the word occurs in a general list of social categories of those to be honoured there, this explanation seems less likely.)

⁵⁹ B. N. Dhabhar, (ed.), *The Pahlavi Rivāyat accompanying the Dādīstān ī dīnik*, Bombay, 1913, lviii.41 (p. 180); transl. H. F. Mirza, University of London Ph.D. thesis, 1940, p. 329.

standing, the final words of the *yenhē hātqm*, i.e. *tāścā yazamaidē*, being recited only once, instead of twice as when there is a single celebrant. All three *rāspīs* then give the *zōt* the *bāj* at the beginning of *hā* VIII, as they had done at the beginning of *hā* VII; and all four priests recite together to the end of VIII.2 (. . . *ašaya.nō paiti.jamyāt*). Then the *zōt* alone recites *aməša spənta . . . jasaiti*, *a. v. 3*, which constitutes the particular *bāj* for the *čāšnī*, and having set the *barsam* in a consecrated vessel, to keep it pure, he, alone, makes the fivefold *čāšnī*. Then he is silent while the other three recite in their turn *aməša spənta . . . jasaiti* (= *Y*, VIII.3-4) and *iθā āat yazamaidē* (= *Y*, v.1), *a. v. 3*. Thus they too take the especial *bāj* for the *čāšnī*, but follow it with the more general *bāj* for eating, already taken by the *zōt* at its due place in the service. Then each *rāspī* pours over his right hand pure water from a vessel in the *pāvi*, and each in turn, from right to left, receives *čāšnī* from the *zōt*, namely a morsel of the bread (*drōn*), dipped in water, with butter and a herb or piece of fruit. Thus each *rāspī* makes *čāšnī* only once, but of all four consecrated things. Then the *zōt* takes the *barsam* from its vessel, and the priests leave the *pāvi* and eat their meal in silence, after which they all leave the *bāj* in the usual way.

This shared *drōn yašt* is referred to in the following passage: ⁶⁰ ‘When it (the *drōn*) is consecrated by several (priests) . . . when 4 *kardas* have been recited the *rāspīs* who then take the *bāj* should go up to *ašaya* of the *barsam* (= *Y*, VIII.2).⁶¹ They should say the Avesta up to *ašaya* of the *barsam*’ (*ka-š čand yašt . . . ka kardag 4 guft rāsvig kē wāj girēnd ē-šān be ō ašaya ī barsam šawēnd u-šān abastāg pad ašaya ī barsam gōwišn*).⁶²

In present Shahanshahi practice, and in old manuscripts with liturgical instructions, the *bāj* is thus given twice to the *zōt* by the *rāspīs*. That in the past it could be given more often is indicated by the *Pahl. Riv. Dd.*, viii.4,⁶³ where the question is asked: ‘In how many places (in the ceremony) can one give the *bāj*?’ (*wāj čand gyāg be pādixšāy dādan*?). The answer suggests five possible places: *tāścā yazamaidē ī fradom, ka ašəm vohū 3 guftan* [= the beginning of vii], *ud waxšag ī dāmanqm, aoxto* [= vii.18-20], *harw 2 jār. ud ašāt hača yašt vahištāt, vispāi yavē yaθā ahū vairyo ī dugānag, tāścā ī didīgar* [= vii.23-7] *ud ašaya.nō paiti.jamyāt* [= viii.1], *harw bār pādixšāy dādan. aētqm ā.yātumanahe jasaiti* [= viii.4] *ēw bār be abāyēd. ast kē ān-iz pad mādagwar gōwēd*.⁶⁴ This last giving of the *bāj*, ‘which some call the essential one’, would thus seem to have taken place after the *zōt* had made his *čāšnī*, and before the *rāspīs* made theirs, so that they thus concentrated their ritual powers once more for this part of the ceremony. The *rāspīs*’ own *bāj*-taking for *čāšnī* would have followed immediately; and in a passage in *Šnš.* they are enjoined not inadvertently to take this

⁶⁰ *Pahl. Riv. Dd.*, lviii.38.

⁶¹ So distinguished from *ašaya . . .* at the beginning of VII.1, because at the phrase *ašaya.nō paiti.jamyāt* of VIII.2 the *barsam* is put in its vessel.

⁶² For the *čāšnī* of the shared *drōn yašt* see also Kaikhusro D. Jamaspji Jamasp Asa, *Dastur Hoshang memorial volume*, 201-2.

⁶³ Ed. Dhabhar, 180-1.

⁶⁴ On this passage see Tavadia, *Šnš.*, 122-3, n.

bāj before the *zōt* has made his *čāšnī*. ‘Who (as *rāspī*) takes the *bāj* due to that *drōn* before the *zōt* tastes from that same *drōn* (it is not proper)’ (*kē wāj az ān drōn gīrēd pēš az zōt az ham drōn čāšnīg kunēd (nē šāyēd)*).⁶⁵

In the past the *drōn* ceremony appears to have been more widely shared by priests as a *bāj ī nān xwardan* than is the present custom. It seems, for instance, to have been a shared *drōn* ceremony by which Virāz took the *bāj* for eating when he recovered consciousness after his vision: *u-šān drōn yašt ud Wirāz wāj grift ud xwarišn xward ud myazd rāyēnīd ud wāj be guft* ‘and they (the other priests) consecrated the *drōn* and Virāz took the *bāj* and ate his meal and made offerings, and left the *bāj*’.⁶⁶ The former use of the *drōn yašt* by the laity is treated in the second part of this paper.

In general priests take the part of *zōt* and *rāspī* turn and turn about, and indeed when two priests need to acquire identical ‘*amal* this is ritually necessary. But during the solemnization of any one ceremony the *zōt* has seniority; and in the *Rivāyats* it is enjoined that if any priest should suffer from a handicap, ‘other priests should not take the *bāj* from him, but if he takes the *bāj* from them, it is proper’ (*dastūr-i dīgar be vāj-i ū na-gīrand, va ū be vāj-i ušān gīrad, šahēd*).⁶⁷ The meaning is evidently that he may act as *rāspī* but not as *zōt*. Elsewhere it is said that a ritually handicapped priest (who has, for instance, a thread torn in *kustī* or *sudra*) may take the *bāj* together with another, but not alone;⁶⁸ and the same rule applied to a priest undergoing purification (*barašnom*) because of some pollution. Until the nine nights are completed, ‘at the time of eating when another priest takes the *bāj* there should be (yet) another priest who accepts the *bāj* from the one who takes the *bāj*. The first priest, even when he has undergone *barašnom* but has not (yet) passed the nine nights’ retreat, it is proper that he should accept the *bāj* (as *rāspī*) together with this priest who accepts a *bāj* from that person who has the *barsam* (i.e. who acts as *zōt*). And it is not proper that he should take the *bāj* alone until that time when all three have passed the nine nights’ retreat’ (*dar gāh-i nān xordan ke herbad-i dīgar vāj mī-gīrad, herbad-i dīgar bāšad ke az ān yek ke vāj mī-gīrad, vāj setānad. ān herbad ham barašnom karde ast, nō-šva na karde ast, šāyad ke bā īn herbad ke vāj-ī setānad be ham az ān kas-ī ke barsam dārad vāj setānad. va tanhā na šāyad ke vāj setānad tā bedān gāh ke har se nō-šva burde*).⁶⁹ The reason for these prescriptions is evidently that the *bāj* spoken by a ritually handicapped person is less effective and needs therefore to be joined to that of a ritually pure person if it is to be accepted to good purpose. Moral qualifications are also required, as is indicated rather cryptically in the *Nīrangestān*⁷⁰: ‘When goodness is apparent (in him, a priest) should consecrate the *drōn* for

⁶⁵ *Šnš.*, xiv.3, ed. Kotwal, 54–5 with note, p. 107.

⁶⁶ *AVN*, iii.20.

⁶⁷ *MU*, II, 8.14 = 9.3; Dhabhar, 396.

⁶⁸ *MU*, I, 17 f., Dhabhar, 28. Cf. *MU*, I, 33.7, Dhabhar, 29, and further *MU*, I, 33.10–16, Dhabhar, 30–1, where the validity is questioned of *drōn yaštan va vāj giriftan* with defective *sudra*.

⁶⁹ *MU*, I, 609.1 ff., Dhabhar, 393.

⁷⁰ *Nīr.*, 67r.–v.

goodness on behalf of all, and the others should take the *bāj* (from him). If goodness is not apparent in him, if (this) does not appear when he consecrates the *drōn*, and the others take the *bāj* (from him), then it is (nevertheless) valid. If all consecrate the *drōn* (independently) it is still better' (*ka wehīh paydāg, hamāg ō wehīh drōn yazišn, ud abāriḡ wāj gīrišn. ka wehīh-eš nē paydāg, ka nē paydāg ka drōn yazēd, ud abāriḡ wāj gīrēd, ē šāyēd. ka hamāg drōn yazēnd, weh-iz*).

It was evidently the need for care in such matters which led to the discomfiture of Abāliš at the beginning of his story : ' One day the accursed Abāliš came, hungry and thirsty, to the fire-temple at . . . , thinking " I shall take the *bāj* ". There was no one there who would give him the *bāj*, and he came out. A man who had wrath dwelling in him met (him) and said : " Why must you do this, and be well-disposed to those people who, when a man like you arrives, do not give him a *bāj*, and keep him weak and wretched and dishonoured ? " ' (*guzastag Abāliš ī zandīg . . . rōz-ē gursag ud tišnag ō ātaxšgāh ī . . . mad, ku wāj gīram. anōh kas nē būd kē wāj dād hēh, ud bēron be mad. mard-ē kē xēsm pad tan mahmān būd padīrag āmad u-š guft ku čē abāyēd ēn warzīdan ud pad ān mardōm nēwagīh-kāmag būdan, kē mard-ē čēon tō frāz rasēd u-š wāj-ē nē dahēnd, ud sust ud xwar ud anāzarm dārēnd ?*)⁷¹. The reference to Abāliš' hunger and thirst misled Barthélemy into thinking that *bāj* here meant simply *bāj ī nān xwardan*⁷² ; but, as Chacha has pointed out,⁷³ a hungry man would hardly go to a fire-temple to beg for a meal. It must rather be supposed that Abāliš was himself a priest (as Chacha says, he later shows considerable knowledge of the faith which he was to abjure) ; and that, as a traveller and penniless, he went to a local fire-temple in the hope of being allowed to take part in the services there, and so share in the emoluments. But naturally the priests would be reluctant to allow a stranger to do so, since they would not know if he had been keeping his purity, or were a morally good man, or thoroughly conversant with the rituals. It is enjoined in the *Nīrangestān* : ' One should not give the *bāj* to him, if he does not know by heart the ritual belonging to it. And one should not take it from him ' (*ē-š wāj nē dahišn ka-š kard aziš nē warm. ē-š aziš nē gīrišn*).⁷⁴ And it is further said : ' One should not take the *bāj* from those of another group, and one should not give it to them ' (*az jud-ristagān wāj nē gīrišn ud wāj-ešān nē dahišn*).⁷⁵ It appears that in Sasanian idiom to give and to take the *bāj* among priests was an expression for celebrating services together. The current usage among the Parsis is ' to tie the *padān* (i.e. the mouth-veil) ' ; and until very recently priests of one *panth* would not ' tie the *padān* ' with those of another.

The exchange of *bāj* occurs not only in the religious services of the fire-temple, but also in the ' outer ' ceremony of the *āfrīnaḡān*, which may be

⁷¹ A. Barthélemy (ed.), *Gujastak Abalish*, Paris, 1887, i.3-9 ; = H. F. Chacha (ed.), *Gajastak Abālish*, Bombay, 1936, 0.1-2.

⁷² See his p. 41, n. 6.

⁷³ See his pp. 52-3.

⁷⁴ *Nīr.*, 67r., 10 f., Bulsara, 147.

⁷⁵ *Nīr.*, 65v., 13-14, Bulsara, 144.

celebrated in any 'clean' place. The fact that *bāj* only introduces or frames ritual is well illustrated by the practice when such a ceremony is performed for the sake of a departed soul. Usually four priests then take part. Three are concerned with the *āfrīnagān* itself, and they exchange the *bāj* just before beginning it, with the triple exchange of the *yasna*, the two *rāspīs* reciting the middle phrase (*yaθā ahū vairiō yō zaotā . . .*) together. After the rituals with their Avesta are completed, these three priests leave the *bāj* with *y. a. v. 21, a. v. 12, ahmāi raēsca . . . kər̥fə muzd*. The fourth priest meanwhile has been engaged in reciting the *Farvardīn Yašt*, and since there is no ritual with this, he neither takes nor leaves a framing *bāj*.⁷⁶

The expression 'to give the *bāj*' is used not only in the sense so far considered, namely for sacred words to be said by one priest to another during a shared act of worship. It is also used in the sense of sacred words being said by an instructed person for the benefit of an uninstructed one, who then simply repeats them exactly after him. Thus when a child first puts on the sacred shirt and girdle, even though it has been taught the appropriate *bāj*, the priest always 'gives' it the words, i.e. says them first, so that there should be no doubt of the utterances being wholly correct. Similarly during *barašnom* and *nō-šaba* (which in Iran are still undergone by the laity) the officiating priest 'gives' the candidate the *bāj* appropriate to each of the various rituals. The priest himself takes the initial *bāj* for the whole ceremony. During the course of it there are some utterances to be said in Pazand (Middle Persian), for example the *dastūrī* or declaration of the authority by which the purification has been ordained. For this it is enjoined: 'Let him say (it) with *bāj*' (*be vāj gūyad*).⁷⁷ *Be bāj guftan* 'to speak with *bāj*' is the Persian idiom for speaking while having the *bāj* i.e. after taking it and before leaving it. To speak even ritually ordained words (such as the *dastūrī*) in Pazand when these are enclosed by Avestan is regarded as something of an irreverence to the sacred tongue; and so such utterances are muted in a particular way, i.e. they are made with the lips closed and the sound produced nasally. Another Persian expression for this is *bista*, < *basta*, 'with closed (lips)', the antithesis, used for ordinary speech, being *gušāda* 'with open (lips)'. In Pahlavi there existed special terms, namely what appears to be an adjective/adverb, **māwāg* 'silently, without articulation', and **māwāgīh* 'silence'. T. D. Anklesaria, who first established the significance of these words, sought to relate them to Sanskrit *mauna* 'silence'.⁷⁸ The number of

⁷⁶ Nowadays this priest performs a small ritual of his own, with eight flowers; but this seems a late development, in imitation of the ritual performed by the *zōt*.

⁷⁷ *Rivāyats*, MU, I, 600.1, Dhabhar, 370.

⁷⁸ See his appendix on *bāj* to the Gujarati transl. of part I of *Dd.*, pp. 53–4. He pointed out, in support of the connexion with *mauna*-, that Neryosangh Dhaval rendered *Mēnōg ī Xrad, Purs.* i.33, 'Do not eat chatteringly' (*drāēa.joišnī mā kun*), by Skt. *maunamadhye jalpaṃ mā kuru*. Anklesaria's reading and interpretation have been adopted by M. F. Kanga, 'Pursišnīhā ī Bost-Mārā u-šān passoz^{vi}ihā—a Pahlavi text', *Indian Linguistics*, xxv, 1964–5, 4, 9. The spelling of the Pahl. word varies between **m'w'g* and **m'yw'g*. On *maunā*-, < **mu-n°*, see M. Mayrhofer, *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*, Lief. 17, 1963, 655.

passages in which these expressions occur is not large,⁷⁹ and several of them will be considered in the second part of this paper. At the end of one, interpreted by Anklesaria, comes the following explanation : ‘ When . . . silence is ordained, one speaks that “ inarticulate ” utterance through the nose. It is called *māwāg. (It is) a resort for communication ’ (*ka . . . xāmūših framūd ēstēd ān saxwan ī *māwāg andar wēnīg gōwēd. *māwāg xwānīhēd. čārag-ē andar āgāhdārīh*).⁸⁰ An example of such a need for communication during a service is given in the *Pahl. Riv. Dd.*,⁸¹ in connexion with the shared *yašt ī drōn*. Here it is said that if one of the *rāspīs* does not know the *šnūman* of the service, ‘ the *zōt* must show him on his fingers,⁸² and if he does not understand, then he must speak to him “ inarticulately ” ’ (*zōt xšnūman pad dast be nimāyišn, ud ka nē dānēd, ē-š *māwāg be gōwišn*).

‘ Inarticulate ’ speech is thus used for two purposes while the *bāj* is being held. One is to say Pazand words which are a fixed and necessary part of the liturgy ; and the other is to use colloquial speech for communication when this is absolutely necessary. This method of speaking ‘ silently ’ is never used for Avestan, except when a short phrase in that language is repeated to mark the end of a piece of ritual, or when a short Avestan prayer concludes a whole ceremony. (Thus, for example, in the *paragnā* ceremony when the *rāspī* has finished tying the *barsam* the last words of the liturgy, *ahurahe mazdā raēvatō xʷarənanhatō*, are repeated ‘ inarticulately ’⁸³ ; and at the end of the *āb-zōhr* which concludes the *yasna* the Pazand words *xʷaršēt amarg . . . vīspa.sētāš* are recited, and then one *a.v.* is said ‘ with *bāj* ’.⁸⁴) The amount spoken ‘ with *bāj* ’ by priests during ceremonies is thus small, and is mainly concerned with Pazand dedications and authorizations of the observances. The Avestan itself is recited clearly and often sonorously, and to speak any part of it ‘ inarticulately ’ is only to be excused on grounds of inadvertence (*ka . . . nē pad nigīrišn *māwāg gōwēd, šāyēd*).⁸⁵ The muted way of speaking ‘ with *bāj* ’ is, however, striking, and although limited in use it evidently caught the attention of *juddīns*, so that *zamzama* (which sometimes appears to describe this manner of utterance) has come, mistakenly, to be regarded as a characteristic Zoroastrian way of reciting Avestan texts.⁸⁶

⁷⁹ The one passage with the abstract, *māwāgīh*, appears to be *Dīnkard*, ed. D. M. Madan, Bombay, 1911, 467.1.

⁸⁰ *Dd.*, *Purs.* xxxix.13.

⁸¹ *Pahl. Riv. Dd.*, lviii.39, with Mirza’s readings.

⁸² i.e. by counting, since the *šnūman* of the *yazad* of the day is according to the number of the day of the month.

⁸³ See T. D. Anklesaria, *Yazishna bā nīrang*, 11.

⁸⁴ *ibid.*, 335. (The *a. v.* I given there in the middle of the Pazand *bhantār* is not recited by the Bhagaria priests.)

⁸⁵ *Šnš.*, x.35.

⁸⁶ The extensive use by Muslim Persians of *zamzam(e)* for Zoroastrian prayers is probably also due to the fact that these were in a language unfamiliar to them, so that the words seemed indistinguishable. Further, private daily prayers (which the unbeliever overhears more readily than formal ceremonies) are naturally said with the rapidity of constant use, and often without much volume of sound.

It should be noted that the phrase *be bāj guftan*, meaning 'to speak with *bāj*, while holding the *bāj*' appears to be a post-Sasanian coinage, first attested in the Persian *Rivāyats*. It is to be distinguished from the Pahlavi expression *wāj be guftan* 'to leave the *bāj*'. The Gujarati equivalent of *be bāj guftan* is *bāj-mā padhvū*.

So far the usages of *bāj* have been considered largely in connexion with acts of worship and purification, and as they affect *pāw-mahal* priests. *Bāj* has an important part also in daily life and for the laity, and its varied uses for ordinary activities will be treated in the second (and concluding) part of this paper, to appear in *BSOAS*, xxxiv, 2, 1971.