



***FIRDAWSII MILLENNIUM INDICUM:
PROCEEDINGS OF THE
SHAHNAMA MILLENNARY SEMINAR,
The K R CAMA ORIENTAL INSTITUTE, MUMBAI,
8-9 January, 2011***

Edited by
Sunil Sharma and Burzine Waghmar

**THE K R CAMA ORIENTAL INSTITUTE
Mumbai
2016**

An Annotated Micro-history and Bibliography of the Houghton *Shahnama*

by
Burzine Waghmar

In 1981 Stuart Welch and Martin Dickson published a study of [a] strange and amazing book in two volumes so huge and expensive as almost to be unreadable except in the best libraries. For a novel I am working on, I studied, this spring, the volumes of The Houghton Shahnameh (Harvard University Press) in the New York Public Library, and was astounded and delighted by the writers' eccentric scholarship. By examining and re-examining pictures of countless kings, princesses, soldiers, heroes, servants, horses, camels, rabbits, demons, dragons, birds, balconies, gardens, flowers, trees, leaves, hunters, lions, lovers, dreams and dreamers. Dickson and Welch rebuilt a lost culture and restored a lost history to minute details. The delightful book, with its imaginative and eccentric scholarship, reminds me of Nabokov's translations of and commentary on Pushkin's Eugene Onegin, and John Livingstone Lowe's The Road to Xanadu.

— ORHAN PAMUK

So for a great Safavid manuscript the binder, the calligrapher, the illustrating painter or painters, the illuminator proper, the margin-gilder, and the ruler, with all the highly specialized rules of their crafts and with all the personal variety imprinted by the varying delicacies and strengths of various hands and minds, yet in their several mysteries all labored with kindred notions of the beautiful. It is awkward, but may convey meaning, to say that such a book becomes not so much a microcosm as a little macrocosm.

— ARTHUR UPHAM POPE

Persian book illuminations 'are the most decorative and poetic' among paintings of the Islamic world. Scholarly consensus contends that only in Persia does Islamic painting's 'strong, well-balanced pigments, fairytale landscapes and inner harmonies' find their efflorescence whence its appeal, enthralling and enduring.¹ The classic canons of Persian painting had fully evolved by the end of the fourteenth century, and the production of exquisite albums by the end of the second half of the sixteenth century, marked a watershed in the visual and decorative arts of Islam.

As mentioned in the *scholium* to this volume, the production of royally commissioned manuscripts by Timurid and Safavid dynasts of epics and legends, especially those of the *Shahnama* as artistic *realia*, enabled the preservation of this lyrical heritage. For a ruler sought, through the visual medium, to bolster his legitimacy and burnish his pedigree by a conscientious 'mythification of the past'.² This becomes patently manifest when, from the beginning of the fourteenth century, illustrated compositions reveal portrayals not inserted to aid or clarify textual narratives but also harken verisimilitudinous parallels between a perceived present and halcyon past. Indeed it was a given that the study of Persian literature and artistic reproduction of this canon was embodied in the *farhang-i shahaneh* or curriculum of all Persian princes from the Mongol epoch onwards.³

The Houghton *Shahnama*, aptly and amply regarded a *Shahnama-yi shahi* ('King's Book of Kings'), is superlative among extant, illuminated *Shahnamas*. It is the most impressive *exemplum* and, given the gripe in our documentary sources of early Safavid material culture, a 'virtually portable art gallery in which the evolution of Safavi painting could be traced through the crucial years of the early 1520s to its maturity in the middle 1530s and beyond.'⁴

The Houghton or Tahmaspi *Shahnama*, engaged the workshop of that otherwise parsimonious bigot, Tahmasp I for more than a decade (1522-37) at whose atelier were ‘fifteen painters, two calligraphers, at least two illuminators, one or more book-binders, and countless gold-sprinklers, margin-rulers, and paper-burnishers’.⁵ Stuart Cary Welch and Martin Dickson concluded that of the fifteen, nine were major painters and five their assistants. Two additional paintings, on thicker paper, were finished sometime around 1540.⁶ Encased within its bejeweled, gilded leather binding, with a dedicatory rosette *sans* colophon, were 759 burnished folios (47 by 31.8 cm), of which 258 were full-page miniatures adorned by 30,000 poetic verses in rhythmic *nasta‘liq* calligraphy, with magnificent gold-flecked margins around a ruled area (26.9 by 17.7 cm).

It was gifted by the second Safavid shah, Tahmasp I (r. 1524-76), to the eleventh Ottoman sultan, Selim ‘the Sot’ II⁷ (r. 1566-74) with a *Qur’an* reputedly penned by Ali, Muhammad’s cousin and fourth caliph;⁸ a pavilion-tent topped with gold depicting painted landscapes; twenty silk carpets complemented by textiles worth 164,000 gold ducats; and a pear-shaped Badakhshan ruby encased in a jewel-box plus two pearls weighing 10 *miskal* (40 drams) among other precious objects transported on thirty-four camels, as an accession gift for ‘a copy of Firdowsi’s *Shahnameh* – often with the addition of a contemporary *Shahnameh* extolling the patron-king – was so indispensable to a ruler’s library that it might almost be considered part of majestic regalia.’⁹ ‘It is,’ as David Roxburgh reminds us, ‘hard to imagine two more potent symbols of Safavid ideology or to comprehend the value of each – the first [*Alid Qur’an*], if authentic, was exceedingly rare, the second [*Tahmaspi Shahnama*], unequalled before or since in number of illustrations and the expense of its material and labor’. They exhibited ‘Tahmasp’s twin language of Irano-Islamic authority.’¹⁰

Both Ottomans and foreigners later recounted the opulence of this ‘propitious’ presentation, nothing if not orchestrated, where Safavid Persians, putative legatees of the Pishdadians, via a honourable detour through the House of Ali, reminded these Anatolian *arrivistes* and – militarily – superior Sunnis, of their regnal prerogative.¹¹ The brutal truth was that it was Tahmasp’s ‘ransom to maintain his country’s peace’ and preserve the ‘laboriously concluded’ treaty of Amasya (1555) which, a decade on, still held and would – after a renegotiating of its terms in 1562 – until 1575.¹² The iconography of these ‘acceptable gifts’ in the *Şehname-Selim Han* is decidedly triumphalist: the composition recognisably sets the Safavids in their station, and does not belie the correct, courtly one-upmanship between two Muslim antagonists.¹³ As Captain Adolphus Slade, a British naval officer who travelled in the Ottoman realms three centuries later cautioned, ‘Pride is necessary to ensure respect from the Osmanley [Ottoman], who ascribes even common politeness to submission.’¹⁴

The Safavid entourage of 320 officials and 400 merchants, with 1,700 pack animals, led by the governor of Yerevan, Shahquli Sultan Ustajlu, initially reached Istanbul, and then proceeded to Edirne in state, where the Sultan was wintering, and presented itself to him on February 16, 1568 (= *A.H.* 17 Shaban, 975). It was officially chronicled and illustrated in not only the sovereign’s history, the *Selimnameh*, but also attested by the then Hapsburg embassy in a diplomatic despatch from the Sublime Porte.¹⁵ It has been doubted if the manuscript’s antecedents, as suggested by Welch and Dickson, can be attributed to Isma‘il I as a homecoming present for his eight-year-old son and crown prince, Tahmasp, who had resided from infancy at Herat, as a nominal governor aged two till he turned six, to Tabriz. His Herat interlude has been rightly compared to a Roman’s growing years in Athens.¹⁶ That Tahmasp, a sometime student of the most renowned Tabrizi *maitre*, Sultan Muhammad, could have ordered its creation upon his coronation in 1524, cannot be discounted.¹⁷

From 1568, almost three hundred years, ‘a blessing to posterity’, the volume remained in Ottoman Istanbul until it reached France towards the end of the nineteenth century.¹⁸ An attestation during its Istanbuli *interregnum* is from the era of Selim III (r. 1789-1807), who commanded that Turkish synopses foregrounding the context of the illustrated fables and its 60,000 archaic, sesquipedalian verses be written on ‘protective sheets interleaved to face the miniatures’, and inserted into the codex, one for each of

its 258 miniatures. This was undertaken at the behest of the sovereign between May 1800 and April 1801 by Mehmed Arif Efendi (1757/58-1829-33?), 'Head Keeper of his Majesty's Guns' at the Palace Treasury, who was also a poet and court historian of considerable learning and standing.¹⁹

Its westward sojourn remains untraceable but what we do now know is that it came into the possession of Baron Edmond de Rothschild (1845-1934).²⁰ This was just before 1903 for its new owner lent it to the *Exposition des Arts Musulmans* held at the Pavillon de Marsal of the Union Centrale (later Musée) des Arts Décoratifs, Paris, April 21 - June 30, 1903.²¹ His heir and another distinguished collector, Baron Maurice de Rothschild (1881-1957) subsequently inherited it. It was surmised that, save Sir Thomas Arnold (1864-1930), no other western scholar had ever seen it in the intervening years.²² The Rothschilds, in fact, denied all scholarly access.²³ Following Baron Maurice's demise, his son and grandfather's namesake, Baron Edmond (1926-97), with a view to wooing chiefly American purchasers, put it up for sale alongside other heirlooms. It was one among several artefacts stolen by the Nazis after the fall of France; the Rothschilds were able to recover it, through the good offices of the Allied Command, after the war.²⁴ The rest followed suit and was reminisced by Stuart Cary Welch in a *Festschrift* for Martin Dickson, almost a decade after their joint collaboration on the Houghton *Shahnama* and a year prior to the latter's passing.²⁵

Welch, a young assistant during the 1950s to the Honorary Keeper of Islamic Art at Harvard's Fogg Art Museum, Erich Schroeder, recalled being queried over luncheon by that museum's Director, John Coolidge, of any major art works for a friend 'who wants one; and he does not care what it is.'²⁶ Welch promptly pointed out that the Rothschild *Shahnama* was, since 1954 on sale for \$360,000, at Rosenberg & Stiebel's midtown Manhattan (32 E. 57th St.) gallery.²⁷ The said friend was the bibliophile, benefactor and collector, Arthur Amory Houghton, Jr (1906-90).²⁸ A Harvard *alumnus*, it was Houghton, curator of Rare Books at the Library of Congress, Washington, DC (1940-42) and principal funder of Harvard's Houghton Library (est. 1942), the nation's first climate-controlled, varsity library for rare books and manuscripts, who bought this *Shahnama* in November 1959. Houghton had inspected it along with Welch earlier in the year in Manhattan. The former felt he simply must have it and the latter 'hoped – even assumed – that he would give it to Harvard as the "crown jewel" of his earlier gift, the Houghton Library.' The memoirs of Thomas Hoving (d. 2009), a former director of the Metropolitan Museum, are suggestive thus lending more than a smidgen of credence to Welch.²⁹ It is imperative to highlight Houghton's passion for books and book collecting in light of what occurred down the years.

Welch next volunteered to research and publish it to which Houghton 'reacted enthusiastically.'³⁰ He was fortunate to elicit the co-operation of Martin Dickson, a Princeton Persianist with a majestic command of primary and secondary sources of the early medieval Muslim world from Anatolia as far afield as Xinjiang. It was agreed at a New York meeting chaired by Houghton and flanked by an array of designers and publishers in April 1961, to create a book that 'would exemplify the highest standards of American design, typography, printing, and binding.'³¹ Houghton would subvent its paper- and plate-production, proof-corrections, printing and binding, with other duties borne by both authors, and staff at the Fogg Museum and Harvard University Press. It was decided to limit the edition to 750 copies, 600 of which were made available for sale.³² Harvard University Press, on behalf of the Fogg Art Museum, eventually published the Houghton *Shahnama* in 'actual size' in 1981.

Barely three years had passed than Houghton decided to disbound it so that some illuminated folios could be displayed on silk mats at New York's Grolier Club (1962; past president 1955-57); M Knoedler and Co. (1968); Pierpont Morgan Library (1968); and Asia House Gallery (1970); besides private viewings at Houghton's Manhattan residence (130 E. 62nd Street), and Wye River plantation, near Queenstown, Maryland, where these matted paintings hung in, naturally, the Persian room.³³ The manuscript was made available to Welch in June 1962 for extended study at Harvard's Houghton Library. Subsequently Coolidge arranged for Dickson and Welch to have complete sets of prints of the binding and miniatures alongside photocopies of the text.³⁴ It must have been the last time ever that

this *Shahnama* was *in toto*. But it ought be pointed out that the volume had to be unsewn for preparing colour and sepia plates.³⁵ This was done by an expert bookbinder at the Morgan Library, who recalled snipping away during her ‘lunch hours’ and that none of the paintings were cut as they were bound in singly with those ‘overlaid sheets’ by Turkish librarians. By 1965 all prints were ready, one for each of the numbered edition of 750 sets, and stored in wooden boxes at Cambridge. It now only awaited the translation and commentary by Welch and Dickson.³⁶

Even when the project was on the drawing-board, Houghton *ex mero motu* took apart the codex in the late 1960s without giving a fig about the ‘[i]mpassioned criticism from many quarters [which] greeted the dismembering and scattering of a document of such value and of such intrinsic beauty, for not only was the complete ensemble destroyed but with it, the possibility of studying and recording the subtle, mathematical, rhythmic interrelationships in the art of the Persian manuscript that have only recently begun to be addressed.’ Hoving recalled Houghton as ‘conspiratorial, manipulative and mercurial.’³⁷

For eleven years Houghton owned ‘one of the supreme illustrated manuscripts of any period or culture and among the greatest works of art in the world’ which, if ‘an Italian project of equivalent magnitude or significance would have to have been a national epic such as the *Divine Comedy* of Dante and to have included in one single, monumental and profusely illustrated volume the masterpieces of a host of Renaissance artists such as Leonardo, Bellini, Perugino, Michelangelo, Raphael, Giorgione, Titian, Corregio and more, and their pupils.’³⁸ The art critic and journalist, Eleanor Munro, in her detailed discussion of this Houghton *histoire* unexaggeratedly exclaimed, ‘The work was unique, as complex and coherent as, some claimed, the Sistine Chapel.’³⁹

In 1970, Houghton donated, as a tax-deductible gift, 76 text folios with 78 paintings to New York’s Metropolitan Museum of Art. It was followed up with a benefaction of half a million dollars. The Met held non-profit status and its centennial fell in 1970, the very year Houghton assumed chairmanship of its board.⁴⁰ It is now known that the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) challenged Houghton when he filed his returns claiming an appreciable tax return on the valuation computed against this donation.⁴¹

The Metropolitan Museum next, felicitously albeit belatedly, mounted an exhibition of these miniatures as the American recognition of the 2,500th imperial Iranian celebrations at Persepolis in October 1971. The exhibition, displaying ninety-eight pages with further donations by Houghton, opened on May 4, 1972 – and the world came to marvel at this masterpiece on the eve of Tahmasp’s three hundredth and ninety-sixth death anniversary.⁴² Stuart Cary Welch, yielding to the ‘museum’s sudden request’, prepared its catalogue, a ‘greatly condensed account’, in a fortnight.⁴³ The exhibition ran until October 31, 1972 in which 75 miniatures from Houghton’s bequest were put on display.⁴⁴ A film, *Tales from a Book of Kings: The Houghton Shah-nameh* was also conceived and produced by the consultative chairman of the Metropolitan’s Islamic department, Richard Ettinghausen (1966-79). This was widely broadcast in the following years at United States Information Service (USIS) centres abroad.⁴⁵ Subsequently the exhibition travelled to The Corning Museum of Glass, November 17, 1973 – January 31, 1974 and The Baltimore Museum of Art, February 12 – March 31, 1974. This, actually, was a first as well for both galleries exhibited those not displayed at The Met in 1972, namely, the later works executed by Aqa Mirak and Mir Mussavar and not those of Sultan Muhammad and his followers.⁴⁶

Houghton’s ‘bafflingly destructive’ streak manifested itself when seven folios sold in fifteen minutes at Christie’s, London for £785,000 (\$1,371,624) in November, 1976 with a single illustration going for £280,000 (\$484,000): a record price for not only any Persian but also Islamic work of art ever thus putting that country’s art finally and financially at par with great western works.⁴⁷ The IRS was on Houghton’s case and his hand was forced to hold ‘a public sale that would establish the actual market value of the individual paintings.’⁴⁸ It vindicated Houghton’s monetary claim against his donation to the Met and that he had not inflated the price. Even prior to this, Houghton had embarked on a spree of divesting his artefacts and assets towards ‘accumulating both capital and tax credits.’ Around the

same time as the gift to the Met, Houghton sold his prized Gutenberg Bible to the renowned rare-book dealer, Hans Kraus. It changed hands for an undisclosed sum.⁴⁹

Audi alteram partem. A glimpse into Houghton's thinking was the one-off statement he ever placed on record:⁵⁰

What will be the eventual disposition of the large remaining number of miniatures I cannot say at this time. Of one thing I feel sure, which is that they should not all be in one place. The risks of destruction by fire, war, civil disturbance, and theft are too great. In addition, I would like to see them somewhat dispersed so that they can be seen and appreciated by the largest number of persons over the long future ...

Abolala Soudavar cuts through the cant and reminds enraged *engagés* that:⁵¹

One cannot evoke the principal of integrity for a work of art without invoking preservation. ... The only way to conserve the integrity of a manuscript is *never to open it*. ... Once a manuscript is unbound, the matter of the location of individual pages, whether in Tehran or in New York, becomes secondary. The primary focus should be on preservation, especially from calamities. To leave 258 of the greatest paintings in the whole realm of Persian painting in one place is to incur the risk of losing them all in one disastrous calamity. ... But a more important danger lurking for illustrated manuscripts is the danger of defacement, or total destruction, by iconoclasts. Many manuscripts have been defaced in the past. Closer to our times, [i]f illustrated manuscripts are not destroyed by religious zealots, the chances are that they will be preempted, since so many images with female figures are not allowed to be seen in Iran nowadays.⁵²

Thomas Hoving, whose warts-and-all interview in 2002 has escaped the notice of Islamic art historians, may well have provided what will become the definitive explanation for what forced Houghton's hand:⁵³

"He wanted the facsimile published and it wasn't going nearly as quickly as he wanted. So in frustration – perhaps it *was* pique, who knows – he pulled the book out of Harvard, brought it down to New York, and proceeded to do what he did with it there." ... A prevailing assumption, one that Hoving did not dispute, is that had the IRS accepted as true value Houghton's estimate of the material he had already donated, the remaining plates may have been given at some point to the Metropolitan Museum as well. ... "I was flatly opposed to the breaking up of the book in any fashion," Hoving told me. "I confronted Arthur physically, personally, on the matter, but he was determined to do this, and he *was* the chairman of our board of trustees, after all; so at the end of the day we wound up with these fabulous plates, which our experts assured me were the very best of them all." ... "When the IRS disallowed Arthur's claim, he became petrified that the government was going to investigate *everything* that he was involved with, in particular that they would look into several of his charitable foundations, which we now know had acted as conduits for the Central Intelligence Agency during the Cold War. That, I firmly, believe, was the concern that drove this highly intelligent man to do the impulsive thing he did with the rest of the *Shahnameh*. It was a totally stupid act on his part to break up this magnificent book and scatter the plates to the four winds, but he allowed his petty fears to take control of his common sense. You have to realize that this was a very arch, very patrician man who was unbelievably paranoid, kind of spooky to tell you the truth, and he had it in him to take offense at anything. What I believe he wanted to say to these people was, 'If you don't believe what I am telling you these plates are worth, then I will *show* you what they are worth.'"

That 1976 Christie's sale, it must be reminded, occurred on the heels of an unsuccessful proposal when Houghton had proffered the remaining volume consisting of one hundred and eighty miniatures for the sum of \$28.5mn, 'barely the price of a Lockheed bomber', to Persia.⁵⁴ Empress Farah, reminiscing years later, stated, '[W]e couldn't pay this sum in those days.'⁵⁵ The deal fell through 'in a series of buffooneries and mixed messages', despite protracted negotiations right through 1975, between Houghton and Farah's factotums. A peeved Persian's *pishkash*, rather the absence of it, allegedly, stymied the arrangement for the said *apparatchik* in the Shahbanou's secretariat expected his *bakshish* to be nothing less than \$1.5mn failing which the transaction would come undone.⁵⁶ There is reason to believe that Houghton, even at this stage in March 1975, was not entirely enthusiastic about selling this prized possession, whose viewing during a bout of shingles had afforded him 'consolation in his pain'. But what a pathetic plaint by the consort of a monarch, 'a modern replay of Cyrus at Lydia', whose kingdom's oil revenues multiplied nineteen times from \$2.4bn to \$17.4bn between 1972 and 1974; and one who, in a wind-swept wilderness, had convened a five and a half hour banquet which remains, in successive editions of the *Guinness Book of World Records*, the most expensive in modern history!⁵⁷

Inasmuch as the aesthetically inclined Empress, a former architecture student, must be acknowledged as a patroness of arts and crafts, including the Shiraz Arts Festival (1967-77), her *avant-garde* tastes led her to prioritize purchasing mostly modish creations by Francis Bacon, David Hockney, Jackson Pollock, Mark Rothko and Andy Warhol. All of these 400 plus works, to the tune of \$3bn, remain stacked on pull-out racks in the storeroom of Tehran's Museum of Contemporary Art (est. 1977), since Persian puritans ousted the Pahlavis more than a generation ago.⁵⁸ How portentous then to look back at a 1975 *Economist* issue's cover of a scene from the Houghton *Shahnama*, where wise men plead with Zal to intercede and reason with the Shah. Muhammad Reza Pahlavi – bereft of his *farr-i izadi* since that night's Belshazzarian banquet in Persepolis – rested his case with history five years later.⁵⁹

Stuart Cary Welch recalled another missed opportunity regarding the equally ill-fated Demotte *Shahnama* passed up by H Khan Monif, a New York based art dealer, when offered in Paris felt, 'its quality did not warrant its "excessive" price (a price that was, in fact, a fraction of what a single page would bring today).'⁶⁰ Persian petty-fogging, typically, carried the day. The Pahlavis, however, honourably redeemed and returned home their ousted predecessors, the Qajars, whose 63 paintings in the Amery Collection were the largest and most extensive outside Persia until 1969. Empress Farah was instrumental in purchasing this cache for 'something like \$3 million', before it fell into the hands of Sotheby's, to form the nucleus of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Persian art at the newly opened Nigaristan Museum, Shiraz, 1975.⁶¹

Enthused by this profitable auction at Christie's and by further private sales, Houghton next dispensed with approximately 40 folios offered at \$275,000-\$375,000 through the Bond Street dealer, Thomas Agnew & Sons Ltd. The British Rail Pension Fund bought four paintings and subsequently sold them in 1996. All four were snapped up spectacularly: Faridun's entry into the palace to strike down the tyrant, Zakhak (£419,500); an enthroned Kay Qubad listening to Rostum (£793,500); Manuchihr at the start of his reign (£535,500); and Rostum deflecting a boulder intended to kill him (£397,500).⁶² In an October 1988 sale, Christie's sold fourteen folios for £986,800. That year Houghton arranged for what was left of a ravaged yet coveted codex to be deposited at Lloyd's Bank, London. In that vault was deposited a box containing remaining paintings carefully encased within rag-board mats prepared by conservators at the Morgan Library. They were then specially boxed and in a separate box was placed the binding and text pages.⁶³ By the time Houghton died in 1990, 62 illustrated leaves had made their way into private and public hands.

So would Dickson and Welch's labour of love, those 600 lavish, two-volume copies which, following nearly two decades of 'delight, struggle, horror, and anticipation', saw the light of an unrelieved day in 1981. The erstwhile crown's advance order of 20 copies stood rescinded by tasteless, Tehrani turbans.⁶⁴ One hundred copies had been set aside for the Fogg Museum and Arthur Houghton to distribute among

deserving libraries and educational institutions. Both Dickson and Welch received twenty-five copies each in lieu of their *khweshkari* over some sixteen years.⁶⁵

To herald its anticipated publication, exhibitions were envisaged on both sides of the Atlantic. Agnew's, where the London auction had occurred, held a small viewing of seventeen folios at their Old Bond Street gallery in the summer of 1979.⁶⁶ A far grander exhibition opened concomitantly at the British Library, August 10 – October 28, 1979. By the time it opened on December 16 1979, at the National Gallery of Art, Washington DC, American diplomats were hostages in their Tehran chancery stormed and occupied by incensed Iranians, shysters doubling up as students, in November, 1979. A *Time* magazine review began its piece declaring: 'In hindsight, the glories of kings are apt to depend on the available talent. All the last Shah could rake up by way of a court artist was Andy Warhol. Four hundred years before, his predecessors were more fortunate.'⁶⁷

Steeped in Firdawsian *gham* and gloom, the exhibition continued to Harvard's Fogg Art Museum, March 20, 1980. Its final opening at the aforementioned, where Welch served as Honorary Assistant Keeper (1956), Lecturer in Fine Arts (1960), and Curator of Islamic and Later Indian Art until his retirement (1976-95), was a cruel irony: the Iranian new year or *Noruz*, augured no spring but an acrimonious season of distrust as Iran imploded within, and some months later, exploded without, on its western front.⁶⁸

Ahead of us lies war and endless strife, Such that my failing heart despairs of life. ...
Alas for their great crown and throne, for all The royal splendor destined now to fall,
To be fragmented by the Arabs' might; The stars decree for us defeat and flight.

Following the flight of the Pahlavis and its *haute bourgeoisie* in tow, mayhem and massacre, logically, followed.

The game, next time round, was played for higher stakes. Following Houghton's death – exactly a decade after the Shah and a year on after Khomeini – his son, Arthur Amory Houghton III (b. 1940), decided to sell the partial codex consisting of 118 illustrations, 501 text pages and binding for approximately £13mn (\$20 mn).⁶⁹ Qataris and Emiratis, now voracious (culture) vultures had not yet initiated their frenzied appropriation of 'Islamic heritage'. Arab one-upmanship, those meretricious museums now in Doha and Abu Dhabi, were still two decades away.⁷⁰ Just what exactly would this partial volume be worth eluded both seller and buyer(s). No buyer was available as no price could truly be estimated.

An Etonian's pragmatism paved the *Houghton Shahnama's* prodigal homecoming: Oliver Hoare, an Islamic art dealer of standing, was 'appalled by the manuscript's dismemberment' and was approached by Houghton III to scout for prospective buyers 'who would vow to keep the text and the remaining 118 miniatures intact.' Houghton shared Hoare's determination to prevent further cannibalization. It was an admirable instance of a collector and dealer committed to preservation.⁷¹ The Houghton estate's asking price elicited little interest. A suggestion that wealthy, diasporic Persians could raise funds was a non-starter. It is to Hoare that the idea of a swap must be credited. And, given discretion, patience, and English tact when handling prickly Persians, it paid off – bartering appealed to their *bazaari* acuity and they ran true to form.

Hoare got wind that the *Iran Cultural Heritage Organisation* (est. 1985) was keen on repatriating works of art.⁷² His initial, cautious missive to its director was that disbursement by disposal of objects that 'didn't fulfill a role in their cultural plans' need not be ruled out. He realized that Tehran's Museum of Contemporary Art (MOCA), then closed, contained modern originals quite unlike elsewhere and that it could, in principle, sell anything from 'André Derain to the New York School paintings' but for the fact that Iranian law prohibited the sale of any national art holdings. Hoare was enthused when Tehran requested Chahryar Adle, the recently deceased Paris-based art historian and archaeologist, to meet and

discuss this in person. For Adle told Hoare that the *Shahnama* ‘was number one on the list of things the Cultural Heritage Organisation wanted to get back.’ After several false starts and stalemates, ‘politically immensely dangerous ... discussions in Iran went on for two years.’⁷³ It was tacitly agreed towards the end of 1993 by a high-level committee of no less than the Supreme Leader (*rahbar*), Ali Khamenei, then President Hashemi Rafsanjani and, instrumentally, Vice-President Hassan Habibi (d. 2013) as well as Mehdi Hojjat, founding chief (ICHO). It required clearing at the very top what with a British dealer and an American seller. While not acrimonious, the negotiations were, in a word, fraught.⁷⁴

Arthur Amory Houghton III, like his Iranian counterparts, was no less nervous. A former diplomat, he was, at the time, a senior staff member at the White House. Hoare, whose discretion was beyond reproach, erred just once by telephoning Houghton at his office to say that ‘the Iranians are really interested’. It had been pre-arranged that Iran and the codex would be coded Spain and an orange shipment on open communication lines. Houghton henceforth never used his White House phone.⁷⁵

Hoare put it to the Persians to close the deal, which they did in June 1994, by agreeing to an one-off exchange of the remaining manuscript with Willem de Kooning’s *Lady No. 3*, an abstract expressionist nude long stored away, considered tasteless and unIslamic, and which would never be exhibited by the regime.⁷⁶ Hoare pragmatically suggested reciprocal arbitration values of \$20mn be affixed to it as well as the Houghton *Shahnama*. On July 26 1994, Hoare formally purchased the *Shahnama* from the Houghton estate. Twenty-four later, Tahmasp’s tome, in seven wooden crates set out from its Lloyd’s Bank vault, London, for Charles de Gaulle airport, Paris. It was on its way home. That very day, July 27, it was inspected and confirmed by Chahryar Adle and Akbar Tajwidi in the presence of Iranian embassy and other officials in France.⁷⁷ On Thursday, July 28 1994/Mordad 6, 1373, the checked crates departed for Vienna’s Schwechat airport. An Iranian government B-727, previously lavishly kitted and purchased by the Shah from Henry Ford II in 1974, had already landed and was sitting on the tarmac containing *Lady No. 3*. A Zurich-based dealer, among other intermediaries, was on hand to verify her. Mehdi Hojjat, principal co-ordinator aboard the presidential B-727, supervised the swap for he accompanied the crates being unloaded and reloaded in a secure van. The van, as Souren Melikian reported, was chained during uplift to the aircraft.⁷⁸ The afternoon atmosphere was swift, secure and skittish.

Tahmasp returned to Tehran via Vienna albeit in reduced circumstances.⁷⁹ Dignified, given how its former Ottoman owners, humiliated twice, had retreated from Vienna’s outskirts (1529, 1683). It was argued, with some justification, that it was repatriated for a song, and that the mutilated codex ‘was worth at least 20 paintings by de Kooning, and that the Houghton Foundation had been the loser in exchanging the work for one painting by de Kooning, and that the Iranian government had actually recovered the *Shahnameh* gratis.’ Rather rich coming from the former empress who crossly queried, ‘If they were really interested in Shahnameh, couldn’t they pay \$6m and keep De Kooning’s painting? ... [It] is the sole exchange they’ve done so far and I hope it remains the last one.’ Alireza Sami-azar, MOCA director (1998-2005), lamented losing the painting but regarded, in the final analysis, that had the authorities not done so, there was every chance the remaining 118 miniatures would have ended up in sales room only to be spirited away into obscurity forever. The de Kooning would remain as a whole despite changing proprietorship.⁸⁰

The Swiss dealer on the Vienna tarmac that day, Doris Ammann, it was later revealed, sold *Lady No. 3* to entertainment mogul, David Geffen for approximately \$20mn. It earned the Houghton estate \$9.5mn which proceeds, as had been willed during his lifetime, were earmarked for his fourth widow, Nina Rodale Houghton.⁸¹ (They had, after all, married in 1972, the very year of the Met exhibition.) Willem de Kooning’s *Lady No. 3* subsequently changed hands when hedge fund billionaire, Steven Cohen, bought it from a Manhattan dealer, Larry Gagosian, for about \$137.5mn in 2006.⁸²

The Houghton *Shahnama* has rested its case with history. But it still made the headlines in the two decades since 30 of its 118 miniatures were displayed at gallery no. 9, Tehran’s Museum of Contemporary

Art (MOCA). A single page sold at Sotheby's, London on October 11, 2006 for \$1.7mn (£904,000) and was bought by the Aga Khan Museum, Geneva.⁸³ What was just as newsworthy was that the Iranians loaned to the Italians some of the Houghton *Shahnama* illuminations among other artefacts, including from the Ardabil shrine, for an exhibition jointly curated by Sheila Canby and Jon Thompson, 'Hunt for Paradise: Court Arts of Safavid Iran, 1501-1576', at New York's Asia Society, October 16, 2003 – January 18, 2004 and the Museo Poldi Pezzoli and Palazzo Reale, Milan, February 23 – June 28, 2004. A budget deficit led to its cancellation at The British Museum, London.⁸⁴ The Tahmaspi *Shahnama* did not cross the Atlantic but short of the Alps where it was possible for visitors to appreciate ten of its paintings alongside one from a private collection in Vaduz and three from the N D Khalili Collection, London. Not only was this laudable but far more enriching because the Milan stint was thematically, not chronologically, organized as New York.⁸⁵

Stuart Cary Welch died in 2008.⁸⁶ His descendants arranged with Sotheby's, London to auction his impressive Islamic art holdings. Some of these objects were exhibited, April 1-5, 2011 and auctioned the following day. Pride of place among his *collectanea* was a leaf of the Houghton *Shahnama* Welch had purchased at the Agnew's auction of 1977. The painting, Faridun in the guise of a dragon testing his sons (folio 42v.) was, according to Welch's handwritten notes on the frame's backboard, 'the costliest acquisition I had ever made. Terrible effort, but successful (a Triumph!) –'⁸⁷ The painting's asking price range was £2-3mn (2.3-3.5mn euros). The present writer was in the room when it sold for £7.4mn (\$12.2mn) on April 6, 2011.⁸⁸ At thrice its pre-sale figure, it set a world record for a single Islamic lot. Total sales from that day's Cary Collection (including buyer's premium) stood at £20.9mn (\$34.4mn).⁸⁹

On November 1, 2011 fifteen galleries devoted to Islamic art at the Metropolitan Museum reopened. This south wing, within its Fifth Avenue building, was closed for major refurbishment in May 2003. The galleries, now expanded by 4000 square feet, display almost 1,200 artefacts in all media from Islam's inception, the seventh century, to the nineteenth century across a floor space covering 19,000 square feet. They constitute the most impressive and extensive holdings of Muslim art in North America.⁹⁰ Houghton's 78 paintings still remain the crown jewels of the Met and are now on display in the newly dedicated gallery 462, Sharmin and Bijan Mossavar-Rahmani Gallery of Safavid and Later Iranian Art (16th-20th centuries). Twelve folios are on display at any given time along the southern end of the gallery. These are replaced through 'rotations' every four to six months.⁹¹ This historical opening could not have come at a more appropriate time, a period when the image of Muslims merits restitution in public discourse. It was fitting that this red-letter event saw the publishing of a facsimile edition of the Houghton *Shahnama* including, for the first time, all of its 258 paintings reproduced in colour and in near original size (39.3 by 26.7 cm; *cf.* original 47 by 31.8 cm).⁹²

Two Persians, Ebadollah Bahari and Dalia Sofer, remain deeply attached to their Perso-Islamic culture. Both separately yearned in print for the day when Shah Tahmasp's *magnum opus* might be collated for posterity's consumption. Bahari wrote, 'It is hoped that some museum or major institution will undertake to produce facsimiles or a good reproduction of the whole book, with all its illustrations in place, in order not only to show how the original work must have looked but also to assist future scholars in studying and evaluating the art and artists of the period.'⁹³

This, happily, came to pass for Sheila Canby concluded her introduction stating, 'Its folios will never be reunited, but at least they can meet again as pages in a modern book.'⁹⁴

A Persian plea was realised and it was America that fulfilled – and redeemed – this realisation.

References

Just as copious as the notes accompanying the *scholium* at the outset of this volume, the student of *Shahnama* studies in South and Central Asia as well as present-day Iran, otherwise unable to access published sources, is presented here an exhaustive survey of the extant literature.

1. Richard Ettinghausen and Marie Lukens Swietochowski, *Islamic Painting*, New York, 1983, pp 2, 6 (repr. of special issue on Islamic painting, *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 36, 2, 1978, pp 3-48.) A sound grounding may be obtained from the following: Ernst Kühnel, 'History of Miniature Painting and Drawing', in *A Survey of Persian Art from Prehistoric Times to the Present*, vol. VI, Arthur U Pope and Phyllis Ackerman (eds.), London and New York, 1939, pp 1829-97; repr. in *op. cit.*, vol. V, Tokyo, 1964; 3rd ed., Tehran, 1977; J Michael Rogers, *The Spread of Islam, The Making of the Past*, Oxford, 1976; Richard Ettinghausen, 'The Categorization of Persian Painting', in *Studies in Judaism and Islam presented to S. D. Goitein*, S Morag et al. (eds.), Jerusalem, 1981, pp 55-63; Basil Gray, 'The Pictorial Arts in the Timurid Period', and 'The Arts in the Safavid Period', in *The Cambridge History of Iran: the Timurid and Safavid Periods*, vol. 6, Peter Jackson and Laurence Lockhart (eds.), Cambridge, 1986; repr. 2006, pp 843-912; Ernst Grube and Eleanor Sims, 'Painting', in *The Arts of Persia*, R W Ferrier (ed.), New Haven and London, 1989, pp 200-23; Sheila Blair and Jonathan Bloom, 'The Arts in Iran and Central Asia under the Timurids and their Contemporaries', and 'The Arts in Iran under the Safavids and Zands', in eadem, *The Art and Architecture of Islam, 1250-1800*, Pelican History of Art, New Haven and London, 1994; corr. repr. 1995, pp 55-69, 165-82; Oleg Grabar, 'Persian miniatures: illustrations or paintings', in *The Persian Presence in the Islamic World*, Georgio Levi Della Vida Biennial Conference Proceedings 13, Richard Hovannisian and Georges Sabagh (eds.), Cambridge, 1998, pp 199-217; Sheila Canby, *The Golden Age of Persian Art, 1501-1722*, London, 1999; rev. repr. 2008; *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., vol. XII, Supplement, s.v. 'Iran viii. Art and Architecture' (by Priscilla Soucek), pp 448-53; M M Ashrafi and Priscilla Soucek, 'Arts of the Book and Painting', in *History of Civilizations of Central Asia: the Age of Achievement, A.D. 750 to the end of the fifteenth century*, vol. IV, pt. 2, C E Bosworth and M S Asimov (eds.), Paris, 2000; repr. New Delhi, 2003, pp 461-505; Jonathan Bloom, 'The Introduction of Paper to the Islamic Lands and the Development of the Illuminated Manuscript', *Muqarnas* 17, 2000, pp 17-23; Yves Porter, 'From the "Theory of the Two *Qalams*" to the "Seven Principles of Painting": Theory, Terminology, and Practice in Classical Persian Painting', *Muqarnas* 17, 2000, pp 109-18; R Pakbaz, 'Painting: to the end of the Safavid Period', in *The Splendour of Iran: the Islamic Period*, vol. III, C Parham (ed.), London, 2001, pp 70-97; Oleg Akimushkin, 'Arts of the Book, painting and calligraphy: Iran and north-western Central Asia', in *History of Civilizations of Central Asia: Development in Contrast from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century*, vol. V, C Adle et al. (eds.), Paris, 2003, pp 555-85; Giovanni Curatola, 'Timeless figures: Persian Miniatures', in *The Art and Architecture of Persia*, Gianroberto Scarcia and Giovanni Curatola (eds.), New York, 2007, pp 191-216; Adel Adamova, *Mediaeval Persian Painting: the Evolution of an Artistic Vision*, J Michael Rogers (tr. and ed.), Biennial Ehsan Yarshater Lecture Series SOAS 2003, New York, 2008; eadem, 'Persian painting from the 14th to the early 20th centuries: a short history', in Adel Adamova, *Persian Manuscripts, Paintings and Drawings: from the 15th to the early 20th century in the Hermitage Collection*, S Hartly (ed.), J Michael Rogers (tr.), London, 2012, pp 11-37; Michael Barry, 'The Islamic book and its illustration', in *Treasures of the Aga Khan Museum: Arts of the Book and Calligraphy*, Carol LaMotte and Shannon de Viviès (tr.), Margaret Graves (ed.), Istanbul, 2010, pp 238-55; Oleg Grabar, *The Hidden Eye: An Approach to Persian Painting*, The Annual Noruz Lecture Series, Bethesda MD, 2003, http://fis-iran.org/en/programs/noruz_lectures/persian-painting; Grabar's swansong, a volume for the connoisseur, containing superbly reproduced large-scale, colour plates, *Masterpieces of Islamic Art: the Decorative Page from 8th to the 17th Century*, Allayne Pullen (tr.) in assoc. with First Edition Translations, Munich and New York, 2009. Islamics lacked a one-volume philosophical approach until Oliver Leaman, *Islamic Aesthetics: an Introduction*, The New Edinburgh Islamic Surveys, Edinburgh, 2004. But see Oleg Grabar, 'Toward an Aesthetic of Persian Painting', in *The Art of Interpreting: Papers in Art History from The Pennsylvania State University*, vol. IX,

Susan Scott (ed.), Univ. Park PA, 1995, pp 129-39 (= idem, *Islamic Visual Culture 1100-1800: Constructing the Study of Islamic Art*, vol. 2, Variorum collected studies series CS825, Aldershot and Burlington VT, 2006, pp 213-51). Grabar, *art. cit.*, 1998 is an alternate version of Grabar, *art. cit.*, 1995. For valuable insights on aesthetics also see Eric Schroeder, *Persian Miniatures in the Fogg Museum of Art*, Cambridge MA, 1942. It merits recalling here what J Michael Rogers, perceptively pointed out when concluding his review, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* XXIX, 3-4, May-June 1972, p 240, of Sir Thomas Arnold, *Painting in Islam: a Study of the Place of Pictorial Art in Muslim Culture*, B W Robinson (introd.), Oxford, 1928; New York, 1965: 'The great difficulty is that Muslim aesthetics, or the aesthetic foundations of individual schools of Muslim painting, must largely be deduced from the works themselves. If Arnold failed to realise this, he was at least in good company and none of his successors has show great success; the problem, indeed, may be insoluble.' This, among other features, is in J Michael Rogers, *The Uses of Anachronism: on Cultural and Methodological Diversity in Islamic Art*, An Inaugural Lecture delivered on 17 October 1991, London, 1994. Rogers was the Nasser David Khalili Professor of Islamic Art and Archaeology in the University of London (1990-2000), the first chair in the British Isles, when subvented at SOAS by its *alumnus* and benefactor, Dr Nasser David Khalili, a scholar-collector of no mean repute who also possesses, at the time of writing, ten miniatures of the Houghton *Shahnama*. Specialised entries on a range of topics covering Persian painting may be consulted in *The Dictionary of Art*, 34 vols., Jane Turner (ed.), New York, 1996; *Encyclopædia Iranica*, <http://www.iranicaonline.org>; and *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd and 3rd edns. It is not possible to marshal all references, including secondary European sources, for that is not the purpose on hand. A representative culling, as a compromise, is provided for South Asian and Middle Eastern readers who, as Anglophones elsewhere, chiefly rely on English materials.

2. Sheila Blair, 'The Development of the Illustrated Book in Iran', *Muqarnas* 10, 1993 [Essays in honor of Oleg Grabar contributed by his Students], p 273. A *subsidiarium* published earlier to this *Festschrift* was Wheeler Thackston, *Album Prefaces and other Documents on the History of Calligraphers and Painters*, Studies and Sources in Islamic Art and Architecture-Supplements to *Muqarnas* 10 Boston, 2001; repr. 2014. Gene Garthwaite, *The Persians*, The Peoples of Asia, Oxford 2005; repr. 2007, p 170 states how Tahmasp's completion of this project initiated by his father 'legitimized the ruler within the tradition of Iranian rulership through identification with the Shahnamah's mythical rulers.' Also see two succinct prologues and epilogues respectively by J Michael Rogers, 'Arts of Islam', in idem, *The Arts of Islam: Treasures from the Nasser D Khalili Collection* Sydney, 2007; rev. exp. ed. Abu Dhabi, 2008, pp 15-22; and Peter Avery, 'The Shaping of Iran's Character', in *The Splendour of Iran: the Islamic Period*, vol. III, C Parham (ed.), London, 2001, pp 380-82.
3. Marshall G S Hodgson, *The Venture of Islam: Conscience and History in a World Civilization: the Gunpowder Empires and Modern Times*, vol. 3, Chicago, 1974; repr. 1977, p 33; Abolala Soudavar, 'The Early Safavids and their Cultural Interactions with Surrounding States', in *Iran and the Surrounding World: Interactions in Culture and Cultural Politics*, Nikki Keddie and Rudi Matthee (eds.), Seattle and London, 2002, pp 92-93; John Perry, 'Cultural Currents in the Turko-Persian world of Safavid and Post-Safavid times', in *New Perspectives on Safavid Iran: Empire and Society*, Colin Mitchell (ed.), Iranian Studies 8, Abingdon and New York, 2011, pp 84-96; Julie Scott Meisami, 'The *Šāh-nāme* as Mirror for Princes: A Study in Reception', in *Pand-sokhan: Mélanges offerts à Charles-Henri de Fouchécour*, eds. Christophe Balaÿ *et al.*, Bibliothèque iranienne 44, Tehran, 1995, pp 265-73. On the other hand, Priscilla Soucek and Filiz Çağman, 'A Royal Manuscript and its Transformation: the Life of a Book', in *The Book and the Islamic World: the Written Word and Communication in the Middle East*, George Atiyah (ed.), Albany NY, 1995, pp 179-208, is a salient study of how rival rulers appropriated earlier commissioned works by interpolation and insertions. A recent thematic examination is Charles Melville, 'The Illustration of History in Safavid manuscript painting', in Mitchell, *op. cit.*, 2011, pp 163-97.
4. 'The Creation of the Book', in *The Houghton Shahnameh*, introduced and described by Stuart Cary Welch and Martin Bernard Dickson, vol. I, Cambridge MA, and London, 1981, p 3. Robert

- Hillenbrand, 'The Iconography of the *Shāhnāma-yi Shāhī*', in *Safavid Persia: the History and Politics of an Islamic Society*, Charles Melville (ed.), Pembroke Persian Papers 4, London and New York, 1996, pp 53-78 is a seminal study departing from commonplace artistic analysis towards contextualizing its production, holistically and historically. Hillenbrand's intensive scrutiny led him to conclude that the preponderance in it of martial, rather than romantic or fantastic images encountered all too often in other illustrated *Shahnamas*, is not coincidental. This was art of its time as Shah Tahmasp was engaged in defending Iran against Turanians or Uzbeks and Ottomans, as the project was underway. Two dissertations on the Houghton *Shahnama* are: Elizabeth Lara Hendee, 'The Houghton Shah-Nameh'. Senior Thesis, Colorado College, 1990; Samantha Lauren, 'Painted Interiors from the Houghton Shahnameh'. Master's thesis, Florida State University, 2004. http://diginole.lib.fsu.edu/32_3257/
5. Tahmasp never earned a good press from contemporary correspondents. This lord of the land was reputed to sell his disused garments in the bazaar. He possessed all the unsavoury attributes routinely ascribed to an oriental potentate for he was, justifiably, a temperamental tyrant who oscillated between profligate intemperance and dour abstinence. See Roger Savory, 'Safavid Persia', in *The Cambridge History of Islam: the Central Islamic Lands from Pre-Islamic Times to the First World War*, vol. 1A, P M Holt *et al.* (eds.), Cambridge, 1970; repr. 1994, p 404; idem, *Iran under the Safavids*, Cambridge 1980, repr. 2007, p 57; Vladimir Minorsky, 'The Medieval Age', in Roman Ghirshman *et al.*, *Persia: the Immortal Kingdom*, Ramesh Sanghvi (ed.), London, 1971, p 141; Hans Roemer, 'The Safavid Period', in *The Cambridge History of Iran: the Timurid and Safavid Periods*, vol. 6, Peter Jackson and Laurence Lockhart (eds.), Cambridge, 1986; repr. 2006, pp 248-50 is empathic compared to extant appraisals in secondary sources; Sheila Canby, 'The World of the Early Safavids: Shah Tahmāsp at Qazvin 1550-76', in *Hunt for Paradise: Court Arts of Safavid Iran 1501-1576*, Jon Thompson and Sheila Canby (eds.), Milan, 2003, pp 19, 22; Homa Katouzian, *The Persians: Ancient, Mediaeval and Modern Iran*, New Haven and London, 2009; repr. 2010, p 120f.; Soudavar, *art. cit.*, 2002, p 103 also relates how his army subsisted without pay during the last fourteen years of his reign. Peter Avery, *The Spirit of Iran: a History of Achievement from Adversity*, Costa Mesa CA, 2007, p 563 notes that, at Tahmasp's death, the treasury was bursting with bejewelled weapons, gold and silver bullion, and silk among other valuables. A 'costly but unproductive hoard' because between 1558 and 1571, five years before his death, the empire's revenue had decline by 'nearly half in cash receipts.' David Blow, *Shah Abbas: the ruthless king who became an Iranian legend*, London and New York, 2009, pp 8-14, is a brisk and very readable overview of Tahmasp's *vita*.
 6. *Recte* its production dates '1522-35' in Welch and Dickson, *op. cit.*, 1981, vol. I, pp 3-7 and ff. Pointed out in Thompson and Canby, *op. cit.*, 2003, p 84 and Sheila Canby, *The Shahnama of Shah Tahmasp: the Persian Book of Kings*, Philomena Mariani (ed.), New Haven and London, 2011, p 14, n 3; and *eadem*, 'The Safavids', in *The Worlds of Islam in the collection of the Aga Khan Museum*, Madrid, 2009, p 202. Savory, *op. cit.*, 2007, p 59. Q.vv. Stuart Cary Welch, 'The *Shāhnāme*h of Shah Tahmasp', in *Treasures of Islam*, Toby Falk (ed.), Geneva, 1985, pp 68-93; Ebadollah Bahari, *Bihzad: Master of Persian Calligraphy*, Annemarie Schimmel (foreword), London, 1997, pp 191-94; Sheila Canby, 'Six illustrations from the *Shahnama* of Shah Tahmasp', in *eadem*, *Princes, Poets & Paladins: Islamic and Indian Paintings from the collection of Prince and Princess Sadruddin Aga Khan*, London, 1998, pp 47-54. *Encyclopædia Iranica*, s.v. 'Tahmāsp I' (by Colin Mitchell), <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/tahmasp-i>; *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., vol. X, s.v. 'Tahmāsp' (by Roger Savory), pp 108-10; *Encyclopedia of Islam and the Muslim World*, vol. 2, s.v 'Tahmasp I, Shah (1514-1576)' (by Sholeh Quinn), Richard Martin (ed.), New York, 2004, p 675. An insightful psycho-social critique on him by a former pupil of Martin Dickson is in Kathryn Babayan, 'Mirroring the Safavi Past: Shah Tahmasb's break with His Messiah Father', in *eadem*, *Mystics, Monarchs and Messiahs: Cultural Landscapes of Early Modern Iran*, Harvard Middle Eastern Monographs XXXV, Cambridge, MA and London, 2002, pp 295-348; *eadem*, 'The Safavids in Iranian History (1501-1722)', in *The Oxford Handbook of Iranian History*, Touraj Daryaee (ed.), Oxford, 2012; repr. 2014, pp 291-95, is a succinct evaluation of Tahmasp's beliefs,

political and religious. (Brilliantly bristling with provocative aphorisms, that would be railed against as ‘reductive’ and ‘essentialist’ by the contemporary custodians of cant cornering Middle East history writing, is the chapter entitled ‘Persian Psychology’ in William Haas, *Iran*, New York, 1946, pp 116-36. It ought be mandatory reading for all embarking on studying or visiting Iran.) In his invaluable study, Abolala Soudavar, *Art of the Persian Courts: Selections from the Art and History Trust Collection*, Milo Cleveland Beach (contrib.), New York, 1992, pp 164 and 200, n 82 cites Munshi Budaq Qazvini, a contemporary chronicler, who mentioned in his *Jawahir al-akhbar* that a *Shahnama* ‘had taken twenty years for completion, beginning early in the reign of the late *shāh* when he had a liking for reading and writing, and calligraphers and painters were constantly in his presence.’ See Mohammad Faghfoory, ‘Jawahir al-akhbar: yek nuskhah-yi khatti-yi kamyab az mamaba‘-yi dawran-i safavi’, *Iran Nameh* XV, 4 [Gholam Hossein Sadighi: A Commemorative], 1997, pp 613-23.

7. *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., vol. IX, s.v. ‘Selim II’ (by Christine Woodhead), pp 131-32. Recte its wrong dimensions given as ‘47.5 x 32 cms’ in *Iranian Masterpieces of Persian Painting [Shahkarha-yi nigargiri yi Iran]*, Claud Karbasi *et al.* (tr.), Anthony Schumacher (ed.), Tehran, 2005; repr. 2011, p 231. 31 full-page, colour miniatures of the Houghton *Shahnama*’s 118 illustrations, now back in Tehran, are reproduced here (pp 231-305).
8. The collector and art historian, Abolala Soudavar, after closely observing a particularly remarkable *Qur’an* put up for sale at Christie’s, London, in the winter of 1992, tantalizingly suggested it could well be the *Qu’ran* which complemented the Tahmaspi *Shahnama*. For his explication see Soudavar, ‘Appendix’ in *art. cit.*, 2002, pp 110-11, 114-15, 120, n 77. Now also consult Abolala Soudavar, *Reassessing Early Safavid Art and History: thirty-five years after Dickson & Welch 1981*, Houston, 2016, which critique affords a defense of Dickson and Welch’s scholarship in the ensuing years.
9. *Ibid.* Also Stuart Cary Welch, *A King’s Book of Kings: the Shah-nameh of Shah Tahmasp*, London and New York 1972; repr. 1976, p 15; q.v. n 43. Further see the Sotheby’s catalogue, *The Stuart Cary Welch Collection, Part One: Arts of the Islamic World, London, 6 April 2011*, London, 2011, p 89 (hereinafter *CWC*, 2011). That ‘contemporary’ *Shahnama*, gifted by Shah Tahmasp, was as the one commissioned by Prince Baysunghur, a ‘Timuri bibliophile’, whose own fine copy had been executed in 1436. The Shah’s recension was assuredly predicated on a more than passing familiarity of several earlier ones including a ‘proto-Baysunghur *Shahnama*’ or ‘Baysunghur’s own copy’: a perceptive comment in Eleanor Sims, *Peerless Images: Persian Painting and its Sources*, with Boris Marshak and Ernst Grube, New Haven and London, 2003, p 64. It was the Baysunghuri *Shahnama*, or a magnificent near contemporaneous equivalent, which contained an introduction on the life of Firdawsi and a historical compilation of the epic. And this ‘Baysunghur Introduction’ was to be appended to subsequent copies of the *Shahnama* including the one presented to the Sultan, see Welch and Dickson, *op. cit.*, 1981, vol. II, plates 1-3. It must be borne that Firdawsi’s final recension of 1010 was revised twice: first by Hamdullah al-Mustawfi al-Qazwini (1280/81-1339/40?) and again by expunging archaisms and augmenting verses for the Timurid prince, Baysunghur (1397-1433), and completed in January 1430. This is now the standard text. See Oleg Grabar and Sheila Blair, *Epic Images and Contemporary History: the Illustrations of the Great Mongol Shahnama*, Chicago and London, 1980, p 1; further, it must also be pointed out that this ‘Baysunghur Introduction’ contains numerous misidentifications of historical personages alongside notations to the epic and epicist, *Encyclopædia Iranica*, vol. IV, s.v. ‘Bāysongorī Šāh-nāma’ (by Dj Khaleghi Motlagh and T Lentz), pp 9-11; Olga Davidson, ‘The Testing of the *Shāhnāma* in the “Life of Ferdowsi” Narratives’, *The Rhetoric of Biography: Narrating Lives in Persianate Societies*, L Marlow (ed.), Ilex Foundation Series 4, Boston and Washington DC, 2011, pp 11-20, esp. pp 15ff.; *eadem*, ‘Why is the Bāysonghori Recension a Recension?’, *No Tapping Around Philology: a Festschrift in honor of Wheeler McIntosh Thackston Jr.’s 70th Birthday*, Alireza Korangy and Daniel Sheffield (eds.), Wiesbaden, 2014, pp 127-30. The codex (= Gulistan ms. no. 716, dated A.H. Jumada I, 833/January, 1430) containing 21 unsigned illuminations within 346 folios remains, thankfully, intact albeit inaccessible, since the 1978-79 revolution at the Gulistan Palace Museum

(former Royal Library), Tehran, unlike other mutilated *Shahnamas* elsewhere. Still unstudied, its images were reproduced as *An Album of Miniatures and Illuminations from the Baysonghori Manuscript of the Shahnameh of Ferdowsi dated 833 A.H./1430 A.D. and preserved in the Imperial Library, Tehran*, Basil Gray (introd. and commentary), Tehran, 1971. This commemorative edition of 3,000 copies was arranged by the Central Council of the Celebration of the 2500th Anniversary of the Founding of the Persian Empire by Cyrus the Great. It was never offered for sale but gifted by the late Shah to heads of states attending the then festivities at Persepolis, October 1971. Its 34 colour plates are appalling water-colour copies as has been pointed out in Eleanor Sims, 'The Illustrated Manuscripts of Firdausī's "Shāhnāma" Commissioned by Princes of the House of Tīmūr', *Ars Orientalis* 22, 1992, p 59, n 4; and Robert Hillenbrand, 'Exploring a Neglected Masterpiece: the Gulistan *Shahnama* of Baysunghur', *Iranian Studies* 43, 1, 2010 [Special issue: Millennium of the *Shahnama* of Firdausi, Firuza Abdullaeva and Charles Melville (eds.)], p 107f. who has done all a service by detailing how 'at a time when the technology was in place for first-class color plates to be made, and when there was clearly no shortage of money, the decision was made not to photograph and reproduce the original paintings themselves, but to paint – presumably on the basis of photographic reproductions – water-color copies of them and to make the color plates from these modern copies rather than from the originals. ... The procedure followed, whatever it was, is not acknowledged anywhere in the 1971 volume. In other words, the book is not what it pretends to be. It is as if a luxury modern edition of, say, *Les Très Riches Heures* of the Duc de Berry were to be produced by hiring some modern artist to out-Limburg the Limburg brothers, coloring the outlines of their composition, and then passing off his work as a photographic record of the real thing. The lack of respect for the original is startling.' Hillenbrand has also done the decent thing by pointing out that Basil Gray had not been in the know and, if anything, deceived by the Persian imperial celebrations council thus leading him to state that the miniatures were 'reproduced in facsimile from the original' (p 107, n 36). Recte A Shahpur Shahbazi, *Ferdowsi: a critical biography*, Cambridge MA, 1991; repr. Costa Mesa CA, 2010, p 17, n 68 who declared it as 'magnificently published' as the Houghton *Shahnama* and published in '1976'. A caveat emptor then to the prospective bibliophile is that this tome is intrinsically worthless and yet able to command an asking price of almost £400 from antiquarian book-sellers. A garish reprint, exactly two decades later to mark the epic's millennial composition, ought elicit no more than bibliographic notice: *Majmu'ah-yi minyaturha va safahat-i muzahhab-i Shahnama-yi Ferdowsi: nuskhah-yi dawrah-yi Baysunghuri* [*The Shahnameh of Ferdosi: the Baysonghori Period Manuscript*], illust. by Karim Safai; Jaber Anasseri (introd. and notes), Tehran, 1991. All 21 illustrations have now been finely reproduced in a difficult to obtain coffee-table tome, *Iranian Masterpieces of Persian Painting [Shahkarha-yi nigargiri yi Iran]*, Claud Karbasi et al. (tr.), Anthony Schumacher (ed.), Tehran, 2005; repr. 2011, plates 41-67. This hefty catalogue, both in weight and price, accompanied an exhibition curated by Mohammad Ali Rajabi during spring 2005 at Tehran's Museum of Contemporary Art. Some of its illustrations were previously reproduced as full-colour transparencies in Mohammad-Hasan Semsar, *Golestan Palace Library: a Portfolio of Miniature Paintings and Calligraphy [Kakh-i Gulistan, ganjinah-i kutub va nafa'is-i khatti: guzinah'i az shahkarha-yi nigargiri va khvushnivisi]*, Karim Emami (tr. and ed.), Tehran, 2000, pp 86-109. It was a limited edition catalogue of that former imperial library's illuminated holdings.

10. David Roxburgh, *The Persian Album: from Dispersal to Collection*, New Haven and London, 2005; repr. 2013, p 317. Kathryn Babayan, *op. cit.*, 2002, p 326. Roxburgh's writings, in shifting from descriptions towards ruminations on the interface between production and reception, artists and patrons, and epistemologies of exchange, patronage and cultural norms compel rethinking. Also see *idem*, 'The Study of Painting and the Arts of the Book', *Muqarnas* 17, 2000, pp 1-16; *idem*, 'Micrographia: towards a visual logic of Persianate painting', *Res: Anthropology and Aesthetics* [Special issue: Islamic Arts] 43, 2003[2004], pp 12-30. In similar vein is a perspicacious *Stand der Forschung* in Anna Contadini, 'The Manuscript as a Whole', in *Arab Painting: Text and Image in Illustrated Arabic Manuscripts*, Handbook of Oriental Studies I.90, Leiden, 2007; corr. rev. ed., 2010, pp 3-16. Perceptive and profitable is Sheila Blair and Jonathan Bloom, 'The Mirage

of Islamic Art: Reflections on the study of an unwieldy field', *The Art Bulletin* 85, 1, 2003, pp 152-84. It would be remiss to overlook Ehsan Yarshater who, almost half a century ago, urged an unitary reconsideration of the visual and verbal in Persian poetics and painting by distinguishing literary *topoi* as harmony and sensuality. See his 'Some Common Characteristics of Persian Poetry and Art', *Studia Islamica* XVI, 1962, pp 61-71 and *idem*, 'Persian Poetry and Painting: Common Features', in *Proceedings, the IVth International Congress of Persian Art and Archaeology, Part A, April 24 – May 3, 1960. A Survey of Persian Art from Prehistoric Times to the Present*, vol. XIV, Arthur U Pope and Phyllis Ackerman (eds.), Tokyo, London and New York, 1967, pp. 3125-29. On the presentation of gifts see *Encyclopædia Iranica*, vol. X, s.v 'Gift giving iv. In the Safavid period' (by Rudi Matthee), pp 609-14; and, generally, Michael Morony, 'Gift giving in the Iranian tradition', in *Gifts of the Sultan: the arts of giving at the Islamic Courts*, Linda Komaroff (ed.), New Haven and London, 2011, pp 32-49. The question of 'knowledge transactions', as propounded by Lisa Jardine, in her analysis of late Elizabethan humanists, where versatile scholars served their sixteenth-century patrons as tutor, secretary and chaplain, hold promising potential for researchers of Muslim material culture. Such transactions or negotiations between savant and sovereign, not entirely predicated on pre-arranged pecuniary practices, can be based on the proffering of expertise towards textual or artistic support for a political or strategic outcome. Examined in Lisa Jardine and William Sherman, 'Pragmatic Readers: Knowledge Transactions and Scholarly Services in Late Elizabethan England', in *Religion, Culture and Society in Early Modern Britain: Essays in honour of Patrick Collinson*, Anthony Fletcher and Peter Roberts (eds.), Cambridge, 1994; repr. 2006, pp 102-24. In her survey, Lale Uluç, 'The *Shahnama* of Firdawsī as an Illustrated Text', in *Treasures of the Aga Khan Museum: Arts of the Book and Calligraphy*, Carol LaMotte and Shannon de Viviès (tr.), Margaret Graves (ed.), Istanbul, 2010, p 263 points out that the *Shahnama* was explicitly minuted in Ottoman archival lists and gift registers whereas other illustrated books went unnamed and enumerated as presents to the Porte. When accompanied by a *Qur'an*, the latter was listed prior to the *Shahnama*; and chancery chroniclers who would subsume other painted tomes under a collective header regularly recorded both in every instance. Also discussed in *eadem*, 'The *Shahnama* of Firdausi in the Lands of Rum', in *Shahnama Studies II: The Reception of Firdausi's Shahnama*, Charles Melville and Gabrielle van den Berg (eds.), Studies in Persian Cultural History 2, Leiden, 2012, pp 161-62. The question of an Alid *Qur'an* brings to mind the iconographic parallels between the paintings in the *Shahnama*, especially those of the Rustam cycle, with those in the *Khavarannama*, a narrative by Ibn Husam (1379/80-1468?) extolling Ali's exploits in a Persianised folk religious setting, the very converse of its Firdawsian one. See Charles Melville, 'Ibn Husam's *Hāvarān-nāma* and the *Šāh-nāma* of Firdausī', in *Liber Amicorum: Études sur l'Iran médiéval et moderne offertes à Jean Calmard*, M Bernardini et al. (eds.), *Eurasian Studies* 5, 1-2, 2006[2007], pp 219-34. Redolent with Alid predestinarian overtones is the illustration, 'Ship of Shi'ism' (folio 18v.) – the very first among the 78 Houghton gifted to the Met (1970.300.1) – which depicts the *ahl al-bayt* ('people of the House'), namely, Muhammad, Ali, Hasan, and Husain who, along with Firdawsī, are saved from the deluge till the end of time. Firdawsī, according to some sources a Shi'i, is unequivocally portrayed as one, along with the Muhammedan quartet and the Safavids, as vanguards of the faith. The parable of the ship of fidelity is a recurrent theme in visual and literary media. Its inclusion by Tahmasp for the allegorical edification of his Sunni counterpart cannot be ruled out of hand. See Raya Shani, 'Noah's Ark and the Ship of Faith in Persian Painting', *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 27, 2002, p 181; and Colin Mitchell, *The Practice of Politics in Safavid Iran: Power, Religion and Rhetoric*, Tauris Academic Studies-BIPS Persian Studies Series 1, London and New York, 2009, p 74. Duncan Haldane, 'Twin Spirits: Angels and Devils Portrayed in Shah Tahmasp's Shah Nameh', in Proceedings of the Colloquium on Paradise and Hell in Islam, Keszthely, 7-14 July 2002, K Dévényi and A Fodor (eds.), *The Arabist: Budapest Studies in Arabic* 30, pt. 2, Budapest, 2012, pp 39-53 describes ancient Zoroastrian doctrines in illustrations of the Houghton *Shahnama*.

11. Not just upstarts but downright 'drunken cowards' is how Tahmasp's forebear and founder of the Safavid state, Shah Ismail I (d. 1524), and his army is depicted and described in the *Selimname* written for Sultan Selim I (r. 1512-20) by Şükri-i Bidlisi, who thinks nothing of making Ismail

acknowledge that, ‘Osman is the shah of the world. We do not deserve to be called shah.’ Noted in Zeynep Tarım Ertuğ, ‘The Depiction of Ceremonies in Ottoman Miniatures: Historical Record or a Matter of Protocol?’, *Muqarnas* 27, 2010, p 253.

12. Soudavar, *op. cit.*, 1992, p 164. *Encyclopædia Iranica*, vol. I, s.v ‘Peace of Amasya’ (by M Köhbach), p 928; *recte* Savory, *art. cit.*, 1994, p 405 because the treaty did not usher in ‘a period of over thirty years of peace with the Ottomans.’ It held for twenty. On the treaty’s renegotiation, Savory, *op. cit.*, 2007, p 67 and Kaveh Farrokh, *Iran at War: 1500-1988*, Oxford, 2011, p 47. Soudavar, *art. cit.*, 2002, pp 105 and 118, n 56, relates how Budaq Qazvini, revealed the mindset of Tahmasp’s successor, Ismail II, desperate to maintain the cold peace, who sent his Sunni nemesis, Murad III (r. 1574-95), ‘fifty illustrated manuscripts copied by unrivaled master-calligraphers, not one of which could be found in the Ottoman sultan’s library. Even though [his cousin] Ebrahim Mirza impertinently repeated that such manuscripts were irreplaceable and that [the Ottomans] could not appreciate their value or their beauty, and that other items should be sent instead, [the shah] replied, ‘I need peace and security, not books and manuscripts, that I never read or see.’ This from a keen poet. A half-century on, Shah Abbas (r. 1588-1629) proposed yet another armistice in 1610, which the Ottomans accepted in 1618, based on that agreed at Amasya, but including a hundred loads of silk to sweeten the deal. Halil İnalçik, ‘The Heyday and Decline of the Ottoman Empire’, in Holt et al. *op. cit.*, 1994, p 339.
13. A point in fact noted at the outset of a catalogue, with a description of this Tahmaspi *Shahnama*, on the tradition of giving and receiving presents in the Islamic oecumene. See Linda Komaroff, ‘The Arts of Giving at the Islamic Courts’, in eadem, *The Gift Tradition in Islamic Art/Taqalid al-ihda’ fi’l-funun al-islamiyah*, Los Angeles, 2012, pp 13-15. This is an abridged, bi-lingual edition of the catalogue published a year earlier, *supra* n 10. Further, generally, Jan Schmidt, ‘The Reception of Firdausi’s *Shahnama* among the Ottomans’, and Zeren Tanındı, ‘The Illustration of the *Shahnama* and the Art of the Book in Ottoman Turkey’, in Melville and van den Berg, *op. cit.*, 2012, pp 121-39; 141-58. (*Recte* Houghton’s death of ‘1991’ to 1990 in Schmidt, *art. cit.*, 2012, p 125, n 36.) Also Emine Fetvacı, *Picturing History at the Ottoman Court*, Bloomington, 2013, pp 78-80. This presentation by Tahmasp’s entourage was exactly reproduced in a double-foley painting in Seyyed Lokman’s *Şehname-yi Selim Han* (Topkapı Library A.3595, fol. 53v-54r) prepared for Murad III in 1581, as noted in J Michael Rogers, tr., exp. and ed., *The Topkapı Saray Museum 2: the Albums and Illuminated Manuscripts*, from the original Turkish by Filiz Çağman and Zeren Tanındı, London, 1986, pp 211-12, cat. no. 157; Rüstem, *art. cit.*, 2012, pp 246-47 (*infra* n 19 for full reference); and Sheila Blair, *Text and Image in Medieval Persian Art*, Biennial Ehsan Yarshater Lectures 6, SOAS-Edinburgh Studies in Islamic Art, Edinburgh, 2014, p 157. It was exhibited for the 2009 ‘Turkey-Iran Culture Year’ organised in collaboration with *Istanbul 2010 European Capital of Culture Agency*, alongside some 300 artefacts at the imperial stables of the Topkapı Palace Museum, December 2, 2009 - February 5, 2010. See *Onbin Yıllık İran Medeniyeti: İkin Yıllık Ortak Miras*, Selmin Kangal (ed.), [Istanbul], [2009], pp 203, 305. Eng. edn., *Ten thousand years of Iranian civilization: two thousand years of Common Heritage*, Selmin Kangal and Drew Batchelder (eds.), [Istanbul, 2009]. ‘10,000 Years of Iran’s Civilizations [*sic*] glitters at Topkapı Palace’, *Tehran Times*, December 2 2009, p 16. Mazhar Ipşiroğlu, *Masterpieces from the Topkapı Museum: Painting and Miniatures*, Adair Mill (tr.), London, 1980, pp 113-14 reminds one that while the sultan’s versifiers imitated Firdawsī by bombastically titling their compositions as *Şehin Şehname* or *Şehname*, his artists eschewed pretentious or fantastic portrayals for consistently showing him as sovereign and head of state. This was in consonance with Ottoman visual conventions that favoured simplicity over sensuousness, an autonomous feature of Ottoman book illustration, notwithstanding its Persian antecedents. The *Süleymanname* was formally, conspicuously, and conceptually based on Firdawsī’s *Shahnama* as it too consisted of 30,000 verses in the *masnavi* genre and *mutaqarib* metre. See Esin Atıl, *Süleymanname: the Illustrated History of Süleyman the Magnificent*, Washington DC and New York, 1986, p 63; and Cigdem Kafescioğlu, ‘The visual arts’, in *The Cambridge History of Turkey: the Ottoman Empire as a world power 1453-1603*, vol. 2, Suraiya Faroqhi and Kate Fleet (eds.), Cambridge, 2012,

p 508. An aside here is that Cornell Fleischer, a protégé of Martin Dickson, is currently the University of Chicago's Kanuni Suleyman Professor of Ottoman and Modern Turkish Studies, a chair named in honour of that sixteenth-century sultan and partially funded by Ankara.

14. Adolphus Slade, 'A Lesson in Pride (1833)', in *A Middle Eastern Mosaic: Fragments of Life, Letters and History*, Bernard Lewis (sel. and presented), New York, 2001, p 156. In a finely-crafted assessment, Peter Avery, 'Empires of Islam: Muslim India, Persia and Turkey', in *The Age of Expansion: Europe and the World 1559-1600*, Hugh Trevor-Roper (ed.), London, 1968, p 306, states: 'War between the two states was inevitable, and the sectarian difference gave it a religious warrant: the rulers could demand internal unity, here against the "Sunnite dog", there against the "Shi'ite heretic". The Prophet's mantle and banner were shown to the Ottoman armies ready to march from Istanbul to the Persian frontier, while Persian armies setting out to seize Tiflis or Baghdad invoked the spirit of 'Ali and cursed those first three Caliphs of Islam who had kept him from his legitimate position as the Prophet's successor.' Rula Jurdi Abisaab, *Converting Persia: Religion and Power in the Safavid Empire*, International Library of Iranian Studies 1, London and New York, 2004 is an important, recent analysis of this transitional period. Thorough going on the whole question is also Colin Turner, *Islam without Allah? The Rise of Religious Externalism in Safavid Iran*, Richmond, 2000; repr. New York and Abingdon, 2014. But in Safavid Persia 'the perceived history of persecution suffered by the Shi'a did not always prompt a sensitivity to the vulnerability of other minorities once the Shi'a became the dominant sect.' Michael Axworthy, *Iran: Empire of the Mind, A History from Zoroaster to the Present Day*, London 2007; repr. 2008, p 140. In the best tradition of English generalists, with perspicacity frequently wanting among specialists, wrote Clive Irving, *Crossroads of Civilization: 3000 years of Persian History*, London, 1978; repr. 1979, pp 166ff.: 'Persia's emergence as a new and independent branch of eastern Islam was not, like the rise of Protestant Europe, intellectually liberating. Shi'ism was no longer a revolutionary or even revisionary force: it became an intensively traditional one, bent on consecrating the fable of 'Ali and Husain, the martyred *imams*, through rituals like the *tazieh* passion plays which had overtones of genocide in their liturgy, and through the pilgrimages to the shrines of the Shi'a *imams*. And the secular climate was no more radical. Isfahan in the seventeenth century did foster a period of intellectual debate; it revolved around theological philosophy of great sophistication but there was little sign of the kind of intellectual questing that had distinguished Baghdad or Nishapur when Persian brilliance sharpened the dialectic of all Islam. There was no equal of Avicenna, the great philosopher and "universal genius" of the Samanid court, whose influence reached twelfth-century Europe, nor of the scientist al-Biruni. That calibre of secular exploration had been snuffed out in the petrification of Islamic thinking, just as it was in Europe by the reaction of the thirteenth-century Papacy.' The farther back you look, the farther forward you can see: Roger Savory, 'Islam and democracy: the case of the Islamic republic of Iran', in *The Islamic World from Classical to Modern Times: Essays in honor of Bernard Lewis*, C E Bosworth *et al.* (eds.), Princeton, 1989, pp 827ff. convincingly delineates how the 1979 revolution led to a theocracy, not democracy, because '[t]he Islamic republic of Iran is, by virtue of its own internal dynamics, a totalitarian state.' The *longue durée* enables one to observe the gestation of intolerance and bigotry within the Persian Shi'a, since the zealous imposition and identification of that credo from the sixteenth century onwards, with Perso-Safavid nationalism. It did not emerge, howsoever much generous credence be accorded, to a century of western meddling and mendacity, *pace* Stephen Kinzer and Christopher de Bellaigue in their harlot-histories precipitated by multicultural shibboleths. A reading of Savory, *loc. cit.*, would have led them to realise how 'the accommodation eventually reached among Sunnis between the theory and practice of government in medieval Islam was never reached, or even attempted, in the *Ithnā 'asharī* Shī'ī tradition.' Both *bien-pensant* journalists are serious reading – masterfully disparaged by the Leavises as the 'literary racket' – for those who have nailed their colours to the mast of anti-Americanism fluttering as responsible penmanship. Sheila Canby, 'The Legacy of Shah 'Abbas', in eadem, *Shah 'Abbas: the remaking of Iran*, London, 2009, p 254, correctly concludes that 'Safavid support of madrasas around the shrine in Qum helped establish the city's position as a centre of learning, while its geographic location between Isfahan and Tehran has enabled it to function as a bridge between the old capitals

of the Safavids and the new one of the Qajars, Pahlavis and Islamic republic during the past two centuries. After the Revolution of 1979 both Mashhad and Qum experience renewed prominence, and images of the shrines began to appear on Iranian banknotes with pictures of protestors carrying banners with the face of Ayatollah Khomeini on the reverse.' Amnesia and appeasement punctuated the reviews of this exhibition on Shah 'Abbas outstandingly curated by Sheila Canby at The British Museum, London (February 19 - June 14, 2009). The 'literary racket' was manifest in idiocy on both the right and left of the 'quality' press: Madeleine Bunting, 'Empire of the Mind', *The Guardian Review*, January 31 2009, pp 16-17, was left awestruck because 'Abbas was gracious enough to accommodate the [forcibly evicted] Armenians that he even allowed them to even build their own Christian cathedral' for '[i]n stark contrast to the disciplined aesthetic of the mosques, the cathedral's walls are rich with gory martyrdoms and saints.' But Miss Bunting is clearly at a loss to put out either buntings or sentinels when declaring, with half-naïve puzzlement, 'Shia rituals of self-flagellation, intercession, pilgrimage, relics and martyrs can alienate in a Europe that is rapidly forgetting its own version of such rituals in the Catholic tradition.' Inconvenient to point out how a Carmelite prior wrote the Pope that Shah 'Abbas was 'the greatest tyrant the Church has had since it began ... for the methods he adopts are taken from hell.' 5,000 Christians were forcibly converted to Shia Islam. David Blow, *op. cit.*, 2009, p 125. Neville Hawcock, 'Show of might and tolerance,' *Financial Times*, February 20 2009, p 13 is another ignoramus according to whom it stands to reason that with the magnificent objects on display 'one gets the impression of a tolerant, outward-looking culture.' (Try publishing that very conclusion after being amazed by the goldwork or temple architecture of the Aztecs.) A balanced corrective is Michael Glover, 'Exotic riches of an Iranian tyrant,' *The Independent*, March 5 2009, p 16: 'The national religion, a brand of Islam called Shia, was a relatively recent imposition.' And that the Shah's 'iron fist guaranteed devotion to Allah in others, and that was what he sought.' Far and away more disappointing is the then British Museum director, Neil MacGregor, admirable as his enthusiasm and industry has been in undertaking curatorial exchanges with Iran, China, and Sudan among other culturally rich but revolting regimes, to declare that, unlike Tudor England, 'the Shah's Iran "accommodated other faiths" as seen by gospels beautifully illustrated by Armenian Christians who were forcibly resettled in Iran from 1603' for entirely commercial reasons. One swallow made that Scotsman's summer, it seems, and an astucious despot can be rehabilitated as an altruist. William Lee Adams, 'The Art of Diplomacy', *Time*, March 2, 2009, p 50. Robert Hillenbrand, regrettably posits in an otherwise learned review, 'Wealth, piety and panache: how Safavid flamboyance redefined Iran', *Times Literary Supplement*, May 8 2009, p 17 that Safavid Persia ushered in 'a tolerance hitherto rarely encountered in Iran' and was 'a multiracial society, welcoming Armenians, Georgians, Hindus and Westerners, including members of religious orders.' Present-day Qatar, UAE and other Persian Gulf shaykhdoms attract all of the aforementioned and others without whose skills and talent such Arab societies would halt in minutes. Just how truly tolerant they are need not be rehearsed. Like Hillenbrand, Roger Savory, 'Land of the Lion and the Sun', in *The World of Islam: Faith, People, Culture*, Bernard Lewis (ed.), London, 1976; corr. repr. 2002, p 247 also succumbed to this fallacy by conflating politic accommodation with spiritual magnanimity as 'he created a climate of religious tolerance which encouraged foreign merchants to live and work in Iran'. None of them have delved into the harrowing ordeal of Armenian Christians endured by the Armenians as Edmund Herzig, 'The Deportation of the Armenians and Europe's myth of Shah 'Abbas I', in *Pembroke Papers 1: Persian and Islamic Studies in honour of P W Avery*, Charles Melville (ed.), Cambridge, 1990, pp 59-71, which conclusion (p 71) merits rehearsal: 'On balance the usual European interpretation of 'Abbās's relations with the Armenians appears sadly distorted by the exclusive focus on the Julfans, by the disregard for the human cost of his successful military strategy, and by the urge to make every aspect of his reign conform with the image of him as a great and good king. ... Far from being the father of the Armenians, 'Abbās thoroughly earned the epithet, "the second Timur", given him by an Armenian scribe in 1606.' Overlooked also is Vera Moreen, 'The Status of Religious Minorities in Safavid Iran, 1617-1661', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* XL, 2, 1981, pp 119-34 which throws light on the plight of all non-Muslim subjects of the Safavids. This grew out of Moreen's 1978 Harvard doctoral dissertation which

focused on the continuous persecution and forcible mass conversion of Jews during ‘Abbas I’s reign and that of his successors, Safi I (r. 1629-42) and ‘Abbas II (r. 1642-66). Eadem, *Iranian Jewry’s hour of peril and heroism: a study of Bābāi ibn Lutf’s Chronicle, 1617-1662*, Text and Studies 6, New York, 1987. Mahan Esfahani, a noted harpsichordist, challenged Robert Hillenbrand in a letter, *Times Literary Supplement*, May 29 2009, p 6 stating, ‘it is generally acknowledged that religious diversity and tolerance were cornerstones of Persian history dating back to the Achaemenid period (559-330 BC).’ On religious intolerance during Shah ‘Abbas’s reign towards all minorities see David Blow, *op. cit.*, 2009, *passim* and Mary Boyce, ‘Under Safavids and Mughals’, in eadem, *Zoroastrians: their religious beliefs and practices*, Library of Religious Beliefs and Practices, London, 1979; corr. repr. 2001, pp 177-95. Boyce, comparatively if unwittingly, affords an excellent evaluation of these beleaguered believers belonging to Sunni and Shi‘a empires of late medieval Islam. On Safavid persecution of Zoroastrians also see Jenny Rose, ‘*Gabr-Mahalle*: Zoroastrians in Islamic Iran’, in eadem, *Zoroastrianism: an Introduction*, I B Tauris Introduction to Religions, London and New York, 2011, pp 175ff.; and Rashna Writer, ‘Emasculation of the Zoroastrians in the Safavid Era’, in eadem, *The Reshaping of Muslim Iran: from Zoroastrian to Muslim*, Jamsheed Choksy (foreword), Lampeter, 2013, pp 293-332. *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., vol. I, s.v. “Abbās I” (by Roger Savory), pp 7-8.

15. Welch and Dickson, *op. cit.*, 1981, vol. I, p 3, and Appendix II, p 270. Joseph von Hammer[-Purgstall] (1774-1856) summarized it in his work based on official Ottoman lists translated into Italian and also that of memoirs and despatches by Europeans. See his *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches ...*, vol. 3, Pest, 1828; repr. Graz, 1963, pp 517-22. It is mentioned for the first time in a 1568 description of the 1566 enthronement of Selim II by the bureaucrat, Feridun Ahmed Beg (d. 1581), in his compilation, *Nūzhet-i esrārū’l-ahyār der ahbār-ı Sefer-i Sigetvar* (‘Joyful Chronicle of the Szigetvár Campaign’), dated A.H. 13 Rajab, 976 (= 1 January, 1569). Filiz Çağman and Zeren Tanındı, ‘Remarks on some Manuscripts from the Topkapi Palace Treasury in the Context of Ottoman-Safavid Relations’, *Muqarnas* 17, 2000, p 144, n 1; Tanındı, *art. cit.*, 2012, p 151, n 52. Different figures are noted in Rogers, *op. cit.*, 1986, p 211 as to the entourage consisting of 700 men and 19,000 pack beasts. Described also in Soudavar, *op. cit.*, 1992, p 164.
16. Stuart Cary Welch, Jr ‘Two Shahs, Some Miniatures and a Boston Carpet’, *Boston Museum Bulletin* LXIX, 355-356, 1971, [Special issue: Persian Carpet Symposium], p 10. The *shamsa* categorically reads as executed for the library of Shah Tahmasp. Welch and Dickson, *op. cit.*, 1981, vol. I, p 4; *contra* in the review by Priscilla Soucek, *Ars Orientalis* 14, 1984, p 133 and Michael Levey, ‘The very rich hours of the Shah’, *The New York Review of Books*, Oct. 7 1982, p 14. (Additional reviews cited *infra* n 23.) In agreement with Welch is Rüstem, *art. cit.*, 2012, p 245 (*vide* n 19 for full citation) and Hillenbrand, *art. cit.*, 1996, p 75, n 36. Eleanor Sims, *op. cit.*, 2003, p 63 and Canby, *op. cit.*, 2011, p 14 eschew speculation leaving it a *non liquet*. Sheila Canby, *The Shahnama of Shah Tahmasp: the Persian Book of Kings*, Marcie Muscat (ed.), New Haven and London, 2014, p 16 reasonably forecloses that, regardless of whether Shah Ismail I commissioned it in 1522 in response to Tahmasp’s rejection of an earlier Turkmen-style *Shahnama* or not, the ‘manuscript is firmly associated with the patronage of Shah Tahmasp.’ Assadullah Souren Melikian-Chirvani [*passim* Souren Melikian], *Le Chant du Monde: L’art de l’Iran safavide 1501-1736*, Paris, 2007, pp 28-29 maintains that it was exclusively for Tahmasp; *contra* Abolala Soudavar, ‘*Le Chant du Monde*: a Disenchanted Echo of Safavid Art History’, *Iran* 46, 2008, p 273. Soudavar’s severe, albeit balanced, review essay of the aforementioned catalogue by Melikian is insightful for its wide-ranging comments on pre- and Safavid painting hitherto unconsidered by Melikian and others.
17. Sultan Muhammad may well have suggested it as well. Tahmasp, it appears, set a precedent for his Safavid successors, Shah Ismail II (r. 1576-77) and Shah ‘Abbas (r. 1588-1629), both of whom decreed the execution of illustrated *Shahnamas* at the start of their reigns. Pointed out in Sheila Canby, ‘138A-G. Seven folios from Shah Tahmasp’s Shahnama (Book of Kings) of Firdausi’, in *Masterpieces from the Department of Islamic Art in The Metropolitan Museum of Art*, Maryam Ekhtiyar *et al.* (eds.), New Haven and London, 2011; repr. 2012, p 203. Barbard Brend, *Islamic*

Art, London 1991; repr. 2005, p 161, remarks that it seems quite probable that Tahmasp sought to secure and assure his legitimacy and kingship ‘by immersing himself in the world conjured up by illustrations to the Persian epic.’ It must be mentioned that not only was Tahmasp a patron of the arts but also his daughters, Gawhar Sultan Khanum (d. 1577) and Pari Khan Khanum (d. 1578). So was their aunt, Mahin Banu or Shahzada Sultan (d. 1562), a confidante of the Shah who had studied with the famed Dust Muhammad, principal manuscript illuminator of this Houghton *Shahnama*. See Andrew Newman, *Safavid Iran: Rebirth of a Persian Empire*, London and New York, 2006; repr. 2009, p 35. Soudavar, *op. cit.*, 1992, p 200, n 54 relates how a talented Tahmasp, aged eleven in 1525, copied ‘Arifi’s *Guy va Chughan* (‘Ball and bandy’) manuscript in 1523-24, which contained 16 unsigned paintings after Bihzad’s style, and gifted this pocket-size album to his guardian, Qazi-yi Jahan. (*Contra* Akimushkin, *art. cit.*, 2003, p 561 has Tahmasp aged twelve.) Soudavar, *loc. cit.*, considers Tahmasp’s handiwork, if so, as ‘distinctly immature’ in a double-folio frontispiece depicting the ruler’s audience in the St. Petersburg *Guy va Chughan* mss. (Russ. Natl. Libr., Dorn 441). Reproduced in M M Ashrafi, *Persidsko-Tadzhikskaja poezija v miniaturakh XIV-XVII vv./Persian-Tajik Poetry in XIV-XVII Centuries* [sic] *Miniatures*, Kamal Aini (ed.), Dushanbe, 1974, pp 46-47. Attributed therein to ‘Tahmasp al-Hussaini’. Bahari, *op. cit.*, 1997, p 188 definitely ascribes Tahmasp’s tutelage to Bihzad. Soudavar suggests that ‘it probably is the work of Tahmasp himself’. *Vide* Ashrafi, *op. cit.*, 1974, pp 48-51; Thompson and Canby, *op. cit.*, 2003, pp 104, 106f. *Contra* Welch, *art. cit.*, 1971, p 10 who considered Tahmasp ‘accomplished’. A sloppy English edition is *Gūy va Chawghān, yā, Hālnāmah. The Ball and Polo stick, or, The book of ecstasy: a parallel Persian-English text, ‘Arifi of Herat*, Wheeler Thackston, Jr and Hossein Ziai (introd., tr. and eds.). Bibliotheca Iranica Intellectual Traditions 3, Costa Mesa CA, 1999. *Vide* William Hanaway’s justifiably critical review in *Iranian Studies* 35, 4 (Autumn, 2002) [2003], [Special issue: Sports and Games, H E Chehabi (ed.)], pp 434-37. One might point out here the pounced drawing traced from a folio of the Houghton *Shahnama* where Gushtasp’s polo prowess before Caesar is portrayed. While the painting is now at Tehran’s Museum of Contemporary Art (folio 403v.), the drawing (AKM65, Cat. 5), is at the newly inaugurated Aga Khan Museum of Islamic Art, Toronto. See *Enchanted Lines: Drawings from the Aga Khan Museum Collection*, Filiz Çakır Phillip (ed.), Toronto, 2014, pp 29, 48. Tahmasp, as a talented teenager, reminds one of that precocious polyglot and more gifted peer, Elizabeth I, aged eleven in 1544, whose New Year’s gift to her fourth stepmother, Katherine Parr, was a translation, *The Glasse of the Synnefull Soule*, of Marguerite of Navarre’s *Miroir de l’âme Pécheresse*, a school exercise, bound in blue canvas displaying her needlework of forget-me-nots, alongside heartsease worked in purple, yellow and green silk with silver threads, and a six-page ‘touchingly funny’ letter which exemplified ‘the kind of modesty that was regarded at the time as simply good manners.’ Evident grammatical and calligraphic cavils ‘are the natural errors of a child who was battling heroically against time to complete a task that stretched her powers of comprehension and concentration to the limit.’ Elizabeth’s New Year gift to her sovereign and father, Henry VIII, when twelve in December 1545, consisted of trilingual (Latin, French and Italian) translations of Queen Katherine’s *Prayers or Meditations*, whose 117 pages of vellum were bound in an embroidered scarlet cover showing Henry’s initials inter-laced with Katherine Parr’s monogram in gold and silver thread set within white, Tudor eglantines and silken leaves in green and yellow. It accompanied a letter with a Latin opening, the only known epistle by her to him in ‘youthful italic hand’. Alison Plowden, *The Young Elizabeth*, London, 1971; repr. 2011, pp 76-77; *Elizabeth I, the Word of a Prince: a Life from Contemporary Documents*, Maria Perry (introd., sel. and ed.), London, 1990, pp 31-39; *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*, Leah Marcus et al. (eds.), Chicago and London, 2000; repr. 2002, pp 6-10; David Loades, *Elizabeth I: the golden reign of Gloriana*, English Monarchs Treasures from the National Archives, London, 2003, pp 12-13; Susan Bassnett, *Elizabeth I: a Feminist Perspective*, Berg Women’s Series, Oxford and New York, 1988; repr. 1989, p 21; Anne Somerset, *Elizabeth I*, London 1991; repr. 2002, p 17; Elizabeth Norton, *Catherine Parr*, London, 2010; repr. 2011, pp 130-32. *Recte* Neville Williams, *The Life and Times of Elizabeth I*, Antonia Fraser (introd. and ed.), Kings & Queens of England Series, London, 1967; repr. 1992, p 20f., because this trilingual translation was gifted to the King and not the Queen. J E Neale, *Queen Elizabeth*

- I, Pelican Biographies, London, 1934; repr. Harmondsworth, 1971, p 23 remarked how Roger Ascham, her tutor, recalled that in 1562, already crowned and then twenty-nine, she ‘read more Greek in a day than some prebendary of the Church did Latin in a week.’
18. Veritably a blessing considering that the silver streaks in some of its illuminations remained, due to lack of exposure, untarnished until the twentieth century. Sims, *op. cit.*, 2003, p 64; *q.vv.* Welch and Dickson, *op. cit.*, 1981, vol. I, p 4; and Stuart Cary Welch, *A King's Book of Kings: the Shah-nameh of Shah Tahmasp*, London and New York, 1972; repr. 1976, p 17. Small wonder it never made it to the International Exhibition on Persian Art, Royal Academy of Arts, London, January 7 - March 7, 1931 whence its absence was lamented in Laurence Binyon *et al.*, *Persian Miniature Painting: including a critical and descriptive catalogue of the miniatures exhibited at Burlington House January-March, 1931*, London, 1933; corr. repr. New York, 1971, p 1; *q.v.* therein ‘Dūst Muhammad’s Account of Past and Present Painters’, pp 183-88: Topkapı Library H.2154 and summarised in Rogers, *op. cit.*, 1986, p 70 as ‘of prime importance for the history of fourteenth-century Persian painting.’ Critiqued in Soudavar, *art. cit.*, 2008, pp 268-69 (additional references furnished) and Contadini, *art. cit.*, 2010, pp 6-7.
 19. The *Shahnama* is slightly longer than the English heroic couplet as each line contains twenty-two syllables with two rhyming couplets in the same metre, *bahr-i mutaqaarib-i mahzuf* (~ - - / ~ - - / ~ - - / ~ - -), which Firdawsi deliberately chose for it was closest to the Persian syllabic system. Its 60,000 Persian couplets would approximate 10,000 English verse lines. The whole question of these Turkish synoptic inserts and *marginalia* form a perceptive, prize-winning essay by Ünver Rüstem, ‘The Afterlife of a Royal Gift: the Ottoman Inserts of the *Shāhnāma-i Shāhī*’, *Muqarnas* 29, 2012, pp 245-337. Rüstem, a Harvard *alumnus*, diligently continues the tradition of studying the Houghton *Shahnama* as two other *alumnae*, Stuart Cary Welch and Sheila Canby. His seminal findings are now indispensable for any substantial discussion of this dispersed manuscript. *Cf.* Welch and Dickson, Appendix II, *op. cit.*, 1981, vol. I, pp 4, 270 and n 1 and *contra* Welch and Dickson, Rüstem, *art. cit.*, 2012, p 266, n 28 alerts us now to the the fact that Arif, in the unquoted section of the colophon, recorded commencing his inserts in *A.H.* 1215 hence May 1801, not 1800. The present whereabouts, as Rüstem now declares, of this colophon sheet, if even still surviving, remain unknown. Dr Rüstem promptly placed at my disposal a typescript of a sequel to his exhaustive prequel cited above: *idem*, ‘An Afterlife Continued: More Ottoman Inserts from the *Shahnama-yi Shahi*’, in *Shahnama Studies IV: The next thousand years*, Charles Melville (ed.), Studies in Persian Cultural History, Leiden, *forthcoming*. Rüstem has now discovered and described in this study four additional inserts by Arif, all of which were pasted ‘along one edge to the margin nearest the spine’. He has now brought to the notice of the academic community a total of 46 such inserts. Welch *apud* Rüstem, *art. cit.*, 2012, p 268f., nn 35, 42 pointed out that these rather ungainly inserts, all intact, were observable when Houghton procured it in 1959 but were carefully detached and stored aside. A sum total of 212 inserts, therefore, at the time of writing, are either missing or destroyed. At least 78 ought be accounted for, in principal, at The Met. We are indebted to Dr Rüstem for rediscovering there 46. This implies 180 inserts may not be in New York but, hopefully, in Tehran where the mangled codex containing 118 illustrations, 501 text pages and its covers returned in 1994. My surmise of Arif’s inserts dovetails with that of Welch *apud* Rüstem, *art. cit.*, 2012, p 268, n 36 in that they were ‘presumably sent back to Iran with the remains of the manuscript.’ I conjecture that in Tehran must also be inserts for those 62 paintings auctioned during Houghton’s lifetime for there is nothing to suggest that they were offered at the time of their bids. Canby, *op. cit.*, 2011, pp 282-87 9 (full reference n 92) contains the sole, latest, complete *index locorum* enumerating all dispersed folios thus listing 118 illustrations, not ‘ninety-one of the pictures’, in present-day Tehran. Rüstem, *art. cit.*, 2012 naturally could not incorporate this into his article already in press by the time Canby 2011 was released; now also *recte* Scarcia and Curatola, *op. cit.*, 2007, p 247, n 92 wherein ‘eighty or so miniatures’ in Tehran are noted.
 20. Soudavar, *art. cit.*, 2002, pp 111, 115 has intriguingly proposed that Tahmasp’s *Shahnama* did not leave Istanbul for Paris but returned home to the Qajars following a peace treaty with

the Ottomans around 1824. He posits that his admittedly slim contention could be bolstered if one trawled through the Qajar archives. Plausibly acknowledged in Canby, *op. cit.*, 2009, p 202.

21. Christopher de Hamel, *The Rothschilds and their Collection of Illuminated Manuscripts*, London, 2005, p 28. How and when it was purchased will never be known for Baron Edmond, to deflect attention from himself and his vendors, eschewed keeping records of his purchases. Its existence through the first published notice was in the 1903 exposition's catalogue compiled by Gaston Migeon, Max van Berchem and Clement Huart. *Vide* Welch, *op. cit.*, 1972, p 17. Alternately advanced by Soudavar, *cf.* n 18.
22. Welch, *op. cit.*, 1972, p 18; and Gray *apud* Welch and Dickson, 'Acknowledgments', *op. cit.*, 1981, vol. I, p vii, wherein Welch points out that Basil Gray 'generously confirmed my assumption that only Sir Thomas Arnold, among twentieth-century scholars in the field, might have seen the *Shahnameh* prior to its purchase by Mr. Houghton.' This is doubtful for Arnold was Lecturer and then Professor of Philosophy, Government College, Lahore, during the years 1888-1904 and only left for London in 1904, a year after the Paris exhibition, to become Sub-Librarian, India Office Library, 1904-21. That year he became Professor of Arabic at the then School of Oriental Studies (SOS), where he was previously a Lecturer since 1917, a year after its founding. See *Iqbal Review: Journal of the Iqbal Academy Pakistan* [Special Issue: Sir Thomas W. Arnold], 1991, p 3. H A R Gibb [revised by Christine Woodhead], 'Sir Thomas Walker Arnold (1864-1930)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 2, H C G Matthew and Brian Harrison (eds.), Oxford, 2004, pp 508-09. Arnold was a visiting professor at Cairo University in 1929-30 when, during a brief holiday in Dubrovnik, met up for the last time with his life-long friend, former Lahorite as himself, and Anglo-Hungarian explorer, Sir M A Stein, whom he requested to write his obituary. Arnold died some months after returning to London. The Stein-Arnold Exploration Fund, set up from Stein's bequest and awarded by The British Academy, commemorates this comradeship. Pointed out in Jeannette Mirsky, *Sir Aurel Stein: Archaeological Explorer*, Chicago and London, 1977; repr. 1998, p 76; Donald Malcolm Reid, 'Cairo University and the Orientalists', *Int. Journal of Middle East Studies* 19, 1, 1987, p 56; and Annabel Walker, *Aurel Stein: Pioneer of the Silk Road*, London, 1995; repr. 1998, p 354. Arnold's appreciative comments on the Rothschild *Shahnama* are to be found in his joint authorship with Adolf Grohmann, *The Islamic Book: a contribution to its art and history from the VII-XVIII century*, [Paris], 1929, p 78. In this *Schwanengesang* he erroneously states it contains '285 miniatures'. The Swedish collector-dealer-diplomat-scholar, Fredrik Robert Martin (1868-1933), published some images from this Rothschild *Shahnama*. He had definitely never seen it but – *pace* Welch, *op. cit.*, 1972, p 18 – did fulsomely describe it in idem, *The Miniature Painting and Painters of Persia, India, and Turkey from the 8th to the 18th centuries*, 2 vols., London, 1912; repr. 1968 (as a single bound limited edition release). Martin noted that it consisted of '256 [*sic*] large miniatures' and is a 'most sumptuous monument of Persian miniature painting of the 16th century' for a 'more magnificent manuscript probably does not exist.' See Martin, *op. cit.*, 1968, vol. I, p 63; 9 illustrations, probably the earliest from this Rothschild *Shahnama*, are in vol. II, plates 122-129, 249. The Bashkir Turcologist, A Zeki Velidi Toğan (1890-1970), mentions an album containing 259 portraits of Shah Tahmasp in his pamphlet, *On the Miniatures in the Istanbul Library*, Spencer Tonguç (tr.), Istanbul, 1963, p 17. Toğan *apud* Welch and Dickson, Appendix II, *op. cit.*, 1981, vol. I, p 270, n 4. This *lapsus* in the published version of that savant's paper read by him at the Second International Congress of Turkish Art, Venice, September 26-29, 1963 could be due to a misreading from a faulty source at some removes. Martin Dickson was mentored by Toğan and was his research assistant for two years at Istanbul University during the 1950s. Dickson returned and submitted his doctoral dissertation to Princeton in 1958, a year before the Rothschild *Shahnama* crossed the Atlantic and changed ownership.
23. Pointed out in the review of Welch and Dickson, *op. cit.*, 1981, by B W Robinson, *The Burlington Magazine* 125, July 1983, p 373 and Toby Falk, 'Miniatures from the Houghton *Shahnameh*', in *A Dealer's Record: Agnew's 1967-81*, London, 1981, p 181. Reviewed also by Basil Gray, 'A

- monument of Persian illumination’, *Apollo: the International Magazine of Art & Antiques*, n.s., CXVI, July 1982, pp 63-65; and Walter Denny, *MESA Bulletin* 17, 2, 1983, pp 182-83. *Supra* n 16 for reviews by Soucek and Levey; *q.v.* n 32.
24. *G.F.C.C. Répertoires des Biens Spoiliés en France durant la Guerre 1939-45*, vol. VII, Berlin, 1947-48, p 34, no. 398. Rüstem, *art. cit.*, 2012, p 264, n 2. The Nazi angle was, oddly, never pointed out by Welch in any of his writings on the Houghton *Shahnama* including Welch and Dickson, 1981. Neither does Canby, *op. cit.*, 2011. Rüstem must be acknowledged as arguably the first to bring this to the attention of all in Islamic art scholarship. The only other instance I have chanced upon is in a Sotheby’s auction catalogue entitled *Three Illustrated Leaves from the Shahnama of Shah Tahmasp, London, 13 April 2000*, London, 2000, p 6. Generally de Hamel, *op. cit.*, 2005.
 25. Stuart Cary Welch, ‘Salute to a Coauthor: Martin Bernard Dickson’, in *Intellectual Studies on Islam: Essays written in honor of Martin B. Dickson, Professor of Persian Studies, Princeton University*, Michel Mazzaoui and Vera Moreen (eds.), Salt Lake City, 1990, pp 3-24. An earlier account is reminisced in *idem*, ‘Private Collectors and Islamic Arts of the Book’, in Falk, *op. cit.*, 1985, p 30f.; *Encyclopædia Iranica*, vol. VII, s.v. ‘Martin Bernard Dickson’ (by Kathryn Babayan), p 387; Dickson’s obituaries are in Cornell Fleischer, *MESA Bulletin* 25, 2, 1991, pp 307-08; Krishna Chaganti, *The Daily Princetonian*, May 17, 1991, p 2; *The New York Times*, May 17 1991, <http://www.nytimes.com/1991/05/17/obituaries/martin-b-dickson-professor-67.html>
 26. Welch, *art. cit.*, 1990, p 11. Coolidge was an architectural historian and the Fogg’s director (1948-72) as well as trustee, and later President, of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (1973-75).
 27. Souren Melikian, ‘Rare heirlooms of Iranian history’, *Int. Herald Tribune*, June 4, 2005, <http://www.nytimes.com/2005/06/03iht-melik4.html?pagewanted=all&r=1>; the price Houghton paid is quoted as ‘a reputed \$100,000’ in de Hamel, *op. cit.*, 2005, p 46. This is incorrect and the sum mentioned by Melikian is the closest to ever knowing what was paid. Eleanor Munro, ‘How to mangle a masterpiece: the sad story of the Houghton Shahnameh’, *Saturday Review*, October 27, 1979, p 23 states that ‘\$400,000 has been knowledgeably mentioned’.
 28. ‘Rare Book Curator named for Capital; Arthur A Houghton Jr named for Congressional Library’, *The New York Times*, March 31 1940, p 24; ‘An Interested Joiner: Arthur Amory Houghton Jr.’, *The New York Times*, September 16 1964, p 28; obituaries: *The New York Times*, April 4 1990, p B8; *Los Angeles Times*, April 5 1990, p A30; *The Washington Post*, April 5 1990, p B10; *The Independent*, April 12 1990, p 27; *Alumni Horae* 70, 2 Summer, 1990, p 103; William Bond, ‘Arthur Amory Houghton, Jr.’, *Proceedings of the American Antiquary Society* 100, 1, April, 1990, pp 30-35; Robert Ankli, ‘Arthur Amory Houghton, Jr.’, *American National Biography*, vol. 11, John Garraty and Mark Carnes (eds.), New York, 1999, pp 259-60. Houghton was also Honorary Curator of Harvard’s Keats Collection and served on the boards of the Grolier Club, Pierpont Morgan Library, New York Public Library and Rockefeller Foundation. His bequest of Keats-related material between 1940 and 1979 makes Harvard the largest depository of that poet’s surviving manuscripts and letters in the world. He was only thirty-three at his curatorial appointment when that poet, playwright and Librarian of Congress, Archibald MacLeish, declared him as, ‘one of the most distinguished American collectors of rare books and the owner of the largest collections of Keats, Spenser and Lewis Carroll in existence.’ Houghton purchased Arnold Toynbee’s notebooks and longhand text of *A Study of History*. He framed some of Toynbee’s historical mishmash alongside that of Alexander Pope. Proudly recounted by Toynbee in Ved Mehta, *Fly and the Fly-bottle: encounters with British Intellectuals*, London, 1963; repr. 1965, pp 120-21. For a general history see *A Houghton Library Chronicle 1942-1992*, Hugh Amory *et al.* (eds.), Cambridge MA, 1992; Davis Dyer and Daniel Gross, *The Generations of Corning: The Life and Times of a Global Corporation*, New York, 2001, p 176. Houghton also served as chair of the New York Philharmonic Symphony Society (1958-63) and, as vice-chairman, was involved in the establishment of the Lincoln Center (1963). An East Coast patrician, he was heir to the Corning Glass Works founded by his family in 1851. But Houghton’s fame and fortune rose even

further when he took over Steuben Glass, formerly a division of the company. At its helms from 1933, he made Steuben the touchstone of superb glass designs, especially by introducing Art Deco and modernist themes. Steuben Glass was the preferred gift of American administrations, on behalf of the nation, to foreign dignitaries. Some of its creations are now in the Royal Collection beginning with President and Mrs Truman's wedding gift of an etched 'merry-go-round' bowl to the Duke and Duchess (Princess Elizabeth) of Edinburgh in 1947. A Steuben crystal bowl with a set of four crystal and gold candle-sticks was received by the Princess Royal for her wedding from President and Mrs Nixon in 1973; Mrs Reagan arrived for the Prince and (late) Princess of Wales' wedding with a truly *shahi* Steuben bowl engraved with a king flanked by crusaders and nobles. When created in 1975, supposedly for an Arab client, it was originally priced at \$50,000 but went up to \$75,000 by 1981 when the State Department bought it at a discounted price of \$8,000. The Duke and Duchess of York received from the Reagans, at their 1986 wedding, hand-formed, crystal goblets with their Christian names calligraphically adorned. See 'Nancy Reagan off to the royal wedding ... and a busy schedule', *St. Petersburg Independent*, July 23 1981, p 10A; 'Nancy Reagan gets a bargain', *Gainesville Sun*, July 20 1981, p 2A; 'It's the thought that counts', *New York Magazine*, July 27 1981, p 12; 'U.S. gives bridal couple engraved Steuben goblets', *The Lewiston Journal*, July 23 1986, p 8C. Houghton's links to the 'old country' was in consonance with many of his ilk: the Houghtons were of Lancastrian stock who, upon sailing from Old to New England in 1635 settled, quite logically, in Lancaster, MA. (Harvard College was founded in 1636 from which Houghton dropped out, as have not a few notable *alumni*, before graduation. Twelve American universities, by the time of his death, had awarded him honorary degrees.) Houghton was President of The English-Speaking Union of The United States (1957-59); founding trustee of The American Trust for The British Library (est. 1979); Senior Fellow, Royal College of Arts; and Fellow, Royal Society of Arts.

29. Welch, *art. cit.*, 1990, p 13. Rüstem, *art. cit.*, 2012, p 264, n 2 also notes the rumour within Harvard circles that Houghton 'initially promised' it to his *alma mater*. It obviously did not come to pass. Rüstem was the last art historian who interviewed Welch and discussed technical aspects of the Houghton *Shahnama* at length with him in his final years (p 269, nn 42, 45). Thomas Hoving, *Making the Mummies Dance: Inside the Metropolitan Museum of Art*, New York, 1993; repr. 1994, pp 70-71 recalls Houghton 'had planned to give it to his rare book library at Harvard but was becoming irked by Harvard's delays in publishing a book about the manuscript.' More startling is when Hoving points out that the outgoing Islamic curator, Maurice Dimand, had implored him to confirm the appointment of Ernst Grube, the 'best young scholar in the United States' and 'to let Grube run after the single most beautiful and important ... Islamic work in the country', Houghton's *Shahnama*, for the Met's collection. Surely Dimand and Grube had the intact volume in mind. They were as much at sea as Welch, Hoving and others about Houghton's eventual moves.
30. Welch, *art. cit.*, 1990, p 13.
31. *Ibid.*, p 15.
32. Welch and Dickson, *op. cit.* 1981 (= *The Houghton Shahnameh*, introduced and described by Stuart Cary Welch and Martin Bernard Dickson, 2 vols., Cambridge MA and London, 1981, published by Fogg Art Museum priced at \$2,000; £1,100). Vol. I (312 pp) consisted of text, 284 black and white images, and 22 tipped, colour plates (including genuine gold burnish) with tissue overlays, which could be removed if desired, for mounting. Vol. II (560 pp), containing 269 deep sepia plates, was a monochrome facsimile of all 258 miniatures, binding, and ornamental illuminations. Both blue buckram and gold-stamped tomes were produced by collotype, a screenless process which while affording fullest integrity of detail was expensive and seldom used because 750 is the maximum number of image reproductions printable from a 'hot type', namely, collotype plate. Both volumes were set in English Monotype Bembo with vol. I's text printed by offset and the sepia plates of vol. II accompanied by directly imprinted texts at the Meridian Gravure Company, which was the acknowledged press for full-tone collotype printing, and had pioneered the use of fine screened, 300-lined, half-tone process for art reproductions. Curtis Rag paper was used for vol.

I, and Caledonia Parchment for vol. II, the latter made to order in Great Britain. *Apud* Coolidge and Welch, 'Foreword', vol. I, p v, 1981, following the printing of monochrome plates for vol. II in the 1960s, the company closed down its collotype operations six months later. According to the Meridian Gravure company, its collotype press was retired by 1967 per the records for the years 1895-1990 archived at Yale's Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library. At the time of writing, all remaining copies in stock are only available for sale from Mazda Publishers, Costa Mesa, CA, and priced at US\$1,695. <http://www.mazdapublishers.com//book/houghton-shahnameh>; a partial, unauthorized, Persian edition, *Shahnama-yi Shah Tahmasb: Shahnama-yi Hutun*, Tehran, 1990, contains a facsimile reproduction of 77 of its 258 miniatures. Reviews cited *supra* nn 16, 23. A four-page spread is devoted to it in *Codices illustres: the world's most famous illuminated manuscripts 400 to 1600*, First Edition Translations Ltd and others (tr.), Ingo Walther (ed.), Cologne, 2001; repr. 2014, pp 420-25.

33. Welch, *op. cit.*, 1972, p 17; Munro, *art. cit.*, 1979, pp 23, 26.
34. Welch, *art. cit.*, 1990, p 16.
35. This was necessitated for reproducing the facsimiles of the edition. Another example of disbounding in recent times is of that Mughal masterpiece, the *Padshahnama*, in The Royal Collection, Windsor Library (ms. HB.149). A seventeenth-century production, and as sumptuous as the Houghton *Shahnama*, its forty-four illustrations were publicly displayed 'for certainly the first and probably the only time in the history of the volume' since this codex of 239 folios 'remained wrapped in the Lucknow silk cloth in which it was presented' to George III by the then Nawab of Lucknow through the offices of the Indian Governor-General, Lord Teignmouth, in 1797. The codex had to be unbound for conservation purposes and in 1994 was rebound after being exhibited in Great Britain, India and the United States. That it went to India in 1997 to mark the golden jubilee celebrations of the subcontinent's independence was a happy coincidence – and a gracious gesture from the Queen, current owner of this manuscript. See Robert Skelton, 'Chronicling the Grand Mughal', in *Celebrating Independence: India and Pakistan together with Sri Lanka and Bangladesh*, Deborah Scott (ed.), London, 1997, pp 65-70. But Skelton, *art. cit.*, p 65 reminds that the volume, however, had been publicly display fifty years earlier, November 29, 1947 - February 29, 1948, at a Royal Academy of Arts' (Burlington House) exhibition marking the transfer of power to both dominions. See *Exhibition of Art chiefly from the Dominions of India and Pakistan 2400 B.C. to 1947 A.D. Catalogue*, H G Rawlinson *et al.* (introd.), 2nd ed., London, 1948, p 110, and laconically described as a '*Shah Jahan-nama*' manuscript. (Burlington House, Piccadilly, the venue of this exhibition, is a stone's throw away from St. James Street, Lord Teignmouth's birthplace. Ainslie Embree, 'John Shore, first Baron Teignmouth (1751-1834)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 50, H C G Matthew and Brian Harrison [eds.], Oxford, 2004, pp 419-23.) Its last public display occurred when the rebound manuscript was exhibited at the Queen's Gallery, Palace of Holyroodhouse, Edinburgh (October 24, 2003 - May 3, 2004). See further Blair and Bloom, *art. cit.*, 2003, p 181, n 75; Dalya Alberge, 'Mogul masterpiece on show for the first time in 200 years,' *The Times*, December 30 1996, p 5; Nilanjana Roy, 'The Return of the Moghul', *Business Standard*, February 11 1997, http://www.business-standard.com/article/specials/the-return-of-the-moghul-197021101032_1.html; Ratnottama Sengupta, 'The Padshahnama: Mughal magnificence brought to life', *The Times of India*, February 18 1997, p 15; 'Art in historic tome on display: illustrations called artistic equivalents to the Taj Mahal', *Charleston Daily Mail (WV)*, February 22 1997, p 4A; 'Ancient Mogul art finally sees the light', *The Hamilton Spectator*, March 1 1997, p E3; Amaresh Mishra, 'Padshahnama: a search for Indianness', *The Times of India*, March 4 1997, p 14; William Packer, 'Jewel in the royal collection', *Financial Times*, March 18 1997, p 23; Shiraz Sidhva, 'Mughal marvel', *Far Eastern Economic Review* 160, 15, April 10 1997, pp 46-47; Gayatri Sinha, 'Return of the native', *Art India: the Art News Magazine of India* 2, i, 1997, pp 26-27; Louise Nicholson, 'Glorious story of an emperor', *The Times Weekend*, April 12 1997, p 22; Richard Cork, 'Small world of a Mogul monarch', *The Times*, April 15 1997, p 35; Juliet Reynolds, 'The Padshahnama is to painting what the Taj is to architecture', *The Art Newspaper*, 8, April 1997, p 25; 'Shah Jahan's paintings displayed amid protests', *The Times of India*, May

18 1997, p 13; Richard Paul, 'Milo Beach, Number One in Queen Elizabeth's Book', *The Washington Post*, May 18, 1997, p G7; Joana Shaw-Eagle, 'Sackler Gallery celebrates with "King of the World" exhibit: India paintings on rare display', and 'Artistic legend of Emperor Shah Jahan', *The Washington Post*, May 18 1997, p D3; *eadem*, 'The Golden Age of Mogul Art summons an opulent world', *The Christian Science Monitor*, June 26 1997, p 10; Kevin Chaffee, 'Modern fashion, ancient Mughal works meld at gala', *The Washington Post*, May 22 1997, p C10; Holland Cotter, 'Glimpsing the king of everything', *The New York Times*, July 30 1997, p C9; *idem*, 'Treasures that rule the senses by imperial decree', *The New York Times*, November 21 1997, p E39; Asok Kumar Das, 'Padshahnama King of the World', *MARG* 49, 1, September 1997, pp 98-99; Georgette Gouveia, *USA Today*, November 26 1997, p ARC; 'Where spice came from', *The Economist*, December 4 1997, p 85; Dan Bischoff, 'Miniature paintings illuminate Mughal's era', *The Star Ledger* NJ, December 19 1997, p 29; Ayyub Malik, 'The Padshahnama of Shah Jahan: the chronicle of The King of the World', *Arts & the Islamic World* 31, 1997, pp 25-32; Caroline Stone, "'The Most Splendid Manuscript'", *Aramco World* 48, 6 (Nov.-Dec., 1997), pp 18-31; Steven Cohen, 'An ideal reality: Carpet images in the Windsor Padshahnama', *Hali* 19, 95, November 1997, pp 92-95, 116; Kristine McKenna, 'History unbound', *Los Angeles Times*, February 22 1998, p 9; Christopher Knight, 'King of Arts Patrons', *Los Angeles Times*, March 4 1998, p F1; 'Up close and beautiful', *Fort Worth Star-Telegram*, May 29 1998, p 22; Mike Daniel, 'Out of India: book charts events during king's reign', *The Dallas Morning News*, May 29 1998, p 51; Christopher Andreae, 'A universe of Mogul royalty portrayed in miniature', *The Christian Science Monitor*, March 11 2004, p 18; Gulfishan Khan, 'Shah Jahan-Nama and Imperial Views of History', *Kriti-Rakshana* 17, 1-2, 2011, pp 3-9. A catalogue, the sole published study, and, thankfully, reasonably priced than the Houghton *Shahnama*, is Milo Beach and Ebba Koch, *King of the World, the Padshahnama: an imperial Mughal manuscript from the Royal Library, Windsor Castle*, Wheeler Thackston (tr.), London, 1997; repr. 2003; reviewed by Nadine Dalton Spiedel, *Library Journal* 122, 11, June 15 1997, p 64; and Marie Lukens Swietochowski, *Studies in the Decorative Arts* 6, 1999, pp 131-33. A commemorative souvenir limited to 2,000 copies is, *A portfolio of miniature paintings released from the Padshahnama, the Chronicle of the reign of Shah Jahan, the King of the World. From an imperial Mughal manuscript in The Royal Library, Windsor Castle. Miniature paintings reproduced with permission The Royal Collection, London*, Robert Skelton (introd.), XII plates and map, Heritage of India Series 5, Air India, [Bombay, 1997]. Robert Skelton, 'Miniature Paintings of the Padshahnama', is an overview essay sheet to accompany these twelve full-colour plates of the following folios respectively: (195a, 46b, 47a, 43b, 98b, 71a, 70b, 120b, 121a, 122b, 123a, 206a). A collector's item, it was published by the publicity department of Air India, the official carrier of the curator, custodians and manuscript's illustrations displayed in conjunction with The British Council, India at the National Museum, New Delhi, January 27 - February 28, 1997. Studied formerly but unpublished is Wilma Komala, 'The Windsor Castle *Badshah Nama* and its Place in the Development of Historical Painting during the reign of Shah Jahan (1628-1658)'. Diss. Univ. of Iowa, 1982. Ann Arbor: UMI, 1982. 8229942. See Komala's supervisor, Wayne Begley, 'Illustrated histories of Shah Jahan: new identifications of some dispersed paintings, and the problem of the Windsor Castle *Padshahnama*', in *Facets of Indian Art: a symposium held at the Victoria & Albert Museum*, Robert Skelton et al. (eds.), London, 1986, pp 139-52. Begley collaborated with the Indo-Persianist, Ziyauddin Desai, in making available again, *The Shah Jahan Nama of Inayat Khan: an abridged history of the Mughal Emperor Shah Jahan compiled by his royal librarian. The nineteenth-century manuscript translation of A. R. Fuller (British Library, add. 30,777)*, W E Begley and Z A Desai (ed. and completed), New Delhi, 1990; reviewed in Stephen Dale, *Journal of Asian Studies* 50, 3, 1991, pp 715-16 and Wak Kani, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1997, pp 466-68. Fuller's partial translation of 1851 was revised and finished by Begley and Desai. Three official court chronicles, it will be remembered, were produced of Shah Jahan (r. 1627-58). Enumerated along with several others composed in Beach and Koch, *op. cit.*, 2003, p 240. Inayat Khan's abridgement, the shortest of three, was based on the two-volume original compiled, but left unfinished at his death in 1654/55, by Abdul Hamid Lahori, *Badshahnama*, Maulavi Kabiruddin Ahmad and Maulavi Abdur Rahim (eds.), 2

vols., Calcutta, 1867-68. Begley and Desai had also proposed translating this but it did not occur. A simplified, condensed account, prepared for Pakistani high-school goers, is Zubeida Dossal, *Shahjahanama* [sic]: *Inayat Khan's Account*, Historical Readers, Karachi, 2001. Extant literature on Mughal illuminations is extensive and what follows is suggestive: for a sound start consult Milo Beach, *The Imperial Image: Paintings for the Mughal Court*, Washington DC, 1981; rev. exp. ed., 2012; idem, *Mughal and Rajput Painting*, The New Cambridge History of India I.3, Cambridge, 1992; repr. 2002; Asok Kumar Das, *Dawn of Mughal Painting*, Bombay, 1982; Amina Okada, *Imperial Mughal Painters: Indian miniatures from the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, D Dusinberre (tr.), Paris, 1992; American edn. entitled *Indian Miniatures of the Mughal Court*, New York, 1992; J Michael Rogers, *Mughal Miniatures*, London, 1993; rev. ed., 2006; Susan Stronge, *Painting for the Mughal Emperor: the Art of the Book 1560-1660*, London, 2002; Abolala Soudavar, 'Between the Safavids and the Mughals: Art and Artists in Transition', *Iran* 37, 1999, pp 49-66; Som Prakash Verma, *Mughal painters and their work: a Biographical Survey and Comprehensive Catalogue*, New Delhi, 1994; idem, 'Persian and Mughal Painting: the Fundamental Relationship', in *A Shared Heritage: the Growth of Civilizations in India and Iran*, Irfan Habib (ed.), New Delhi, 2002; repr. 2004, pp 150-72 (= idem, *Interpreting Mughal Painting: Essays on Art, Society, and Culture*, New Delhi, 2009, pp 121-36); idem, *Mughal Painting*, Oxford India Short Introductions, New Delhi, 2014.

36. Munro, *art. cit.*, 1979, p 22.
37. Hoving, *op. cit.*, 1994, p 87. Grube and Sims, *art. cit.*, 1989, p 212. Blair and Bloom, *op. cit.*, 1995, p 168 describe it 'sold at auction like so many slices of pizza, and the integrity of one of the masterpieces of Islamic art was so ignominiously destroyed.' Grabar and Blair, *op. cit.*, 1980, p x, lament the piecemeal tearing and selling 'like pastry in a bakery' of the Great Mongol or *Shahnama* and its some 180 illustrations within 280 folios by that Belgian dealer, Georges Demotte (1877-1923), who next mangled the text, in 1909, and forged pages to conceal its provenance. Fifty-eight illustrations and text pages survive scattered. Also review of Grabar and Blair, *op. cit.*, 1980, in Jerome Clinton, *Speculum* 57, 4, October 1982, pp 891-93. *Recte* Abd-ol-Majid Hosseini Râd, 'The Evolution of Persian Painting', in Schumacher, *op. cit.*, 2011, p 33 n 2, Demotte himself was the vandaliser and not his descendants who ripped up the codex to sell individual folios. Six separate owners lent its twenty-two paintings for display at the Piccadilly Persian art exhibition of 1931 as mentioned in Binyon, *op. cit.*, 1971, pp 1, 14. How poignant that the Demotte *Shahnama's* depiction of Alexander the Great's bier is a 'splendid example of tragic expression in Muslim painting': Nurhan Atasoy et al., *The Art of Islam*, UNESCO Collection of Representative Works: Art Album Series, Paris, 1990; repr. 1992, p 135. *Encyclopædia Iranica*, vol. VII, s.v. 'Demotte Šâh-Nâma' (by Priscilla Soucek), pp 277-78; Demotte probably brought the 1602 *Akbarnama* to Europe which was later part of Baron Edmond's collection. One volume of its two parts was sold to Sir Alfred Chester Beatty (1875-1968) in 1923. See de Hamel, *op. cit.*, 2005, p 28, n 24. For a recent examination see Eleanor Sims, 'Thoughts on a *Shāhnāma* legacy of the Fourteenth century: Four *Īnjū* Manuscripts and the Great Mongol *Shāhnāma*', in *Beyond the Legacy of Genghis Khan*, Linda Komaroff (ed.), Islamic History and Civilization 64, Leiden and Boston, 2006, pp 269-86.
38. CWC 2011, pp 86, 89. The Persian proclivity for hyperbole among *dilettanti* notwithstanding, it is salutary to turn to the *cognoscenti*: Basil Gray, *Persian Painting*, London, 1930, p 67f., remarked about 'painting by the yard' during Tahmasp's era as evident in a *Shahnama* 'belonging to Baron Eduard de Rothschild, for which he insisted on 276 miniatures, which, though it is always charmingly decorative, is apt to appear somewhat monotonous.' *Recte* 'Eduard' to Edmond and '276' as 278 miniatures. Gray passingly noted its change of ownership, 'formerly in the collection of Edmond de Rothschild' in idem, *Persian Painting*, Treasures of Asia, Geneva, 1961; repr. 1995, pp 136, 138; Binyon, *op. cit.*, 1971, p 113 felt the paintings were 'unsatisfying and a trifle mechanical' albeit '[t]echnically excellent' yet 'somehow just fail to "come off", and give the impression of a set task conscientiously performed, without particular enthusiasm, by talented and carefully trained painters.' Tersely, Sheila Blair and Jonathan Bloom, *Islamic Arts*, Arts & Ideas, London,

1997, p 338, of its artists ‘whose talents ranged from brilliant to plodding’; Sims, *op. cit.*, 2003, p 64 describes the Houghton *Shahnama* as ‘wildly uneven in its pictorial quality [and that] [s]ome of its paintings are superlatively fine ... others are good but undistinguished illustrations; still others are compositionally banal, even boring.’ Q.v. *The Grove Encyclopedia of Islamic Art and Architecture*, vol. 2, s.v. ‘Illustration. VI c. 1500-1900, A. Iran, c. 1500-c. 1750, 2. The style of Tabriz, 1502-48’ (by Eleanor Sims), Jonathan Bloom and Sheila Blair, (eds.), New York, 2009, p 240 who states: ‘Towards the middle of the volume the need to produce large numbers of pictures at some speed dictated a formula: pictures occupy only part of the written surface with essential figures or other elements placed in the simplest of settings, often with a void in the center. Such pictorial expediency seems to hard to reconcile with a princely manuscript of such quality in all the other aspects of its production, including paper, calligraphy, ornamentation, binding, and, above all, the quality of such images as Sultan Muhammad’s *Court of Gayumars*.’ It repays reading and remembering that, ‘its finer paintings recast familiar Jalayirid and Timurid compositions in a larger and more magnificent Safavid format.’ An appositely titled review of Sims 2003 is in Robert Irwin, ‘How to read Persian painting’, *Times Literary Supplement*, July 18 2003, p 25. Similarly summed up in Oleg Akimushkin, *art. cit.*, 2003, p 561.

39. Munro, *loc. cit.*
40. 78, not ‘79’ paintings, for which *recte* Welch, *art. cit.*, 1990, p 24. Correctly in Canby, *op. cit.*, 2011, p. 17. Stuart Cary Welch, ‘78 Pictures from a World of Kings, Heroes, and Demons’, *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* n.s., 29, 8, 1971, pp 341-57. It is understandable that Welch diplomatically demurred during Houghton’s lifetime. But in Welch, *loc. cit.*, a *laudatio*, which typescript was ‘completed July 4, 1988’ for Dickson’s *Festschrift* published two years later, he commiserated with Houghton ‘in the belief that even for him the responsibility of possessing such a glorious work of art was excessive.’ Rüstem, *art. cit.*, 2012, p 264, n 2 posits that Houghton’s ‘motivation cannot have entirely been financial.’ His largesse went unchallenged much less questioned given that Houghton was a trustee (1952-74), museum president (1964-69), and chairman of the board (1970-72). But it would be unfair to overlook that the detached miniatures were presented during the Met’s year-long centennial celebration. They were then shifted to the newly-renovated Islamic galleries in 1975. See William Luers and Philippe de Montebello, ‘Report of the President and Director’, *Annual Report of the Trustees of the Metropolitan Museum Bulletin* 120, 1989-90, p 8. Houghton’s time at the museum is extensively covered in a blistering account by Michael Gross, *Rogues’ Gallery: the Secret Story of the Lust, Lies, Greed and Betrayal that made the Metropolitan Museum of Art*, New York, 2010. What Houghton did 1976 onwards was fatidic in auctions and private sales right through the 1980s. An irate Iranian rants, ‘What this manuscript amounted to was in effect a sizable mobile museum – and vandalizing it as Houghton did was like planting a bomb at the Uffizi and then auctioning the masterpieces of Renaissance art that are strewn on the site to the highest bidder.’ See Hamid Dabashi, *The World of Persian Literary Humanism*, Cambridge MA, and London, 2012, a book bristling with cavils: Houghton’s erroneous dates and designation as ‘(1910-1993)’ and ‘American art dealer’ (pp 214, 351, n 55); the well-springs of the revolts rocking the Abbasid caliphate were crypto-, not ‘proto-Zoroastrian’ (pp 49, 110); ‘Arsacids’ and ‘Parthians’ are synonyms, not distinct ethnonyms (p 56); and India was not partitioned in ‘1948’ (p 256). A post-modern reading of its acquisition and dispersal is Judie Newman, ‘Pictures from a Revolution: Dalia Sofer, *The Septembers of Shiraz*’, in eadem, *Utopia and Terror in Contemporary American Fiction*, Routledge Transnational Perspectives on American Literature 21, New York and Abingdon, 2013, pp 94ff.
41. Munro, *art. cit.*, 1979, p 23.
42. *Recte* Tahmasp’s death of ‘May 4’ to May 14, 1576 when that sixty-two-year-old shah ended his fifty-two year reign, the longest in Safavid history, in Welch, *op. cit.*, 1976, p 76.
43. Welch, *art. cit.*, 1990, p 24. Welch *apud* Munro, *art. cit.*, 1979, p 23, first got wind of it only from Ettinghausen at the Met. Welch 1976 (= *A King’s Book of Kings: the Shah-nameh of Shah Tahmasp*, London and New York, 1972; repr. 1976, is the said catalogue. French edn., *Le livre des*

rois: *le Chah-nameh de Chah Tahmasp*, T Catherine-Juvet (tr.), Lausanne, 1972; Italian edn., *Il libro dei Re: lo Shah-nameh di Shah Tahmasp*, D Tarizzo and E Ganni (tr.), Milan, 1972; German edn., *Das Buch der Könige: das Schahname des Schah Tahmasp*, I Beyer (tr.), Munich, 1976; Persian edn., *Muraqqa-yi Shahnama-yi Shah Tahmasbi: asari az Aqa Mirak, Sultan Muhammad, Dust Muhammad, Mirza Ali, Muzaffar Ali, Mir Musavvar, Mir Sayyid Ali bih munasabat-i barguzari-yi kungrih-yi jahani-yi buzurghdasht-i Firdawsi (hazara-yi tadvin-i Shahnama) The King [sic] Book of Kings: an Album of Miniatures from the Shah Tahmaspi Manuscript of the Shahnameh of Ferdowsi*, K Afsar (tr.), Tehran, 1990; repr. 2000, is an unauthorized reproduction published for an international congress convened in Tehran to mark its compilation. A booklet (14 pp) was published by Tehran's Museum of Contemporary Art as *King Tahmasb's Shah-name Manuscripts: the Magnificent Treasure of Islamic Art*, Tehran, 2000. The Met, with customary American magnanimity, has made this out of print catalogue, the original English edition, downloadable from its website: <http://www.metmuseum.org/research/metpublications/>; since 2012 it has also been available as a print on demand paperback from Yale University Press, <http://yalepress.yale.edu/yupbooks/> Priscilla Soucek's critique of the catalogue is in *Int. Journal of Middle East Studies* 6, 3, 1975, pp 349-51; also reviewed by Simon Digby, 'The deeds of the Shahs', *Times Literary Supplement*, May 4 1973, p 508. A brochure was also released, *Synopses of the Stories Illustrated in the Exhibition: A King's Book of King's, May 4-October 31, 1972*, Marie Lukens Swietochowski and Suzanne Boorsch (comp.), [New York, 1972]. This *vade mecum* contained just perfect blurbs for viewers to savour the *mise-en-scène* of a cultural context exotic at once as removed from the western literary canon. *Q.v.* Marie Swietochowski, 'A Famous Persian Manuscript: the Subject of an Exhibition, a Book, and a Film. Exhibition opens May 4, 1972', in *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* n.s., 30, 5, 1972, pp 250-51; David Shirey, 'Art: Intricacy of Persian miniatures', *The New York Times*, May 6, 1972, p 37.

44. According to the most recent history of the Met, ninety-two paintings in all went on display. So this denotes Houghton lent seventeen over and above the seventy-five recently acquired from him by the Met. Pointed out in Priscilla Soucek, 'Building a Collection of Islamic Art at the Metropolitan Museum, 1870-2011', in Ekhtiyar et al. *op. cit.*, 2012, pp 7-8; *vide* n 90. This catalogue was published to mark the reopening of the Islamic galleries at the Met, November 2011. It complements the earlier one entitled *The Metropolitan Museum of Art: the Islamic World*, Stuart Cary Welch (ed.), New York, 1987; repr. 2008.
45. Richard Ettinghausen, 'The Shah-Nameh film', in *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* n.s., 30, 5, 1972, pp 252-53. Richard Ettinghausen and Harry Parker III, conceived and supervised *Tales from a Book of Kings: The Houghton Shah-nameh*. Written by George Malko. Dir. and prod. Wheaton Galentine. 16mm, 26 min. The Metropolitan Museum, 1972. Transferred to VHS Videocassette, April 1992. *Encyclopædia Iranica*, vol. IX, s.v. 'Richard Ettinghausen' (by Priscilla Soucek), pp 62-63; Welch was appointed, following Ettinghausen's retirement, and held that Met post of special consultant from October 1979 until 1987. From 1972 onwards, Houghton Shahnama *memorabilia* was a fixture at the Met's gift shop. A spiral-bound diary for the year 1980 was produced which depicted coloured plates with detailed close-ups of several miniatures, *1980 Magic Kingdom Engagement Calendar*, Stuart Cary Welch (introd. and comments), New York, 1980. Cloth calendars, for the years 1981 and 1982, were also available as far away as India. The present writer recalls such hangings produced by India's leading textile firm, The Bombay Dyeing & Manufacturing Company Ltd. Other such souvenirs, now available on EBay, range from ball-point pens to dinner trays.
46. *Tales from a King's Book of Kings: the Houghton Shah-nameh Miniatures*, Corning NY, 1973. Of the fifty-two paintings, thirty-eight were lent by Houghton, who then still retained one hundred and eighty miniatures in his private collection, and which were mounted for the first time ever at Corning and Baltimore. Only fourteen were borrowed from The Met, Houghton's gift, to complement those at the two exhibitions. This was purposefully so as to 'acquaint non-specialists ... with the subject in general' (p 5).
47. Geraldine Norman, '£785,000 paid for seven pages of MS', *The Times*, November 18 1976, p

- 1; '7 Persian manuscript pages bring \$1.25 million', *Los Angeles Times*, November 18, 1976, p B30; Blair and Bloom, *art. cit.*, 2003, p 177. *Vide* catalogue, Christie, Manson and Woods Ltd., *Seven Folios from the Houghton Shahnameh, London, November 17, 1976*, London, 1976, *recte* therein Sultan Selim II for 'accession present to Sultan Murad III just before his death in 1576' (p 7); and it was presented, as has been described above, in 1568. Murad III (r. 1574-95) was, it is true, a renowned bibliophile who was only too eager to receive costly Safavid manuscripts. He and his avaricious descendants would receive those following the precedent set by Tahmasp's presentation to his predecessor. The 7 folios sold were: the Death of Zakhak; Firdawsi and the court poets of Ghazna; Nightmare of Zakhak; Nushirvan receives an embassy from the King of Hind; Qaran slays Barman; Sam returns with Zal; Tus' vision of Siyavush.
48. Munro, *art. cit.*, 1979, p 23. Geraldine Norman, 'Houghton library sale over £2.5m', *The Times*, June 13, 1980, p 16.
 49. Kraus immediately put this two-volume codex, also known as the Shuckburgh copy, up for sale at \$2.5-2.75mn. Houghton had purchased it in the early 1950s for \$150,000. See Sanka Knox, 'Gutenberg Bible Bought for Resale at \$2.5-million', *The New York Times*, April 4 1970, pp 1, 37. On Houghton's sales a good account is Nicholas Basbanes, *A Gentle Madness: Bibliophiles, Bibliomanes, and the Eternal Passion for Books*, 1995; repr. 1999, pp 229-31. An expanded 2012 edition is unobtainable in England.
 50. Munro, *art. cit.*, 1979, p 26.
 51. Soudavar, *art. cit.*, 2008, p 274. Differently argued in Grabar, *art. cit.*, 2006, p 229, n 19: 'The issue is that of preserving, as far as possible, the integrity and authenticity of individual works of art (which means keeping miniatures in the books, for which they were made) versus the accessibility of these same works of art, often hidden in shamefully unavailable private collections.'
 52. This is precisely what happened when Persian mobsters, hired hands bussed in by the regime to protest against sanctions, ransacked the British Embassy as well as diplomatic residences at Golhak Gardens, Tehran, November 29, 2011. Three years on, it was disclosed that six portraits from the Government Art Collection, all uninsured, were damaged or stolen in the attack: an 1823 oil painting measuring five feet, of the second Qajar ruler, Fath Ali Shah (r. 1797-1834), personally presented by that monarch to the then English plenipotentiary in the early nineteenth century, £1.2mn; *Queen Victoria*, 1863, by George Hayter, £20,000; *Tulips and Irises*, 1928, by Sir Cedric Morris, £20,000; King Edward VII by Sir Samuel Fildes, £2,000; *Gloucester Gate, Regent's Park*, 1983, by Adrian Berg, £10,000. Absent from this report is mention of damages or breakage of rugs and ceramics. Christopher Hope, 'Masterpieces from British embassy destroyed by Tehran mob in 2011', *The Daily Telegraph*, June 23 2014, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/travel/destinations/middleeast/iran/10914297/Masterpieces-from-British-embassy-destroyed-by-Tehran-mob-in-2011.html>; Martin Bailey, 'Mob damages art at UK embassy, Tehran', *The Art Newspaper* 231, January 2012, p 7. Our embassy reopened in Tehran on August 23, 2015. Britain is expected to send restoration specialists later and all refurbishment has been borne by the British taxpayer. A compensation claim has yet to be filed with the Iranian government. David Blair, 'UK's embassy in Iran reopens, still with "Death to England" graffiti', *The Daily Telegraph*, August 24 2015, p 13; Julian Borger, 'Civilised words but no hurry to embrace as Britain reopens its embassy in Tehran', *The Guardian*, August 24 2015, p 15; the same day saw the Iranians reopen their London premises with 'Qur'anic verses [and] expressions of florid goodwill' in a ceremony, typically, 'long on formal expressions of mutual respect and short on matters of substance or contention.' Ian Black, 'Iran marks mission's "reactivation"', *The Guardian*, August 24 2015, p 15.
 53. Hoving recounted all of this to Nicholas Basbanes, *A Splendor of Letters: the Permanence of Books in an Impermanent World*, New York, 2003; repr. 2004, pp 190-91. *Recte* the year of the *Shahnama's* return to Iran as 1994, not '1993', p 192.
 54. Houghton *apud* Munro, *loc. cit.*
 55. Other reports tagged it at \$20 mn. See Blair and Bloom, *loc. cit.*; and Myrna Ayad, 'The Queen

- of Culture: Her Majesty Farah Pahlavi', *Canvas: Art & Culture from the Middle East and Arab World* 6, 1, 2010, p 46; rubbishing the former Shahbanou's lament as well as the *apologia* for the war-weary Islamic republic in Melikian, *op. cit.*, 2007, p 20 is Soudavar, *art. cit.*, 2008, p 275. Furthermore, it was unclear if Houghton intended to offer 'the entire *Shahnameh*' which would also include those 78 pictures bequeathed to the Met six years earlier – a sticky situation to say the least. But he did air his concern about it for, had the deal gone through, the Met would have had to be persuaded to surrender his gift of 78 paintings as well. He was aware that the Persians would not be expected to be content with a partial volume for that price tag. See Munro, *loc. cit.* about the anonymous American middleman who met Houghton at his Maryland plantation and ruefully recounted these shenanigans. He had to forego his brokerage set at \$3mn. The deal was doomed according to Richard Feigen, *Tales from the Art Crypt: the Painters, the Museums, the Curators, the Collectors, the Auction, the Art*, New York, 2000, p 211f.
56. Souren Melikian, 'Rare heirlooms of Iranian history', *Int. Herald Tribune*, June 4, 2005, http://www.nytimes.com/2005/06/03/arts/03_iht-melik4.html?scp=88&sq=art%20history&st=cse
 57. Sandra Mackey, *The Iranians: Persia, Islam and the Soul of a Nation*, New York, 1996; repr. 1998, p 256. Katouzian, *op. cit.*, 2010, p 280 noted oil revenues were \$300mn in 1963 but rose in 1977 to \$24bn, an eighty-fold increase. Donald McFarlan and Norris McWhirter, *Guinness Book of World Records 1990*, David Boeh (ed.), New York, 1990, p 131; William Shawcross, *The Shah's Last Ride*, New York, 1988; repr. 1989, pp 39-48; Burzine Waghmar, "A celebration of 25 centuries": Pahlavisants, Pakistanis and Parsis'. Paper read at *Persepolis 40 Years on: International Conference on the Archaeology, History and Reception of Persepolis, October 14-16, 2011*, School of History, Classics and Archaeology, The University of Edinburgh. Typescript.
 58. Anna Somers Cocks, 'The hidden face', *The Guardian*, August 10 2002, *Review*, p 14; 'Behind the veils at the museum', *The Times*, February 28 2004, p 37; Christopher de Bellaigue, 'Lifting the veil', *The Guardian*, G2 supplement, October 7 2005, p 14; Robert Tait, 'The art no one sees: a basement that symbolises cultural isolation', *The Guardian*, October 29 2007, p 23; Saeed Kamali Dehghan, 'Former queen of Iran on assembling Tehran's art collection', *theguardian.com*, August 1 2012, <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2012/aug/01/queen-iran-art-collection>; *idem*, 'Tehran goes pop with modern art show', *The Guardian*, August 2 2012, p 23; *idem*, 'Tehran swaps "death to America" for art as city becomes a giant outdoor gallery', *The Guardian*, May 8 2015, p 21; Jonathan Jones, 'Treasure trove from the 1970s', *The Guardian*, August 2 2012, p 23; Donna Stein, 'For the love of her people: an interview with Farah Diba about the Pahlavi Programs for the Arts in Iran', in *Performing the Iranian State: Visual Culture and Representations of Iranian Identity*, Staci Gem Scheiwiller (ed.), Anthem Middle East Studies, London and New York, 2013, pp 75-82. A catalogue, rather pictorial album of this trove, is *Masterpieces of the World's Great Artists: Tehran Museum of Contemporary Art [Jelvehayi az athar-i hunarmandan-i buzurgh-i jahan: muzeh-yi hunarha-yi mu'asir-i Tihran]*, Kiana Delshad Nik (ed.), Payam Parishanzadeh and Mojtaba Ahmad Khan (tr.), Mahmood Shalooei and Gholam Ali Taheri (introd.), Tehran, 2009. A comprehensive examination is in Tereda Yuki, 'Exhibitions of Art in Iran and the Tehran Museum of Contemporary Art', in *Translation, History and Arts: New Horizons in Asian Interdisciplinary Humanities Research*, Meng Ji and Ukai Atsuko (eds.), Newcastle upon Tyne, 2013, pp 88-108.
 59. *The Economist*, September 20, 1975. The Shah died in July 1980. The *exilée* Shusha Guppy, writing on her deathbed, poignantly noted that, unlike the monarch of the land of her birth, 'the Queen and Prince Charles are both endowed with *farr-e izadi*.' See her 'A paean to kingship: Persia's epic captures the greatness of monarchy, a quality embodied by our maligned Prince of Wales', *The Guardian*, February 18 2008, p 28; <http://www.guardian.com/commentisfree/2008/feb/18/monarchy.iran>
 60. Anthony Welch and Stuart Cary Welch, *Arts of the Islamic Book: the Collection of Prince Sadruddin Aga Khan*, London, 1982, p 15. *Supra* n 37.
 61. As recalled by the former Shahbanou. See 'Empress Farah Pahlavi Washington DC/Paris', *Art & Patronage: the Middle East*, Hossein Amirsadeghi (ed.), London, 2010, p 126. S J Falk, *Qajar*

Paintings: Persian Oil Paintings of the 18th and 19th centuries, London, 1972 was the first catalogue of this collection which also discusses their procural by the Amerys in Cairo before and after the Great War (p 57); French edn., idem, *La Peinture Qajar: Un catalogue de peintures Qajar du 18e et du 19e siècles*, Tehran, 1973; q.vv. Y Dawud, 'The Amery Collection of Persian Paintings,' *Indian Art and Letters* n.s. XVI, 2, 1942, pp 90-92, 8 plates; and B W Robinson, 'The Amery Collection of Persian Oil Paintings', *Studia Iranica* I, 1972, pp 43-53. At the time of transfer, the paintings had been inherited by the then Rt. Hon. Julian Amery, MP, later Lord Amery of Lustleigh (1919-96), and housed at his Eaton Square residence in London. He was the son of an equally distinguished statesman and fellow of All Souls, Oxford, Leo Amery (1873-1955), a former Secretary of State for India and Burma (1940-45): natural given that he was born in Gorakhpur, United Provinces (today's Uttar Pradesh), and, thanks to a succession of *ayahs* (native nannies), was reputed to have started speaking Hindustani aged three.

62. Laura Suffield, 'British Rail sells Houghton Shahnama sheets', *The Art Newspaper* 7, March 1996, p 28. Auctioned at Sotheby's, see 'Four Folios from Shah Tahmasp's Monumental Illustrated Manuscript of the Shahnama (known as the "Houghton" Shahnama)', in *Persian and Indian Manuscripts and Miniatures from the collection formed by the British Rail Pension Fund, London, April 23, 1996*, London, 1996, pp 28-41; <http://www.islamicmanuscripts.info/reference/books/Sothebys-19960423/Sothebys-19960423-011-014.pdf>; Souren Melikian, 'Destroying a treasure: the sad story of a manuscript', *Int. Herald Tribune*, April 27, 1996, http://www.nytimes.com/1996/04/27/style/27iht-lon.t_3.html
63. Christie, Manson and Woods Ltd., *Fourteen Folios from the Houghton Shahnameh, London, October 11, 1988*, Ralph Pinder-Wilson (introd.), London, 1988. An *index locorum* of then folios dispersed worldwide is on p 40. Sarah Jane Checkland, 'Tales from ancient Persia for sale', *The Times*, October 10 1988, p 3; *eadem*, 'BR fund paintings may be saved for the nation', *The Times*, October 13 1988, p 5. Norman, *art. cit.*, 1976, p 1; Munro, *art. cit.*, 1979, p 26.
64. Welch, *art. cit.*, 1990, p 23.
65. Welch, *loc. cit.*; Munro, *art. cit.*, 1979, p 26. Given that the two-volume set was priced at \$2,000, this would yield almost \$200,000 in charitable deductions for Houghton. Welch recalled being told by Coolidge that, in the best traditions of American scholarship, the question of remuneration simply did not arise for works of such nature. Welch was stoic about it – he could afford to – and noted that Dickson, the 'personification of academic poverty' thought nothing of it (p 16).
66. Toby Falk, *Persian Miniatures: an exhibition of seventeen pages from the Houghton Shahnameh*, London, 1979.
67. Robert Hughes, 'The Gardens of the Princes', *Time*, January 28, 1980, p 79.
68. Stuart Cary Welch, *Wonders of the Age: Masterpieces of Safavid Painting, 1501-1576*, with contributions by Sheila Canby and Nora [sic] Titley, Cambridge MA, 1979, was the catalogue of this exhibition highlighting 85 'miracles of miniaturization', exquisitely painted samples of the Houghton *Shahnama*, plus those of Nizami, Hafiz and Sa'adi from Uppsala, Paris, Edinburgh, Cleveland, London and private collectors. Recte Norah for Nora on the catalogue's title page; also, this 'ground-breaking exhibition' did not occur in '1977', *pace* her obituarist, 'Norah Titley: scholar of Islamic painting', *The Times*, May 28 2010, p 86. Reviewed by Barbara Brend, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 43, 1980, pp 381-84 and Chahryar Adle, *Abstracta Iranica* 2, 1979, p 172; also Eleanor Munro, 'Illuminations of Persia past', *The Washington Post Magazine*, December 16, 1979, p SM46; Robert Taylor, 'At the Fogg: Persian paintings from a golden age', *Boston Globe*, April 14, 1980, p 1; *idem*, 'The glory of a vanished world', *Boston Globe*, May 4, 1980, p 1. Abolqasem Ferdowsi, *Shahnameh: the Persian Book of Kings*, tr. Dick Davis, Azar Nafisi (foreword), London and New York, 2007, p 833.
69. Louis Werner, 'London's Islamic Art Market', *Aramco World* 46, 3 (May-June, 1995), p 44; Geraldine Norman, 'How art dealer did a pounds 13m swap with rulers of Iran', *The Independent*,

October 17, 1994, p 5. Habibollah Ayatollahi, ‘Authentic manifestation of Iranian art: royal Tahmasebi miniatures (Shah-nama)’, in *Contemporary Iranian Art & the Islamic World*, Zahra Rahnavard (ed.), Tehran, 2002, pp 146-48 is a somewhat useful write-up marred by nativism and chauvinist twaddle, as when the author states, that the Houghton *Shahnama* remained unopened ‘due to lack of knowledge of [*sic*] Persian language’ whence ‘the majority of miniatures in the Shahnameh is pure colours which has [*sic*] remained unchanged.’ It was seldom displayed, as Stuart Cary Welch and Eleanor Sims correctly pointed out, *supra* n 18, but surely neither Ottomans nor others could be found entirely wanting in their facility with classical Persian. And *recte* 78, not ‘88 miniatures’, Houghton donated to the Met. Rüstem, *art. cit.*, 2012, p 245 states at the very outset how his study intended to challenge the *communis opinio* that the Ottomans ‘cared little for the book’ and, citing J M Rogers, how ‘it is a good demonstration that bibliophily often stops at the library door.’ Rogers did have a point given its giftee, Selim ‘the Sot’, was ‘fat, drunken and dull-witted’. Michael Levey, *The World of Ottoman Art*, London, 1975, p 84. Ünver Rüstem has now convincingly explained otherwise (p 253f.) because, by conscientiously producing those synoptic inserts, ‘the project was essentially a reflexive and reiterative one’, for scribe (‘Arif) and sultan (Selim III), ‘the book – far from languishing in obscurity after being given to Selim II – remained both known about and appreciated by the Ottoman elite, even into the late period’. *Q.v.* p 264, n 3 for a range of adduced views by past scholars. Rüstem concurs with Welch, *op. cit.*, 1976, p 17 that ‘its extraordinarily fresh condition, showing few ill effects from damp, insects, or the many hazards of Eastern libraries, proves that it was always treated with due respect.’ Concluding his 1990 Kevorkian Lectures at New York University (NYU), B W Robinson, *Fifteenth-Century Persian Painting: Problems and Issues*, Hagop Kevorkian Series on Near Eastern Art and Civilization, New York and London, 1991, p 79, contrasted the ‘doleful procession of dismembered manuscripts from Demotte to Houghton’, and acknowledged: ‘How thankful we should be, then, to the Ottoman Sultans who stored so many priceless volumes for so many centuries in the peace and security of the Topkapi library – that is, till enterprising Western “art lovers” gained access to it with their penknives and portfolios in the heady days of the 1900s.’ It is consoling that Princeton University’s Peck *Shahnama*, a gift received from the sister of an *alumnus* in 1983, is in near-fine condition and unbroken. See George Eager, ‘Library acquires “Book of Kings”’, *Princeton Weekly Bulletin*, October 17 1983, pp 1-2. This late sixteenth-century manuscript in red morocco, eighteenth-century English binding contained full-page 48 paintings within 475 folios (approx. 48 x 32 cm), signed by one Qivam b. Muhammad Shirazi and dated 1589-90, attests to the superlative quality of the Shiraz school of painting. Conservation and a technical analysis of the codex necessitated its disbanding which occasioned an inaugural exhibition at Princeton University Art Museum (Oct. 3, 2015 – Jan. 24, 2016). *Vide* catalogue by Marianna Shreve Simpson, *Princeton’s Great Persian Book of Kings: the Peck Shahnama*, with an essay by Louise Marlow, New Haven and London, 2015.

70. Christa Salamandra, ‘Cultural Construction, the Gulf and Arab London’, in *Monarchies and Nations: Globalisation and Identity in the Arab States of the Gulf*, Paul Dresch and James Piscatori (eds.), London and New York, 2005, pp 75ff. Werner, *art. cit.*, 1995, pp 40-47.
71. Werner, *art. cit.*, p 44f. *Aureo hamo piscari* as Hoare rightly pointed out sellers tended to retain complete manuscripts only if they do not sell intact. See Lee Lawrence, ‘Seeing Deeper: Reappreciating Manuscripts’, *Aramco World* 48, 4 (Jul.-Aug., 1997), p 39. Georgina Adam, ‘The truth about that sheikh and other tall tales’, *Financial Times Life & Arts*, April 4 2009, p 14; Colin Gleadell, ‘Indulging his love of the Middle East’, *The Daily Telegraph*, March 31 2015, p 26. Melik Kaylan, ‘Clandestine Trade’, *The Wall Street Journal*, December 8 2011, p D8 is the most complete and correct account of this swap and its history.
72. In 2005 the Iranian Touring and Tourism Organisation (ITTO) and the Iran Cultural Heritage Organisation (ICHO) were merged to form the Iran Cultural Heritage and Tourism Organisation (ICHTO). Kevin O’Gorman, L R McLellan and Tom Baum, ‘Tourism in Iran: central control and indigeneity’, in *Tourism and Indigenous Peoples: Issues and Implications*, Richard Butler and Tom Hinch (eds.), Oxford and Burlington MA, 2007, p 252.

73. Norman, *art. cit.*, 1994, p 5; Melikian, *art. cit.*, 2005. ‘Historian Chahryar Adle dies at 72’, *Tehran Times*, June 23 2015, p 12; ‘Iranians bid farewell to historian Chahryar Adle’, *Tehran Times*, June 29 2015, p 12.
74. Kaylan, *art. cit.*, 2011, p D8. Hassan Habibi was the Islamic republic’s first vice-president (1989-2001) and, until his death, head of the Academy of Persian Language and Literature as well as member of the High Council of the Cultural Revolution. Mehdi Hojjat, since the revolution, headed the Organization for the Preservation of Iranian Cultural Heritage. See Mehdi Hojjat, ‘Cultural Identity in Danger’, in *The Iran-Iraq War: the politics of Aggression*, Farhang Rajaei (ed.), Gainesville FL, 1993, pp 41-46.
75. Kaylan, *art. cit.*, 2011, p D8. Arthur Amory Houghton III, like his father, was notable in public life. As a diplomat he served abroad in Amman, Beirut and Cairo, and at home, the National Security Council. He was, at the time of these negotiations, a senior staff member of the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy (1988-95). Himself a scholar-cataloguer of Seleucid coinage, he has served as a member of the American School of Classical Studies, Athens; Cyprus-American Archaeological Research Institute; Corning Museum of Glass; Baltimore Museum of Art; and the American Numismatic Society. His principled approach to curatorial scholarship brought him into conflict with the corrupt practices of the Czech curator, Jiri Frel (d. 2006), at the J Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles. Frel was fired in 1984. Houghton III had been appointed in 1982 as an associate curator of antiquities. See Jason Felch and Ralph Frammolino, *Chasing Aphrodite: the Hunt for Looted Antiquities at the World’s Richest Museum*, Boston and New York, 2011, pp 41ff.
76. Vice-President Habibi considered *Lady No. 3*, besides unIslamic, also unacceptable as ‘a contorted woman’s figure whose body is not covered and shows emotions including hate.’ ‘Iran swaps “contorted nude” for poetry book’, *The Independent*, August 4 1994, p 1.
77. Karim Emami, ‘Dastan-i bazgardandan-i Shahnama-yi Shah Tahmasbi’, *Kilk*, 58-59, 1995/1373, p 55. In this essay (pp 51-56) and an earlier one, *idem*, ‘Bazgasht-i Shahnama-yi Shah Tahmasbi’, *Kilk*, 53, 1994/1373, pp 11-21, the Calcutta-born Persian translator and literary critic, Karim Emami (1930-2005), accurately narrated the vicissitudes of the Houghton *Shahnama* for a Persian readership. Utterly useless and published by the Ministry of Culture and Islamic Guidance is Habibollah Ayatollahi, *The Book of Iran: the History of Iranian Art*, Shermin Haghshenas (tr.), Zhaklin Haghshenas (ed.), Tehran, 2002, p 270 where we discover ‘an American millionaire called Hutton [*sic*]’ who ‘took the books [*sic*] apart’ and ‘presented 70 [*sic*] of the leaves to the Metropolitan Museum’ and that ‘the remaining leaves of these valuable books [*sic*] were finally exchanged in return for a European artwork by’ Presumably Willem de Kooning, a Dutch mouthful, was too much for author and translator.
78. Melikian, *art. cit.*, 1996. Lee Iacocca (with William Novack), *Iacocca: an autobiography*, New York, 1984; repr. 1986, p 109; David Lanier Lewis, *Ford Country: the Family, the Company, the Cars*, vol. 2, Sidney OH, 1999, p 170. The Shah bought it for \$5mn. It is now mothballed.
79. Norman, *art. cit.*, 1994, p 5; *eadem*, ‘Behind the scenes: a secret swap’, *Art & Antiques* 18, January 1995, pp 47-48; Kaylan, *art. cit.*, 2011, p D8; Melikian, *art. cit.*, 1996; *idem*, *art. cit.*, 2005; *idem*, *art. cit.*, 2011; Martin Bailey, ‘The Book of Kings for a de Kooning’, *The Art Newspaper*, 5, October 1994, p 1; Amy Gamerman, ‘Iran swaps de Kooning for Persian manuscript’, *Wall Street Journal*, October 13 1994, p A14; ‘Iran swaps Shah’s de Kooning’, *Art in America* 82, December 1994, p 120; Philip Jodidio, ‘Le ciel contre l’enfer’, *Connaissance des Arts*, 512, December 1994, pp 10-11; Kambiz Foroohar, ‘Iran swaps de Kooning’, *ART News* 94, 1, January 1995, p 41; Yuki, *art. cit.*, 2013, p 103. *Recte* D[avid] R[oxburgh], ‘The Shahnama of Firdawsi’, in *Treasures of the Aga Khan Museum: Masterpieces of Islamic Art*, Verena Daiber and Benoît Junod (eds.), Berlin, 2010, p 203, ‘1996’ to 1994 for the year of its return to Iran.
80. According to the late David Sylvester (d. 2001), noted British critic of Modernism. Sylvester is said to have made this remark at a de Kooning retrospective, The Tate Gallery (now Tate Britain), London, February 15 - May 7, 1995. See Ayatollahi, *art. cit.*, 2002, p 146; Dehghan,

- art. cit.*, 2012, p 23; Melikian, *art. cit.*, 2005. In Myrna Ayad, 'Farah Diba Pahlavi: an exile from a collection', *The Art Newspaper*, 278, April 2016, p 58, the former empress revealed that she anonymously telephoned MOCA after the swap as 'an art student interested in this museum' pleading with them that 'this is cultural and material heritage for our people, [and] please don't exchange any more.' Tehran's collection might find its place in the German sun as discussions are underway for a travelling exhibition, a first overseas, to that country in 2017.
81. Kaylan, *art. cit.*, 2011, p D8; Norman, *art. cit.*, 1994, p 5.
 82. Kaylan, *art. cit.*, 2011, p D8; Carol Vogel, 'Landmark De Kooning crowns collection', *The New York Times*, November 18 2006, p B7; Ayad, *art. cit.*, 2010, p 46. On Geffen see Thomas King, *The Operator: David Geffen Builds, Buys, and Sells the New Hollywood*, New York, 2000; repr. 2001, pp 566-67; Arsalan Mohammed, 'Iran and the art of detente', *Financial Times*, Life & Arts FT Weekend, December 5-6 2015, p 13.
 83. Caroline Davies, 'Single page of book fit for Persian prince may fetch pounds 1/2 m', *Daily Telegraph*, April 2 1996, p 18. 'Iranian studies institutes [*sic*] to celebrate Shahnameh millennium in Toronto', *Tehran Times*, June 26 2008, p 16. K E Eduljee, 'Shahnameh manuscripts', *FEZANA Journal* 24, 4, Winter/December 2010, p 26. An insight into the art market for Persian illuminations can be obtained from recalling how a single page of the Demotte *Shahnama* sold for £100,000 in 1978. See Geraldine Norman, '£310,000 for a Persian manuscript', *The Times*, April 4 1978, p 16.
 84. Pointed out in Blair and Bloom, *art. cit.*, 2003, pp 180-81, n 66. *Recte* end date 'May 2004' of its Milanese venue for the exhibition closed on June 28, 2004. The catalogue, *Hunt for Paradise: Court Arts of Safavid Iran 1501-1576*, Jon Thompson and Sheila Canby (eds.), Milan, 2003; Italian edn., *A caccia in Paradiso: Arte di corte nella Persia del Cinquecento*, Jon Thompson and Sheila Canby (eds.), Milan, 2004. It is handsomely produced and scholarly reviewers have rightly commended its editors: J Michael Rogers, *The Burlington Magazine* 146, June 2004, pp 407-08; and David Roxburgh, *Iranian Studies* 39, 4, 2006, pp 603-06. Rogers declares (p 407) that 'Shah Tahmāsp's Shāhnāme is probably the finest Persian manuscript ever made.' Roxburgh counsels that the catalogue (p 606) lends itself to a 'virtual exhibition of all the desired objects that could or could not make it to New York and Milan ... [and so] it is likely that the exhibition catalogue will continue to be the staple vehicle for publishing objects in sufficiently ample means – in color and lengthy descriptions ... and ... catalogues ... achieve this double duty, of documenting the exhibition that gave them cause and becoming the site for ongoing scholarly inquiry and debate.'
 85. 'Safavid artistic art from Persia in Milan', *Art Daily*, April 21 2004 http://artdaily.com/section/news/index.asp?int_sec=2&int_new=10035#.VeSLCelN1SX
 86. Mary McWilliams, 'Lifeline: sketches in appreciation of Stuart Cary Welch', in *From mind, heart, and hand: Persian, Turkish, and Indian drawings from the Stuart Cary Welch Collection*, Stuart Cary Welch and Kimberly Masteller (eds.), New Haven, 2004, pp 15-29. Obituaries: Margalit Fox, *The New York Times*, September 11 2008, p 12; Bryan Marquard, *The Boston Globe*, October 5 2008, p A19; Milo Cleveland Beach, *Orientations* 39, 7 (Oct. 2008), pp 92-93; Howard Hodgkin, *Artibus Asiae* 68, 1, 2008, p 159; *Art Newspaper* 17 (Jan. 2009), p 4; Marcus Fraser, 'A man for all seasons', *Canvas: Art & Culture from the Middle East and Arab World* 7, 2011, pp 104-09; *The Stuart Cary Welch Collection Part Two: Arts of India 31 May 2011*, London, 2011, pp 6-7. Annemarie Schimmel, *Terres d'Islam: Aux sources de l'Orient musulman*, Voyage Intérieurs, Paris and Brussels, 1994; repr. 2005 was dedicated to him 'pour toutes les années d'amitié' by this long-time colleague and collaborator at Harvard and the Met. In her autobiography, eadem, *Morgenland und Abendland: Mein west-östliches Leben*, Munich, 2002; repr. 2003, p 194, Schimmel recalled how Richard Ettinghausen, Welch's predecessor at the Met, queried, 'Why do you almost always attend Cary's lectures and tutorials?' [Warum nimmst du eigentlich immer an Carys Vorlesungen und Übungen teil?] She replied, 'Because he teaches me to see!' [Weil er mich *sehen* lehrt!]. A patchy English edition is eadem, *Orient and Occident, My Life in East and West*, Karin Mittmann

(tr.), Lahore, 2007. Persian and Arabic editions are now also available. Schimmel, *op. cit.*, 2003, pp 199-204 recounts her association, arranged by Welch as part-time special consultant to the Museum's Department of Islamic Art, and the several exhibitions they jointly mounted there: Annemarie Schimmel and Stuart Cary Welch, *Anvari's Divan: a Pocket Book for Akbar. A Dīvān of Auhaduddin Anvari, copied for the Mughal emperor Jalaluddin Akbar (r. 1556-1605) at Lahore in A.H. 996/A.D. 1588. Now in the Fogg Art Museum of Harvard University*, Philippe de Montebello (foreword), New York, 1983; Stuart Cary Welch, Annemarie Schimmel, Marie Swietochowski and Wheeler Thackston, *The Emperors' Album: Images of Mughal India*, Philippe de Montebello (foreword), New York, 1987. Annemarie Schimmel, *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* [Special issue: Islamic Calligraphy, with the assistance of Barbara Rivolta] n.s., 50, 1, 1992. Annemarie Schimmel, *A Life of Learning*, Charles Homer Haskins Lecture, ACLS Occasional Paper 21, [New York], 1993 was a memoir delivered as a lecture exactly a decade before her death. She modestly recounts (p 11) how she was 'of some help when Cary Welch prepared the glorious "INDIA!" exhibition in 1985 at the Metropolitan Museum.' Stuart Cary Welch, *India: Art and Culture 1300-1900*, New York, 1985, p 11 generously noted how Schimmel not only contributed and provided translations, but was 'an eagle-eyed proof reader' and 'a superb, always smiling, indexer.' The exhibition *INDIA!*, Metropolitan Museum of Art, September 14, 1985 – January 5, 1986 was one of the lead exhibitions held across the United States as part of the Festival of India, May 5, 1985 – November 9, 1986, officially sponsored by both governments where more than seventy exhibitions, performance programmes, educational projects and symposia were staged across eighty cities in forty-two American states during 1985 designated as 'The Year of India'. Vice-President George Bush and Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi officially inaugurated the festival on June 13, 1985. For the official publication see *Festival of India in the United States 1985-1986*, Lory Frankel (ed.), Pupul Jayakar (foreword), New York, 1985. All three catalogues, Welch and Schimmel, *op. cit.*, 1983, Welch, *op. cit.*, 1985 and Welch et al., *op. cit.*, 1987, as well as Schimmel, *op. cit.*, 1992 are out of print but downloadable, like Welch 1976 (*vide n* 43), from the Met website: <http://www.metmuseum.org/research/metpublications/>

87. *The Stuart Cary Welch Collection, Part One: Arts of the Islamic World*, London, 6 April 2011, London, 2011, p 91 (*supra* nn 9, 38). Full write-up of the piece, lot 78 (pp 86-91). A second auction held later was *The Stuart Cary Welch Collection Part Two: Arts of India 31 May 2011*, London, 2011.
88. *Ibid.*, p 86. 'A connoisseur and his treasures', *The Economist*, April 7 2011, pp 94-95.
89. Gareth Harris, *The Art Newspaper*, 20, May 2011, p 12; 'Stuart Cary Welch's legacy: Brand loyalty', *The Economist.com*. June 6 2011, <http://www.economist.com/blogs/prospero/2011/06/stuart-cary-welchs-legacy>; Scott Reyburn, Harvard lecturer's Persian manuscript fetches \$12 million', *Bloomberg News*, Apr. 6 2011, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2011-04-05/harvard-lecturer-s-persian-manuscript-may-sell-for-5-million>; Stuart Cary Welch sold 40 art works to the Museum of Islamic Art, Doha. Georgina Adam, 'Persian and Mughal paintings for Doha', *The Art Newspaper*, 17, April 2008, p 25.
90. Walter Denny, 'The Met resets a gem', *Saudi Aramco World* 62, 6 (Nov.-Dec., 2011), pp 36-43; Charlotte Higgins, '10 years after 9/11, New York museum prepares for celebration of Islamic art', *The Guardian*, October 27 2011, p 25; Sheila Canby, 'The Islamic Galleries at the Met: Art of the Arab Lands, Turkey, Iran, Central Asia and Later South Asia', *Arts of Asia* 42, 5, 2012, pp 80-89. A new catalogue which accompanied this opening is *Masterpieces from the Department of Islamic Art in The Metropolitan Museum of Art*, Maryam Ekhtiyar *et al.* (eds.), New Haven and London, 2011; repr. 2012 (*supra* nn 17, 44).
91. As conveyed to the present writer by a gallery assistant during my Met visit, June 11 2015.
92. *The Shahnama of Shah Tahmasp: the Persian Book of Kings*, Sheila Canby (introd.), Philomena Mariani (ed.), Thomas Campbell (foreword), New Haven and London, 2011. The volume (300 pp) containing 300 colour illustrations was printed on 170 gsm Furioso, a matt textured paper with high opacity produced by heat set web offset printing for catalogues, at Brizzolis, Madrid and bound by

Encuadernación, Madrid. Published by the Metropolitan Museum and distributed by Yale University Press (priced at \$120), it was subvented through the generosity of the Iranian-American community. The *Noruz at the Met* Committee provided funding for locating and digitally photographing all folios in public and private collections worldwide. This elephant folio, slip-cased, hardback was released at the same time as a deluxe edition of 400 copies each hand-numbered on the last folio under a portrait of Firdawsi. They were hand-made in midnight blue leather, individually gilded with gold stamping on front and back covers with blue endpapers bearing a tooled, embossed doublure, reproduced from the Tahmaspi original, and presented in a custom clamshell box (priced \$300). Both went out of print rapidly. A French edition is still available, *Le Shâhnâmè de Shah Tahmasp: Le livre des rois*, tr. Odile Ménégaux, Paris, 2014; vide 'Le Shâhnâmè enfin réunis', *L'Oeil*, 674, December 2014, p 120. This facsimile edition won the 20th *World Book of the Year Award* annually awarded by the Ministry of Culture and Islamic Guidance, Islamic Republic of Iran. It was put on public view at the Iran Arts Academy, Tehran. Sadaf Pour Ilaei, 'Untold story of "Shahnameh of Shah Tahmasp"', *Tehran Times*, April 30 2014, p 12. Sheila Canby, *The Shahnama of Shah Tahmasp: the Persian Book of Kings*, Marcie Muscat (ed.), Thomas Campbell (foreword), New Haven and London, 2014 is a namesake title (358 pp) but markedly different from the 2011 edition as it contains, besides an extended introduction by Sheila Canby (pp 13-18) and a detailed analysis, eadem, 'The Material World of Shah Tahmasp' (pp 21-60). Following all 258 colour reproductions (pp 61-323) are synopses or 'Notes on Folios' (pp 334-57) not supplied in Canby, *op. cit.*, 2011 which, however, has an *index locorum* (pp 282-87). The paintings, although reduced in size here, were printed and bound just as superbly as in the collector's edition.

93. Bahari, *op. cit.*, 1997, p 191. Dalia Sofer, *The Septembers of Shiraz*, London 2007; repr. 2008, p 217; *recte* Houghton's '1962' purchase of the codex to 1959.
94. Canby, *op. cit.*, 2011, p 17; eadem, *op. cit.*, 2014, p 18.