



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

Mary Boyce; Firoze Kotwal

Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, Vol. 34, No. 2.
(1971), pp. 298-313.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0041-977X%281971%2934%3A2%3C298%3AZ%22A%22%3E2.0.CO%3B2-R>

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 BAJ AND DRŌN—II¹

By MARY BOYCE and FIROZE KOTWAL

In the first part of this study 'framing' *bāj* have been considered in connexion with religious rituals celebrated in the fire-temples, and with acts for achieving or maintaining ritual purity, mostly by *pāw-mahal* priests. Here it is proposed to consider such *bāj* as are needed and used in daily life.

Among the many *bāj* prescribed for ordinary actions those for eating and drinking are the most numerous and the most frequently referred to. Hence the common (if not always appropriate) rendering of *bāj* as 'grace before food'. The fact that in literary references usually only the opening *bāj* is mentioned has further helped to obscure the special character of the Zoroastrian observance. For most activities there is one fixed pair of *bāj*, initial and final; but for eating and drinking there are four, which vary according to the solemnity of the occasion and the piety and learning of the individual concerned. These *bāj* are known in the Pahlavi and Persian books as the *bāj ī nān xwardan*, or more briefly *bāj ī nān*, and in Gujarati as the *jamvānī bāj*. Of them the three main ones are listed in descending order of dignity in the *Saddar Bundahiš*, where it is said: 'It is necessary that before men are about to eat they should first thank God the great and glorious, and should acknowledge the favours which they have received'.² The initial *bāj ī nān* is not, however, only an utterance of thanksgiving, but protects something almost sacramental, since by the acts of eating and drinking man consumes the creations of Hordād and Amurdād, as the priest does in the sacred ceremonies; and if he is a good man, partaking temperately and reverently, he benefits by so doing the good creation. Accordingly the highest form of *bāj ī nān*, namely the *drōn yašt*, which nowadays, as we have seen, is used only by priests in the fire-temples,³ was formerly celebrated much more generally, by the laity as well as priests, by women as well as men; in fact by any Zoroastrian who wore *sudra* and *kustī*, and by whom worship had been performed (*yašt kard ēstēd*),⁴ anyone, that is, who had reached maturity and had entered fully into the religious life of the community.⁵

The *drōn yašt* is the only *bāj ī nān* which is said with *barsam*; and from the Pahlavi and Persian texts it appears that, with one exception, it was always so recited. There were, however, two separate observances which could be followed when the *yašt* was used as a domestic *bāj*. By one the service could be fully solemnized, in which case the expression *drōn yaz-* was properly used; by the other it was recited without ritual, in which case the idiom was *drōn . . . ul gōw-* 'to say aloud the *drōn*(-service)'.⁶ The latter course was specifically

¹ For part I see *BSOAS*, xxxiv, 1, 1971, 56-73.

² B. N. Dhabhar (ed.), *Saddar Naṣr and Saddar Bundešesh*, Bombay, 1909, lix.2 (p. 131).

³ See part I, p. 65.

⁴ See *Šnš.*, ed. Tavadia, p. 83, n., p. 92, n.

⁵ cf. *Y.*, viii.4.

⁶ See *Pahl. Vd.*, xvi.7 (*drōn . . . ul gōwišn*) and cf. *Šnš.*, iii.35.

enjoined in the past on a woman in menses, who could not herself, being ritually impure, consecrate anything or touch anything consecrated.⁷ In such circumstances she was to recite the service only, using the *šnūman* of Srōš, the great protector against evil. This appears to be the one time when the service was spoken without *barsam*. On other occasions a woman could, as *zōt*, consecrate the *drōn* with *barsam* in hand,⁸ making the ritual *čāšnī*; and could moreover act as *zōt* for other women (*zan pad zōtīh ī zanān šāyēd*).⁹ This presumably refers to the shared *drōn yašt* used as a *bāj ī nān* for several persons, as is still the custom among *ham-qalām* priests.¹⁰ It is probably also in connexion with the domestic celebration of this shared rite that the question was asked whether a man might take the *bāj* from his former slave. The answer was that if the ex-slave were now truly free, wore *sudra* and *kustī*, and spoke the *bāj* correctly (*bāj durust xʷānad*), it was proper; but that it was not proper to take the *bāj* from a man who was actually a slave.¹¹

It is not, however, in connexion with women or slaves that the highest form of grace is generally mentioned in Pahlavi literature and the *Šāhnāma*; but rather in stories about kings and nobles, high priests and ministers, and men of substance. Formerly the *drōn yašt* was evidently recited generally by all priests wherever they were and whatever the occasion. Thus when the high priest of Hormizd IV visited the minister Īzad Gušnasp in prison, 'food was placed before the pious men. Then they took the *bāj*, holding the *barsam*' (*nihādand xʷān pīš-i yazdān-parast, giriftand pas bāž u barsam be dast*).¹² Although nothing is known of forms of prayer which may have been used of old in pagan Iran, there appears to be a link between such observance and a reported incident in the life of the prophet himself, when a pagan priest came to his father's house, and Pourušaspa set before him a cup of mare's milk and asked him to consecrate it. Zoroaster, then only a boy, is represented as protesting because he regarded the priest, a *daēva*-worshipper, as unfit to bless the milk.¹³

The strict piety whereby not even a drop of water was to be drunk without the *bāj* of the *drōn yašt* appears required ideally in Sasanian times of the lay gentry as well as the priests. When Kharrād expounds the Zoroastrian faith to the Byzantine emperor, he declares 'unless the sage, devout *dihqān* has the *barsam* in his hand, having taken the *bāj*, he should not taste a drop of water, even if thirst drives him to dream of water' (*jihāndēde dihqān-i yazdān-parast ču bar bāž barsam *na-gīrad be dast, na šāyad čāšīdan-š yak qatre āb, gar az*

⁷ See, e.g., *Rivāyats*, MU, I, 222.10–16, Dhabhar, 223–4. On present practice see below, p. 309.

⁸ See *Šnš.*, iii.32, and x.35.

⁹ *Šnš.*, x.35. It was only a woman of ill-fame who could not herself consecrate the *drōn*, but who had to employ others to do so (*Šnš.*, x.36).

¹⁰ See part I, p. 67.

¹¹ *Rivāyats*, MU, II, 29.4–10, Dhabhar, 415.

¹² Firdausī, *Šāhnāma*, Tehran ed., 1934–6, VIII, p. 2571, l. 96 (transl. Warner, VIII, 82–3).

¹³ See *Wizīdagīhā ī Zādspām*, xii.1–5 (ed. B. T. Anklesaria, Bombay, 1964, 68–9); *Dīnkard*, VII.3.34–6 (ed. D. P. Sanjana, London, 1912, XIII, 57–8; M. Molé, *La légende de Zoroastre selon les textes pehlevi*, Paris, 1967, 35–7).

tišnaḡī āb bīnad be x'āb).¹⁴ This general statement is borne out by various incidents in the epic, such as the time when a meal was hastily set out in an orchard for the retinue of Bahram Čübīn, but before they ate 'a loyal servitor entered the orchard having taken the *bāj*, barsam in hand' (*biyāmad yakī mard-i mehtar-parast, be bāy az pay-ī bāž u barsam be dast*).¹⁵ He was presumably to act as *zōt* for the band of nobles. The Syrian Acts of Christian martyrs provide further testimony for the lay observance of this rite; for there it is told how the Persian noble Mihrāngušnasp, about to abandon the religion of his forefathers, became 'disgusted with the mumbling of the Magian custom, and when-ever, in accord with heathenish usage, a Magian came and gave him *wask* at mealtimes, he began to say to himself [a Christian prayer] . . . and to make the sign of the Cross over the *drōn*, and then to eat'.¹⁶

The king himself was one of the nobility, a member of the second estate; and there are a number of stories told of Sasanian kings in which they take the *bāj* before eating, sometimes even in times of dire stress. One occurs in the *Kārnāmaq ī Ardašīr*, when the king comes, lonely and dispirited, to the house of Burzag and Burzādur. The hospitable brothers, who did not know the wayfarer's identity, 'consecrated the *drōn* and said to Ardašīr: "Be pleased to take the *bāj* and eat" . . . Ardašīr . . . took the *bāj* and ate' (*drōn yašt ud ō Ardaxšīr xwāhišn kard ku wāj framāy grift ud xwarišn xwar . . . Ardaxšīr . . . wāj grift ud xwarišn xward*).¹⁷ In this domestic ceremony, it seems, the guest took part as *rāspī* in a shared *drōn yašt*, in which one of his hosts acted as *zōt*. Although the piety of Burzag and Burzādur is insisted upon, there is no suggestion that the brothers were priests; and although they worship and invoke the divine beings on the king's behalf,¹⁸ their reward for the help which they give him is 'a district to govern and rule' (*rōstāg-ē pad sardārīh ud kadag-xwadāyīh*).¹⁹

It seems that it was only when the king was thus unrecognized that he was called upon to act in the lesser capacity of *rāspī*. In all the other incidents it is the king himself who takes *barsam* in hand, usually, it would appear, simply to speak the service. Thus it seems to have been a spoken *drōn yašt* which was shared as their *bāj ī nān* by Khusrau Parvēz and his nobles before the banquet given by the king for the Byzantine prince Niyātus. As an act of courtesy

¹⁴ *Šāhnāma*, IX, p. 2762, l. 1513 (Warner, VIII, 277). The texts have *be-gīrad*, which yields little sense. On the use of *bāj* by the *dihqān* class cf. *Šāhnāma*, VII, p. 1820, l. 214 (. . . *dīn-i dihqān-i ātaš-parast, ke bī bāž barsam na-gīrad be dast*).

¹⁵ *Šāhnāma*, VIII, p. 2648, l. 1445 (Warner, VIII, 157).

¹⁶ See G. Hoffmann, *Auszüge aus syrischen Akten persischer Märtyrer*, Leipzig, 1880, 96. The word *wask* has been interpreted as a drink, see W. B. Henning, 'The Middle-Persian word for "beer"', *BSOAS*, XVII, 3, 1955, 603-4; in this particular passage one would expect it to signify some part of the *čāšnī* (on which, in current usage, see part I, p. 68), and to be associated therefore with the *drōn*. Cf. the Mandaeon passage cited by Henning, loc. cit.

¹⁷ D. P. Sanjana (ed.), *The Kārnāme ī Artakshīr ī Pāpakān*, Bombay, 1896, vii.6, 7. The brethren presumably addressed their guest 'inarticulately' (see part I, p. 71), and the longish speech added in the text after their courteous request must be taken as romancer's licence.

¹⁸ *ibid.*, viii.8 (where *yazišn* is evidently used as a general term, and not with reference to the *yasna*).

¹⁹ *ibid.*, viii.19.

Khusrau had donned for the occasion a robe sent him by Theodosius, which was adorned with crosses, his priests having allayed his scruples by decreeing that ‘clothes make not faith’ (*dīn nīst . . . be pūšiš be-pāy*).²⁰ In Firdausī’s account of the taking of *bāj* the *barsam* is handed to the king by his uncle Bindōy. No priest is mentioned. The poet describes the scene as follows :

*xarāmīd xandān bar-ī x^vān nišast be šud tīz Bindōy barsam be dast
jihāndār be-grift u andar nihān be zamzam hamī rāy zad bā radān*

‘He (Khusrau) strode, smiling, to take his seat at the table. Bindōy hastened, *barsam* in hand. The ruler of the world took (it) and privately murmured with the nobles’.²¹ It seems probable that Firdausī has here confused *bāj* and *zamzam*, on account of the Persian idiom *be bāj guftan* ‘to speak with *bāj*’, i.e. ‘inarticulately’²²; and that the original Pahlavi meant that the king (reciting the *drōn yašt*) exchanged the *bāj* with his nobles. This interpretation is borne out by the next lines, which describe how Niyātus, outraged by the sight of Khusrau in his cross-adorned robe reciting Zoroastrian prayers, flings from the table, saying: ‘*bāj* and cross together are an insult to Christ through Caesar’ (. . . *bāz ū čalīpā be ham zi Qaisar buvad bar Masīhā sitam*).²³ Bindōy strikes him for this, and Niyātus demands Bindōy’s person from Khusrau. In the king’s answer occur the following words: ‘God forbid that I should abandon the faith of my fathers, chosen and pure lords of the earth, and go over to the faith of Christ—not take the *bāj* at table and become a Christian’ (*mabādā ke dīn-ī niyāgān-i x^vīš, guzīdē jihāndār u pākān-i x^vīš, guzāram be dīn-ī Masīhā šavam, na-gīram be x^vān bāz u tarsā šavam*).²⁴

Khusrau’s piety in respect of the *bāj ī nān* is shown also in earlier incidents of his reign, during the campaigns against Bahrām Čūbīn. Once when fleeing across the desert with only two companions the king asked for food at a lonely shrine, and was offered such meagre fare as the place had. ‘The king having taken the *bāj* with those two liegemen, *barsam* in hand, they sat down upon the soft grey sand and ate in haste what there was’ (*jihānjūy bā īn do xusrau-parast girift az pay-ī bāz barsam be dast, nišastand bar narm rīg-ī kabūd be uštāb x^vardand ānčē ke būd*).²⁵ A shrine could naturally provide a *barsam*. On another similar occasion, when a caravan-leader, an Arab, slew an ox for the fugitive Khusrau and his followers, they simply ‘took the *bāj*’ with no mention of *barsam* (*giriftand bāz ān ke būd dīn-pīžūh*),²⁶ presumably, that is, they spoke one of the lesser *bāj ī nān*. That *barsam* could not always readily be obtained is a key factor in the pathetic story of the death of Yazdigerd III, as recounted by Firdausī. As a hungry fugitive the king came to the miller’s door, and was offered what the man had—dry bread and water-cress. ‘The king replied :

²⁰ *Šāhnāma*, IX, p. 2793, l. 2092 (Warner, VIII, 308).

²¹ *ibid.*, IX, p. 2794, ll. 2102–3 (Warner, VIII, 309).

²² See part I, pp. 72–3.

²³ *Šāhnāma*, IX, p. 2794, l. 2105.

²⁴ *ibid.*, IX, p. 2795, ll. 2119–20 (Warner, VIII, 310).

²⁵ *ibid.*, IX, p. 2716, ll. 706–7 (Warner, VIII, 234).

²⁶ *ibid.*, IX, p. 2734, n. (Paris ed. only); Warner, VIII, 250.

“Bring what you have. With *barsam* the food indeed will serve”’ (*bedū guft šāh ānče dārī biyār, x^variš n̄z bā barsam āyad be kār*).²⁷ The miller brought the food, but had to hasten away to procure the *barsam*. His request for one, from a local *dihqān*, awakened curiosity,²⁸ and his description of his noble guest led to Yazdigerd’s murder. This story emphasizes the fact that *barsam* was not used by members of the lowest estate.

Other occasions are described in the *Šāhnāma* when hungry and desperate fugitives insist on *bāj* and *barsam* before they will eat. Only once is it said that a noble in these circumstances, namely Bahrām Čübīn, forgot the *bāj*. But a comrade recalled him to his religious duty: ‘Yalān-sīna gave the *barsam* to Bahrām—in his grief he had forgotten the *bāj*’ (*Yalān-sīna barsam be Bahrām dād, nayāmad hamī dar γam az bāz yād*).²⁹ If self-discipline was truly as strictly required as this, it may well still have been the *bāj* with *barsam* which Ardašīr Pāpakān took when he came in, hungry and thirsty, from hunting.³⁰ The classical authors have certainly paid a number of tributes to the Persians’ moderation and self-control in the matter of eating, which accords with Zoroastrian discipline.³¹ On the other hand, the ‘Book of Kings’ was compiled by priests, and it may well be that they went beyond the facts of daily life in their stress on the use of the *drōn yašt* as the essential *bāj ī nān*. There is also the possibility that in Firdausī’s redaction the word *bāj* (or *bāz*) tended to draw *barsam* with it in fixed association, so that not every reference of his to *bāz* with *barsam* is necessarily reliable.

Other *bāj ī nān* were certainly recognized. In the *Saddar Bd.* the second one is called the *wāj ī Ohrmazd*, which in the *Saddar Našr* is glossed *ya‘nī Amašā-sfandī*.³² The first name is given because the initial *bāj* contains the *šnūman* of Ohrmazd, the second because it includes *Y*, VIII.3–4, whose opening words are *aməša spənta*. In India it is regularly known as the *Amešaspaṇḍ bāj*. It is purely a spoken *bāj*, with no ritual and no *barsam*; but it also is a solemn one, which is used (now almost solely by priests) at *gahāmbārs* and on anniversary days, and at religiously endowed feasts in general. Its texts are as follows:

Opening *bāj*: *a. v. 3, fravarāne . . . [with appropriate *gāh*] . . . frasastayaēča ahurahe mazdā raēvatō x^varəmanhatō xšnaoθra*, greater *šnūman* of Ohrmazd, *aməša spənta . . . jasaiti* (= *Y*, VIII.3–4), *iθā āat yazamaidē* (= *Y*, v.1), *a. v. 3, humata hūxta huvaršta . . .*, Pazand *dībāča*, with lesser *šnūman* of Ohrmazd (recited ‘inarticulately’).

Closing *bāj*: *a. v. 4, y. a. v. 2, vasasča tu . . . drvatō.stōiš* (= *Y*, VIII.5–8), *a. v. 3, y. a. v. 2, yasnəmča vahməmča . . . āfrīnāmi*, lesser *šnūman* of Ohrmazd, *a. v. 1, ahmāi raēšča . . . kərfə muzd, kustī bastan*.

²⁷ *ibid.*, IX, p. 2995, l. 497 (Warner, IX, 100).

²⁸ *ibid.*, IX, p. 2995, l. 502 (*barsam čerā x^vāhiy āy rūzbeh?*).

²⁹ *ibid.*, IX, p. 2788, l. 2003 (Warner, VIII, 304).

³⁰ *Kārnamag*, ed. Sanjana, ix.10.

³¹ e.g., Xenophon, *Anabasis*, v.2.17.

³² *Saddar Našr*, xxi.7.

It is noteworthy that, essentially, this *bāj* is based on *Y. VIII*, i.e. the final *hā* of the *drōn yašt*; for *Y. VIII.3-4* and *Y. v.1* of the opening section form the essential *bāj* for the *drōn čāšnī*; and *Y. VIII.5-8* of the closing section follows the *čāšnī* and concludes the service.³³

The third *bāj* is much simpler, consisting essentially of *Y. v.1*. (= *Y. xxxvii.1*). It is called in the Pahlavi books by the opening words of this section, namely *iθā āat yazamaidē*, or, briefly, simply *iθā*.³⁴ The *bāj* is taken with *Y. v.1, a. v. 3*; and is left with *a. v. 4, y. a. v. 2, a. v. 1, ahmāi raēšča . . . kərfa muzd*, and *kustī bastan*. Until the early decades of the present century this *bāj* was generally taken by Zoroastrians for their ordinary meals. It is now used mostly by priests, and in Iran by the laity too when they take their meals during the nine nights' retreat.

In the *Saddar Bundahiš* it is said: 'That person who does not know how to offer the *drōn* must take the *bāj* of Ohrmazd. And if they do not know even this, they must recite aloud *iθā āat yazamaidē*, and say 3 *ašəm vohū* (*ān kas ke drōn na-dānad yaštan, bāyad ke vāj-i Ohrmazd hā girad. Va agar in nēz na-dānad, iθā āat yazamaidē bar x'ānand va se ašəm vohū be gūyand*).³⁵ There is, however, another very simple *bāj* which was admitted for children, the sick, and presumably the ignorant, namely one *ašəm vohū* said before and after eating. This is mentioned in *Šnš.*, v, where *bāj ī nān xwardan* appear to be treated, namely the *drōn yašt*, *iθā*, and *ašəm vohū*. The exposition here is not wholly clear, however, for the author, writing for fellow-priests, appears to use *yašt* indifferently for *yašt ī keh* i.e. the *drōn* service, and *yašt ī meh*, here apparently the *yašt ī nō nāvar*, the equivalent of *gētī-xrīd*, whose performance (personally or through a priest) was enjoined on every Zoroastrian upon attaining his or her majority.³⁶ The text is concerned with the sin of eating irreverently, the different ways in which this can be done being subsumed under the one expression *drāyān-jawišnēh* 'devouring while chattering', this being the most grievous way of erring. 'A child of from 8 to 15 years, male or female, even if without sin with regard to celebrating the (*drōn*) *yašt* [i.e. though not expected to do so], yet if he can say *iθā* and *ašəm vohū*, and does not do so, then (the sin of) "devouring chatteringly" goes to his account. And if (an adult) can celebrate the (*drōn*) *yašt* by heart, and (yet) says (only) *iθā* and *ašəm vohū*—there was one (authority) who said that it is as if he had not celebrated the *yašt* (of *nō nāvar*) and had not become *gētī-xrīd*; and there was another (authority) who said that he did not (thereby) become one "devouring chatteringly"' (*az hašt sālag tā 15 sālag, mard ud zan, haqar-ez pad yašt kardan awināh, be-š iθā ud ašəm vohū tuwān guftan, ud nē gōwēd, ē-š drāyān-jawišnēh ō bun. ud ka-š yašt warm tuwān kardan, ud iθā ud ašəm vohū gōwēd, būd kē guft ku ēdōn bavēd čēōn ka-š yašt nē*

³³ See part I, pp. 63-4.

³⁴ See *Saddar Bd.*, lix.5; *Šnš.*, v.2, 5.

³⁵ *Saddar Bd.*, xxvii.4, and cf. *Saddar Našr*, xxi.7.

³⁶ Tavadia, *Šnš.*, p. 92, n., takes *yašt* throughout as referring to the *yašt ī nō nāvar*; but this yields poor sense.

kard ēstēd, ud gētī-xrūd nē barwēd. ud būd kē guft ku drāyān-jawišnīh nē barwēd).³⁷ Thus one authority held that the *drōn yašt* must be celebrated by all who were qualified to do so, whereas another, less exacting, found *iθā* and even *ašəm vohū* acceptable. In the *Dādestān ī dīnīg*, *Purs*. lxxviii.7, it is conceded that in a case of serious weakness or illness even a fully qualified priest (*herbad ī gāhān-srūd*) may say *iθā*, or *ašəm vohū*, or merely the word *ašəm*, as his *bāj* for water or food or medicine, if thereby he can preserve his pure body (*tan ī pāk*) from death.³⁸

Since to eat and drink are acts of such regular occurrence, a special vocabulary developed in this connexion. Thus a man who takes the *bāj* before eating is *wāj-xwar* or *wāj-xwaranda*; and one who fails to do so is *drāyān* or *bī-wāj-xwaranda*.³⁹ One of the souls which the just Virāz saw suffering in hell was 'the soul of that sinful man who in the world devoured Hordād and Amurdād, water and plants, chatteringly, and ate unlawfully and did not keep the *bāj*' (*ruwān ī awē druwand mard kē-š pad gētīg Hordad ud Amurdad* [sic], *āb ud urwar, drāyān jūd ud adādīhā xward ud wāj nē dāšt*).⁴⁰ The text continues: 'And sinfully, he did not celebrate the (*drōn*) *yašt*, and as he despised Hordād, water, and Amurdād, plants, so this soul must thus undergo heavy punishment' (*ud pad wināhgārīh yašt nē kard u-š Hordad āb ud Amurdad urwar ēdōn tarīh būd, oh ēn ruwān ēdōn grān pādīfrāh abāyēd burd*).⁴¹ In the *Namāz ī Ohrmazd* the Zoroastrian thanks God for having created him 'as one eating with *bāj* (*wāč-xwar*), and not as one devouring chatteringly'.⁴² In the *Rivāyats* it is insisted that everyone must take *bāj* for meals, and that to speak while eating is 'the way of the non-Zoroastrian' (*āyīn-i darvand*).⁴³ Darab Pahlān in his *Farziyāt-nāma* of the late sixteenth century makes the same stipulation, permitting the recital of *iθā* only to those who do not know the 'great *bāj*' (i.e. the *Amešaspad bāj*)⁴⁴; and he ends his section on the subject by exhorting himself: 'Do you, O Darab, refrain from being without *bāj*, so that you may find a place full of light in highest heaven' (*Tō, āy Dārāb, az bī bāj šaw dūr, k-az ān yābī garōθmān jāy pur nūr*).⁴⁵ Nowadays in Iran it is ordinarily only the priests who take a *bāj* for eating; but there some at least do so strictly and on all occasions. In India this was the practice until early in the present century; but now the Parsi priests in the main eat with *bāj* only when they are keeping the highest purity, or upon special occasions, such as *jašns*, i.e. ceremonial feasts.

³⁷ *Šnš.*, v.2.

³⁸ Cited in part I, p. 65.

³⁹ For references see Tavastia, *Šnš.*, 152, on v.1, n. 3-4; and further *Saddar Bd.*, lxxiv.13.

⁴⁰ *AVN*, xxiii.6; cf. *MX*, ii.33.

⁴¹ *AVN*, xxiii.7-9.

⁴² *Rivāyats*, MU, I, 412.7-8, Dhabhar, 320.

⁴³ *Rivāyats*, MU, I, 350.12, Dhabhar, 312.

⁴⁴ J. J. Modi (ed.), *The Persian Farziāt-nāmah and Kholāseh-i dīn of Dastūr Dārāb Pahlān*, Bombay, 1924, 25.8. Modi (*Ceremonies and customs*, 349) distinguishes between the 'great *bāj* with barsom' (the *drōn yašt*) and the 'great *bāj* without barsom' (the *Amešaspad bāj*).

⁴⁵ Modi (ed.), *The Persian Farziāt-nāmah*, 25.36.

It was the silence which Zoroastrians maintained during meals which caught the attention of *juddīns* rather than the words which they said before and after ; and to questions about this silence the Zoroastrians returned rationalized explanations,⁴⁶ without mention of the reverence for Hordād and Amurdād which is insisted upon in their own treatises on the subject. In fact no particular explanation is required, since silence is maintained between all *bāj* other than those which frame actions accompanied by Avesta.

Since silence was kept throughout a meal, when toasts were proposed at a feast, the names of those for whom the wine was drunk were said ' with *bāj* ' : ' So also during the meal . . . every toast, be it to the sacred memory of the departed or be it of any living being, ought to be taken inwardly . . . that is, inarticulately with lips compressed . . . ' .⁴⁷ The Gujarati expression for this is *mum madhe yād kījye* ' to remember in silence '. It is not the Persian custom to make speeches on such occasions. Only the short formula is used : *be yād-i fulān*, or *fulān-nī yād*.⁴⁸ The word *yād* is also used in connexion with acts of worship, for ' all the liturgical services, besides being performed in honour of a particular heavenly being or beings, are celebrated in the name or in the memory of somebody who is named in the recital ',⁴⁹ i.e. in the Pazand *dībāčā*. The invariable phrase used is *ēdar yād bād* ' may (so and so) be remembered here '. When this *dībāčā* is repeated within the service, since it is in Pazand it is necessarily said inarticulately or ' with *bāj* '. From these various usages an association developed between the term *yād* and the muted method of speaking ; and so one finds instructions in one of the *Rivāyats* to recite ' with *yād* ', i.e. inarticulately, instead of the usual ' with *bāj* '.⁵⁰

The third *bāj* for eating, *iθā*, is the one said when an individual consumes something ritually, for purification or initiation (e.g. *nīrang* or pomegranate leaf)⁵¹ ; and it is almost certainly therefore the *bāj* which was used before oath-taking, when a sulphur drink was given to the man on trial. Before the ceremony began, a *yašt ī drōn* was solemnized with the *šnūman* of the just Rašn.⁵² Then the vessel used for *parāhōm* in the *yasna* was brought, containing a little water infused with sulphur, herbs, and a grain of gold dissolved⁵³ ; and when the time came the oath-taker was told to sit and say the *bāj*, then to drain the vessel, cleanse his mouth, and leave the *bāj* before standing up again to take the oath.⁵⁴

Iθā and the other initial *bāj* for eating have evidently a double intention, partly for protection of the act, partly for thanksgiving for the means of life.

⁴⁶ See al-Birūnī, *The chronology of ancient nations*, ed. E. Sachau, 223 ; Mas'ūdī, *Les prairies d'or*, ed. Ch. Pellat, I, 198, § 533 (= Barbier de Meynard, II, 108).

⁴⁷ T. D. Anklesaria, appendix to the Gujarati transl. of *Dd.*, p. 53.

⁴⁸ See Modi, *Ceremonies*, 43.

⁴⁹ Modi, *Ceremonies*, 359-60.

⁵⁰ MU, I, 263.3 (*x'āndan-i yād*), Dhabhar, 263.

⁵¹ See, e.g., Modi, *Ceremonies*, 93, 123.

⁵² MU, I, 51.19-52.1, Dhabhar, 48.

⁵³ MU, I, 51.13-15, Dhabhar, 47.

⁵⁴ MU, I, 52.17-18, Dhabhar, 49.

It appears to be the element of thanksgiving which predominates in the use of the *Amešaspaṇd bāj* in the ritual of *gahāmbār pāvi*. At this observance a priest who has acted as *zōt* at a *drōn yašt* for a *gahāmbār* consecrates a vessel of pure water (or, in another form of the ceremony, vessels of pure water and milk).⁵⁵ While doing so he keeps his hands round the vessel's neck, making *paivand* with it; and the other priests who wish to take part in the ceremony make *paivand* with him by holding a fold of his *sudra*. The *zōt* has not left the *bāj* of the *drōn* ceremony⁵⁶; but all the other priests now take the specific *bāj* for the *gahāmbār pāvi*, which is the *Amešaspaṇd bāj*. When the short ceremony is over, each priest leaves this *bāj* in the usual way, and the *zōt* the *bāj* of the *drōn yašt*. Nothing is partaken of during this service, and the *Amešaspaṇd bāj* appears to be used simply as a blessing on water as the basis of all created life and of all that man consumes.

Apart from the *bāj ī nān*, the *bāj* of daily life appear to be used largely for protection, protection sought both through the inherent power of the sacred words themselves, and also through that of the *yazad* who is thereby invoked. It is not surprising that for the purely protective *bāj* the *yazad* is most often *Srōš*, lord of this world and especial guardian of mankind against evil. This role is presumably attributed to *Srōš* precisely because he is *tanu.məθra* or **bājtan*, 'having the sacred word as body', and so is the *yazad* of the *bāj*, one of the most potent weapons against *Ahriman*.⁵⁷

There are a number of occasions when a *bāj* is to be taken explicitly in the name of *Srōš*, and with regard to Parsi idiom one has to distinguish therefore between the *Srōš bāj* which is a *yašt ī drōn* with the *šnūman* of *Srōš*, and the *Srōš bāj* which is a *bāj* proper incorporating the *šnūman* of this *yazad*.⁵⁸ It is solely in the latter sense that the term is used here. The *bāj* is frequently referred to in the *Rivāyats*, where the expressions *vāj-ī Srōš giriftan*⁵⁹ and also *vāj az Srōš giriftan*⁶⁰ occur.

The texts of the *Srōš bāj* as now recited are as follows⁶¹:

Opening *bāj*: *xš. a. m., a. v. 1, y. a. v. 5,*⁶² *a. v. 3, fravarāne . . . [with appropriate *gāh*] . . . sraošahe ašyehē taxmahe tanu.məθrahe darši.draoš āhviryehē . . . viđvā mraotu, ahunəm vairīm tanūm pāiti 3 (= *Vd.*, xi.3), *y. a. v. 1, kəm.nā mazdā . . . astvaitiš ašahe.**

⁵⁵ For the ceremony with consecration of pure water see H. M. E. Pavry, *Bājdharṇānē laqtī pāvmahalnī kriyao*, III, Bombay, [1938], 156-7.

⁵⁶ See part I, p. 64.

⁵⁷ It is presumably as lord of prayer that *Srōš* is held to preside over the religious life of the individual; see *Farziyāt-nāma*, text, 2, transl., 3.

⁵⁸ Modi seeks on occasion to distinguish these as the '*Srōš bāj*' i.e. the *yašt*, and the 'smaller *Srōš bāj*', i.e. the *bāj* proper, see, e.g., *Ceremonies*, 409, 410; but he does not separate the two in the index to this work.

⁵⁹ MU, I, 586.1.

⁶⁰ MU, I, 607.13.

⁶¹ See Darmesteter, *ZA*, II, 686-8.

⁶² Five *y. a. v.* belong to *Srōš* the protector; cf. *Vd.*, xi.3.

Closing bāj: *nəmascū yā ārmaitiš izačā 3, y. a. v. 2, yasnəmča vahməmča aojasča zavarəča āfrīnāmi sraošahe ašyehe . . . āhuiryehē, a. v. 1, ahmāi raēšča . . . kərfo muzd.*

The *Srōš bāj* is so important and so frequently used that until fairly recently it was one of the small number of Avestan texts which a child had to learn by heart before it was invested with the *kustī*.⁶³

It is evidently because of the care which *Srōš* takes for the individual soul, here and hereafter, that the *patēt* or confession of sins is recited with the *bāj* of *Srōš*. Some kind of *paiwand* must always be made for the recitation of *patēt*, but this is done before the *bāj* is taken, and can in any case hardly be regarded as constituting a ritual action, for which the protection of *bāj* would be necessary. Presumably therefore the taking of *bāj* for *patēt* is an old extension of the use of 'framing' *bāj*, evolved perhaps to invoke the particular protection of *Srōš* at a time when wrong is being spoken of. Those saying *patēt* accordingly recite the five *y. a. v.* proper to *Srōš*, and then the opening *bāj* of *Srōš*. After this they recite the *patēt*, and then say *y. a. v. 21, a. v. 12*, and the closing *bāj* from *yasnəmča . . .*

The recitation of *patēt* is enjoined in various circumstances, and is essential for the dying or on behalf of the dead. There is a striking instance of this in the *Šāhnāma*, when Khusrau Parvēz, perceiving that the hour of his assassination is at hand, bathes and calls for fresh garments and the *barsam*: 'When he saw the *barsam* he took the *bāj*. There was no time for speech or private talk. When the king had put on those clothes he recited the confession of his sins' (*ču barsam be-dīd andar āmad be bāž, na gāh-ī saxun būd u guftār-i žāž, ču ān jāmehārā be-pūšīd šāh, be zamzam hamī taruba kard az gunāh*).⁶⁴ This account is wholly Zoroastrian, in spirit and details, except for the mention of *barsam*. Either practice has greatly changed, or this is one of the instances where Firdausī has automatically associated *barsam* with *bāj*. The *bāj* taken on this occasion by the doomed king would undoubtedly have been that of *Srōš*.

Death is, in general, one of the times when the protection of *Srōš* is most needed, both for the departed soul and also for those who dispose of its abandoned body. With regard to its use by the latter, the *Srōš bāj* is also referred to as the *wāj-i Nasūš*, because it protects against the demon of decay.⁶⁵ At the building of a new *dakhma*, accordingly, *Srōš* is repeatedly invoked. In India before the work begins at all a *yasna* is celebrated at the very centre of the chosen site, followed by five *yašt* ī *drōn*, with the *šnūman* respectively of *Srōš*, *Dādar Ohrmazd*, *Asfandārmad*, *Ardā Fravaš*, and the *Haft Amēšaspands*.⁶⁶ The *zōt*, who should be a priest holding the highest purity, then takes up a

⁶³ See Modi, *Ceremonies*, 180.

⁶⁴ *Šāhnāma*, IX, p. 2935, l. 452-3 (Warner, IX, 34).

⁶⁵ See *Rivāyats*, MU, I, 162.2, Dhabhar, 175. The *Srōš bāj* is used on other occasions also against *Nasūš* 'who, of all *dēvs*, is the most bold, continuously polluting and fraudulent' (*Farzīyāt-nāma*, ed. Modi, text, 10, transl., 19).

⁶⁶ Modi, *Ceremonies*, 231; cf. the *Rivāyat* of Kamdin Shapur, MU, I, 99.11-12, Dhabhar, 102, where however only the first four of these *drōn yašts* are enjoined.

spade, and having said the initial *bāj* of Srōš digs out a part of the ground needed for the tower, reciting as he does so *y. a. v.*, 21 times, after which he leaves the *bāj*. The rest of the site is then excavated, and when the work is complete the area of the tower is marked out by nails. For this two priests with the highest purity make *paiwand*, take the *bāj* of Srōš, and drive in the nails, a central one, four to mark the cardinal points, and 296 others.⁶⁷ Threads are passed between and round these nails to mark out exactly the different parts of the *dakhma*; and it is not until the whole process is completed that the priests leave their *bāj*.⁶⁸

When the *dakhma* is finished, the building is consecrated by ceremonies lasting for three days, all of which are dedicated to Srōš, who guards the soul for the three days after death. A *yasna* is solemnized each morning, and a *Vendīdād* each night.⁶⁹ Then on the fourth day a *yasna* is consecrated in the name of Ohrmazd, and four *drōn yašts* and *āfrīnagāns* in honour of Ohrmazd, Ardā Fravaš, Spendārmad, and Srōš.⁷⁰

The *Srōš bāj* is essential at the disposal of the dead; and the knowledge of it is therefore among the minimal Avesta required of the *pāk-šus* and *nasā-sālārs* (those who lay out the dead and carry the bier). When the former approach the dead body, they make *paiwand* and take the initial *bāj* of Srōš; then they shroud the body, lay it on a stone slab, and mark three furrows round the slab, after which they withdraw, still keeping *paiwand*, and leave the *bāj*.⁷¹ For the funeral ceremony itself two priests make *paiwand*, take the *bāj*, and recite the *Ahunavaitī Gāthā* (*Y*, xxviii–xxxiv).⁷² When they have finished the *nasā-sālārs*, also in pairs with *paiwand*, take the *bāj* before they lift the bier, and do not leave it until they have deposited the body in the *dakhma*, and have themselves come out from there.⁷³ All this time they must therefore keep silence. To speak any word openly (*gušāda*) would be a breach of purity,⁷⁴ and if done wittingly would make them themselves *rīman*. If they should speak involuntarily, they can mend matters by taking the *bāj* of Srōš again.⁷⁵

As for the mourners, in India the custom is that when the priests who recite the *yašt ī gāhān* (*geh-sārnā*) approach the end of *Y*, xxxiv, a man moves among those assembled, saying quietly: *Sarōš-nī bāj lev, sāhebō* ‘Sirs, take the *bāj* of Srōš’; and those who intend to go to the *dakhma* all take the *bāj*, each man for himself. When the priests have finished, the mourners file past

⁶⁷ For the details see Modi, *Ceremonies*, 231–4.

⁶⁸ *ibid.*, 234; cf. MU, I, 99–100, Dhabhar, 102, 103.

⁶⁹ Modi, *Ceremonies*, 238. It is the three *Vendīdāds* which are enjoined in the *Rivāyat* of Kamdin Shapur, MU, I, 99, Dhabhar, 103.

⁷⁰ Modi, *Ceremonies*, 238.

⁷¹ See Modi, *Ceremonies*, 53, and cf. *Rivāyats*, MU, I, 235.2, Dhabhar, 236.

⁷² Modi, *Ceremonies*, 62.

⁷³ See *Rivāyats*, MU, I, 144.1–6, Dhabhar, 162.

⁷⁴ See *Rivāyats*, MU, I, 107–8, Dhabhar, 109.

⁷⁵ See *Rivāyats*, MU, I, 108.8–17, Dhabhar, 110. (In MU. 108.12 the phrase for ‘having the *bāj*’ is elaborated to *vāj dar dahān dārand* ‘they have the *bāj* in the mouth’, the sacred words of the initial *bāj* remaining as it were still on the tongue.)

the body and bow to the soul that stands beside it. The corpse is then carried away, with *bāj*, by the *nasā-sālārs*; and the others who have taken the *bāj* follow silently in pairs, some 30 paces behind, each pair making *paivand* with one another, usually by holding a handkerchief between them. The bier is set down on a stone slab 30 paces from the *dakhma*, and the mourners, forming a line some distance away, bow down once more. The *nasā-sālārs* then carry the body into the *dakhma*, closing the door behind them; and when they open it again to come out (and to leave their own *bāj*) the mourners likewise leave the *bāj* of *Srōš*. Then, still keeping *paivand*, they say the 'prayer of the *dakhma*' (*namāz-i dakhma, dōkhmā-no namaskār*): *az hamā gunāh patēt pašmānom, ida iristanqm urvānō yazamaide yā ašonqm fravašayō 3, ahmāi raēšca . . . kərfo muzd*. They then relinquish the *paivand*, and withdraw to make ablutions, and to perform *kustī bastan*.⁷⁶

The *Srōš bāj* is also needed at times of sudden death, when for instance a body must be recovered from running water or a well. The rescuers should make *paivand* and take the *bāj* of *Srōš* and bring the body out and then leave the *bāj*.⁷⁷ The same ritual should be observed for bringing a body out from the ruins of a building, after a fire.⁷⁸

The protection of *Srōš* is needed not only at death, but also on the frequent minor occasions when dead matter from the living body, i.e. cut hair and nails, is disposed of. The ritual for this, which is described in various places,⁷⁹ is as follows: the nail-parings or hair-trimmings, placed in a piece of paper or cloth, are taken to a barren piece of ground, away from water or fire. The person disposing of them sets them down, takes the *bāj* of *Srōš*, and draws three furrows round them, reciting one *y. a. v.* for each furrow. He then recites the *nīrang* (or accompanying *bāj*) *paiti.tē mərəya . . . (= Vd., xvii.9)*,⁸⁰ throws dust thrice over the parings,⁸¹ and leaves the *bāj*.

The *Srōš bāj* is necessary against other pollutions than those of death and decay. In the old days, as we have seen from the *Šnš.*, a woman in menses was required, ideally, to say the *yašt ī drōn* with the *šnūman* of *Srōš* as her *bāj* for eating.⁸² By later custom women at these periods are regarded as *bī namāz* 'without prayer' and therefore say no Avesta during the time of their seclusion. This accords with the stipulations of the *Rivāyats*⁸³; but in them it is enjoined

⁷⁶ See Modi, *Ceremonies*, 65–6; and for accounts of similar funeral procedures in Iran the *Rivāyats*, MU, I, 143, 144 (Dhabhar, 161–2), 163 ff. (Dhabhar, 176).

⁷⁷ *Rivāyats*, see Dhabhar, 90, 94.

⁷⁸ *Rivāyats*, MU, I, 131.15–17, Dhabhar, 146–7.

⁷⁹ *Vd.*, xvii.1–10 with Pahl. commentary; *Rivāyats*, MU, I, 244.7–14, 246.13–247.19; Dhabhar, 249–51.

⁸⁰ See *Saddar Našr*, xiv; West, SBE, xxiv, 275; Modi, 'Two Iranian incantations for burying hair and nails', *J. of the Anthropological Society of Bombay*, VIII, 8, 1909, 557–72.

⁸¹ Authorities differ as to whether the parings should be actually buried (the usual custom in India) or not. On the need for care in disposing of the nail-parings see also *Šnš.*, xii.6 (ed. Kotwal, p. 28).

⁸² It is of course possible that such exacting rules of conduct laid down in the *Šnš.* and elsewhere applied, and were meant to apply, mainly to priestly families.

⁸³ See MU, I, 205–7, Dhabhar, 211–16; and cf. MU, I, 238.2, Dhabhar, 240 with n. 7.

that when she performs her ablutions thereafter, a woman should take the initial *bāj* of Srōš before the bath, and after washing with *gōmēz* and water should finish off the *bāj*, her purity being thus restored.⁸⁴

The *Srōš bāj* is also necessary at the *barašnom*, for this is essentially a rite for removing pollution, or for 'smiting (the demon) Nasūš' (*zadan-i Nasūš*).⁸⁵ At the very beginning, therefore, when the administering priest prepares the ground on which the purification is to be carried out, he takes the *bāj* of Srōš before drawing the first encircling furrow, and leaves it when he has drawn the last one. The candidate first drinks *nīrang*, for which he takes the third *bāj ī nān xwardan* (i.e. *iθā*); and then, having left this *bāj*, he takes the *bāj* of Srōš and does not leave it until the whole rite is over, and he is clothed again.⁸⁶ (There are various Avestan prayers to be spoken at different stages of the purification, but these prescribed utterances in the sacred tongue do not break the framing *bāj*.⁸⁷)

The *bāj* of Srōš is taken again by the candidate for each of the three ritual ablutions made during the nine days' retreat which follows the *barašnom*.⁸⁸ There are two reasons why the protection of Srōš is invoked for these. One is that these ablutions are intended to continue the work of purification, in which the *yazad*'s aid is needed. The other is that at such times not only are clothes laid aside but also the *kustī*, which 'is very protective for the body and good for the soul' (*pad tan pāsbāntar ud pad ruwān weh*)⁸⁹; and the guardianship of Srōš is therefore then particularly sought. The *bāj* is taken before the clothes and *kustī* are removed, and is not left until the clothes have been put on again, just before the *kustī* is retied. When the candidate is a priest (now invariably the case in India) he must then perform *pādyāb kustī* with *gōmēz* immediately, in order to preserve his 'amal; for ritual power is diminished through the act of being naked. For this reason the *Srōš bāj* was generally said until recently by priests when they took baths in their own homes⁹⁰; and this practice is still maintained by the most pious.

Srōš is invoked, not only when the *kustī* is laid aside, but also at the initial consecration of the sacred girdle, for its greater protectiveness.⁹¹ The priest performs *pādyāb kustī*, and takes the *bāj* of Srōš. After this he cuts the *kustī* (woven in a continuous circle) into half, saying as he does so the prescribed Avesta (which forms the accompanying *bāj* or *nīrang*⁹²), and inarticulately or 'with *bāj*' the Pazand formula: *Srōš ašō taqi tan farmān* 'At the command of Srōš, the just, mighty of body'. He then leaves the *bāj*.

⁸⁴ MU, I, 208-9, Dhabhar, 215.

⁸⁵ See *Rivāyats*, MU, I, 599, Dhabhar, 376.

⁸⁶ See, e.g., *Rivāyats*, MU, I, 559-60, Dhabhar, 378-80; Modi, *Ceremonies*, 124 f. The *bāj* is similarly taken for the lesser purification of *sī-šōy*, or *sī-šūr*, still administered in Iran.

⁸⁷ See part I, p. 57.

⁸⁸ See *Rivāyats*, MU, I, 603-4, Dhabhar, 384-5.

⁸⁹ *Šnš.*, iv.13.

⁹⁰ See Modi, *Ceremonies*, p. 61, n. 1.

⁹¹ See Modi, *Ceremonies*, 174-5.

⁹² See E. K. Antia, *Pāzend texts*, Bombay, 1909, 177.

As we have seen in the case of bathing, a *bāj* may be used to safeguard or restore ritual power diminished by the act thereby enclosed. Answering calls of nature affects purity, and there is therefore an especial *bāj* for this, with a brief opening portion and a long, closing one. This is variously called the *abastāg pad čamišn*,⁹³ or *nask ī pad čamišn*,⁹⁴ or *pīšāb-nī bāj*, or *bāj-i šāša*. In the Pahlavi of *Vd.*, xviii.43–4, where the matter is treated, the term ‘Avesta’ (*abastāg*) is used for the *bāj*. The opening part consists of the Pazand words *gunāh šekaste sad hazār bār*, followed by a single *y. a. v.* The closing part, said after cleansing, and at least three paces away, is as follows⁹⁵: *a. v. 3, humatanam huxtanam huvarstanam . . . vohunam mahī 2 (= Y, xxxv.2), huxšaθrōtāmī . . . ašāica vahištāi 3 (= Y, xxxv.5), y. a. v. 4, ahunam vairīm yazamaide, ašəm vahištəm sraēštəm amāšəm spəntəm yazamaide (= Y, XIII.8), yenhē hātqm . . . , a. v. 1, pādyāb kustī* with *gōmēz* (during *barašnom*) or water.

This *bāj* is now used by priests keeping the highest purity.

Sleeping at night is another act which calls for protection, since a man is then helpless and the forces of darkness are abroad. He should therefore put himself into a state of physical cleanliness by washing before he lies down,⁹⁶ and of spiritual strength, ideally, by reciting *patēt*, followed by one *y. a. v.*, and one *ašəm*.⁹⁷ Or the *Srōš yašt sar-i šab* (*Y*, LVII) may be recited. On rising he should perform *kustī bastan*, and then take the *bāj* of *Srōš* before washing first with *gōmēz* and then with water, after which he leaves the *bāj* and performs *pādyāb kustī*. The impurities of the night hours are thus discarded.⁹⁸ In this connexion the *Srōš bāj* is also called the *Avestā-i dast-u-ruy-šōyīn*, the ‘Avesta for washing hands and face’.⁹⁹

Bāj are used also, as we have seen, to guard positively good acts, such as that of eating. Marriage and the begetting of children are among the most commendable acts for a Zoroastrian, and the union of husband and wife should, ideally, be protected by a *bāj*.¹⁰⁰ The initial *bāj* should consist of nine *y. a. v.*’s, and the closing one of the following prayers: *a. v. 3, humatanam 2, huxšaθrōtāmī 3, yaθā . . . ahunam.vairīm yazamaide . . .*, after which the husband alone should say *āa.aošiti . . . ašəm*.¹⁰¹ Further, ‘if a person is affected with nocturnal pollution during sleep, then when he gets up, he should recite the *bāj* with the *šnūman* of *Asfandārmad . . .*. He should show the seminal fluid to the earth

⁹³ *Šnš.*, x.5; and see further Dhabhar, *Persian Rivāyats*, p. 101, n. 1.

⁹⁴ *Šnš.*, iii.9.

⁹⁵ See *Vd.*, xviii (without *Y*, XIII.8), cf. *Rivāyats*, MU, I, 603, Dhabhar, 384, *Farzīyāt-nāma*, text, 26, transl., 38–9.

⁹⁶ See *Šnš.*, x.38.

⁹⁷ See *Farzīyāt-nāma*, text, 4, transl., 7–8.

⁹⁸ *ibid.*, text, 3, transl., 4–5.

⁹⁹ *Rivāyats*, MU, I, 315.8–9, Dhabhar, 299. The expression also occurs generally as a synonym for the *Srōš bāj*, see, e.g., MU, I, 144.2, Dhabhar, 162.

¹⁰⁰ See *Rivāyats*, MU, I, 191, Dhabhar, 206.

¹⁰¹ *Vd.*, xviii.51–2. For a first consorting, an initial *bāj* of 11 *y. a. v.*’s was enjoined, MU, I, 192, Dhabhar, 206. In India it is still the custom for priests to undergo *barašnom* after the marriage-night.

(i.e. he should first wash the piece of cloth on which the seminal fluid separated from the body has fallen), and then he should recite the . . . *nīrang*,¹⁰² so that the earth Spendārmad may convey to him a son in the spiritual world'.¹⁰³

There are other *bāj* to be said, which have, similarly, the *šnūman* of the *yazad* particularly concerned. Thus when an animal has to be slain, a *bāj* should be said to protect the act, and the creature's spirit. Initially this consists of *xš. a. m., a. v. 1*, followed 'with *bāj*' by the Pazand *šnūman* of Bahman. Then the first part of *y. a. v.* should be said, *gušāda*, up to *šyaoθnanam*. After this the animal should be swiftly and mercifully slain, and when hands and knife have been washed the rest of the *y. a. v.* should be recited, followed by 20 other *y. a. v.*'s, and then one *a. v.*, to complete the *bāj*.¹⁰⁴ The opening *bāj* for milking an animal for ritual purposes is similar, but on such occasions the *šnūman* is of Gəuš Tašan and Gəuš Urvan, and the closing *bāj* is as follows: *y. a. v. 2, yasnəmča . . . āfrīnāmī gəuš . . . huđānhō urune. hazarəm baēšazanam baēvare baēšazanam* (said once *gušāda*, and repeated inarticulately).¹⁰⁵ During the religious services there are *bāj* also with the *šnūman* of Hōm, and of the *fravaši* of Zardušt himself.¹⁰⁶

There are also certain recitations of Avesta which, like the *patēt*, have their appropriate *bāj*. One notable one is the observance of the Gāthā days, when as an equivalence in merit to chanting the Gāthās themselves the devout laity recite 1,200 *yathā ahū vairyōs*. Naturally some method of counting these is necessary, whether with flowers, or pebbles, or a string of beads; and this counting constitutes a small continuous action. This action is, however, practical rather than ritualistic; and it is probable therefore that in this and other similar cases (such as the recital of *yašts* to individual *yazads*) the use of *bāj* is again by extension, as a form of invocation. For the recitation of the Gāthās a *bāj* is accordingly taken with the *šnūman* of the Gāthās themselves. This is as follows¹⁰⁷:

Opening *bāj*: (Pazand, *gušāda*) *pa nām ī yazdān . . . geh gāthābyo geh ahunavad, geh uštavad . . . geh vahištōiš, geh gāthābyo ardāfravaš be rasād. az hamā gunāh . . . pa patēt hom. xšnaobra . . . tarōidite . . . , a. v. 3, fravarāne . . . frastayaēča*, the lesser *šnūman* of the Gāthās, *y. v. x. fr. . . . viđvā mraotū*, the greater *šnūman* of the Gāthās, *ahunəm vairīm tanūm pāiti 3*.

Closing *bāj*: (Pazand, inarticulately) *hormazd xodāy awazūnī . . . ēdōn bād. y. a. v. 2, yasnəmča v. aoj. zav. āfrīnāmī*, the lesser *šnūman* of the Gāthās, *a. v. 1, ahmāi raēšča . . . kərfə muzd*.

This *bāj* is used, with different appropriate *šnūman*, for the recital of other Avestan texts (such as the *yašts*).

¹⁰² *Vd.*, xviii.51-2.

¹⁰³ *Rivāyats*, MU, I, 193, II, 464, Dhabhar, 207. On the *bāj* see *Vd.*, xviii.49-50.

¹⁰⁴ See *Rivāyats*, MU, I, 261-2, Dhabhar, 262.

¹⁰⁵ See part I, p. 59.

¹⁰⁶ See part I, p. 59.

¹⁰⁷ See Kavasji Dadabhai, *Tamām Khordeh Avastā* (in Gujarati), Bombay, 1902, 473-5.

Although such *bāj* with an individual *šnūman* exist, most *bāj* in use in daily life are uttered, as we have seen, either with the *šnūman* of Ohrmazd or that of his vice-regent Srōš, the first having a strong element of thanksgiving, the second more positively a seeking of protection. At all stages in Zoroastrian history there must have been divergences between one household and another, and one individual and the next, in the number and elaboration of *bāj* used. Plainly the laity, although themselves using a variety of *bāj*, have tended to look to the priests to maintain such observances more strictly, so that they may be in a higher state of purity and their prayers on behalf of the whole community the more effective. Despite individual variations, the fact remains that 'taking the *bāj*' is a characteristic and general Zoroastrian observance, which in daily life sets a religious frame round secular acts, and which, with the need to keep it silently, demands well-developed self-control.¹⁰⁸ Apart from its immediate purpose, therefore, the *bāj* has probably been an effective aid in sustaining the remarkably disciplined religious life of the Zoroastrians.

¹⁰⁸ Keeping the *bāj* may well have helped develop the Persians' guard of their tongues, which caused Ammianus Marcellinus ruefully to observe ('History', XXI.13.4) that some among them worshipped the god of silence.