KAVĀD'S HERESY AND MAZDAK'S REVOLT*

By Patricia Crone
University of Cambridge

I

The famous heresiarch Mazdak is generally believed to have been a communist active in the time of Kavād (488–96, 498–531), and to have been killed along with many of his followers by Khusrau Anōshirvān (531–79), Kavād's son and successor, after Kavād's attempt to implement his communist ideas had unleashed a popular revolt which plunged the Sasanid empire into chaos.[1] H. Gaube, however, dissents from this view. According to him, Mazdak may never have existed; even if he did, he played no role in Kavād's politics, nor did such doctrines as he may have espoused stir up social unrest: it was Kavād who mobilised the masses against the nobility in the name of communist ideas, while Mazdak was probably invented or misrepresented to take the blame for the king's unorthodox behaviour.[2] This is a claim apt to make a historian sit up in surprise. Though friction between kings and nobles has been commonplace in history, one does not often hear of kings stirring up peasant revolts against their noble rivals, for the obvious reason that the latter were the pillars of the established order: if the peasants destroyed the nobility, by what means was the king to restore order among the peasants? Whatever else may be said for it, Gaube's argument certainly makes Kavād's behaviour even more problematic than it already is. But is there anything to be said for it? It rests on the two facts that no contemporary source mentions Mazdak (though several refer to Kavād's communist phase) and that the later sources are full of contradictions. Both facts do indeed suggest that something is wrong with the standard account, but there is a less radical way of explaining them than that which Gaube proposes.

Kavād was king of Persia twice. He was elevated to the throne in 488 and expelled in 496, whereupon he spent two years in exile among the Hephtalites; he regained his throne with Hephtalite help in 498 and ruled without interruption from then onwards until his death in 531.[3] All the sixth-century sources place his communist phase in his first reign. The sources in question are, first, the Syriac chronicle attributed to Joshua the Stylite which was compiled about 507, well before Kavād's second reign was over;[4] secondly, Procopius' account based on information gathered during the war of 527–31, in which he participated as Belisarius' secretary;[5] and thirdly, the history of Agathias, who died about 582 and who had access, not just to Procopius, but also to notes taken by a Christian interpreter from the Royal Annals of the Sasanids.[6] (There are also a couple of lines by the apparently sixth-century John Diakrinomenos, who does not however add anything to Procopius and Agathias.)[7] Given the unanimity of the contemporary sources, Kavād's communist phase must be regarded as securely dated. In fact, the late Nestorian Chronicle of Si'ird also places it in his first reign,[8] and so do numerous Muslim authors: Ibn Qutayba,[9] al-Dīnawarī,[10] al-Ṭabarī,[11] al-Mas'ūdī,[12] Muṭahhar al-Maqdisī[13] and others.[14] All these sources, both Christian and Muslim, state that his unorthodox views were the very reason why he was deposed. However, neither the sixth-century sources nor the Chronicle of Si'ird mentions Mazdak, whereas practically all the Muslim sources claim that he was the moving force behind Kavād.[15] This is the problem to which Gaube draws attention.

Klíma, who was the first to discuss the sixth-century silence, initially argued that the Christians were simply ill-informed.[16] But Mazdak's absence from the contemporary sources contrasts strangely with his towering presence in later accounts: if he was really so prominent, how could contemporaries have overlooked him? Joshua was very close indeed to the events in terms of time and place alike, while Procopius's account is full of circumstantial and local detail which he must have picked up in conversation with Persians.[17] He knew the story of how Kavād's wife and/or sister helped the latter escape from jail, for example;[18] why did no story about Mazdak come to his attention? Gaube is right that the sixth-century silence is problematic; it continued to worry Klíma too.

When Klíma returned to the problem twenty years later, he argued that Khusrau must have deleted Mazdak from the official records in order to save his father's reputation.[19] But this hypothesis is even less satisfactory than his first. Khusrau may well have revised the official records after his accession, but he cannot thereby have affected information transmitted before it: Mazdak's absence from Joshua and Stylite and Procopius thus remains problematic. Khusrau's revisions ought however to have affected the *Islamic* tradition, given that most of it goes back to a Book of

*I should like to thank Prof. W. Madelung, Prof. S. Shaked and Dr. H. Halm for comments on this paper.

Kings based on the very records from which Mazdak was supposedly deleted: Mazdak's presence in the Muslim sources thus becomes problematic too.[20] Klíma argued that Ibn al-Muqaffa', the first translator of the Sasanid Book of Kings, inserted an account of Mazdak where he found it missing;[21] but where did Ibn al-Muqaffa' get his information from? He cannot have got it from the Book of Mazdak/Marwak/Mardak, which he translated too; for though this work is conventionally assumed to have been a Mazdak romance, it has now been identified as a piece of wisdom literature.[22] Besides, the Muslim sources contain information which is too precise for an origin in romantic fiction to be plausible (though they are full of romantic stories too).[23] It is presumably for this reason that Klíma only adduces the supposed Mazdak romance as evidence of Ibn al-Muqaffa''s familiarity with Mazdakite material, not as his actual source: Ibn al-Muqaffa', he says, relied on his own knowledge, or on some account already in existence, when he inserted his account of Mazdak in the Book of Kings. But this does not solve the problem where Ibn al-Muqaffa' got his knowledge from unless we assume the pre-existing account to have been found in the Book of Kings itself. In short, Klíma's second hypothesis merely creates new problems without solving the one it was meant to remove.

Gaube stands Klíma's hypothesis on its head: Khusrau did not delete Mazdak from the official records, but on the contrary wrote him into them; Mazdak is absent from the contemporary sources because he played no role in the events which they report, but present in the later sources because Khusrau invented or redesigned him as a scapegoat for Kavād's misbehaviour. This does at least have the merit of offering a coherent solution, and there is no objection to it on the Greek or Syriac side, though it would have been to Gaube's advantage if Mazdak had figured in Agathias' account: his sudden appearance in a Greek author who used the Sasanid records some forty years after Khusrau's accession would have reinforced the suspicion that the records had been doctored. But Agathias' silence is not important.[24] Gaube's hypothesis is however hard to square with the Islamic tradition. Mazdak does not sound in the least like an apologetic invention here; there is nothing schematic about him, nor are there other suggestions of ahistoricity once the romantic embellishments have been discounted. Could Khusrau have thought up so convincing an account? And could a figure invented or reshaped by him have captured popular imagination to the extent of generating so much embellishment? It does not seem likely.

But there is an obvious chronological problem. If Mazdak was the man behind Kavād, he was active in the 490s; yet the sources are agreed that he was suppressed by Khusrau, in the 530s. Kavād was dethroned for heresy thirty-five years before Khusrau's accession, at a time when Khusrau had not even been born;[25] and there is no suggestion that he resumed his heretical activities after his restoration: both Joshua and Procopius provide detailed accounts of his second reign (up to 506 and his death respectively) without breathing a word about communist activities on his part, or for that matter on the part of anyone else; some Muslim sources explicitly say that his heretical phase came to an end on his fall;[26] and as Nöldeke points out, he would hardly have been capable of conducting major wars against Byzantium if he had continued to alienate his clergy and nobility.[27] Yet Mazdak is associated with both Kavād *and* Khusrau, or with Khusrau on his own, in Zoroastrian and Muslim sources, be they Pahlavi,[28] Arabic[29] or new Persian[30]: Mazdak, they say, seduced the former and was killed by the latter. What, one wonders, was he doing in the thirty-five years in between? The simplest solution is that two different incidents have been conflated: the sources contemporary with Kavād's heretical phase fail to mention Mazdak for the simple reason that Mazdak only made his appearance after this phase, in the reign of Khusrau.

This hypothesis accords well with the fact that the sources associate Kavād and Mazdak with different doctrines and incompatible events. As regards the doctrines, the sixth-century sources unanimously describe Kavād as a communist in respect of women alone. According to Joshua, he re-established (*sic*, a point to which I shall come back) the abominable heresy which teaches that "women should be in common and that everyone should have intercourse with whomever he liked".[31] According to Procopius, he legislated "that Persians should have communal intercourse with their women"[32] which is also what Agathias and John Diakrinomenos tell us: "it is said that he actually made a law according to which women were to be available to men in common", as Agathias puts it, adding that "these sins were committed frequently and with full legality".[33] But of communism in respect of property there is not a word. The Nestorian Chronicle of Si'ird provides details of the facilities provided for the sins in question: Kavād built shrines and inns (*hayākil wa-fanādiq*) where people could meet and engage in incontinence.[34] And the Jewish *Seder 'olam zuta* refers vaguely to sexual immorality at the courts of Persian princes, which Graetz, probably wrongly, understood as a reference to heretical practices.[35] But there is no reference to communism in respect of property in these sources either. Communal sex is of course a particularly scandalous idea, but the abolition of private property struck Muslim authors as almost equally horrendous, and it is hardly to be supposed that contemporaries would have remained silent if Kavād had launched an attack on aristocractic and ecclesiastical possessions. Yet silent they were. By

contrast, practically all the later sources associate Mazdak, and thus Kavād too, with heretical views in respect of women and property alike.[36] Pigulevskaja solves this problem by blithely reading tenth-century Muslim accounts into sixth-century Greek and Syriac sources,[37] while Christensen harmonises by assuming Kavād's innovations in respect of property to have been of minor importance: perhaps they took the form of extraordinary taxes on the rich to alleviate the condition of the poor.[38] But complete silence in the contemporary sources on Kavād plus descriptions of revolutionary measures in the later sources on Mazdak hardly add up to evidence for moderate reforms by the former. We may take it that Kavād's heresy was only about women, whereas Mazdak's was about women and property alike.

As regards the events, the sixth-century sources are unanimous that Kavād's measures were unpopular. "The nobles . . . of his kingdom hated him because he had allowed their wives to commit adultery . . . . . The Persian grandees plotted in secret to slay Kavād, on account of his impure morals and perverse laws", Joshua says;[39] Kavād's law "by no means pleased the common people (*plēthos*)", who rose against him according to Procopius.[40] Many later sources also state that his heresy led to his deposition.[41] Under Kavād the Persians thus rebelled *against* a heresy. But under Mazdak they rebelled *in the name of* one; and whereas Kavād's heresy had been imposed from above, Mazdak's heresy was sponsored by the masses. Mazdak's adherents were the poor, base, weak and ignoble plebs (*al-fuqarā'*, *al-sifla*, *al-ḍu'afā'*, *al-lu'amā'*, *al-ghawghā'*), as numerous sources tell us;[42] and there is general agreement that the crowds ran riot: they began by breaking into the royal granaries according to al-Tha'ālibī and Firdawsī (whose accounts are however largely fictional);[43] "they would break into a man's home and take his dwelling, his wives and his property without him being able to prevent them", we are told by Ibn Qutayba, al-Ṭabarī and others;[44] they "killed those who did not follow them".[45] Countless people followed Mazdak,[46] and immense numbers were duly slaughtered by Khusrau: no less than 80,000, 100,000 or even 150,000 were killed in one day in just one area, as several sources allege.[47] It is hard to agree with Gaube that Muslim accounts of Mazdak's revolt camouflage an original account of royal manipulation of the masses. For one thing, the Muslim sources patently describe a phenomenon directed *against* the authorities; and for another thing, there is no mention of an alliance between king and masses in the contemporary accounts of Kavād's communist phase; on the contrary, even the *plēthos* disliked his innovations according to Procopius.[48] We may accept that Kavād was a heretic who tried to impose his views on a reluctant populace (reluctant nobles above all), while Mazdak was a rebel who stirred up a peasant revolt: they simply did not act at the same time, let alone in alliance.

This hypothesis would also explain the proliferation of variations and contradictions in the later sources. It is obvious that once Mazdak had come to be seen as the moving force behind Kavād even though he was only suppressed by Khusrau, then the interval between Kavād's heretical phase and Khusrau's accession had somehow or other to be eliminated. It is for this reason that we are told, now explicitly and now implicitly, that Kavād adopted communist ideas *after* his restoration,[49] or that he was deposed for his heresy by *Khusrau*,[50] or that his heresy caused him to *abdicate* in favour of the latter,[51] or that he made the latter his *co-regent*,[52] or that the heretics *survived* his deposition or *came back* towards the end of his reign,[53] or even that Mazdak's revolt lasted *all the time* from his first reign to Khusrau's accession.[54] What all these variant versions are trying to say is that a heretical Kavād gave way directly to an orthodox Khusrau, without a thirty-five year gap in between. But an explanation also had to be found for the problem that Kavād was supposed to have been in league with the very heretics who rebelled against the crown. Hence we are told that Kavād was *forced* to join the rebels, the latter having grown very strong,[55] or that he had to *pretend* to be on their side lest he lose his throne,[56] or that he was *deceived* into supporting people who were really against him;[57] some sources even think that it was the *rebels* who deposed him[58] or at least kept him in isolation while the grandees of the realm enthroned his brother:[59] Kavād escaped from *them* to become king again, which is why the Mazdakites had to be suppressed prior to his restoration,[60] Mazdak himself being killed at that time.[61] But how then did Mazdak and his followers come to be around at the time of Khusrau's accession? Back to square one. Since all this wriggling and writhing is accompanied by efforts to fit in Kavād's flight to the Huns, his fathering of Khusrau, and his relations with his regent Sōkhrā and the latter's son Zarmihr, it is hardly surprising that the outcome is a confusing mass of similar, yet never quite identical accounts.[62] Gaube is right that some of them have an apologetic intent, but the apologetic element is minute compared with that of genuine confusion.

II

The argument so far, then, is that Kavād tried to enforce communal access to women in the 490s, only to be deposed by his nobility in 496, while Mazdak was a later heretic who tried to enforce communal access to women *and* property by raising a peasant revolt, only to be executed along with his followers by Khusrau in the 530s. The reason why the two episodes have been conflated is undoubtedly that they were closely spaced

events in the history of the same sect, and I shall now examine the nature of this sect. The question of how the events are to be interpreted will be taken up in the last section.

There is nothing to be learnt about the religious views involved from the Greek authors, all of whom describe Kavād's innovations in terms of secular legislation; but according to Joshua, Kavād's communism was derived from "the abominable Magian heresy known as the Zaradushtaqan", which he re-established (*ḥaddet*).[63] This heresy is also referred to in the Syriac History of Karka de-Bet Selok, a sixth-century Nestorian account written in Persian Mesopotamia, which credits a certain Zarādusht, described as a contemporary of Mānī (d. 277), with a heresy that existed now openly and now secretly until the time of Khusrau.[64] The heresiarch in question was Zarādusht Khrōsakān of Fasā according to the *Dēnkard*, which identifies him as the original propounder of the doctrine that women and property should be held in common;[65] and that he was the source of Kavād's ideas is confirmed by the Chronicle of Si'ird (in which the author has some trouble distinguishing the third-century heresiarch from the original Zoroaster).[66] He was the source of Mazdak's ideas, too. According to al-Ṭabarī, Zarādusht b. Khurrakān of Fasā had introduced innovations into Zoroastrianism and many people had followed him: Mazdak was one of those who made propaganda for his views.[67] Miskawayh says much the same.[68] Al-Ya'qūbī and others wrongly make him a contemporary of Mazdak rather than a third-century figure,[69] while Ibn al-Nadīm quaintly refers to him as "the older Mazdak"[70] but the sheer fact that they know him is important. Molé toys with the idea of taking the name of Zarādusht as a title, noting that this would make Zarādusht of Fasā identifiable with Mazdak himself:[71] Mazdak was Zarādusht in the sense of *mōbad*.[72] According to Klíma, on the other hand, it is Mazdak's name that could be taken as a title: Zarādusht was the older Mazdak in the sense of first leader of the sect.[73] But whether one or the other name was a title or not, the Syriac and Muslim evidence leaves no doubt that Zarādusht of Fasā was a person separate from, and indeed much earlier than, Mazdak. Besides, they had different patronymics, Zarādusht being a son of Khrōsak/Khurrak while Mazdak was the son of Bāmdād;[74] and they are also said to have come from different places, Zarādusht being a native of Fasā, whereas Mazdak is said to have come from Nasā,[75] Istakhr,[76] Tabrīz,[77] Nīshapūr[78] or MDRYH, identified as Mādharāyā in Iraq by Christensen,[79] as the Murghāb in eastern Iran by F. Altheim and R. Stiehl.[80] In short, we may accept that Zarādusht Khrōsakān was the original propounder of tenets taken up by Kavād and Mazdak in succession.

The fundamental idea behind Zarādusht's heresy was that women and property engender envy, anger, hatred, greed and needs which would not arise if both were held in common:[81] women and wealth are the ultimate causes of practically all dissension among mankind.[82] But God had created all men alike[83] and placed the means of sustenance, including the means of procreation, on earth "so that mankind may divide them equally among themselves" (*li-yuqassimahā 'l-'ibād baynahum bi 'l-ta'āsī/sawiyya*).[84] Women and property should be held in partnership like water, fire and pasture (*ja'ala 'l-nās shirka fī-himā ka-'shtirākihim fi 'l-mā' wa 'l-nār wa 'l-kalā'*);[85] nobody was allowed to have more than others;[86] sharing was a religious duty.[87]

The sources are not clear exactly how the sharing is to be envisaged. The formulations just cited suggest collective ownership, and this is also what many other authors took to be the objective: Mazdak abolished marriage and private property according to Bal'amī;[88] he told his followers that "your wives are like your other possessions, they too should be regarded as common property", according to Niẓām al-Mulk;[89] he preached communal control of children as well, according to the *Bundahishn* and Ibn al-Balkhī.[90] Nöldeke likewise believed Mazdak to have abolished private property and marriage, on the grounds that equality in respect of possessions cannot be maintained for long unless collective ownership is instituted and hereditary transmission of property eliminated.[91] But though this may well have been what Zarādusht had in mind, it is not how it worked out in practice. Kavād is said to have ruled that children born of extra-marital unions were to be affiliated to the husband:[92] his communist views on women notwithstanding, marriage thus persisted along with parental control of children and hereditary transmission of property. And a widely cited tradition has it that Mazdak and his followers did not institute collective ownership as much as engage in redistribution: they claimed that "they were taking from the rich and giving to the poor (*annahum ya'khudhūna li'l-fuqarā' min al-aghniyā' wa-yaruddūna min al-mukaththirīn 'alā 'l-muqillīn*) and that whoever had a surplus in respect of landed property, women or goods had no better right to it than anyone else".[93] Mazdak "ordered that people should be equal in respect of property and women" (*yatasāwū fī 'l-amwāl wa 'l-ḥuram*), as al-Ya'qūbī put it.[94] Mazdak "made people equal" (*sawwā bayna 'l-nās*), according to Ibn al-Athīr: he "would take the wife of the one and hand her over to another, and likewise possessions, slaves, slave-girls and other things, such as landed property and real estate (*al-ḍiyā' wa 'l-'iqār*).[95] These statements clearly imply that private property and marriage alike were left intact, only inequalities being removed. Mazdak's view seems to have been that the rich should divest themselves of their surplus by giving freely, and that the poor were allowed to help themselves to the possessions of those who had more than the rest: "when

Adam died, God let his sons inherit [the world] equally; nobody has a right to more property or wives than others, so that he who is able to take people's possessions or obtain their wives by stealth, deceit, trickery or blandishment is allowed and free to do so; the property which some people possess in excess of others is forbidden to them until it is distributed equally among mankind", as al-Malaṭī quotes the Mazdakites as saying (in terms obviously borrowed from Islam and with an emphasis on non-violent methods which suggests that the statement refers to later conditions rather than Mazdak's revolt).[96] This goes well with the claim that Mazdak sanctioned guest prostitution[97] and other forms of wife-lending,[98] a measure for which he may have found inspiration in Zoroastrian law. According to the *Mātigān-i hazār dātastān* as interpreted by Bartholomae, a man could cede his wife (be she willing or unwilling) to another man in need, who would be entitled to her labour, but not to her property or to any children born of the union; in other words, he might lend her as he would a slave, and the deed counted as charitable.[99] The existence of such an "interim marriage" has been disputed by M. Shaki,[100] but Shaki implicitly outlines an interim marriage of another kind: a man without male issue might give his wife in *stūrīh* (loosely translatable as levirate) to another man even in his own lifetime with a view to procuring heirs for himself (*stūrīh* being more commonly arranged after a husband's death); he would retain his guardianship over his wife, in addition to his rights to any children she might bear,[101] and the *stūrīh* would (or could) come to an end on the birth of a son.[102] Or indeed (putting Bartholomae's and Shaki's institutions together), he could lend her to another man so that the *latter* could acquire heirs.[103] One way or the other, there certainly seems to have been a Zoroastrian institution of wife-lending which the followers of Zarādhust took up and generalized. But in doing so, they confirmed rather than abrogated the existence of marriage (and they obviously took male control over women for granted too).[104] The later Khurramīs also endorsed *ibāḥat al-nisā'* (as the Muslims were to call communal access to women) without abolishing marriage thereby.[105] Kavād and Mazdak seem to have argued that nobody had *exclusive* rights to women or (in Mazdak's case) to anything at all: everything in a man's possession was available to others, ownership being common in the last resort, and anything he possessed in excess of others could be freely taken, the correct distribution being equal. But actual pooling of property, women or children was not apparently attempted.

Even so, Nöldeke is undoubtedly right that *ibāḥat al-nisā'* was meant in a drastically egalitarian vein. What the Zarādushtīs demanded was not simply that women hoarded in princely harems should be redistributed or that women should be allowed to marry outside their own class, that it should be cheaper to marry, that the rules of levirate should be relaxed, or the like;[106] but nor was it against hereditary transmission of property that their views on women were directed. What *ibāḥat al-nisā'* achieved was to obstruct the growth of social distance and (crucially in Kavād's case) to undermine the power of those who had a vested interest in its preservation. Communal access to women prevented the formation of noble lineages sealed off from the rest of the community by endogamous or indeed incestuous unions;[107] communal access to the wives of aristocrats destroyed the mystique of noble blood produced by generations of such unions, placing a question mark over the political entitlements with which such blood was associated. The horror of *ibāḥa* to non-Zarādushtīs lay precisely in the fact that it obliterated hereditary ranking. It worked by "obscuring the descent of every individual", as the *Dēnkard* complains.[108] "Genealogies were mixed",[109] "base people of all sorts mixed with people of noble blood", as we are told with reference to Mazdak's revolt.[110] "If people have women and property in common, how can they know their children and establish their genealogies?", as Zoroastrian priests asked Mazdak, who was supposedly dumbfounded, never having thought that far himself.[111]

If Kavād and Mazdak modified Zaradusht's vision on women and property in the course of their attempt to implement it, the later Mazdakites, or some of them, seem to have changed it almost beyond recognition. The *Dēnkard* accuses them of tracing descent through the mother and of holding the property of sons and brothers in common,[112] thus conjuring up a society similar to that of the famous Nayar of Malabar (or for that matter Strabo's Yemenis), among whom ownership of land and livestock was vested in the matrilineal lineage, agricultural work being done by brothers while their sisters produced children by non-resident and temporary husbands.[113] In western Persia, to which the information in the *Dēnkard* is most likely to refer, Mazdakism would thus appear to have come to validate a local and, by Zoroastrian standards, highly unorthodox form of kinship organisation to which there is perhaps an allusion in Herodotus' account of Achaemenid Iran as well;[114] and Narshakhī gives us to understand that Mazdakism came to perform the same function in Transoxania.[115] But there were also Khurramīs who used the creed to sanction monogamy.[116] The Mazdakite association with deviant systems is consonant with the fact that it was among isolated mountaineers (many of them Kurds) that Mazdakism survived,[117] but it is unlikely to throw light on the origins and nature of the heresy itself. Zaradushtism was undoubtedly a priestly response to mainstream Zoroastrian problems which only came to be adapted to local institutions after Mazdak's death.

At all events, Zarādusht's creed was not just

egalitarian, but also pacifist. Kavād disliked war and bloodshed in his heretical phase;[118] he was a mild man who tried to deal leniently with his subjects and enemies alike, a fact which some construed as weakness;[119] and he was a vegetarian too: "the king eats no meat and holds bloodshed to be forbidden because he is a *zindīq*", as the ruler of the Yemen was informed.[120] The king proved warlike enough on his restoration.[121] Mazdak similarly wanted to eliminate war, hatred and dispute,[122] and he too was a vegetarian: according to Ibn al-Athīr, he held that "plants and animal products such as eggs, milk, butter and cheese suffice as human food".[123] According to al-Bīrūnī, he told Kavād to abstain from the slaughter of cattle "before the natural term of their life has come" (*ḥattā ya'tiya 'alayhā ajaluhu*),[124] which is more ambivalent: it could be taken to mean that carrion was legitimate food, which Nöldeke rightly deemed unlikely,[125] or that cattle could be both slaughtered and eaten provided that it was old, which is a view attested in Zoroastrian literature,[126] or that cattle could only be slaughtered (but not eaten, as opposed to cut up for its hides, horns, etc) after it had died. Possibly al-Bīrūnī mixed up Zoroastrian and Mazdakite doctrine here and possibly it was the third interpretation he had in mind; either way, the evidence for Zarādushtī vegetarianism is strong. (*Pace* Nöldeke, however, there does not seem to be a reference to his vegetarianism in the Pahlavi commentary on the *Vendīdād*;[127] nor does there seem to be one in the *Dēnkard*.)[128] The Khurramīs of the early Muslim world likewise disapproved of bloodshed, except in times of revolt; no living being should be killed in their view,[129] and they too were vegetarians: Bābak complained that the hands and breath of his Muslim prison-guard stank of meat.[130] One twelfth-century Khurramī sect prohibited injury to humans, animals and plants alike.[131]

Possibly, Zarādusht was also an antinomian, but it is only of Mazdak's followers that we have any information on this point. According to the *Dēnkard*, they did not perform the external acts of worship.[132] They continued to ignore them after they had become Muslims (of sorts) as well: the Khurramīs did not perform the ritual prayer, observe the fast or otherwise adhere to the law, as several sources inform us.[133]

Three further points need to be made about the Zarādushtī heresy. First, neither Zarādusht's heresy nor its Mazdakite version was a species of Manichaeism. The idea that Mazdak was a Manichaean dissident goes back to Christensen and it is still widespread even though it was refuted by Molé almost thirty years ago,[134] and again by Shaki and Yarshater in more recent publications.[135] Christensen based his argument on a passage in Malalas according to which a third-century Manichaean by the name of Bundos proposed a new doctrine to the effect that the good god had defeated the evil god and that the victor should be honoured; this Bundos was active in Rome under Diocletian (285–305), but he subsequently went to Persia where his religion was called the doctrine of *tōn daristhenōn*, explained by Malalas as "the adherents of the good [god]" (probably from *d*ᵉ*rist-dēn*, "professing the true religion").[136] On the strength of the fact that Malalas also calls Kavād *ho darasthenos*, Christensen identifies Bundos and Zarādusht of Fasā, construing Bundos as a Greek rendition of Pahlavi *bundag* or the like, meaning "venerable".[137] It must be granted that there is an odd coincidence here, and all the more so in that the *Dēnkard* could be taken to say that Zarādusht of Fasā was called *d*ᵉ*ris*[*t*]*-dēn* (though the word could also be read as Khrōsakān),[138] that various garbled epithets of Kavād in Muslim sources could likewise be read as *d*ᵉ*rist-dēn* (though this reading is not compelling),[139] and that the appellation *al-'adliyya* and *madhhab-i 'adl* attested in Muslim sources for the Mazdakite sect could be taken as a translation of the same term (on the assumption that *d*ᵉ*rist* could mean "just" as well as "true", which is not however obvious).[140] It may also be added that al-Iskāfī has Mazdak come from Syria.[141] But even so, Christensen's theory is hard to accept.[142] Al-Iskāfī's testimony is best discounted, partly because *adab* works are unreliable sources of historical information and partly because it is Bundos/Zarādusht rather than Mazdak who ought to have come from (or via) Syria. If "Mazdak" was a title, as Klíma argued, one could of course take al-Iskāfī's statement as a confused reflection of the fact that the *older* Mazdak came from Syria and seek support for this view in the fact that al-Iskāfī has his Mazdak go to Fars, the province with which Zarādusht is associated. But conjectures based on confusion do not make good evidence. Malalas' testimony should probably be discounted too. It is not very likely that a native of a provincial town of Fars should have travelled all the way to Rome and made it as a preacher there before going back to found a sect in Iran; conversely, if Bundos was a Roman (or other non-Persian resident of Rome), how did the Farsīs come to accept him as a religious authority? A Syriac-speaking citizen of the Roman empire might well have made it as a preacher in Iraq, but surely not in Fasā; that Zarādusht came from Fasā is however a point on which Zoroastrian and Muslim sources are agreed. No communist views are reported for Bundos, and no assertion regarding the victory of the good god is attested for Zarādusht, or for any of his followers,[143] so that all they have in common is the appellation *d*ᵉ*rist-dēn*. If there is any significance to this, all one can say is that Malalas' story is too garbled for us to retrieve it.

But even if one accepts that Bundos and Zarādusht are somehow related, it does not in any way follow that Zarādusht's creed was a species of Manichaeism, for Malalas plainly uses that word in the completely non-specific sense of "dualist heresy".[144] Obviously,

Zarādusht was a dualist. Zoroastrian, Christian and Muslim sources are however agreed that his dualism was Zoroastrian rather than Manichaean.

Thus the *Dēnkard* refers to him as heretic who came up with the wrong answer to a Zoroastrian problem,[145] while the History of Karka de-Bet Selok credits him and Mānī with different heresies, not, as Pigulevskaja would have it, the same.[146] Al-Ṭabarī describes his sect as a development within Zoroastrianism (*milla .... ibtada'ahā fī 'l-majūsiyya*);[147] and it is similary described by al-Ya'qūbī[148] and Ibn al-Nadīm.[149] As for Kavād, the abominable Zarādushtī heresy that he took up was Zoroastrian (*de-magushuta*),[150] and his religion is likewise described as Zoroastrianism (*majūsiyya*) in the Chronicle of Si'ird;[151] the description is correct for he tried to impose fire-worship on the Armenians in his heretical phase.[152] Mazdak, too, is classified as a Zoroastrian by Ibn al-Nadīm;[153] and Mazdak was also a Zoroastrian according to the Pahlavi books, which depict him as a heretic, not as a Manichaean (Mānī being seen as the founder of a new religion);[154] Mazdak modified Zoroaster's religion according to al-Bīrūnī, Abū 'l-Ma'ālī and Ibn al-Athīr, all of whom clearly mean the original prophet, not Zarādusht of Fasā;[155] he proposed a new interpretation of "the book of Zoroaster known as the Avesta", according to al-Mas'ūdī, al-Bīrūnī and al-Khwārizmī, and it was for this reason that he was known as a *zindīq*.[156] He claimed to be a prophet sent to restore the religion of Zoroaster according to Niẓām al-Mulk.[157] He aspired to the spiritual leadership of the religion of Ohrmazd according to the *Dēnkard* (in a passage on which he is not however explicitly named).[158] What is more, he is said to have been a *mōbad*[159] or even chief *mōbad*,[160] that is to say, a member of the Zoroastrian priesthood; and though he is more likely to have been a minor priest than a leader of the clerical hierarchy (a position ascribed to him on the basis of his supposed association with Kavād), his allegiance to that hierarchy is not in doubt, for he (or a follower of his) compares two divine powers to the chief *mōbad* and chief *hērbad* in the fragment in cosmology preserved by al-Shahrastānī.[161] He worshipped fire, too, for he had his own views on the number and distribution of fire-temples;[162] and he allegedly proved the truth of his religion by making a fire speak,[163] a miracle which is moreover borrowed from the life of Zoroaster.[164] He also appears as a Zoroastrian in the *Dābistān-i madhāhib*, the author of which relied on Mazdakite informants and an alleged book of Mazdak's entitled the *Dīsnād*;[165] and his speeches in Niẓām al-Mulk, Firdawsī and other sources are wholly Zoroastrian too.[166]

The fact that Mazdakism originated within Zoroastrianism does not of course rule out the possibility that Zarādusht and/or Mazdak were influenced by Manichaeism; but where is the influence supposed to be? In terms of ethos, the two heresies were diametrically opposed. Manichaeism was a world-renouncing religion which taught liberation from matter through abstention from procreation, bloodshed and material possessions. Zarādusht and his followers by contrast taught equal access to all the good things of life, including women and material possessions.[167] Christensen understands Mazdak's vegetarianism as an attempt to avoid entanglement in matter,[168] and Carratelli and others follow suit by crediting the Mazdakites with abstention from sex and material goods as well in their supposed effort to kill desire![169] But unlike the Manichaeans, the followers of Zarādusht were vegetarians because life was good, not because bloodshed would entangle them in matter. Their general idea (as reported with particular clarity for later Khurramīs) was that everyone should be nice to everyone else, and that all pleasurable things should be allowed as long as they did not harm the interests of others, animals included.[170] There is a strange statement in al-Shahrastānī, citing Abū 'Īsā al-Warrāq, to the effect that Mazdak enjoined *qatl al-anfus*, "killing of souls/selves" as a means of liberation from evil and darkness, which Christensen took to mean that he enjoined asceticism.[171] But in Ibn al-Malāḥimī's and 'Abd al-Jabbār's versions of Abū 'Īsā, the reference is to actual killing;[172] Christensen's interpretation of the passage is thus untenable.[173] There is in fact no reason at all to assume that the Mazdakites practised asceticism:[174] though Mīrkhwānd, a fifteenth-century author, claims that Mazdak "wore woollen clothing and engaged in constant devotion",[175] all early sources give us to understand that Mazdak preached elimination of desire through fulfilment; of one Mazdakite sect we are explicitly told that they rejected the asceticism of the Marcionites; with whom they otherwise had much in common.[176] But what then does Abū 'Īsā's statement mean? Since he knew that Mazdak was a pacifist,[177] he can hardly have credited the latter with a recommendation of ritual murder; but he may well have meant that Mazdak permitted killing, normally prohibited, under conditions of revolt, which is what the later Mazdakites took to be the case;[178] and he may further have stated that Mazdak rationalised this dispensation on the grounds that opponents [so overcome by evil as to force the believers into revolt] should be killed because there was no other way of releasing their souls. But this is not a Manichaean view. No doubt Mazdak's heresy *resembled* Manichaeism, as Abū 'Īsā says with reference to Mazdak's belief in two principles,[179] but then what dualism did not? The fact that Abū 'Īsā compares it with Manichaeism rather than Zoroastrianism merely illustrates the fact that Manichaeism was the most important form of dualism to early Muslims, being infinitely more intelligible, enticing and dangerous than Zoroastrianism; it does not mean that Manichaeism and Mazdakism were especially closely related. Like all the Iranian dualists,

Mazdak had views on the nature of light and darkness, but his views were Zoroastrian, not Manichaean.[180] If Abū ʿĪsā (or an anonymous informant) is to be trusted, Mazdak had certainly been exposed to Gnostic influence in respect of his cosmology,[181] but there is nothing specifically Manichaean about this influence; some even conjecture it to have been neo-Platonic;[182] Madelung suggests that it was Kanthaean.[183] The later Khurramīs likewise subscribed to a number of beliefs commonly associated with Gnosticism, notably reincarnation of the soul and periodic incarnation of the deity (or, less radically, of messengers) on earth;[184] and they shared with the Manichaeans the concept of the moon as a soul-carrying vessel which waxes and wanes in accordance with its freight.[185] But they need not have borrowed any of these ideas from the Manichaeans,[186] and they were in any case quite unlike the Manichaeans in their ethos, a fact well captured by the fact that they came to be known as Khurramīs or Khurram-dīnīs "adherents of the joyous religion". Zaradushtism was not a religion of cosmic alienation in either its original or its later versions; it did not preach that man is a stranger in this world, a fallen soul or spark of light trapped in matter by mistake, nor did it teach asceticism as a means of escape. It did say that the world has arisen through a deplorable mixture of light and darkness to which man should respond by trying to vanquish darkness and its evil creations (notably by avoiding discord and bloodshed), but then so did Zoroastrianism. Clearly Zoroastrianism was the common source of Gnostic dualism and the Zarādushtī/Mazdakite/Khurramī religion; the latter sprang directly from it, not from a Gnostic offshoot,[187] and it continued to be a Zoroastrian heresy rather than a Gnostic creed inasmuch as it remained life-affirming: hatred of matter is not attested.

The second point that needs to be stressed is that Zarādusht's communism owed its existence to Zoroastrian thought, not to classical antecedents. The practice of looking for Greek antecedents is a venerable one inasmuch as Agathias was the first to do so: he rejected the theory, not because of its historical implausibility, but rather because the Persians could not in his view be credited with motives higher than concupiscence.[188] More recently, Altheim and Stiel have located the origins of Mazdakite thought in neo-Platonism supposedly transmitted by Bud, a sixth-century Syrian whom the authors briskly redate to the third century and identify with Bundos, who supposedly picked up neo-Platonist ideas in Rome before moving on to the Murghāb in eastern Iran, where his ideas lay dormant for two centuries until they were picked up by Mazdak.[189] Klíma, on the other hand, played around with the idea of finding the roots of Zarādushtī communism in Carpocratianism, and though he more or less renounced this view in his second publication,[190] it has since been revived by Caratelli, according to whom Zarādusht picked up Carpocratian ideas during his sojourn as Bundos in the Roman empire.[191] That these suggestions are strained in the extreme should be obvious. Christensen saw a reference to Zarādusht of Fasā in a bilingual inscription (Phoenician and Greek) from Cyrenaica in which Zaradēs is mentioned along with Pythagoras as having commended communism in respect of property and wives;[192] and Klíma cautiously followed suit in his first book on the subject.[193] But later he discovered that the inscription had long been dismissed as a fake, as had another (in Greek alone) in which Zōroastrēs and Pythagoras appear along with Maedakēs and others as commenders of communal life.[194] Even if Zoroaster were to turn up as a commender of communism in a genuine inscription, he was so widely invoked as a figure of wisdom in the Graeco-Roman world that his appearance along with Pythagoras as a source of exotic ideas would tell us no more about intellectual exchanges between the Roman and the Persian empires than does the legend to the effect that Pythagoras and other Greek philosophers had learnt their wisdom from Persian Magi.[195] The Carpocratian hypothesis is quite unnecessary too. For one thing, the idea of joint property and/or women is so simple that it is unlikely only to have been dreamed up once, all other occurrences being the outcome of diffusion.[196] For another thing, Zarādushtī communism was intimately linked with Zoroastrian speculation on Āz, concupiscence, which is the principal force through which Ahriman (the evil god) gains power over mankind and which represents both excess and deprivation, fulfilment in the right measure being the remedy against it.[197] Communal goods and wives were meant to diminish the power of Āz, as a heretic affirms in the Zoroastrian books; and the only objection his orthodox adversary could mobilise against it was that communism turns the socio-political order upside down: logically, the communist argument was unimpeachable.[198] That the Zoroastrians should have had to visit the Roman empire in order to develop such ideas is implausible in the extreme.

Finally, the modern tendency to dismiss accounts of Zarādushtī communism, or more precisely that in respect of women, as exaggerated by hostile reporters, twisted by malicious slander and so forth, is mistaken.[199] Obviously there are embellishments in the sources, such as Kavād becoming a Mazdakite because he fancied an otherwise unavailable woman or Mazdak provoking his own fall by asking Kavād for Khusrau's mother;[200] this is as might be expected. But there is nothing embellished about the simple claim that communal access to women was part of the Zarādushtī creed. On this there is agreement in Greek, Syriac, Zoroastrian and Muslim sources; and we may take the sources on their word, for the Zarādushtīs are the only sectarians of the Middle East to whom a

communist vision of production and reproduction is imputed.

It is true, of course, that numerous Gnostic sects both before and after the appearance of Kavād and Mazdak were accused of promiscuity and that the Ismā'īlīs of tenth-century Iraq and eleventh-century Baḥrayn are said to have been communists, the former in that they pooled both their women and their property on the eve of their ritual departure from non-Ismā'īlī society and the latter in that they organised themselves along communist (or semi-communist) lines on a permanent basis.[201] But neither the Ismā'īlīs nor their Gnostic predecessors, with the exception of the Carpocratians, are described as adherents of communist creeds. The Gnostics rejected the law as an instrument of salvation and frequently preached and/or engaged in the most outrageous behaviour they could think of by way of proving its irrelevance, with the result that they were routinely accused of promiscuity; and believers in messianic visions were apt to engage in the same kind of behaviour, partly because they shared the Gnostic view of the law and more particularly because ritual violation of deeply internalised rules is an effective way of burning bridges, or in other words of ensuring that the sectarians will have to stick together even though life on the margins may prove difficult and the messiah may fail to arrive.[202] But the antinomian behaviour rarely amounted to communism in either case, and there was no communism in the creeds themselves. The Ismā'īlī leader in Iraq who persuaded his followers to pool their women and property under his control accomplished the bridge-burning and united his followers in abject dependence on himself by one and the same measure: his communism was instrumental. We do not know what sort of permanent order emerged from his innovations, but in Ismā'īlī Baḥrayn, where the first (and apparently non-communist) attempt at transition to millenarian conditions was a failure,[203] a new order eventually emerged which had communist features too. Here the communism was not instrumental, or not anymore, but it was still a local vision of messianic society which the propounders of the official creed had not envisaged. One can deny that the Ismā'īlīs engaged in any communist activities whatever, be it in Iraq or Baḥrayn (and many scholars are suspicious of the reports) without greatly affecting our understanding of the Ismā'īlī belief system.

But in the case of Zarādushtīs, communism is presented as an integral part of the belief system itself, and one cannot reject it as mere slander without thereby causing the very creed to vanish: take away the communist vision of production and reproduction and what is left? Either we must accept that the Zarādushtīs advocated joint control of women and property, as the sources say (since one can hardly reject the claim in respect of women and accept it in respect of land), or else we must admit that all we know about their beliefs is that they included pacifism and vegetarianism, everything else being misrepresentation. But misrepresentations of what? If we take the sources to be indulging in stereotypes, the only stereotypes available are those associated with Gnostic and millenarian sects, but these have the merit of being instantly recognisable and they do not fit: whether a particular group did or did not go in for orgiastic nights, incestuous couplings, obligatory pederasty/wine-drinking/murder or the like is usually impossible to determine, but the nature of the charge is unmistakable; and it is not the charge we encounter in connection with the Zarādushtīs. Mazdak preached *qatl al-anfus*, but the reference is not to ritual murder. Both he and Zarādusht may have rejected Zoroastrian law, given the Gnostic tendencies of their sect, but the sources say nothing about it. The Zarādushtīs believed in communal access to women and property, but their views are described as utopian, not antinomian. It was only among the later Khurramīs that *ibāḥat al-nisā'* assumed an antinomian colouring (*ibāḥat al-māl*, or communal access to land, having been largely or wholly forgotten in the meantime), just as it was only among them that millenarianism made its appearance. It is precisely because the Zarādushtīs were utopian rather than antinomian communists that scholars such as Klíma and Caratelli were fascinated by the Carpocratians, who likewise incorporated communism in their very creed: the parallel is real even though the genetic relationship between them is fictitious. It is for the same reason that the Zarādushtīs cannot be presented as victims of a stereotype; on the contrary they *engendered* one: all communist tendencies in the Muslim world were automatically branded as Mazdakite borrowings. And it is not of course problematic that the Zarādushtīs were less communist in practice than they were in principle, whereas it is the other way round with the Ismā'īlīs. Neither Kavād nor Mazdak could hope to transform Sasanid Iran into a communist society in the sense of one in which resources were pooled under state control: the empire was too large and too complex for this to be possible, and too opposed to the attempt; however the vision was to be enacted, public ownership was not an option, and it does not in fact seem to have suggested itself to them.[204] But petty communities opting out of mainstream society in the name of a heretical creed were well placed to obtain a consensus on communist ways, even if these ways were not part of the heresy itself, and they were sufficiently small and homogeneous for public control of land and other resources to be viable. (There was no pooling of women once the transitional phase was over.)

In sum, sources of the most diverse kind are unanimous that the Zarādushtīs preached communal access to women and property, and many confirm that communal access to women continued to be preached

by the Khurramīs; some of the observers were contemporaries of the Zarādushtīs, others of the Khurramīs, and they were not invariably hostile;[205] their claim is specific, not stereotypical, and what they say makes sense. On what grounds, then, do we purport to know better, a millennium and a half later? The modern scepticism does not arise from the nature of the documentation, but rather from a deep-seated conviction that communist solutions to the problems of production and reproduction simply *cannot* have been proposed in earnest in Sasanid Iran.[206] But this is a matter of evidence: a great many things that simply cannot happen do happen.[207] To reject the evidence on the basis of an *a priori* conviction is to engage in a circular argument; and the circular argument leads to the absurd proposition that the sources invented an intellectually coherent communist doctrine in order to distance themselves from a sect which, whatever else may be said about it, certainly was not communist. We may take it that Kavād and Mazdak endeavoured to transform Zoroastrian speculation on the elimination of Āz into practical politics, as Molé said;[208] the question is not whether they made the attempt, but rather why they made it.

III

Kavād's communism is generally, and undoubtedly correctly, interpreted as an anti-noble measure.[209] Joint access to women, promoted in the name of the Zoroastrian faith to which practically all Iranian nobles were committed, offered a beguilingly simple way of curtailing the power of the nobility for a ruler who had no army with which to defeat or despoliate it, his only troops being those furnished by the nobles themselves. In practice, of course, the attempt was a failure, and Kavād would scarcely have made it if he had not been a very young man at the time: he was twelve or fifteen when he was raised to the throne,[210] or at any rate a minor (some dissenting views notwithstanding),[211] meaning that he was only in his early twenties when the Persians put an end to his experiment. But unconventional though it was, the experiment clearly formed part of the protracted effort of the Sasanid emperors to modernise the Sasanid state. Modernity from a Sasanid point of view was incarnate in Byzantium, which was highly centralised, wealthy and sophisticated by the standards of its Persian neighbours and which unwittingly induced the latter to reorganise themselves along similar lines by being almost constantly at war with them, the Sasanids being forced to imitate in order to keep up. Pērōz, Kavād's father, had incurred the enmity of the Zoroastrian clergy by attempting to introduce Roman baths,[212] which Kavād himself was also to sponsor too in due course,[213] presumably in much the same spirit as that in which Atatürk sponsored European hats; and Kavād is said to have engaged in a whole string of Byzantinising measures in his first reign, reducing his kitchen expenses in imitation of Julian and promoting agriculture in imitation of the Romans in general (though he hardly needed the Greek example as far as agriculture is concerned).[214] He is also said to have engaged in ideological market research, ordering each religious community in his realm to present him with a treatise on its faith, presumably with a view to ascertaining which religion offered the most appropriate aegis under which to effect the reorganisation;[215] and though he abandoned both his heresy and his openness to foreign religions on his restoration, he stuck to his efforts at centralisation: it was he who initiated the cadastral survey which culminated in Khusrau's celebrated tax-reform.[216] Khusrau was a Byzantiniser, too, for whether or not his tax reform was inspired by the Byzantine system,[217] he built an exact replica of Antioch in Iraq, populating it with Antiochene prisoners-of-war and proudly proclaiming it better than the original version;[218] and he took pleasure in upstaging the Greeks by offering hospitality to the pagan philosophers when Justinian closed their academy.[219] The Sasanid reaction to its Byzantine neighbour is an example of the well-known rule that military competition between states of similar standing is apt to engender political, social and cultural change;[220] and it is doubtless in this context that Kavād's heresy should be seen.

As regards Mazdak's revolt, however, we can only guess at its causes. But before we start guessing we need to establish where and when it broke out, a question on which there is some contentious evidence.

The sources generally assume the Mazdakites to have rebelled in response to Kavād's adoption of the Zarādushtī heresy, that is in the 490s, and to have been suppressed by Khusrau after the latter's accession, that is in the 530s. If Kavād's heresy and Mazdak's revolt were separate phenomena, we are left without a date for the beginning of the revolt, but its end is not affected. It is, however, to the end of the revolt that the problematic evidence refers.

The problem is caused by Malalas. According to this source, an unnamed Persian emperor was angered by the appearance of "Manichaeans" in his realm and summoned them to a meeting at which he had all of them massacred, including their "bishop" Indazarar, whereupon he gave orders for their property to be confiscated and for all Manichaeans elsewhere in his realm to be burnt along with their books; Malalas had this information from a Persian convert to Christianity by the name of Timothy.[221] That the "Manichaeans" were Mazdakites is hardly open to doubt; their bishop Indarazar (*andarzgar*, adviser or teacher) may well have been Mazdak himself;[222] and though it is unlikely that Zoroastrians should have wished to defile fire by

burning heretics and their books,[223] the claim that the Mazdakites were massacred at a meeting at court recurs in Arabic and Persian sources.[224] Malalas, however, places his account between the Antiochene earthquake of 528 and al-Mundhir's Syrian incursion of 529, meaning that the unnamed emperor is Kavād. By contrast, all Muslim sources credit both the meeting and the massacre to Khusrau, and almost all are agreed that Khusrau acted as king;[225] one version in al-Ṭabarī even says that he only took action when he was firmly established on the throne (*lamma 'staḥkama lahu 'l-mulk*);[226] and Khusrau was certainly king when he tidied up the social and economic disorder left by the revolt.[227] The History of Karka de-Bet Selok, a contemporary Syriac source, implicitly places the suppression in the reign of Khusrau too,[228] while the Christian Arabic Chronicle of Si'ird does so explicitly;[229] and it is also Khusrau who disposes of Mazdak in the Zoroastrian books.[230] How can Khusrau have massacred Mazdakites after his accession if Kavād had already done so in 528–9?

Nöldeke's answer is that the Mazdakites were suppressed twice, first in 528–9 by Khusrau in his capacity of heir apparent, and next some time after 531 by Khusrau in his capacity as king.[231] As regards the second occasion, Nöldeke notes that Malalas has a strange story that Khusrau granted *tolerance* to the "Manichaeans" at the time of his accession: the nobles and priests reacted by plotting to depose him in favour of a brother of his, whereupon Khusrau executed all of them.[232] This, Nöldeke thought, could perhaps be seen as a confused reflection of the second occasion on which Mazdakites were suppressed.[233]

But Nöldeke's solution is not acceptable. In the first place, it is one and the same meeting plus massacre which is placed in 528–9 by Malalas and after 531 by the Islamic tradition. Khusrau can hardly have massacred the Mazdakites twice in precisely the same manner; and if Mazdak was killed in the reign of Kavād under the name of Indazarar, how did he come to be killed all over again by Khusrau after the latter's accession? In the second place, it does seem a bit strange that an edict of tolerance should be used as evidence of persecution. And in the third place, Klíma is right that 528–9 is a most implausible date in view of the fact that the Persians were then in the middle of a war with the Byzantines. It was not an opportune moment for the emperor to start killing thousands of Persians;[234] and if thousands of Persians *had* been killed in that year, we can be sure that the Byzantines would have heard of it. "It has been customary from ancient times both among the Romans and the Persians to maintain spies at public expense; these men are accustomed to go secretly among the enemy, in order that they may investigate accurately what is going on, and may then return and report to the rulers": thus Procopius, who was in the field with Belisarius at the very time when the massacre is supposed to have been perpetrated.[235] But the Byzantines heard nothing until a Persian convert got talking to Malalas some forty years after Khusrau's accession. Readers of Abu 'l-Baqā''s recently published *Manāqib* may object that Nöldeke's reconstruction is confirmed by a passage in this text according to which "[Khusrau] killed Mazdak and his followers in the reign of his father and then again in his own reign, until he destroyed and exterminated them; but the truth (*wa 'l-aṣaḥḥ*) is that it only happened under Kavād, for he was weak".[236] Nöldeke would however have been the first to see that this passage does not make sense. The manuscript does not have *qatala*, "he killed", but *qīla*, "it is said", which should be left unemended while two missing words should be supplied (*an ẓahara* or the like): "it is said [that] Mazdak and his followers [appeared] in the reign of his father and then again in his own reign until he destroyed and exterminated them, but the truth is that is only happened under Kavād, for he was weak". Abu 'l-Baqā' was puzzled by the dual appearance of the "Mazdakites" and reacted by placing it all in the reign of Kavād. That was one way of bridging the gap between the Kavād's heresy and Mazdak's revolt, and it was quite possibly how Malalas' Persian informant had bridged it too.

Klíma, however, solves the problem by placing the bloodbath earlier rather than later, with reference to Theophanes. Theophanes tells much the same story as Malalas, but he adds that Kavād's third son, Phthasouarsan, had been brought up by the "Manichaeans" and that he made a bid for the throne with their help: the "Manichaeans" undertook to make Kavād to abdicate in his favour, and he undertook to uphold their faith in return. This was why Kavād (who is explicitly named in this account) killed "thousands upon thousands of Manichaeans is a single day", along with their bishop Indazaros, etc. Theophanes places his account in 523–4, and this is the date that Klíma accepts.[237]

Theophanes' Phthasouarsan renders Padashkhwārshāh, ruler of Ṭabaristān, the ruler in question being Kāvūs, Kavād's eldest son, not his third.[238] Assuming that Kāvūs was born in Kavād's first reign, it is not impossible that he should have been tutored in the Zarādushtī faith for a while; but given that Kavād was only in his twenties when he was deposed, the instruction must have ceased when Kāvūs was a mere child, and it certainly cannot have continued right up to his bid for the throne, as Michael the Syrian's version of Theophanes' story would have it.[239] Kāvūs was the natural heir according to Procopius, but Kavād did not want him to succeed, and his second son Jāmāsp was disqualified because he had lost an eye, so Kavād's heart was set on Khusrau.[240] At some point after the accession of Justin I in 518, he began negotiating with the latter in the hope of making him adopt Khusrau

and thus guarantee his succession.[241] These negotiations came to nothing, and in 527 war broke out again, so that when Kavād fell ill in 531 the best he could do was to write a succession document in Khusrau's favour, as Procopius and many later sources say he did,[242] or to crown Khusrau himself, as he did according to Malalas.[243] Kāvūs laid claim to the throne immediately after Kavād's death according to Procopius,[244] and staged a revolt at some point or other after Khusrau's accession according to Ibn Isfandiyār, claiming the throne with reference to his seniority and losing his life in the process.[245] Did he also conspire with Mazdakites some seven years before Kavād's death, thereby causing the Mazdakites (though not himself) to be massacred? This is what Klíma would have us believe, but his reconstruction carries no more conviction than does Nöldeke's.

In the first place, the Mazdakites can hardly have entertained hopes of making Kavād resign in favour of Kāvūs in 523-4, given that Kavād had by then revealed his willingness to go to extremes in order to ensure the succession of Khusrau. In the second place, and more importantly, Theophanes places the death of Kavād in 526. The interval between the massacre and Kavād's death is thus exactly the same in Theophanes as it is in Malalas: two to three years. Since Kavād did not die in 526, but rather in 531, the massacre should be moved from 523–4 to 528–9, the date at which Malalas puts it; or in other words, Theophanes' date is simply Malalas' date in a new guise, as Klíma himself saw even though he refused to accept it.[246] In the third place, what do we do about the fact that the non-Greek sources, be they Muslim, Zoroastrian or Christian, associate the massacre with Khusrau rather than Kavād? Klíma's answer is that Khusrau suppressed the Mazdakites in the reign of Kavād, acting as co-regent; but the sources on which be bases this conjecture are both exceedingly late and ahistorical, as he himself admits;[247] and if Khusrau was co-regent, how could the Mazdakites have believed that Kavād might resign in favour of Kāvūs? If morever the Mazdakites were suppressed in the reign of Kavād, why were they still around in the reign in Khusrau for the latter to grant them tolerance (according to Malalas) or to suppress them (according to the Islamic tradition), and why was it only in his reign that the chaos left by the rebellion was tidied up? Or are we to take it that *all* the sources are mistaken when they claim that something or other happened between Mazdakites and Khusrau in the latter's reign?

Let us start again. The massacre placed by Malalas and Theophanes in the reign of Kavād is identical with that placed by the Islamic tradition in the reign of Khusrau, and Khusrau is so firmly associated with Mazdakites in general and their end in particular that their suppression must in fact be credited to him. Khusrau did not however act as co-regent with his father, nor did the latter abdicate in his favour, except in the limited sense that Khusrau may have been raised to the throne a couple of weeks before his father died.[248] This may well have been the starting point for the stories of co-regency and abdication with which some sources try to bridge the gap between Kavād's heresy and Khusrau's accession, but it does not allow for any action by Khusrau against the Mazdakites before the year in which he actually acceded. In other words, Khusrau must have suppressed them in his capacity as king. It follows that Malalas must have misplaced his account of this event. Either his Persian informant shared the view of Abu 'l-Baqā' or else he himself got things wrong, being in general apt to do so; the unnamed emperor was at all events Khusrau, not Kavād, and the date was some time after 531, not 528–9. (Theophanes merely followed suit; spelling out the emperor's name as Kavād and getting the latter's death date wrong in the process.)

If the Mazdakites were suppressed in Khusrau's reign, by far the most reasonable conjecture is that the revolt broke out on his accession. For one thing, it was the kind of revolt that would rapidly paralyse the workings of the state, yet Kavād was engaged in war against the Byzantines from 527 until his death: clearly, both money and men could be raised in the normal fashion; indeed, Byzantine overtures of peace were vigorously rejected.[249] For another thing, it is precisely when rulers are preoccupied with succession disputes, civil war or other forms of splits within the elite that peasant revolts tend to occur. Khusrau's succession was problematic, as has been seen, and it continued to be disputed after he had been enthroned. His eldest brother Kāvūs rebelled against him, while others plotted to overthrow him in favour of a son of Jāmāsp, the brother who was disqualified because he had lost an eye.[250] That the Mazdakite revolt should have broken out in the course of all this makes excellent sense.

Khusrau made peace with the Byzantines as soon as he succeeded,[251] and there is every reason to believe Malalas' assertion that he made peace with the Mazdakites too, issuing some sort of a decree of tolerance for the Zarādushtī faith in order to buy time.[252] That this action increased the opposition against him on the part of the clergy and nobility, as Malalas claims, is perfectly possible too. At all events, he crushed the revolt of Kāvūs and foiled the plot in favour of his nephew, executing all his brothers along with numerous grandees of the realm (though the nephew is supposed to have escaped);[253] and being now firmly ensconced on the throne (*fa-lammā 'staḥkama lahu 'l-mulk*, as al-Ṭabarī says), he took on the Mazdakites: their revolt was suppressed and the chaos they had left tidied up. And once this was done, he took on the Byzantines too, resuming the war against them in 540.[254] By 540, then, it was all over. This fits with a passage in the Chronicle of Si'ird, according to which

Zaradushtism was still rampant in the period between Mar Aba's return from Constantinople, which took place somewhere between 525 and 533, and his election as patriarch in either 536–7 or 540, five or eight years after Khusrau's accession:[255] in that period Mar Aba did his best to warn the people of the Nisibis area against the doctrine of Zarādusht which taught that "all physical pleasures are licit".[256] This is certainly a reference to the Zarādushtī heresy, not Zoroastrianism,[257] and it lends some support to the view that Mazdakism was only suppressed after Khusrau's accession.

Were the Mazdakites really in league with Kāvūs, as Theophanes asserts? It is not impossible. A princely contender for the throne may not be an obvious ally for a rural mob on the rampage, but both were rebels, and their revolts must have been enacted about the same time. It does however seem more likely that the complicity is a later fiction. Khusrau may have used the Mazdakite revolt to destroy his brother's credentials, accusing him of complicity with the dreaded rebels and harping on his real or invented upbringing in the Zarādushtī faith, or later generations may have inferred the complicity from the sheer fact that the revolts were contemporary. The latter seems more likely given that the story fails to appear in Malalas, who wrote about 570, whereas it was known to Theophanes, who wrote about 800 and whose version of the Mazdakite bloodbath reflects other developments in the tradition: thus he is familiar with the idea of Kavād abdicating; and his statement that myriads of Mazdakites were killed "in one day" echoes that current in the Islamic tradition.[258]

As for where the revolt broke out, the *Dēnkard* implies that the rebellion affected all or most of Iran, but the passage is both vague and polemical.[259] Most of such exiguous evidence as we have points to Iraq. Mazdak may have come from Mādharāyā in lower Iraq; it was in the Nisibis area that Mar Aba encountered Zarādushtīs; and it was in Iraq (between al-Jāzir and al-Nahrawān) that myriads of Mazdakites were slaughtered in one day.[260] This is not to deny that the revolt may have spread to Persia itself: the later Khurramīs were concentrated in the mountains of western Persia,[261] and al-Iskāfī has it that Mazdak corrupted the population of Fars.[262]. But Iraq would seem to have been the centre.

What then was the revolt about? Some might argue that this question is superflous: since peasants always had grounds for rebellion against landlords, agents of the state and other exploiters, their perennial grievances are less important for explanatory purposes than the particular conditions under which they manage to take action against their oppressors.[263] The facilitating factors in our case were the disarray of the central government on the one hand (as argued already) and the availability of a religious message with corresponding organisation on the other; and as regards the latter, it seems reasonable to infer that Kavād's sponsorship of the Zarādushtī heresy had given it a boost which assisted its diffusion. But one would nonetheless like to know more about the specific grievances involved.

To Marxists such as Pigulevskaja, Klíma and Nomani, the revolt was a response to the break-up of the old commune in which land was held in collective ownership, the break-up being effected by landlords representing the forces of feudalism;[264] to non-Marxists, the complete lack of evidence for the existence of such communes in Iran precludes acceptance of the thesis: that the Mazdakite movement reflects "the interest and hopes of those reduced to dependent status" is obvious enough, but there is no particular reason to believe that the dependence was recent.[265] There had been a famine under Pērōz, with which the government is supposed to have coped admirably;[266] but this was some time ago, and the later famine which Firdawsī and others describe as the trigger of Mazdak's is probably fictitious.[267] The relationship between famines and revolts is in any case contentious. It is considerably more tempting to link Mazdak's rebellion with the cadastral survey initiated by Kavād. The fiscal reforms which followed the completion of this survey are described as having involved a change from payment of a proportion of the harvest, presumably in kind, to payment of fixed taxes in cash.[268] This is routinely acclaimed as the epitome of justice in the sources, and from the ruler's point of view, fixed taxes were of course highly desirable in that they made for a stable and predictable income. But it is precisely the kind of change that would threaten the peasants' livelihood, partly because fixed taxes removed the guarantee that *something* would be left for the peasants themselves to eat, and partly because taxes in cash forced the peasants to sell their crops, which in the vast majority of cases meant selling at the same time, with the result that prices would slump and that taxes could not be paid and/or that subsistence could not be ensured without ruinous loans from landlords or merchants.[269] There are no complaints about taxes in cash in the sources, be it because they were generally paid in cash already, or had come to be by Muslim times, or because our information is fragmentary in the extreme; but we are explicitly told that the shift to fixed taxes was a source of hardship. A story in al-Ṭabarī has it that when Khusrau solicited reactions to his proposed tax reforms, a scribe pointed out that he was putting a "perpetual tax on perishable things, such as a vine which may die, a grain which may dry up, a canal which may disappear or a spring or *qanāt* which may lose its water" (to which Khusrau reacted by having the scribe executed);[270] a tenth-century landowner from Nihāwand informs us that the Persians were horrified by the Sasanid shift from proportional to

fixed taxes (which he attributes to Ardashīr, the founder of the dynasty);[271] and the anonymous *Nihāyat al-irab* adds that the Iraqis found Khusrau's tax régime so hard to bear and protested so much against it that proportional taxation (*muqāsama*) was eventually restored.[272] Here then we have a change of the requisite kind.

Kavād did not live to complete his cadastral survey, and the sources generally credit the fiscal reform to Khusrau, who is said to have enacted it *after* his suppression of the Mazdakite revolt. Modern scholars are accordingly more inclined to see the revolt as the cause or facilitating factor of the reform than the other way round, the argument being that the Mazdakite disturbances broke the power of the nobility, thereby enabling the crown to reorganise the state.[273] But this argument rests on the assumption that the Mazdakites rebelled in Kavād's heretical phase and continued to be on the rampage for another thirty-five years thereafter (orchestrated by Kavād himself in Gaube's view). If Kavād initiated his cadastral survey before Khusrau was confronted with Mazdakites, we have the choice between arguing that the survey formed part of the aetiology of the revolt or else that there was no connection between the two phenomena, and the latter does sound improbable. Mere fear of the reform could hardly have generated a major rebellion. It is however likely that the reform was instituted piecemeal as the cadastral survey went along, in which case it was started by Kavād and completed by Khusrau, not instituted by the latter alone; and Kavād undoutedly started the survey with attendant reform in Iraq. Several sources, in fact, inform us that it was Kavād who instituted the new tax system in Iraq, or more precisely in the Sawād,[274] adding that he collected 150 million *mithqāls* of silver,[275] though others claim that it was Khusrau who collected this sum after Kavād had died;[276] and Kavād is also credited with the shift from *muqāsama* to fixed taxes in Fars.[277] He set up his tax office (*dīwān*) in Ḥulwān,[278] which he is commonly said to have built and in which the registers were kept until Umayyad times.[279] If the fiscal reform was initiated by Kavād himself in Iraq and western Persia, it is not surprising that the peasants of these regions rebelled under the leadership of a dissident priest as soon as an opportune moment presented itself in the form of a disputed succession. But Khusrau crushed the revolt and completed the reform, be it in a modified form or otherwise.

This would seem to be the best that one can do in the way of guesswork. Going beyond guesswork would be preferable, of course, but it is only in connection with Mazdak's revolt that the sources on Sasanid history afford us a glimpse of a real society at work, and they only show us enough to make us realise how little information was transmitted.

[1] The basic works are A. Christensen, *Le règne de Kawādh I et le communisme mazdakite* (Copenhagen, 1925) (summarised in idem, *L'Iran sous les Sassanides*[2] (Copenhagen, 1944), ch. 7); O. Klíma, *Mazdak, Geschichte einer sozialen Bewegung im sassanidischen Persien* (Prague, 1957); *idem, Beiträge zur Geschichte des Mazdakismus*, Prague 1977. See now also the helpful survey by E. Yarshater, "Mazdakism", in E. Yarshater (ed.), *CHIr*, vol. III (2) (Cambridge, 1983).

[2] "Mazdak: Historical Reality or Invention?", in *St Ir*, XI, 1982 (= *Mélanges offerts à Raoul Curiel*).

[3] Thus Th. Nöldeke, *Geschichte der Perser und Araber zur Zeit der Sasaniden aus der arabischen Chronik des Tabari* (Leiden, 1879), pp. 427 f. (In what follows I shall give the author of this work as Ṭabarī when the reference is to the translation and as Nöldeke when the reference is to the commentary). Kavād was deposed in 495 according to N. Pigulevskaja (*Les villes de l'état iranien* (Paris, 1963), p. 215), in 497 according to Gaube ("Mazdak", p. 111), and restored in 499 according to both; but neither offers any arguments against Nöldeke's reasoning.

[4] *Chronicle*, ed. and tr. W. Wright (Cambridge, 1882), §20; cf. A. Baumstark, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur* (Bonn, 1922), p. 146.

[5] *History of the Wars*, ed. and tr. H. B. Dewing, vol. I (Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1914), I, 5 1 ff.; cf. A. Cameron, *Procopius and the Sixth Century* (London, 1985), pp. 8, 152 ff.

[6] A. Cameron, "Agathias on the Sassanians", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* xxiii-xxiv (1969–70), pp. 128 f. = 129 f.

[7] Diakrinomenos, in G. C. Hansen (ed.), *Theodoros Anagnostes Kirchengeschichte* (Berlin, 1971), p. 157 (Epitome, fragment no. 557). The date of John Diakrinomenos seems impossible to fix precisely. His history ran from about 431 to 471 according to A. Cameron and J. Herrin (eds. and trs.), *Constantinople in the Early Eighth Century: the Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronikai* (Leiden, 1984), p. 39. But fragment no. 557 refers to Kavād's restoration and so must date from 498 at the earliest; and its wording reflects that of Procopius or Agathias (though he transcribes Kavād as Kōadēs where his two predecessors have Kabadēs), so it must have been written in the second half of the sixth century or later. Hansen places Theodoros Anagnostes/Lector in the early sixth century and dates the epitome of his ecclesiastical history, in which John Diakrinomenos is cited, to "probably after 610" (*Kirchengeschichte*, pp. ix ff, xxii, xxxviii).

[8] A. Scher (ed. and tr.), "Histoire nestorienne (Chronique de Séert)", part II, 1, in *Patrologia Orientalis*, ed. R. Graffin and F. Nau, vol. VII (Paris, 1911), p. 125.

[9] *al-Maʿārif*, ed. M. 'I. 'A. al-Ṣāwī (Beirut, 1970), pp. 291 f.

[10] *al-Akhbār al-ṭiwāl*, ed. V. Guirgass (Leiden, 1888), pp. 66 f.

[11] *Taʾrikh al-rusul wa 'l-mulūk*, ed. M. J. de Goeje and others (Leiden, 1879–1901), ser. i, pp. 885, 886 f. = *idem., Geschichte*, pp. 141, 143 f.; cf. also Balʿamī, *Tarjume-yi tārīkh-i Ṭabarī*, ed. M. J. Mashkūr (Tehran, 1337), p. 144 = *idem., Les prophètes et les rois*, tr. H. Zotenberg (Paris, 1867–74), [vol. II], *De Solomon à la chute des Sassanides* (Paris, 1984), p. 239. (This re-edition of Zotenberg's translation unhelpfully gives Ṭabarī as the author, omits marginal references to the original pagination and lacks volume numbers; but it has the merit of being generally available.)

[12] *Murūj al-dhahab*, ed. and tr. A. C. Barbier de Meynard and A. J.-B. Pavet de Courteille (Paris, 1861–77), vol. II, pp. 195 f. (ed. C. Pellat (Beirut, 1966–79) vol. I, §618).

[13] *Kitāb al-badʾ wa 'l-taʾrīkh*, ed. and tr. Cl. Huart (Paris, 1899–1919), vol. III, pp. 167 f. = 170 f.

[14] Ḥamza al-Isfahānī, *Taʾrīkh sinī mulūk al-arḍ wa 'l-anbiyāʾ*, ed. J. M. E. Gottwaldt (Leipzig, 1844), p. 56; Miskawayh, *Tajārib al-umam*, vol. I, ed. L. Caetani (in facsimile) (Leiden and London, 1909), p. 168; Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil fī 'l-taʾrīkh*, ed. C. J. Tornberg (Leiden, 1851–76), vol. I, pp. 297 f.; E. G. Browne, "Some Accounts of the Arabic Work Entitled 'Niháyatu'l-irab fī

akhbári'l-Furs wa'l-'Arab', Particularly of That Part which Treats of the Persian Kings", *JRAS* (1900), p. 226; Ibn al-Balkhī, *Fārs-nāme*, ed. G. Le Strange and R. A. Nicholson (London, 1921), pp. 84 f.; Mīrkwānd, *Ta'rīkh-i- rawḍat al-ṣafā*, vol. I (Tehran, 1338), p. 774 = *idem*, *The Rauzat-us-ṣafā*, tr. E. Rehatsek, part I, vol. II (London, 1892), pp. 369 f. (a confused account).

[15] The exceptions are al-Ya'qūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, ed. M. Th. Houtsma (Leiden, 1883), vol. I, p. 186, and the narratives B and C in Ṭabarī (Christensen, *Kawādh*, pp. 26 f.), where Mazdak is first mentioned under Khusrau.

[16] *Mazdak*, p. 135.

[17] Cameron, *Procopius*, p. 155.

[18] Procopius, *Wars*, I, vi, 1–9, where she is Kavād's wife. She is a sister in the Islamic tradition, and also in the Chronicle of Si'ird (Scher, "Histoire nestorienne", part II, 1, p. 127). But as Klíma notes, Zoroastrian marriage laws were such that she could have been both (*Mazdak*, p. 142); and she is in fact described as both in Bal'amī, *Tarjume*, p. 145 = 239 (he had a son by her); cf. also Mīrkhwānd, *Rawḍa*, vol. I, pp. 774, 775 = part I, vol. II, pp. 369, 370, where Kavād sleeps with her with Mazdak's permission, Mazdak being the inventor of incestuous marriages (a role also ascribed to him by modern Zoroastrians, cf. Christensen, *L'Iran*, p. 325).

[19] *Beiträge*, pp. 43 ff. (where Gaube's theory is rejected in advance: we are *not* to infer that Mazdak did not exist).

[20] Cf. Nöldeke's introduction to his *Geschichte*, pp. xv ff.; Christensen, *Kawādh*, pp. 22 ff.; Klíma, *Mazdak*, pp. 7 ff.

[21] *Beiträge*, p. 54.

[22] A. Tafazzoli, "Observations sur le soi-disant Mazdak-Nāmag", *Acta Iranica* xxiii (1984); the work in question is variously known as *kitāb mzdk/mrwk/mrdk*; Ḥamza assigns it to the Parthian period, so its subject matter cannot have been Sasanid; no book of Mazdak is cited in any account of Mazdak's revolt, and several references show the book of Marwak or Mardak to have contained wisdom.

[23] Cf. Yarshater, "Mazdak", pp. 994 f., where the fictional themes (here assumed to have come from a *Mazdak-nāmag*) are listed.

[24] He explicitly says that the translator who furnished him with the extracts from the Royal Annals had abbreviated his material, so that silence in Agathias cannot be taken to mean silence in the Annals; and his account of Kavād's law was clearly dependent on Procopius (Cameron, "Agathias on the Sasanians", pp. 114, 156).

[25] The Muslim sources have Kavād father Khusrau during his journey to the Hephtalites after his deposition, or on such a journey in the reign of his predecessor Balāsh; and since the latter journey is simply a duplicate of the former (Nöldeke, *Geschichte*, pp. 133 n., 137 n.), the story would imply that Khusrau was conceived in 498. But the story is obviously legendary. (For "an indication, if such be needed, that the tale is a fable", see Cameron, "Agathias", p. 158; incredibly, it *is* needed: the fable is regularly accepted at face value.) Some sources claim that Khusrau was seventeen, eighteen or nineteen at the time of his accession, meaning that he was born between 512 and 514 (cf. below, n. 52; S. H. Taqizadeh, "Some Chronological Data relating to the Sasanian Period", *BSOS* IX (1937–9), p. 130, citing 'Awfī). This may be equally unhistorical. Given that Khusrau died in 579, it does however seem unlikely that he should have been born in Kavād's first reign.

[26] Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 68 (where the Persians realise that he *raja'a ammā kunnā ittahamnāhu*); Bal'amī, *Tarjume*, p. 146 = 241 (where Kavād stops supporting the Mazdakites, though he continued to adhere to them in secret); Ibn Qutayba, *Ma'ārif*, p. 292 (where Mazdak is killed prior to Kavād's restoration to the throne); Maqdisī, *Bad'*, vol. III, p. 168 = 171 (*fa-tabarra'a minhum*).

[27] Nöldeke, *Gechichte*, p. 462.

[28] Mazdak seduces Kavād and is killed by Khusrau in the *Bundahishn* (B. T. Anklesaria (ed. and tr.), *Zand Ākāsīh* (Bombay, 1956), p. 277; missing from the translation of E. W. West, *Pahlavi Texts*, part i (Oxford, 1880)). He is disposed of by Khusrau without reference to Kavād in the *Bahman Yast* (B. T. Anklesaria (ed. and tr.), *Zand-ī Vohûman Yasn and Two Pahlavi Fragments* (Bombay, 1957), pp. 102, 106; West, *Pahlavi Texts*, part i, pp. 193 f., 201; Christensen, *Kawādh*, pp. 20 f.). Mazdak is also mentioned on his own in the *Dēnkard* (J. de Menasce (tr.), *Le troisième livre du Dēnkart* (Paris, 1973), p. 318; below, nn. 42, 112), and in the Pahlavi commentary on *Vendīdād* (below, n. 127), while Khusrau is also mentioned in the *Dēnkard* as having combated unspecified heresy and tyranny (West, *op. cit.*, part iv (Oxford, 1892), p. 415; Christensen, *Kawādh*, pp. 21 f.).

[29] Cf. Christensen, *Kawādh*, pp. 26 ff.

[30] These are mostly Muslim (cf. Christensen, *Kawādh*, pp. 26 ff.); but there are also two seventeenth-century Zoroastrian ones: a poetic account of Mazdak and Khusrau by a Kirmānī *dastūr* (in Dārāb Hormazyār, *Rivāyāt*, ed. E. M. R. Unvala (Bombay, 1922), vol. II, pp. 214 ff.; summarised by A. Christensen, "Two Versions of the History of Mazdak", in *Dr. Modi Memorial Volume* (Bombay, 1930); and the Parsee *Dābistān-i madhāhib* (Calcutta, 1809), vol. I, pp. 164 ff. = *The Dabistán, or School of Manners*, tr. D. Shea and A. Troyer (Paris, 1843), vol. I, pp. 372 ff. (on which see also *EI*², s.v. "Dabistān al-madhāhib"; Christensen, "Two Versions", pp. 86 ff.; below, n. 165).

[31] *Chronicle*, §20.

[32] *Wars*, I, 5, 1.

[33] Cameron, "Agathias", p. 128 = 129; Hansen, *Kirchengeschichte*, p. 157.

[34] Scher, "Histoire nestorienne", part II, 1, p. 125.

[35] H. Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, vol. V (Leipzig, 1861), pp. 420 f., on the revolt of Mar Zutra, who supposedly conquered Mahoza with 400 men and ruled it for seven years: the rebels were defeated because they had taken to drinking heathen wine and engaging in fornication at the courts of princes. Presumably this simply means that they had been corrupted by court life (similarly Klíma, "Mazdak und die Juden", *Ar O* XXIV (1956), p. 430). Besides, Graetz dates Mar Zutra's revolt to between 508–20 and asserts that the "Mazdakites" renewed their heretical activities after Kavād's return (*ibid.*, p. 12); but Kavād did not renew his, as has been seen, nor (one assumes) did the princes who had deposed him for his heresy, so the dating is incompatible with the interpretation. (Klíma, *op. cit.*, departs from Graetz in respect of dating and interpretation alike.)

[36] In Abu 'l-Faraj al-Iṣbahānī, *Kitāb al-Aghānī* (Cairo, 1927–74), vol. IX, p. 79, Kavād adopts Mazdak's doctrine regarding *ibāḥa* of women without reference to property; but the account is brief and hardly meant to be exhaustive.

[37] Pigulevskaja, *Les villes*, p. 198. Cf. also her handling, *ibid.*, p. 208, of P. Bedjan (ed.), *Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum*, (Paris, 1890–7), vol. II, p. 521 = G. Hoffmann (tr.) *Auszüge aus syrischen Akten persischer Märtyrer* (Leipzig, 1880), p. 52 (an episode explicitly set in the reign of Yazdgard II); and contrast her interpretation at pp. 218 ff. with the sober comments of S. Gero, *Barsauma of Nisibis and Persian Christianity in the Fifth Century* (Louvain, 1981), p. 21 and note 40 thereto.

[38] Christensen, *L'Iran*, p. 345. According to S. W. Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, second edition, vol. III (New York, 1957), p. 56, Kavād *only* engaged in redistribution of noble property, there being no evidence that he tried to enforce communal access to women!

[39] *Chronicle*, §§22 f.

[40] *Wars*, I, 5, 1 f.

[41] See the references given above, nn. 8–14. Cf. also the confused account in Eutychius, *Annales*, ed. L. Cheikho, part i (Beirut, Paris and Leipzig, 1906), p. 206, in which the Persian people consider killing Kavād *whereupon* he gets involved with Mazdak (here Marzīq).

[42] Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 69; Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, ser. i, pp. 886, 893 = *Geschichte*, pp. 141, 154; Ḥamza al-Isfahānī *Ta'rīkh*, p. 107; Maqdisī, *Bad'*, vol. III, p. 167 = 171; Miskawayh, *Tajārib*, pp. 168, 177; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, vol. I, p. 296; al-Tha'ālibī, *Ghurar akhbār mulūk al-furs wa-siyarihim*, ed. and tr. H. Zotenberg (Paris, 1900), pp. 598 ff. Cf. also the *Dēnkard* in M. Shaki, "The Social Doctrine of Mazdak in the Light of Middle Persian Evidence",

ArO XXXXVI (1978), p. 295 = 297 (previously, and rather differently, translated in de Menasce, *Troisième livre du Dēnkart*, p. 212), for a reference to someone, presumably Mazdak, gathering hungry rabble around him by means of religious propaganda and allowing them to plunder.

[43] Tha'ālibī, *Ghurar*, p. 598; Firdawsī, *Shāh-nāme*, ed. S. Nafīsī, vol. VIII (Tehran, 1935), p. 2301 = *idem*, *The Epic of Kings*, tr. R. Levy, revised by A. Banani (London, etc., 1967), p. 318.

[44] Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, ser, i, p. 886 = *Geschichte*, p. 142; Ibn Qutayba, *Ma'ārif*, p. 292; Maqdisī, *Bad'*, vol. III, p. 167 = 171; Miskawayh, *Tajārib*, p. 168; cf. also Eutychius, *Annales*, part i, p. 206; Tha'ālibī, *Ghurar*, p. 600.

[45] Maqdisī, *Bad'*, vol. III, p. 168 = 171.

[46] al-Bīrūnī, *al-Āthār al-bāqiya 'an al-qurūn al-khāliya*, ed. C. E. Sachau (Leipzig, 1923), p. 209 = *idem*, *The Chronology of Ancient Nations*, tr. Sachau (London, 1879), p. 192; cf. also Tha'ālibī, *Ghurar*, p. 598; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, vol. I, p. 297.

[47] Mas'ūdī, *Murūj*, vol. II, p. 196 (ed. Pellat, vol. I, §618); Maqdisī *Bad'*, vol. III, p. 168 = 172; Tha'ālibī, *Ghurar*, p. 605, cf. p. 606 (80,000); *Aghānī*, vol. IX, p. 80 (100,000); Ibn al-Balkhī, *Fārs-nāme*, pp. 90 f. (150,000).

[48] Procopius may of course be wrong, or he may have meant the mass of the aristocracy; but though one may discount his *plēthos*, one does not thereby create evidence for popular support.

[49] This dating is explicit in *Mujmil al-tawārikh wa 'l-qiṣaṣ*, ed. M. Sh. Bahār (Tehran, 1318), p. 73; Tha'ālibī, *Ghurar*, pp. 586 ff.; it is implicit in all the accounts in which Kavād is a heretic towards the end of his life, cf. *Aghānī*, ix, 79; Ḥamza al-Isfahānī, *Ta'rīkh*, p. 107 (contrast p. 56); Bīrūnī, *Āthār*, p. 209 = 192, and the continuation in J. Fück, *Documenta Islamica Inedita* (Berlin, 1952), p. 79; Niẓām al-Mulk, *Siyāsat-nāme*, ed. M. Qazvīnī and M. Modarresi Chahārdehi (Tehran, 1956), pp. 195 ff. = *idem*, *The Book of Government or Rules for Kings*, tr. H. Darke, London 1960, pp. 195 ff.; Christensen, "Two Versions" p. 322 ff. (the Zoroastrian poem); *idem*, *Kawādh*, pp. 44 ff.

[50] Niẓām al-Mulk, *Siyāsat-nāme*, p. 213 = 211; Ibn Isfandiyār, *Ṭārīkh-i Ṭabaristān*, ed. 'A. Iqbāl (Tehran [1320]), vol. I, pp. 147 f. = E. G. Browne, *An Abridged Translation of the History of Ṭabaristán* (Leiden and London, 1905), p. 93, with explicit reference to Niẓam al-Mulk; Christensen, "Two Versions", pp. 323, 325 (the Zoroastrian poem, which also has much in common with Niẓām al-Mulk).

[51] Ibn al-Balkhī, *Fārs-nāme*, p. 88.

[52] Cf. the *Bundahishn*, in Anklesaria, *Zand Ākāsīh*, p. 276 = 277, where Khusrau takes action against the Mazdakites on reaching the age of majority without reference to the position of his father); similarly *Mujmil al-Tawārikh*, p. 73 (where Kavād is still alive); compare the claim that Khusrau was seventeen when he deposed his father (the Zoroastrian poem in Christensen, "Two Versions", p. 323) or eighteen at the time of his confrontation with the Mazdakites (Niẓām al-Mulk, *Siyāsat-nāme*, p. 198 = 199). Klíma inferred from the Zoroastrian poem and Niẓām al-Mulk that Khusrau had ruled in tandem with his father ("Über das Datum von Mazdaks Tod", in *Charisteria Orientalia*, ed. F. Tauer, V. Kubíčková and I. Hrbek [Prague, 1956], p. 140); and it is presumably also one of these sources (in conjunction with the tale of Khusrau's conception referred to above, note 25) that lies behind Baron's claim that Khusrau he had acted as co-regent since 513 (*Social and Religious History of the Jews*, vol. III, p. 56). (Note, however, that Niẓām al-Mulk also describes Khusrau as eighteen when his father died, *Siyāsat-nāme*, p. 32 = 34.) But it is difficult to see how Mas'ūdī arrived at the idea that Khusrau was active in government already at the time of Kavād's restoration, in which he allegedly played a leading role! (*Murūj*, vol. II, pp. 195 f.; ed. Pellat, vol. I, §618).

[53] Cf. Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, pp. 67, 69; Ibn Qutayba, *Ma'ārif*, p. 292; Ṭabarī, ser. i, p. 886 = *Geschichte*, p. 142; Ibn al-Balkhī *Fārs-nāme*, pp. 84 ff. Compare Graetz, cited above, n. 35; Nöldeke, *Geschichte*, p. 462; R. Frye, *Ancient Iran*, p. 324. (Neither Christensen nor Pigulevskaja seems to have noticed the problem.)

[54] This view is explicit in Eutychius, *Annales*, part i, p. 207 (where the Mazdakites are massacred on Kavād's restoration, but nonetheless remain strong enough to wreak havoc in his kingdom, whereupon he dies); and it reappears in the secondary literature too, cf. R. Ghirshman, *Iran from the Earliest Time to the Islamic Conquest* (Harmondsworth, 1954), pp. 302 f.; J. Duchesne-Guillemin, *La Religion de l'Iran ancien* (Paris, 1962), p. 286; J. Neusner, *A History of the Jews in Babylonia*, vol. V (Leiden, 1970), p. 75, where Kavād's second reign is dominated by the struggle against the Mazdakites. Compare Ḥamza al-Isfahānī, *Ta'rīkh*, p. 107; Mas'udī, *Murūj*, vol. II, pp. 195 f. (ed. Pellat, vol. I, §617), which could be taken to imply the same, as could many other sources which fail to specify whether the Mazdakites came back or had been active all the time.

[55] Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, ser. i, p. 886 = *Geschichte*, p. 142; Bīrūnī, *Āthār*, p. 209 = 192; al-Iskāfī, *Kitāb Lutf al-tadbīr*, ed. A. 'Abd al-Bāqī (Cairo, 1964), p. 131.

[56] Browne, "Nihāya", p. 226.

[57] Bīrūnī, *Āthār*, p. 209 = 192, where the bait was a married woman Kavād fancied; cf. Ibn Qutayba, *Ma'ārif*, p. 292 (Kavād was weak); Niẓām al-Mulk, *Siyāsat-nāme*, pp. 32, 198 = 34, 199 (he succumbed to Mazdak's wiles); Tha'ālibī, *Ghurar*, p. 596; Ibn al-Balkhī, *Fārs-nāma*, p. 84 (similarly).

[58] Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, ser. i. p. 886 = *Geschichte*, p. 142; Maqdisī, *Bad'*, vol. III, p. 168 = 171; Miskawayh, *Tajārib*, pp. 168 f. (where this view is rejected); Christensen, *Kawādh*, pp. 29 ff.

[59] Thus Eutychius, *Annales*, part i, p. 206 (where Jāmāsp, spelt Rāmāsf, is one of his *akhwāl* rather than a brother).

[60] Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, ser. i, p. 886 = *Geschichte*, p. 142; Maqdisī, *Bad'*, vol. III, p. 168 = 171; Eutychius, *Annales*, part i, pp. 206 f.; cf. also Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, vol. I, p. 298; Christensen, *Kawādh*, pp. 29 ff.

[61] Ibn Qutayba, *Akhbār*, p. 292.

[62] See the summaries in Christensen, *Kawādh*, pp. 26 ff. (recapitulated in *idem*, "Two Versions", pp. 321 f.); Gaube, "Mazdak", pp. 117 ff.

[63] *Chronicle*, §20. (The view of Klíma, *Mazdak*, p. 156, that it reflects the name Zaradushtak, "little Zaradusht", is not right, cf. Nöldeke, *Geschichte*, p. 457.)

[64] Bedjan, *Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum*, vol. II, p. 517 = Hoffman, *Auszüge*, p. 49. On the date of the text, see Baumstark, *Geschichte*, p. 135.

[65] M. Molé, "Le problème des sectes zoroastriennes dans les livres pehlevis", *Oriens* XXIII-XIV (1960–1), p. 24 = 25. A fuller transliteration and translation of the same passage (deemed untranslatable by de Menasce, *Troisième livre du Dēnkart*, p. 31) is given in Shaki, "Social Doctrine", pp. 290 f. = 291 ff. where Zarādusht of Fasā has lost his patronymic, the word read as *Khrōsakān* by Molé being read as *d*ris(t)-dēn* by Shaki.

[66] Scher, "Histoire nestorienne", II, 1, p. 125; cf. p. 147, where Khusrau suppresses Zarādusht's doctrine and imposes Manichaeism! Other sources distinguish effortlessly between the Zoroasters (cf. Miskawayh, *Tajārib*, p. 177, where the heretic is called "the second Zarādusht"), and they have different patronymics too, so there is no reason to regard the one as a doublet of the other (similarly Nöldeke, *Geschichte*, pp. 456 f.; but Molé, "Sectes", p. 25, toys with the idea of identifying them nonetheless, and de Menasce, *Troisième livre du Dēnkart*, p. 31, follows him; cf. also Klíma, *Mazdak*, p. 172, n. 4).

[67] *Ta'rīkh*, ser. i, p. 893 = *Geschichte*, p. 154.

[68] *Tajārib*, p. 177.

[69] Ya'qūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, vol. I, p. 186, where Khusrau executes Zarādusht b. Khurrakān along with Mazdak; Browne, "Nihāya", p. 226, where he is a Persian nobleman supporting Mazdak. Klíma, who did not know the passage in the *Acta Martyrum* (discovered by Pigulevskaja), also describes him as a contemporary of Mazdak (*Mazdak*, p. 157); similarly Yarshater, "Mazdakism", p. 996.

[70] *Fihrist*, ed. R. Tajaddud (Tehran, 1971), p. 406 (where the younger Mazdak is the historical Mazdak).

[71] "Sectes", p. 25 f. with reference to Yasna, 19, 18 ("every land has a Zaradusht", sc. a religious chief) and the expression *zartushtrōktom* for the chief *mōbad* in Pahlavi writings.

[72] Mazdak is in fact supposed to have been a *mōbad*, or even chief *mōbad* (cf. the references given below, nn. 159–60). Another two Zarādushts mentioned in the Muslim sources are expressly said to have been *mōbad*s too (one in 379 A.D. and the other in the time of the caliph Mu'taṣim, cf. Nöldeke, *Geschichte*, pp. XXXIIIn, 457).

[73] *Mazdak*, pp. 166 f., with reference to the *Fihrist* (above, n. 70).

[74] Mazdak appears as the son of Bāmdād in the *Bundahishn*, *Bahman Yast* and *Vendīdād* (above, n. 28; below, n. 127), and in Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, ser. i, pp. 894 = *Geschichte*, p. 154; Ḥamza al-Isfahānī, *Ta'rīkh*, p. 107; Niẓām al-Mulk, *Siyāsat-nāme*, p. 195 = 195; Tha'ālibī, *Ghurar*, p. 596. Compare Ibn Isfandiyār, *Tārīkh*, vol. I, p. 147 (Bamdādān) = 93 (Nāmdārān); Bīrūnī, *Āthār*, p. 209 = 192 (Hamdādān); Miskawayh, *Tajārib*, p. 177 (Qāmārd); Dīnawarī's Māzyār is presumably also a corruption of Bāmdād[ān] (*Akhbār*, p. 69).

[75] Bīrūnī, *Āthār*, p. 209 = 192; Abu 'l-Ma'ālī, *Bayān al-adyān*, in Ch. Schefer (ed.), *Chrestomathie persane* (Paris, 1883–5), vol. I, p. 145 = H. Massé (tr.), "L'Exposé des religions par Abou 'l-Maâli", *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* xciv (1926), p. 36; Bal'amī, *Tarjume*, p. 143 (*az zamīn-i Khurāsān az shahr-i Nasā*; but cf. below, n. 78); Browne, "Niháya", p. 226. Christensen emends Nasā to Fasā and sees confusion with Zarādusht's provenance here (*Kawādh*, pp. 41 n., 99; *L'Iran*, pp. 337, 339 f.). But the form Nasā is too stable for this to be convincing.

[76] Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 67; Mīrkhwānd, *Rawḍa*, vol. I p. 774 = part I, vol. II, p. 369 (presumably from Dīnawarī, who is mentioned as a source at p. 776 = 371).

[77] Thus the thirteenth-century *Tabṣirāt al-'awāmm* cited in Schefer, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 158.

[78] Bal'amī, *Du Solomon*, p. 238 ("du pays de Khorâsân, de la ville de Nischabour"). But Mashkūr's text has Nasā (above, n. 75).

[79] Ṭabari, *Ta'rīkh*, ser. i, p. 893 = *Geschichte*, p. 154; cf. *ibid.*, p. 547, where MDRYH is wrongly supplied with a definite article which would make Christensen's reading of it as Mādharāyā even more difficult than it is. Christensen's suggestion (*Kawādh*, p. 100, with reference to G. Le Strange, *The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate* (London, 1905), p. 38) was cautiously accepted by Klíma (*Mazdak*, pp. 159 ff.).

[80] "Mazdak und Porphyrius" in their *Geschichte der Hunnen*, vol. III, Berlin 1961 (reprinted from *La nouvelle Clio* v (1953); also reprinted, in English, in *History of Religions* (iii), 1963) pp. 72 f.; cf. also *eidem*, *Ein asiatischer Staat* (Wiesbaden, 1954), p. 200. For objections, see Klíma, *Mazdak*, pp. 160 f. The seventeenth-century Kirmani *dastūr* outbids Altheim and Stiehl by making Mazdak come from India (Christensen, "Two Versions", p. 322).

[81] My formulation is indebted to Firdawsī on the "five demons" (*Shāh-nāme*, pp. 2303 f. = *Epic*, p. 319); but compare the *Dēnkard* in Molé, "Sectes", pp. 24 f.; Shaki, "Social Doctrine", pp. 290 ff.

[82] 'Abd al-Jabbār, *al-Mughnī*, vol. V, ed. M. M. al-Khuḍayrī (Cairo, 1965), p. 16 = G. Monnot, *Penseurs musulmans et religions iraniennes* (Paris, 1974), p. 164; al-Shahrastānī, *Kitāb al-Milal wa 'l-niḥal*, ed. W. Cureton (London, 1846), p. 193 = *idem.*, *Religionspartheien und Philosophen-Schulen*, tr. Th. Haarbrücker, (Halle, 1850) vol. I, p. 291; *Dabistān*, vol. I, p. 166 = vol. I, p. 377. On their common source, see below, n. 165.

[83] "The Mazdakites . . . . claim that God created the world as one creation and created for it one creature, that is Adam" (Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Malaṭī, *Kitāb al-Tanbīh wa 'l-radd 'alā ahl al-ahwā' wa 'l-bid'a*, ed. S. Dedering (Istanbul, 1937), p. 72). "All are God's servants and children of Adam" (Mazdak in Niẓām al-Mulk, *Siyāsat-nāme*, p. 197 = 197. Though the terminology is heavily contaminated by Islam, Mazdak presumably did argue something along those lines.

[84] Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, ser. i. pp. 885 f. = *Geschichte*, p. 141; cf. Ibn Qutayba, *Ma'ārif*, p. 292; Maqdisī, *Bad'*, vol. III, p. 167 = 170 f.; Tha'ālibī, *Ghurar*, p. 600; Miskawayh, *Tajārib*, p. 168; Eutychius, *Annales*, part i, p. 206; Bal'amī' *Tarjume*, p. 144 = 239.

[85] Shahrastānī, *Milal*, p. 193 = vol. I, p. 291; *Dābistan*, vol. I, p. 166 = vol. I, p. 377.

[86] Ibn Qutayba, *Ma'ārif*, p. 292; Ṭabarī, ser. i, p. 886 = *Geschichte*, p. 141; Maqdisī, *Bad'*, vol. III, p. 167 = 170 f.; Eutychius, *Annales*, part i, p. 206; Tha'alibī, *Ghurar*, p. 600; Firdawsī, *Shāh-name*, p. 2302 = *Epic*, pp. 318 f; Malaṭī, *Radd*, p. 72.

[87] Ṭabarī, ser. i, p. 893 = *Geschichte*, 154; Bal'amī, *Tarjume*, p. 144 = 239.

[88] *Tarjume*, pp. 143 f. = 239.

[89] *Siyāsat-nāme*, p. 198 = 197 f.

[90] Anklesaria, *Zand Ākāsīh*, p. 276 = 277; Ibn al-Balkhī, *Fars-nāme*, p. 84.

[91] *Geschichte*, p. 458.

[92] Scher, "Histoire nestorienne", part II, 1, p. 125.

[93] Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, ser. i, p. 886 = *Geschichte*, p. 141; similarly Ibn Qutayba, *Ma'ārif*, p. 292; Maqdisī, *Bad'*, vol. III, p. 167 = 171; Miskawayh, *Tajārib*, p. 168; Tha'alibī, *Ghurar*, p. 600.

[94] *Ta'rīkh*, vol. I, p. 186; cf. Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, ser. i, p. 893 (*al-ta'āsī fī amwālihim wa-ahlihim*).

[95] *Kāmil*, vol. I, p. 297.

[96] *Radd*, pp. 72 f.

[97] Niẓām al-Mulk, *Siyāsat-nāme*, p. 198 = 198. The tone is sensationalist and the example gross (cf. below, n. 113), but the claim is corroborated by Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, p. 406, on the Mazdakites of Muslim times: they do not deny a guest anything, whatever it may be.

[98] Mazdak wanted husbands to lend their wives to those who had none, and to swap wives from time to time with those whose wives were less beautiful than their own, or so at least according to the *Dabistān*, vol. I, p. 166 = vol. I, pp. 377 f. citing the *Dīsnād* (on which, see below, n. 165) without a shred of malice or sensationalism.

[99] C. Bartholomae, "Zum sasanidischen Recht. I", *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie* (1918), pp. 29 f., 36 ff.; cf. also *idem*, *Die Frau im sasanidischen Recht* (Heidelberg, 1924), pp., 14 ff. (accepted by A. Perikhanian, "Iranian Society and Law" in *ChIr*, vol. III (2), p. 650). Barthomolae's institution was first adduced in explanation of Mazdakite ideas by Christensen, *L'Iran*, pp. 329 f., 344 f. Yarshater, on the other hand, adduces *Vendīdād*, IV, 44, according to which fellow-believers, brothers and friends asking for money, wife or wisdom should be given these things ("Mazdakism", p. 997); but this is less interesting because the passage hardly claims that one should give them one's *own* wife.

[100] "The Sassanian Matrimonial Relations", *Ar O* XXXIX (1971), pp. 324 f.

[101] *Ibid.*, p. 331, cf. pp. 327, 340; cf. also the passages in Shaki, "Social Doctrine", p. 303 n. The various institutions designed to procure heirs for dead men are helpfully summarised in Perikhanian, "Society and Law", pp. 649 f., 653 ff.

[102] Shaki, "Matrimonial Relations", p. 330, on women as *stūr*s for life or for a limited period. Shaki does not relate this distinction to that between live and dead husbands; but whether *stūrīh* in favour of dead husbands could be limited or not, it stands to reason that a man who gave his wife in *stūrīh* in his own lifetime would want her back when the purpose of the *stūrīh* had been fulfilled. (For historical evidence of such "interim marriages", "wife lending", "rent an inseminator" or whatever else one might wish to call it, see S. Wikander, *Der arische Männerbund* (Lund, 1938), pp. 11 f.)

[103] It is hard for an outsider to avoid this conclusion. Shaki disagrees with Bartholomae on two counts. First, does the disputed passage say that a man may cede his wife to another who is in need *for* his children (Bartholomae) or to another who is in need *of* children (Shaki)? If the former, the recipient was a widower or divorcee unable to cope on his own; if the latter, he was presumably a man too poor to marry. The passage specifies that he must be in need through no fault of his own, which is compatible with either interpretation, but Shaki's interpretation is the more plausible: assisting a single parent may have been meritorious, but helping a man to have heirs was infinitely more important. Without male offspring a man could not pass the Chinvad bridge, so the fate of

his soul, not merely his worldly welfare, was at stake; placing one's own wife at the disposal of such a man would indeed be the height of charity. Secondly, did the first husband make a straight gift of his wife (Shaki) or did he lend her for a specified period (Bartholomae)? Here Bartholomae would seem to have the better case, for if the first husband had ceded all rights to her, the *Nīrangistān* (cited in Shaki, "Matrimonial Relations", p. 324) would hardly have found it necessary to explain that she was not allowed to cohabit with both men at the same time. Shaki asserts that Bartholomae's institution would have been regarded as a great sin, but the passage adduced in support of this contention (*ibid.*, pp. 338, 343 f.) speaks of a woman who *does* cohabit with two men; and his own *stūrīh* could clearly function as an interim marriage too. In short, just as a woman could be handed over to a *stūr* for the benefit of her own husband (alive or dead), so she could be placed at the disposal of a poor and kinless man who had no wife himself, remaining the legal wife of her first husband in both cases and returning to him (if still alive) after the task had been accomplished. Shaki seems to clinch this interpretation by quoting Isho'bokht as saying that a wife was like a fertile field which could be rented in the lifetime of its owner or after his death (Shaki, "Social Doctrine", p. 303, with reference to Sachau (ed.), *Syrische Rechtsbücher* (Berlin, 1907–14), vol. III, p. 97); but unfortunately the quote is incorrect.

[104] For Mazdak as a liberator of women, see Pigulevskaja, *Les villes*, p. 200; Klíma *Mazdak*, p. 186; cf. also Baron, *Social and Religious History of the Jews*, vol. III, p. 55, according to whom the Mazdakites insisted on the woman's free consent. But the Zarādushtīs plainly equated women with property, and it is only in connection with the tenth-century Khurramīs that female consent is mentioned (below, n. 114). When Shahrastānī says that Mazdak *aḥalla 'l-nisā'*, he means that he made women available to all, not that he "liess... die Frauen frei", as Haarbrücker translates (*Milal*, p. 193 = 291), followed by Pigulevskaja and Klíma (cf. the sensible comments of Shaki, "Social Doctrine", pp. 301 ff.)

[105] Cf. below, n. 114, and the twelfth-century Khurramīs in W. Madelung, *Religious Trends in Early Islamic Iran*, Columbia 1988, p. 10 (all women were available to everyone, but having two wives was a deadly sin).

[106] Cf. Yarshater, "Mazdakism", p. 1000, for a list of what *ibāḥa* may have meant if it is not to be understood literally.

[107] Cf. J. Darmesteter, "Le hvaêtvadatha", *RHR* XXIV (1891).

[108] Shaki, "Social Doctrine", p. 291 f.; cf. Molé, "Sectes", pp. 24 f. (both citing the *Dēnkard*).

[109] Maqdisī, *Bad'*, vol. III, p. 168 = 171.

[110] Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, ser. i, p. 893 = *Geschichte*, p. 154; Miskawayh, *Tajārib*, p. 177.

[111] Tha'alibī, *Ghurar*, p. 602; cf. Niẓām al-Mulk, *Siyāsat-nāme*, p. 203 = 202 f. The objections presented to communism here are almost identical with those in the *Dēnkard* (above, n. 108), and the context in which they are presented (a gathering of priests around Khusrau) is almost identical with that in the *Bahman Yasht* (Anklesaria, *Zand-ī Vohûman Yasn*, p. 102; Christensen, *Kawādh*, pp. 20 f.).

[112] Shaki, "Social Doctrine", pp. 293 ff. (a new translation of *Dēnkard* VII, 21, previously translated, though not very intelligibly, by West, *Pahlavi Texts*, part v (Oxford 1897), pp. 88 f., and briefly mentioned in Christensen, *Kawādh*, p. 22). As Shaki notes, this passage must refer to normal rather than revolutionary conditions ("Social Doctrine", pp. 304 f.); and since the heretics are explicitly called Mazdakites, it must refer to normal conditions after the suppression of Mazdak's revolt. (Shaki's interpretation ignores this point.)

[113] R. Fox, *Kinship and Marriage* (Harmondsworth 1967), pp. 100 ff., where other examples of matrilineal organisation are also discussed; Strabo, *Geography*, ed. and tr. H. L. Jones, vol. VII (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1965), XVI, 4, 25 (brothers are held in higher esteem than children, property is held in common by kinsmen, one woman is wife for all). Niẓām al-Mulk has it that if a man had sexual relations with a woman, he would put a hat on the door to indicate that the woman was occupied (*Siyāsat-nāme*, p. 198 = 198). This is told in connection with guest prostitution, clearly in a sensationalist vein (all guests at a party, even twenty, would visit the host's wife one by one!). But the custom has nothing to do with guest prostitution, nor is it presented as such in Narshakhī, according to whom the descendants of al-Muqanna''s followers in Transoxania would put a mark on the door when they were visiting other men's "wives" (Narshakhī, *Tārīkh-i Bukhārā*, ed. Schefer, (Paris 1892), p. 73 = *idem*, *The History of Bukhara*, tr. R. N. Frye (Cambridge, Mass., 1954), pp. 75 f., a remarkably sober account). Among the Nayar the men with visiting rights to a certain woman (of whom there were up to twelve) would indicate that they were visiting their "wife" by leaving a spear or a shield outside the house (Fox, *Kinship*, p. 101). In Strabo's Yemen they would place a staff by the door; cf. also the following note). Presumably there were customs of this kind in all polyandrous societies.

[114] According to him, the Massagetes of the Caucasus used wives promiscuously; if a man visited a woman, he would hang his quiver in front of her waggon (*History*, ed. and tr. A. D. Godley (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1920–5), I, 216; cf. the preceding note). Presumably they too were matrilineally organised, though Herodotus does not say so. Of the tenth-century Khurramīs of Jibāl, or some of them, we are explicitly told that they accepted *ibāḥat al-nisā'*, provided that the women consented (Maqdisī, *Bad'*, vol. IV, p. 31 = 29; cf. also Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, p. 406); but we are not told how they practised it or what their kinship system was. (*Pace* Yarshater, "Mazdakism", p. 1013, Maqdisī's information is based on personal information, not on heresiographical stereotypes; and it is not contradicted by the existence of marriage among the Khurramīs, still less by the Khurramī concern with purity, honesty and avoidance of harm to others!)

[115] Cf. above, n. 113. Narshakhi also mentions another local arrangement of a peculiar kind in this passage.

[116] Cf. Madelung, above, n. 105 (the area was Azerbayjan).

[117] Cf. *EI²*, s.v. "Khurramiyya".

[118] Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, ser. i, pp. 888, 889 = *Geschichte*, pp. 148 f., 150; Maqdisī, *Bad'*, vol. III, p. 167 = 170; Miskawayh, *Tajārib*, p. 171; Scher, "Histoire nestorienne", part II, 1, p. 125.

[119] Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, ser. i, p. 888 = *Geschichte*, pp. 148 f.; Scher, *op. cit.*, part II, 1, p. 124; Sebeos, *Histoire d'Héraclius*, tr. F. Macler (Paris, 1910), p. 4 (where his peaceful relations with his neighbours are explained with reference to the state of his army rather than his creed, neither Sebeos nor any other Armenian source displaying awareness that he was a heretic). On his supposed weakness, see also Ibn Qutayba, above, n. 57, and Abu 'l-Baqā', below, n. 236.

[120] Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, ser. i, p. 889 = *Geschichte*, p. 150.

[121] He started a long war against by Byzantines as soon as he was back and is said to have slaughtered a huge number of people on his conquest of Amida (Procopius, *Wars*, I, vii, 29; Joshua, *Chronicle*, §53).

[122] Shahrastānī, *Milal*, p. 193 = i, 291.

[123] *Kāmil*, vol, I, p. 297; similarly Mīrkhwānd, *Rawḍa*, vol. I, p. 774 = part I, vol. II, p. 369.

[124] p. 209 = 192.

[125] *Geschichte*, p. 460.

[126] M. Molé, "Un ascétisme moral dans les livres pehlevis?", *RHR* clv (1959), pp. 178 f., citing the *Dēnkard* and the Pahlavi *Rivāyāt*.

[127] The *Vendīdād* contains a long harangue against asceticism: having a wife is better than being celibate, having children better still, eating meat is better than abstaining therefrom and eating is better than fasting (J. Darmesteter (tr.), *The Zand-Avesta*, part i (Oxford, 1880), pp. 46 f.); the Pahlavi commentary explains "the impure heretic who does not eat" (i.e. who fasts) with the gloss "like Mazdak, the son of Bāmdād, who satisfied himself but abandoned men to hunger and death" (thus Klíma, *Mazdak*, p. 192; but cf. also the translations in Nöldeke, *Geschichte*, p. 460; Christensen, *Kawādh*, p. 20). Nöldeke, followed by Christensen and Klíma, read

the gloss as a reference to Mazdak's vegetarianism. But one would have expected such a reference to have been offered in explanation of the statement that "he who fills himself with meat is filled with the good spirit much more than he who does not"; moreover, Mazdak is said to have satisfied himself (though only in Klíma's translation); and vegetarianism can hardly be equated with hunger and death (*sōk u marg*). It seems more likely that the commentator had the dire effects of Mazdak's revolt in mind: the means of livelihood were destroyed, as Maqdisī says (*Bad'*, vol. III, p. 168 = 171). Presumably the gloss was triggered by the description of the non-eating heretic as someone against whom one should fight.

[128] Shaki, "Social Doctrine", pp. 294 f. and n. 61 thereto, 306. Though Shaki's emendation of the text may well be right, the statement that "they buy the milk of cattle" is not an obvious reference to vegetarianism.

[129] Maqdisī, *Bad'*, vol. IV, p. 31 = 28; Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, p. 406.

[130] Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, ser. III, p. 1228 = *idem*, *The Reign of Mu'taṣim*, tr. E. Marin (New Haven 1951), p. 52.

[131] Madelung, *Religious Trends*, p. 10.

[132] Shaki, "Social Doctrine", p. 294.

[133] Narshakhī, *Bukhārā*, p. 73 = 75; al-Nawbakhtī, *Kitāb firaq al-Shī'a*, ed. H. Ritter (Istanbul, 1931), p. 42; al-Baghdādī, *al-Farq bayna 'l-firaq*, ed. P. K. Hitti (Cairo, 1924), p. 163 = *idem*, *Moslem Schisms and Sects*, tr. A. S. Halkin, part ii, (Tel Aviv 1935), p. 90; Niẓām al-Mulk, *Siyāsat-nāme*, p. 243 = 244; Madelung, *Religious Trends*, p. 10.

[134] "Sectes", pp. 17 ff.; cf. *idem*, "Ascétisme moral", pp. 167.

[135] Shaki, "Social Doctrine", pp. 298 ff.; *idem*, "The Cosmogonical and Cosmological Teachings of Mazdak", *Acta Iranica*, xi, 1985 (*Papers in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce*); Yarshater, "Mazdakism", pp. 995 ff.

[136] *Chronographia*, ed. L. Dindorf (Bonn 1831), pp. 309 f. = *idem*, *Chronicle*, tr. E. Jeffreys, M. Jeffreys and R. Scott (Melbourne, 1986), p. 168 (xii, 42); cf. Nöldeke, *Geschichte*, p. 457, n. 1; Christensen, *Kawādh*, p. 97 n.

[137] *Kawādh*, pp. 96 ff; *idem*, *L'Iran*, pp. 337 f.; cf. Malalas, *Chronographia*, p. 429 = 248 (xviii, 9).

[138] Cf. above, n. 65.

[139] Christensen, *Kawādh*, pp. 94 f., with reference to Ḥamza al-Isfahānī, *Ta'rīkh*, p. 56; *Mujmil al-tawārikh*, p. 36; and Tha'ālibī, *Ghurar*, p. 602. For the uncertainty of the reconstruction, see Nöldeke. *Geschichte*, p. 135 n. It was also deemed unconvincing by Altheim and Stiehl, "Mazdak und Porphyrius", p. 75 and n. 8 thereto.

[140] Shaki, "Social Doctrine", p. 300, with reference to Miskawayh, *Tajārib*, p. 168, and Ibn al-Balkhī, *Fārs-nāme*, p. 84.

[141] *Lutf al-tadbīr*, p. 130.

[142] Similarly Altheim and Stiehl, *op. cit.*, p. 75 and n. 8 thereto (where it is however replaced by an even wilder theory); Duchesne-Guillemin, *Religion de l'Iran*, p. 286 (where the views reported for Bundos are nonetheless presented as Mazdakite doctrine in the next paragraph, Malalas being ranked with Shahrastānī as a key source on Mazdakite ideas!).

[143] Both Christensen and Klíma contrive to find an echo of it in Mazdak's view that light acts knowingly whereas darkness does not (Christensen, *L'Iran*, p. 340; Klíma, *Mazdak*, p. 183). But this is farfetched (cf. below, n. 180).

[144] Cf. Molé, "Sectes", pp. 17 f. Yarshater's explanation ("Mazdakism", pp. 997 f.) that the Mazdakites were known as Manichaeans because their enemies in Iran branded them as such is unconvincing (they are not branded as such in the Zoroastrian books) and at any rate superfluous.

[145] Molé, *op. cit.*, pp. 18 f., 25; cf. *idem*, "Ascetisme moral", p. 167.

[146] *Villes*, p. 198.

[147] *Ta'rīkh*, ser. i, p. 893 = *Geschichte*, p. 154.

[148] *Ta'rīkh*, vol. I, p. 186, where Khusrau kills Mazdak for his communism and Zarādusht b. Khurrakān for his innovations within Zoroastrianism (*limā ibtada'a fi 'l-majūsiyya*).

[149] *Fihrist*, p. 406.

[150] Joshua, *Chronicle*, §20. (Rejected by Klíma, *Mazdak*, p. 172, n. 4.)

[151] Scher, "Histoire nestorienne", part II, 1, p. 125.

[152] Joshua, *Chronicle*, §20. (Rejected by Christensen, *Kawādh*, p. 110.) Yarshater adduces Procopius, *Wars*, I, xii, 2–4, where Kavād tries to make the Iberians adopt Zoroastrian rites ("Mazdakism", p. 996 n.); but this passage refers to the period after his restoration, when he had ceased to be a heretic.

[153] *Fihrist*, p. 406.

[154] Molé, "Sectes", p. 14; Shaki, "Social Doctrine", p. 298.

[155] Bīrūnī, *Āthār*, p. 209 = 192; Abu 'l-Ma'ālī, *Bayān*, p. 145 = 36; Ibn al-Athīr, *Kāmil*, vol. I, p. 296.

[156] Mas'ūdī, *Tanbīh*, p. 101; al-Khwārizmī, *Kitāb mafātīḥ al-'ulūm*, ed. G. van Vloten (Leiden 1895), p. 37 f.; Bīrūnī, in Fück, *Documenta Islamica Inedita*, p. 79 (adding that it was in a metaphorical vein that the Manichaeans were likewise known as *zindīqs*); cf. Molé, "Sectes", pp. 1 ff., on the meaning of this word.

[157] *Siyāsat-nāme*, pp. 195 f. = 196.

[158] Shaki, "Social Doctrine", p. 295 = 297.

[159] Mas'ūdī, *Tanbih*, p. 101; Ḥamza al-Isfahānī, *Ta'rīkh*, p. 107.

[160] Bīrūnī, *Āthār*, p. 209 = 192; Khwārizmī, *Mafātīḥ*, p. 37; Niẓām, al-Mulk, *Siyāsat-nāme*, p. 195 = 195; *Mujmil al-tawārikh*, p. 73.

[161] As Yarshater notes ("Mazdakism", p. 997, with reference to Sharastānī, *Milal*, p. 193 = vol. I, p. 292).

[162] Cf. Ibn al-Faqīh al-Hamadhānī, *Kitāb al-Buldān*, ed. M. J. de Goeje (Leiden, 1885) p. 247; repeated in Qummī, *Tarīkh-i Qumm*, ed. J.-D. Tihrānī (Tehran, 1353), p. 89.

[163] Niẓām al-Mulk, *Siyāsat-nāme*, pp. 196 f. = 195 f.

[164] Molé, "Sectes", pp. 22 f. And note that *Zoroastrian* priests at the court of Yazdgard I are credited with an attempt at the same miracle when they felt threatened by the Christian Maruta (Christensen, *Kawādh*, p. 67; Klíma, *Beiträge*, pp. 55 f.; add *Chronicon Anonynum ad Annum Christi 1234 Pertinens*, ed. and tr. J.-B. Chabot (Louvain, 1920–37) vol. I, pp. 174 f. = vol. II, pp. 137 f.).

[165] *Dabistān*, vol. I, pp. 164 ff. = vol. I, pp. 372 ff. This is the only surviving account to be favourable to Mazdakism ("Mazdak was a holy and learned man"), so the author's claim to have used Mazdakite informants is hard to reject even though we have no other evidence that Mazdakism/Khurramism survived into the seventeenth century (cf. pp. 166 f. = 378, where we are told that they lived as Muslims and had both Zoroastrian and Muslim names, several of which are given). It was these informants who showed the author a copy of Mazdak's book, entitled the *Dīsnād*, which had supposedly been translated from old into new Persian. But when the author quotes from this book, he reproduces the same passages as Shahrastānī and 'Abd al-Jabbār (cf. above, n. 82, 85: below, n. 180 f.) except that he omits one of theirs (below, n. 172) and adds one which they do not have (above, n. 98). He cannot have lifted his *Dīsnād* passages from Shahrastānī (as implied by Shaki, "Social Doctrine", p. 301), let alone from 'Abd al-Jabbār, partly because several of his quotes are longer and partly because of the quote they lack. All three, then, must have used a common source. But if Abū 'Īsā al-Warrāq (the ultimate informant of Shahrastānī and 'Abd al-Jabbār) and the much later author of the *Dabistān* had independently excerpted a Mazdakite work entitled the *Dīsnād*, one would have expected greater diversity in the passages chosen. The common source must thus be Abū 'Īsā al-Warrāq himself, be it directly or (more probably) via Nawbakhtī, whose account was the direct source of Shahrastānī and 'Abd al-Jabbār (cf. W. Madelung, "Abū 'Īsā al-Warrāq über die Bardesaniten, Marcioniten und Kantäer, in H. Roemer and A. Noth (eds.), *Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Vorderen Orients, Festschrift für Berthold Spuler* (Leiden, 1981), pp. 210 f., 214 n.). Possibly, the Khurramīs had extracted Abū 'Īsā's account of Mazdakism from Nawbakhtī's work as a true statement of their own beliefs, translating it into Persian and eventually ascribing it to Mazdak himself; but where the title came from and what it meant is hard to say (Shaki's suggestion, "Social Doctrine", p. 301, that it reflects an original *D'rist-namag* is not persuasive).

[166] Cf. the tangle in which Klíma gets caught in his attempt to accommodate Christensen's theory: it is certain that Mazdak's doctrine arose out of speculation about the Manichaean faith (*Mazdak*, p. 183), but it is completely clear from the *Dīsnād*, Niẓam al-Mulk's *Siyāsat-nāme* and other sources that he based himself on his own interpretation of the holy texts of the Zoroastrians (p. 200); his speeches in Firdawsī are wholly Zoroastrian, but that was simply because Zoroastrianism was the only religious language the Iranians understood: he used it as a means of propaganda (p. 195); yet his doctrine cannot really be described as a reform of Manichaeism (p. 205).

[167] God made over the world to Adam so that he could "eat of its foods, drink of its drinks, enjoy its pleasures and marry its women"; and the sons of Adam inherited it in equal measure (Malaṭī, *Radd*, p. 72).

[168] *Kawādh*, pp. 102 f.; *idem*, *L'Iran*, pp. 342 f.

[169] G. Pugliese Carratelli, "Les doctrines sociales de Bundos et de Mazdak", *Acta Iranica* (1974), pp. 286 f.; Duchesne-Guillemin, *Religion de l'Iran ancien*, p. 286; *idem*, "Zoroastrian Religion", in *CHIr* vol. III (2), p. 892.

[170] Maqdisī, *Bad'*, vol. IV, p. 31 = 28 f.; Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, p. 406; Madelung, *Religious Trends*, p. 10; cf. also Malaṭī above, n. 167.

[171] *Milal*, p. 193 = vol. I, p. 291; Christensen, *Kawādh*, p. 103; *idem*, *L'Iran*, p. 342.

[172] 'Abd al-Jabbār, *Mughnī*, vol. V, pp. 16 ,65 = Monnot, *Penseurs*, pp. 165, 237; Maḥmūd b. Muḥammad al-Malāḥimī al-Khwārizmī, *Kitāb al-Muʿtamad fī uṣūl al-dīn*, ed. W. Madelung, forthcoming (cf. Madelung, "Abū ʿĪsā al-Warrāq"; my thanks to Professor Madelung for transcribing the relevant passage for me). The *Dabistān* does not cite Abū ʿĪsā al-Warrāq/the *Dīsnād* on this point.

[173] Compare Shahrastānī, *Milal*, p. 92 = 138, where the expression also refers to literal killing (the Najadāt held *taqiyya* to apply *wa-in kāna fī qatl al-nufūs*).

[174] The existence of Mazdakite asceticism is accepted by Yarshater ("Mazdakism", pp. 1013 f.), with reference to Shahrastānī on *qatl al-anfus*, which is not about ascetism (above, nn. 172 f.) and the Pahlavi commentary on the Vendīdād, the interpretation of which is doubtful (above, n. 127). I thus cannot agree with Madelung that a current of asceticism among the Khurramīs is "well attested" (*Religious Trends*, p. 5, with reference to Yarshater). Shaki also accepts Mazdakite asceticism, though on what grounds is not clear ("Cosmogonical and Cosmological Teachings", p. 543, cf. p. 528).

[175] *Rawḍa*, vol. I, p. 774 = part I, vol. II, p. 369.

[176] Madelung, *Religious Trends*, p. 6 (on the Māhāniyya).

[177] Cf. above, n. 122.

[178] Cf. above, n. 129.

[179] Shahrastānī, *Milal*, pp. 192 f. = vol. I, p. 291.

[180] According to Abū ʿĪsā al-Warraq, he differed from the Manichaeans in that in his view light had a will and acted knowingly whereas darkness did not (Shahrastānī, *Milal*, p. 193 = vol. I, p. 291; 'Abd al-Jabbār, *Mughnī*, vol. V, p. 16 = Monnot, *Penseurs*, p. 165; *Dabistān*, vol. I, p. 165 = vol. I, p. 375 (with reference to Mazdak's *Dīsnād*). Abū 'Isā reports the same view for the Daisānites, once more noting that it was not Manichaean (the divergence being over the nature of darkness, not that of light), cf. Madelung, "Abū ʿĪsā al-Warrāq", p. 212. For its Zoroastrian origins, see Shaki, "Cosmogonical and Cosmological Teachings", pp. 529 f.

[181] Shahrastānī, *Milal*, pp. 193 = vol. I, pp. 291 ff.; *Dabistān*, vol. I, pp. 165 f. = vol. I, pp. 375 ff.; cf. H. Halm, "Die Sieben und die Zwölf. Die ismāʿīlitische Kosmogonie und das Mazdak-Fragment des Šahrastānī", in *XVIII. Deutscher Orientalistentag*, ed. W. Voigt (Wiesbaden, 1974); Shaki, "Cosmogonical and Cosmological Teachings". In Madelung's opinion, this part of Shahrastānī's account does not go back to Abū ʿĪsā, but rather to an unknown informant ("Abū ʿĪsā al-Warrāq", p. 221n.); however, the fact that it is also found in the *Dabistān* could be taken to suggest that Abū 'Isā was the source after all (cf. above, n. 165).

[182] Altheim and Stiel, "Mazdak and Porphyrius".

[183] "Abū ʿĪsā al-Warrāq", p. 224.

[184] Yarshater, "Mazdakism", pp. 1006 ff.; Madelung, *Religious Trends*, p. 10.

[185] Maqdisī, *Bad'*, vol. II, pp. 20 f. = 20; compare Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, p. 394 (cited in G. Flügel, *Mani, seine Lehre und seine Schriften* (Leipzig, 1862), pp. 8 f.); Scher, "Histoire nestorienne", part I, 1, in *PO*, vol. IV (Paris, 1908), p. 227 = 226; G. Widengren, "Manichaeism", in *CHIr*, vol. III (2), p. 978. The Manichaeans also regarded the sun as a carrier of souls/light.

[186] Reincarnation of the soul and periodic incarnation of the deity were ideas with a wide diffusion in the pre-Islamic Near East, and the concept of the moon as a carrier of souls is likely to have been widely diffused too. The idea was Indian and linked with reincarnation from the start (cf. Kauṣītakī Upaniṣad, I, 2, in F. M. Müller (tr.), *The Upaniṣads*, vol. I (Oxford, 1879) (reprinted New York, 1962), p. 273 f.)

[187] Rekaya's view that the Khurramīs originated within Islam is evidently also mistaken (M. Rekaya, "Le *Ḫurram-dīn* et les *ḫurramites* sous les 'Abbāsides", *Studia Islamica* LX (1984)).

[188] Kavād legislated that women should be held in common "not, I'm sure, according to the argument of Plato and Socrates or for the hidden benefit in their proposal, but so that anyone could consort with whichever one he liked" (Cameron, "Agathias on the Sasanians", p. 128 = 129).

[189] Altheim and Stiehl, "Mazdak und Porphyrius", pp. 76 ff. (cf. Baumstark, *Geschichte*, pp. 124 f., on Bud). The whole article is a star example of what one might call philological *ḫurūfiyya*.

[190] *Mazdak*, pp. 209 ff. (favoured by Yarshater, "Mazdakism", p. 1020); *idem*, *Beiträge*, p. 129, n. 20.

[191] "Doctrines sociales", pp. 288 ff.

[192] *L'Iran*, p. 339 n., with reference to W. Sherwood Fox, "Passages in Greek and Latin Literature relating to Zoroaster and Zoroastrianism", *Journal of the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute* (Bombay), XIV (1929), p. 118.

[193] *Mazdak*, p. 211 f.

[194] *Idem*, *Beiträge*, pp. 122 ff.

[195] Cf. F. Cumont, *Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism* (New York, 1956), p. 138; cf. also J. Bidez and F. Cumont, *Les mages hellénisés* (Paris, 1938).

[196] I hope to publish, jointly with John Hall, a volume of conference papers on the attestation of such ideas throughout the pre-industrial world.

[197] Molé, "Ascétisme moral", pp. 162 ff.; *idem*., 'Sectes', pp. 24 f.

[198] Shaki, "Social Doctrine", pp. 291 ff.; Molé, "Sectes", pp. 24 f. (both citing the *Dēnkard*).

[199] See for example A. Bausani, *The Persians* (London, 1971) p. 63; Frye, "The Political History of Iran under the Sasanians" in *CHIr*, vol. III (1), p. 150; H. Kennedy, *The Prophet and the Age of the Caliphates* (London, 1986), p. 9; cf. also Duchesne-Guillemin, "Zoroastrian Religion", p. 892; Yarshater, "Mazdakism", pp. 999 f., 1013 (contrast p. 1020).

[200] Cf. above, n. 57 (the unavailable woman); Christensen, *Kawādh*, p. 59 (Khusrau's mother).

[201] This topic will be dealt with by H. Halm in the volume referred to above, n. 196. In the meantime, see B. Lewis, *The Origins of Ismāʿīlism* (Cambridge, 1940), pp. 96 ff.

[202] The most famous modern example is Patricia Hearst, the American heiress who was kidnapped by a revolutionary group and signalled her conversion to the creed of her kidnappers by raiding a bank. This was obviously meant as an irrevocable act, partly in that she would be jailed and partly in that she would be deeply ashamed of her behaviour if she returned to normal society; but as the daughter of a newspaper magnate she only found it difficult, not impossible, to rebuild her bridges.

[203] Cf. Bīrūnī, *Āthār*, p. 213 = 196. Compare the analysis of the transitional stage in millenarian movements in K. Burridge, *New Heaven, New Earth* (Oxford, 1969), pp. 167 ff.

[204] Some might wish to deny that the Zarādushtīs were communists on this ground; but this is to adopt a narrow definition of

communism which does not, of course, disprove that the Zarādushtīs believed in communal access to the means of production and reproduction.

[205] The author of the *Dabistān* was highly sympathetic, though unfortunately also late (cf. above, n. 165). Maqdisī was a good scholar who did field-work on the Khurramīs and presented their doctrines as seen by his informants (cf. above, n. 114). Narshakhī was horrified by al-Muqanna', but simply curious about the odd habits of the sectarians he had left behind (cf. above, n. 113).

[206] This is clear from the fact that most of the scepticism is directed at the tenet on women, not that on land, for all that the tenet on women is far better attested. For the degree to which modern convictions shape the evidence rather than the other way round, see above n. 38.

[207] To historians of twentieth-century Europe writing a millennium and a half after the event, it will be obvious that the Nazi mass murder of Jews simply cannot have taken place. It does not fit the general picture of Europe (were Jews not highly assimilated?); we owe the claim to hostile sources (the victors); it is a patent exaggeration (who could believe it?); and both contemporary and slightly later sources reveal the existence of sober observers who denied it.

[208] Cf. his "Ascétisme moral", p. 167.

[209] Thus already Nöldeke, *Geschichte*, p. 459.

[210] Browne, "Nihāya", p. 226 (twelve); Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 66 (fifteen).

[211] Ya'qūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, vol. I, p. 185; cf. Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, ser. i, p. 885 = *Geschichte*, p. 139, and the comments of Christensen, *Kawādh*, pp. 34 f., thereto. Malalas claims that Kavād was 82 when he died (*Chronographia*, p. 471 = 274 (xviii, 68), and Firdawsī has it that he was 80 (*Shāh-nāme*, p. 2308), meaning that he was in his late thirties on his accession. This was accepted by Nöldeke (*Geschichte*, p. 143 n.) and Christensen (*Kawādh*, p. 93 n.); but it seems unlikely in view of the fact that he died in the field without there being any comments on his frailty.

[212] Joshua, *Chronicle*, §19.

[213] *Ibid.*, §75 (after his conquest of Amida, where he tried a public bath).

[214] Scher, "Histoire nestorienne", part II, 1, p. 125. Promotion of agriculture was an activity in which Zoroastrian kings were traditionally expected to engage.

[215] *Ibid.*, part II, 1, p. 126.

[216] Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, ser. i. p. 960 = *Geschichte*, pp. 241 f.; Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 72; Mas'ūdi, *Tanbīh*, pp. 101 f.; Ibn Ḥawqal, *Kitāb Ṣūrat al-arḍ*, ed. J. H. Kramers (Leiden, 1938–9), vol. II, pp. 303 f.; Qummī, *Tārīkh-i Qumm*, pp. 179 f.

[217] A Byzantine inspiration was proposed by Altheim and Stiehl, "Staatshaushalt der Sasaniden", *La nouvelle Clio*, v (1953), pp. 312 f.; *eidem*, *Finanzgeschichte der Spätantike* (Frankfurt am Main, 1957), pp. 40 ff.; *eidem*, *Asiatischer Staat*, pp. 39 ff.; Pigulevskaja came to the same conclusion in an untranslated work, according to I. Hahn, "Sassanidische und Spätrömische Besteuerung", *Acta Antiqua* (Budapest) vii (1959), p. 149; Hahn argues against it.

[218] Christensen, *L'Iran*, pp. 386 f.

[219] Cameron, "Agathias on the Sasanians", 164 ff. = 165 ff., and the comments thereto.

[220] See for example J. A. Hall, *Powers and Liberties* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 139 f.

[221] *Chronographia*, p. 444 = 258 f. (xviii, 30).

[222] Nöldeke, *Geschichte*, p. 462 n.; Christensen, *Kawādh*, pp. 123 f.; Klíma "Mazdak's Tod", p. 137.

[223] As Klíma rightly notes (*ibid.*, p. 137; cf. the Greek references to Zoroastrian prohibition of cremation cited in Cameron, *op. cit.*, p. 99.

[224] Niẓām al-Mulk, *Siyāsat-nāme*, pp. 210 ff. = 209 ff.; Ibn al-Balkhī, *Fārs-nāme*, pp. 90 f.; Mīrkhwānd, *Rawḍa*, vol. I, pp. 778 f. = 373 f.; Christensen, "Two Versions", p. 325 (the Zoroastrian poem); cf. also above, n. 47, on the huge numbers of Mazdakites slaughtered in one day; Christensen, *Kawādh*, pp. 124 ff.

[225] For the exceptions, see above, n. 52.

[226] *Ta'rīkh*, ser. i, p. 893 = *Geschichte*, pp. 153 f.; the alternative tradition (*ibid.*, pp. 896 f. = 161) has him take action as soon as the crown was on his head.

[227] Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, ser. i, p. 897 = *Geschichte*, pp. 163 f.; Eutychius, *Annales*, part i, p. 207; cf. also Ibn Qutayba, *Ma'ārif*, p. 292; Christensen, *Kawādh*, pp. 122 f.

[228] The heresy is here said to have existed now openly and now in secret until the time of Khusrau, presumably meaning that it was suppressed in his reign (cf. the reference given above, note 64).

[229] Scher, "Histoire nestorienne", part II, 1, p. 147 (with the confusion referred to above, n. 66).

[230] Cf. above, n. 28.

[231] *Geschichte*, pp. 462 ff. Nöldeke's reconstruction has been generally accepted in the sense that the end of the revolt is usually placed in 528–9, the second suppression being forgotten (cf. Christensen, *Kawādh*, p. 124; *idem*, *L'Iran*, pp. 359 f.; Pigulevskaja, *Les villes*, p. 218; Altheim and Stiehl, "Mazdak and Porphyrius", p. 71; Neusner, *Jews in Babylonia*, vol. V, p. 75; Yarshater, "Mazdakism", pp. 1021 f.).

[232] Malalas, *Chronographia*, p. 471 = 274 (xviii, 69).

[233] *Geschichte*, p. 466.

[234] "Mazdaks Tod", p. 138.

[235] *Wars*, I, xxi, 11.

[236] Abu 'l-Baqā' Hibat Allāh, *Kitāb al-Manāqib al-mazyadiyya fī akhbār al-mulūk al-asadiyya*, ed. S. M. Darāka and M. 'A.-Q. Kharīsāt ('Ammān, 1984), vol. I, p. 121. On Kavād's reputation for weakness, see above, nn. 57, 119.

[237] Theophanes, *Chronographia*, ed. C. de Boor (Leipzig, 1883–5), vol. I, pp. 169 f. (A. M. 6016); Klíma, "Mazdaks Tod", pp. 139 f.

[238] Christensen, *Kawādh*, p. 117; *idem*, *L'Iran*, p. 353; Procopius, *Wars*, I, xi, 3. Theophanes' claim that Kāvūs was Kavād's son by a daughter is thus implausible.

[239] *Chronique*, ed. and tr. J.-B. Chabot (Paris, 1899–1910), vol. IV, p. 278 = vol. II, p. 190. In the Armenian version of Michael the Syrian and the Chronicle of 1234 it is *Khusrau* who is being tutored by "Manichaeans", presumably because Malalas had identified the son in question as the third rather than the first (M. K. Patkanian, "Essai d'une Histoire de la dynastie sassanides", *JA* VII (1866), p. 179; *Chronicon ad 1234*, vol. I, p. 193 = vol. II, pp. 152 f.). Hence Neusner's claim that Khusrau had been brought up in the Mazdakite religion (*Jews in Babylonia*, vol. V, p. 78).

[240] *Wars*, I, xi, 3 ff.

[241] *Ibid.*, I, xi, 6 ff. Arcadius is said previously to have used a similar ploy to secure the succession of his son Theodosius, appointing Yazdgard his guardian (Cameron," Agathias on the Sasanians," p. 124 = 125; cf. the discussion of both cases at p. 149).

[242] *Wars*, I, xxi, 19; Scher, "Histoire nestorienne", part II, 1, p. 146; Ya'qūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, vol. I, p. 186 (where the *waṣiyya* is understood as moral advice); Bal'amī, *Tarjume*, p. 146 = 241; Firdawsī, *Shāh-nāme*, pp. 2307 f.; Browne, "Nihāya", p. 227; Mīrkhwānd, *Rawḍa*, p. 777 = 272; cf. Christensen, *L'Iran*, p. 362 n.

[243] *Chronographie*, p. 471 = 274 (xviii, 68); compare Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 69.

[244] *Wars*, I, xxi, 20.

[245] *Tārīkh*, vol. I, pp. 148 ff. = 93 f.

[246] "Mazdaks Tod", p. 140.

[247] *Loc. cit.*, with reference to Niẓām al-Mulk, Firdawsī and the sixteenth-century Zoroastrian poem (cf. above, n. 52).

[248] Cf. Taqizadeh, "Some Chronological Data", pp. 128 ff., where it is calculated (on the basis of Malalas himself and other sources) that Khusrau acceded on 18 August, 531, three weeks before Kavād's death in mid-September.

[249] Procopius, *Wars*, I, xiv, 1 ff.; xxi, 1.

[250] For Kāvūs, see above, nn. 244 f.; for the son of Jāmāsp, see Procopius, *Wars*, I, xxiii, 1 ff.

[251] *Ibid.*, I, xxi, 23 ff.; xxii, 1 ff.; Malalas, *Chronographia*, p. 471 = 274 (xviii, 68). The so-called "endless peace" was ratified in 532.

[252] It might be argued that Malalas' story of Khusrau granting tolerance to "Manichaeans" reflects the same confusion between

Zoroastrians and Zarādushtīs as that which prevails in the Chronicle of Si'ird, where the suppression of Zarādushtism is taken to mean that Khusrau must have established Manichaeism (above, n. 66). But this interpretation is awkward in view of Malalas' statement that Khusrau's decree of tolerance alienated the *magoi*: "Manichaeans" does seem to mean Mazdakites here, not Zoroastrians.

[253] Procopius, *Wars*, I, xxi, 20 and xxiii, 1 ff.; Scher, "Histoire nestorienne", part II, 1, pp. 146 f.

[254] Procopius, *Wars*, II, i, 1 ff.;

[255] Scher, *op. cit*, part II, 1, pp. 156 f., and notes 1 and 3 thereto. According to N. Pigulevskaya, "Mar Aba I, une page de l'histoire de la civilisation au VIe siècle l'ère nouvelle", *Mélanges d'Orientalisme offerts à Henri Massé* (Tehran, 1963), p. 330, he became patriarch in 540.

[256] Scher, *op. cit.*, part II, 1, p. 157 (*al-mubāḥ fīhi 'l-lidhdhāt al-jismāniyya*).

[257] There is no reference to licentiousness in Mar Aba's dispute with a Magian *ibid.*, part II, 1, pp. 164 ff.).

[258] Compare the references given above, n. 47.

[259] Shaki, "Social Doctrine", p. 295 = 297.

[260] Cf. above, nn. 47, 79, 256; Nöldeke, *Geschichte*, p. 465.

[261] Cf. EI², s.v. "Khurramiyya".

[262] *Lutf al-tadbīr*, pp. 130 f.

[263] Cf. T. Scocpol, *States and Social Revolutions* (Cambridge, 1979), p. 115.

[264] Klíma, *Mazdak*, p. 196; Pigulevskaja, *Villes*, pp. 195, 209; F. Nomani "Notes on the Origins and Development of Extra-Economic Obligations of Peasants in Iran, 300–1600 A.D.", *Iranian Studies* ix (1976), pp. 122 f. For Engels' view that common ownership had been a feature of all primitive societies from India to Iceland, see B. O'Leary, *The Asiatic Mode of Production* (Oxford, 1989), pp. 145 f.

[265] Cf. Nomani, "Notes", p. 123.

[266] Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, ser. i, pp. 837 f. = *Geschichte*, pp. 121 f.; cf. Anklesaria, *Zand Ākāsīh*, p. 276 = 277.

[267] Firdawī, *Shāh-nāme*, p. 2303 = *Epic*, p. 317; Tha'alibī, *Ghurar*, pp. 597 ff.; *Mujmil al-tawārikh*, p. 73.

[268] Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, ser. i, pp. 960 ff. = *Geschichte*, pp. 242 ff.; Dīnawarī, *Akhbār*, p. 72.

[269] Cf. J. C. Scott, *The Moral Economy of the Peasant* (New Haven, 1976); P. Crone, *Pre-industrial Societies* (Oxford, 1989), pp. 23 f.

[270] *Ta'rīkh*, ser. i, p. 961 = *Geschichte*, p. 243. Elsewhere, the scribe reproaches Khusrau for placing an eternal tax on perishable *humans*, suggesting that the problem was fixed provincial rates in conjunction with fluctuating populations (*Nihāyat al-irab* reproduced in M. Grignaschi, "La riforma tributaria di Ḫosrō I e il feudalismo sassanide", in *La Persia nel medioevo* (Atti del convegno, Accademia nazionale dei lincei) (Rome, 1971), p. 135; compare Qummī, *Tārīkh-i Qumm*, p. 183).

[271] *Ibid.*, pp. 183.

[272] Cited in Grignaschi, *op. cit.*, p. 137. Grignaschi takes this passage to refer to the reintroduction of *muqāsama* in the time of the 'Abbāsid caliph al-Mahdī (p. 119), but the formulation suggests a much earlier change.

[273] Christensen, *L'Iran*, p. 361; Klíma, *Mazdak*, pp. 281 ff.; Pigulevskaja, *Les villes*, pp. 197, 211; Neusner, *Jews in Babylonia*, p. 75; Frye, *Ancient Iran*, pp. 324, 325.

[274] Ibn Rusta, *Kitāb al-A'lāq al-nafīsa*, ed. M. J. de Goeje (Leiden, 1892), p. 104; Mas'ūdī, *Tanbīh*, p. 39; Yāqūt, *Mu'jam al-buldān*, ed. F. Wüstenfeld (Leipzig, 1866–73), vol. III, p. 175, s.v. "al-Sawād"; Qummī, *Tārīkh-i Qumm*, p. 180.

[275] Thus Ibn Khurradādhbih, *al-Masālik wa 'l-mamālik*, ed. M. J. de Goeje (Leiden, 1889), p. 14; Qummī, *Tārīkh-i Qumm*, and Ibn Rusta (slightly different figure; cf. the preceding note).

[276] Mas'ūdī, *Tanbīh*, p. 39; cf. pp. 101 f.

[277] Ibn Ḥawqal, *Ṣūrat al-arḍ*, vol. II, pp. 303 f.

[278] Qummī, *Tārīkh-i Qumm*, p. 180.

[279] A. K. S. Lambton, *Landlord and Peasant in Persia* (London, 1953), p. 16 n., with reference to Ya'qūbī, *Ta'rīkh*, vol. II, p. 258; cf. *EI²*, s.v. "Ḥulwān".