

APPENDIX A

JUZ' 6

recto	verso	location
introductory folio (4:148-49)	4:148	Dublin f 1v Minnesota
4:150-51	4:151-52	Dublin f 2
4:153	(4:153-54)	Cincinnati
----- 2 folios -----		
4:157-59	4:159-60	Cleveland
4:160-61	4:161-62	Fogg 1982.40
4:162-63	4:163	Dublin f
----- 1 folio -----		
4:166-67	4:167-69	Dublin f 4
4:169-70	4:170-71	Keir
----- 1 folio -----		
4:171-72	4:172-73	Dublin f 5
----- 1 folio -----		
4:175-76	4:176	Dublin f 6
----- 14 folios -----		
5:12	5:12-13	MMA 1 24
----- 5 folios -----		
5:20	5:20-21	MMA 1 23
5:22-23	5:23-24	MMA 3 25
----- 2 folios -----		
5:29-31	5:31	Dublin f 7
----- 1 folio -----		
5:32-33	5:33	Berlin
----- 5 folios -----		
5:43-44	5:44	Dublin f 8
5:44	5:44-45	Aga Khan
----- 1 folio -----		
5:46-48	5:48	Dublin f 9
5:48	5:48-49	Dublin f 10
----- 2 folios -----		
5:52	5:52-53	Freer
5:53	5:53-54	Cambridge
----- 12 folios -----		
5:78-80	5:80-81	Dublin f 11
----- 1 page to end of Juz -----		

APPENDIX B

JUZ' 14

16:69-70
16:24-25

APPENDIX C

JUZ' 16. Lacunae only.

19: 26-19: 38 f 21v and 21r
20: 39-20: 71 f 44v and 45r
20:100-20:135 f 54r and 55r

ON THE TRACK OF THE "DEMOTTE" SHĀHNĀMA MANUSCRIPT

Sheila S. BLAIR

In 1980 Oleg Grabar and I published a monograph on one of the most sumptuous Persian manuscripts, the "Demotte" *Shāhnāma*; further work allows me to refine our original conclusions. Examining the folios once in the Vever Collection and not available for our original publication confirms our suggestion of page splitting and our original reconstruction. However, I can correct and refine our hypothesis about the original format and show that the entire manuscript must have had approximately 190 miniatures (not the 120 we had originally posited) and was done in two volumes.

I can also chronicle the manuscript's later provenance. A recently-discovered photograph taken at the Qajar court shows the bound manuscript, suggesting that the Qajar librarian had the damaged Ilkhanid manuscript repaired, retouching some of the miniatures and conflating the two volumes in one. Around 1910, the manuscript was brought from Iran to the West, where, failing to sell it as a whole, Demotte broke it up. In addition to having folios split, he commissioned text pages of unusual format. Reconstructing the manuscript's quires suggests that these text folios were made to be sold as bifolios with the illustrated ones. Demotte quickly tired of this time-consuming process of splitting, recopying, and remargining folios and by 1915 turned to the more profitable business of selling.

In 1980, O. Grabar et moi-même avons publié une étude sur l'un des plus prestigieux manuscrits persans, le *Shāhnāma* de Demotte; des recherches ultérieures me permettent d'affiner nos conclusions originelles. L'examen des feuillets jadis dans la collection Vever, qui n'avaient pas été accessibles pour notre publication précédente confirme notre suggestion selon laquelle les pages avaient été séparées et notre reconstitution originale. Il m'est cependant possible de corriger et affiner notre hypothèse à propos du format primitif et de démontrer que le manuscrit complet a dû compter environ 190 miniatures (et non 120 initialement supposées) et se présenter en deux volumes.

Je peux aussi faire l'histoire ultérieure du manuscrit. Une photographie prise à la cour Qajar, récemment découverte, montre le volume relié, ce qui suggère que le bibliothécaire Qajar avait fait réparer le manuscrit Ilkhanid, retoucher certaines miniatures et fait de deux volumes un seul. Vers 1910, il fut apporté d'Iran en Occident où Demotte le démembra, puisqu'il ne réussissait pas à le vendre entier. En outre, il fit exécuter des pages de texte d'un format inhabituel; la reconstitution des cahiers originels fait penser que ces pages étaient destinées à être vendues comme des diplômes avec les pages enluminées. Demotte se lassa vite des lenteurs de ce procédé et, vers 1915, commença à vendre.

One of the most sumptuous manuscripts produced in Iran is a dispersed copy of the Persian national epic, the *Shāhnāma*, probably made at Tabriz in the first half of the 14th century and generally known after the French dealer G. J. Demotte who first offered its miniatures for sale in the West. Ten of the manuscript's surviving 58 miniatures were first published in Schulz's 1914 study of Islamic miniature painting¹, and 22 were included in the major exhibition of Persian art held at Burlington House, London in 1931². The miniatures soon entered the scholarly literature, with experts identifying the subjects illustrated and debating hands, provenance, and date³. Most of these earlier studies concentrated on art historical questions concerning the paintings, and it was only in a 1975 seminar at Harvard University that attention turned from the miniatures to the manuscript. Oleg Grabar and I published the rather startling results in the first monograph on the manuscript⁴.

In examining the manuscript as a whole, we uncovered two sorts of problems - split and pasted pages. In reading the text, we found three continuous sides of text (e.g. 20, 19, and 33) on miniatures located in three separate museums (respectively, the William Rockhill Nelson Gallery in Kansas City, Missouri; the Harvard University Art Museums in Cambridge, Mass., and the Boston Museum of Fine Arts). While two continuous

sides could simply be explained as the verso of one folio and the recto of the succeeding folio, this explanation was inadequate for three continuous text sides. Scutinizing the watermarks, stains, creases and other features of each side, we determined that two of the sides (20 and 19) had originally been recto and verso of the same folio but had been split apart and had irrelevant text sides pasted on the backs. Altogether, we encountered six such split folios, making a total of 12 illustrated sides with irrelevant texts pasted on the back. Such splitting was obviously a dangerous process and in one case (35-36) damaged a large triangular area.

Splitting of folios was not the only irregularity in the manuscript. We also uncovered 8 illustrations which were pasted on irrelevant texts. It seemed that the miniatures had been pasted on complete text folios, as in all cases the miniatures overlapped the columnar rulings and the text was missing the appropriate number of hemistiches covered by the miniatures. Surprisingly, however, examination showed that there was no text underneath the miniatures; rather each of the text folios omitted exactly the right number of verses to make blank spaces the size of each of the illustrations.

On paleographic grounds we were able to divide the text into two hands. Type 1 occurred on all the "altered" sides, that is, the irrelevant text sides pasted to the back

1. P. W. Schulz. *Die persisch-islamische Miniaturmalerei* (Leipzig, 1914) pls. 20-29.

2. Most readily available in the classic study by Laurence Binyon, J.V.S. Wilkinson, and Basil Gray, *Persian Miniature Painting, including a and descriptive catalogue of the Miniatures exhibited at Burlington House January-March, 1931* (London, 1933, reprint 1971), no. 29.

3. Eustache de Lorey, "L'Ecole de Tabriz", *Revue des Arts Asiatiques* 9 (1935), 27-39; Ivan Stchoukine, *La peinture iranienne sous les derniers Abbassides et les Il-Khans* (Bruges, 1936); de Lorey, "Peinture musulmane ou peinture Iranienne", *Revue des Arts Asiatiques* 12 (1938), 20-31; Doris Brian, "A Reconstruction of the Miniature Cycle in the Demotte *Shah Nameh*", *Ars Islamica* 6 (1939): 97-112; Eric Schroeder, "Ahmad Musa and Shams al-Din: A Review of Fourteenth Century Painting", *idem*, 113-142.

4. Oleg Grabar and Sheila Blair, *Epic Images and Contemporary History: The Illustrations of the Great Mongol Shahnama* (Chicago, 1980).

of split folios or the text folios with pasted-on miniatures. Type 2 occurred on all other, "normal" folios. Four characteristics of the script distinguished the two hands. The altered sides used three dots below *shn* to distinguish it from *shin* whereas normal sides used a comma-like mark over *shn*. On the altered sides a mark like a stylized *ra'-ya'* typically filled the end of a hemistich whereas this mark was rare on normal sides. The letter *ya'* was pointed with two dots below on the altered sides whereas it was undotted or pointed with two dots above on the normal sides. The letter *kaf* on the altered sides was embellished with a tail, whereas this was only used at the beginning of a hemistich on the normal sides.

Several other features also distinguished the two hands. The letters *cha'* and *pa'* usually had three dots on the altered sides but only one on the normal sides. The altered sides had many more mistakes than the normal ones. Repairs to the manuscript were always done in the Type 1 hand. Finally the intercolumnar rulings were different, those on the altered sides measuring three millimeters while those on the normal sides measure seven.

We were further able to prove that the alterations to the manuscript were done in the 20th century. Photographs taken by the Archives Photographiques show two folios (36 and 44) with large blank spaces but as now visible in the Keir Collection in London, the two have fragments of text pasted over the blanks. The fragments are taken from a cut-up text folio now in the Chester Beatty Library, Dublin.

We explained all these irregularities as the dismemberment of the manuscript by an unscrupulous dealer. Possessing folios with miniatures on both sides, he simply split the folios lengthwise. This explanation readily solved the problem of the six split folios which were divided by the dealer who then commissioned 12 text sides to paste on the backs. The splitting was possible because the original folios were so large that they had to be made of pasted pieces of paper, but the damage to miniatures 35 and 36 shows that it was still difficult. The dealer must have tried the same procedure with the other altered folios, but damaged so much of the text around the miniatures that he needed to commission whole new folios on which to paste the miniatures. He must have had original text folios to copy, as the pasted-on folios bear numbers in the lower left corner. By setting the altered folios in order according to text, rather than miniature, the numbers fell into sequence and showed that when the manuscript was still bound, it had been paginated.

These numbers allowed us to reconstruct the layout of the original manuscript. We established it as a luxury production of some 280 folios with 120 illustrations. The rate of illustration was extremely variable, with some

episodes like the Alexander sequence heavily illustrated but other, more famous ones like the Rustam cycle less well represented. Enthronements of various minor kings were also included. Based on a combination of ideological and historical arguments, we concluded by attributing the manuscript to the patronage of the vizier Ghiyâth al-Dîn b. Rashîd al-Dîn in Tabriz between November 1335, when he organized the appointment of Arpa as sultan, and his death on May 3, 1336.

These, briefly, are the hypotheses we put forward in our 1980 monograph. Further work, including study of the eight folios from the Vever Collection recently acquired by the Center for Asian Art at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D. C. but inaccessible to us for the original publication, allows me to confirm and refine our original conclusions about the manuscript of the "Demotte" *Shâhnâma*.

Most important, examining the folios once in the Vever Collection confirms our suggestion of page splitting and our reconstruction of the manuscript. We had noticed (p. 7) that all eight of the folios with pasted-on miniatures occurred in the text near already known miniatures: six immediately fell into pairs (3/4, 11/12, and 43/44) while two others (8 and 33) fell close to other illustrated sides (8 and 34). We had suggested that the original folios from which the pasted-on miniatures were detached resembled the split folios with illustrations on both recto and verso. Wanting to sell the miniatures separately, the dealer split the folios. In three cases (3/4, 7/8 and 43/44) the text around the miniatures was so badly damaged that he had to commission whole new text folios. In the other two cases (7/8 and 33/34) only one side of the text was destroyed, requiring a whole text folio on which to paste miniatures 8 and 33; the other side remained intact and required only a new back for miniatures 7 and 34. This remained a hypothesis because both miniatures 7 and 34 were in private collections and their other sides were unavailable for examination. Examining number 7, now in Washington, shows that it has been split from its original verso and confirms our original theory of split pages.

Moreover, all the pages once in the Vever Collection, not only the eight with illustrations (7, 8, 10, 14, 32, 37, 42, and 43) but also two text folios (16 and 166, attached to folios 19 and 171 with illustrations 10 and 32, respectively) fit the reconstructed manuscript we had proposed. For example, we had posited that illustration 32, "Taynush before Alexander and the Visit to the Brahmins," would fall on folio 171, and indeed the verso of the folio is so numbered. Similarly, the folio containing illustration 10, "Sindukht becoming aware of Rudaba's Action", although not numbered because of repairs to the bottom of the folio, falls exactly into place in the text as folio 19.

The only place we had to modify our original pagination was at the end of the first section where we had under-calculated by five folios. The text folio pasted around illustration 8, for example, is numbered 48, not the 43 we had estimated, and therefore the first section should end with folio 51, instead of folio 46⁵.

This minor modification to the pagination does not alter our original reconstruction of a major luxury manuscript with some 280-300 folios. Further study, however, does show that we made a mistake in calculating the number of illustrations. We were able to reconstruct about half the original manuscript (approximately 150 of the 300 folios). Thinking of the 58 known illustrations, we had simply doubled the number and suggested that the manuscript originally had some 120 illustrations. Instead, we should have doubled the number of illustrations we were able to posit in the reconstructed half (95), giving a total of 190. The manuscript is thus more monumental than we had assumed, in line with the one made for Shah Tahmasp in the 16th century with 250 illustrations⁶.

Furthermore, I can suggest that the original manuscript was bound in two volumes. Volume II would have begun with folio 142, now in the Bibliothèque Nationale (pl. XIX A), with the heading "The Story of Rustam and Isfandiyar". It is the only surviving illuminated folio. As it is numbered, it is, and always was, a verso. Its recto (pl. XIX B) now contains the end of the preceding story about the seven exploits of Isfandiyar, but this is a modern addition. The recto is penned in a third hand, neither that of the original manuscript nor that of the altered pages but one with a flatter base line and smaller characters. While folds and creases on recto and verso are contiguous and suggest that the two

were joined some time ago, nevertheless, close scrutiny shows that they were not originally the same folio. The last line of the plain recto, for example, is damaged, while there is no damage in the corresponding place on the illuminated verso. Holding the folio up to the light shows that the two were joined after the gold rulings were done, for that on the illuminated verso extends beyond that of the plain recto⁷.

We can compare the division of the "Demotte" *Shâhnâma* manuscript into two volumes to some of the other contemporary "small" *Shâhnâma* manuscripts, as expertly reconstructed by M. S. Simpson⁸. Although much smaller in size, the folios from these manuscripts resemble those from the "Demotte" (text written in six columns by approximately 30 lines per page), making manuscripts of approximately the same number of folios as the "Demotte" (300). The first "small" *Shâhnâma*, like the "Demotte", is a rare paginated manuscript, and Simpson has reconstructed it as some 330 folios. Both it and the second "small" *Shâhnâma*, are divided into two volumes. In the second "small" *Shâhnâma*, the number of lines per page shifts from volume I to volume II. In the first "small" *Shâhnâma*, the division is marked by illuminated pages with verses about the beauty of the calligraphy and painting. In both cases, the division falls between the reigns of Kay Khusraw and Luhrasp (Russian edition, end of volume 5 and beginning of volume 6). In the "Demotte" manuscript, the division is slightly further along in the story, occurring halfway through volume 6 of the printed edition.

The original recto of volume II from the "Demotte" *Shâhnâma* manuscript must have been blank so that the illuminated side was protected on the verso. At some point when the manuscript was rebound in a single

5) Briefly, the end of the first section reconstructed in appendix 2, p. 185 should read:

Folio no.	Brian no.	Verses omitted	Comments
36	11a*-11*		
(37)	x-x	1827	(19 1/2 sides) 9 folios without illustration
(38)	x-x		
(39)	x-x		
(40)	x-x		
(41)	x-x		
(42)	x-x		
(43)	x-x		
(44)	x-x		
(45)	x-x		
(46)	x-24a*	90	(1 side)
(47)	x-3a*		
48	8*-8a*		
49	x-37a*	231	(2 1/2 sides) Condensed to 1 side
50	43*-43a*		
(51)	44*-[44a*]		

6. Martin Bernard Dickson and Stuart Cary Welch, *The Houghton Shahnameh* (Cambridge, Mass., 1982). Like the Demotte manuscript, this luxury production is often referred to by the ignominious person who allowed it to be chopped up. In this case the action was even more reprehensible since the manuscript had survived intact until the 1970s and it was done without even recording the original codicology.

7. Edgar Blochet, *Notices sur les Manuscrits de la Collection Marteau* (Paris, 1923) 7-21, calls it a frontispiece and notes that it had been cropped at the gold margin.

8. Marianna Shreve Simpson, *The Illustration of an Epic: The earliest Shahnameh Manuscripts* (New York, 1979), Chapter 2.

volume, the text from the end of volume I was copied on the beginning of volume II. Codicological considerations can tell us when this was done.

Glenn Lowry, Curator of Near Eastern Art at the Freer Gallery in Washington, D. C., discovered an old photograph of the manuscript, now in the archives of the Freer Gallery. The negative was taken by A. Sevruhin, a photographer of Russian origin who worked at the court of Nasir al-Din Shah in Tehran in the late 19th century. It shows the bound manuscript open to the illustrated page of "Bahram Gur hunting with Azada" (47), now in collection of the Harvard University Art Museums (pl. XX A).

We can imagine that while part of the Qajar imperial library, the unfinished and damaged Ilkhanid manuscript was fixed up. The two volumes were conflated into one by copying a new recto for the illuminated opening folio of volume II. The pages were numbered so they could be put in correct order when the single new volume was rebound. Some of the miniatures were reworked. Many of the faces show heavy eyebrows typical of the Qajar style and some miniatures like "Bahram Bahramiyan Enthroned" (45) may be almost entirely repainted. This Qajar provenance for the manuscript shows, parenthetically, that it is pointless to search in the Istanbul or Diez albums for missing miniatures from the manuscript.

The redone manuscript, although partly repainted and reduced to a single volume, was still a luxury product, available for sale by an impoverished monarch or an unscrupulous librarian to one of the many Western agents collecting manuscripts in the Near East. According to a letter dated November 2, 1937 from Dikran Kelekian to John Thatcher, Assistant to the Director of the Fogg Art Museum, and now in the archives of the Harvard University Art Museums, in this case the recipient was Shemavan Malayan, the brother-in-law of the Armenian dealer Hagop Kevorkian. Malayan brought the manuscript to Paris and offered it intact to Kelekian

père for \$30,000 to \$35,000. Unable to raise the asking price, Kelekian père brought in his fellow dealer Demotte⁹.

Demotte bought an unfinished manuscript that had some folios with miniatures on both sides. At first he may have tried to sell the manuscript as a whole, but was unable to find a buyer¹⁰. Wanting to maximize his profits, he split folios which originally had miniatures on both recto and verso. He knew this was possible, for he had in hand the frontispiece to volume II to which the Qajar restorers had added a recto and he had seen the practice on other 14th century *Shāhnāma* folios¹¹. Demotte needed new sides and folios on which to paste the detached miniatures, so he gave his calligrapher extant text folios from the manuscript, instructing him to copy the original script (type 2) as closely as possible. He did so, but with small discrepancies (type 1).

At the same time that he commissioned new pages for his split miniatures, Demotte also commissioned other new text folios. Today, we know of 12 separate text pages from the manuscript¹². Four are full (six columns by 31 lines) text pages done in the normal, type 2 hand: folio 15 in the Chester Beatty Library, now cut up with part pasted on miniatures 36 and 44 in the Keir Collection; folio 154 in the Freer Gallery, now pasted to folio 5 with illustration 1; folio 166 in the Sackler Collection and attached to folio 171 containing illustration 32; and folio 211 in the Chester Beatty Library, the only one which is detached. These four must be original folios.

The remaining eight text folios (folios 16, 20, 145, 147, 163, 173, 179, and 189) are done in type 1 hand, the hand used for the altered sides, and have an unusual layout with blank squares, either in the form of a checkerboard or flanking a central column¹³. In our 1980 publication (p. 10) we had suggested that they were modern forgeries because they had an odd format and were done in the same hand as the altered pages. Codicology confirms what paleography had suggested.

Having split miniatures and commissioned texts,

9. Eric Schroeder knew of this letter, for he notes that according to D. G. Kelekian, one of the first people to see the manuscript in Europe, it was extracted from the old royal library in Tehran, became Demotte's property and was then dispersed (*Persian Miniatures in the Fogg Museum of Art* [Cambridge, 1942], p. 35).

An unnamed dealer repeated this information to Carolyn Kane of the Islamic Department at the Metropolitan Museum, who kindly relayed it to me in a letter dated November, 3, 1975.

10. Edgar Blochet, *Les Peintures des Manuscrits Orientaux de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Paris, 19??) p. 7 and n. 4 already mentions that he hadn't seen the manuscript before Demotte's dismemberment, but that apparently it was unfinished.

11. See Simpson, p. 61 for split folios from the Freer "small" *Shāhnāma* manuscript.

12. In our 1980 publication I had included folio 142 in the Bibliothèque Nationale with the illuminated heading as a text folio. Instead it should be considered as another illustrated one, for undoubtedly it was preserved due to its illumination. Furthermore, as we have seen, it is different from all other folios in that its verso is original, but its recto was added at a different time in a third hand.

13. In addition to the six already noted in our 1980 publication (two in the Chester Beatty Library and the Musée d'Art et d'Histoire, Geneva; one in the Bibliothèque Nationale and the Freer Gallery of Art) the Sackler Museum has also acquired one as part of the Vever Collection: folio 16 with a checkerboard recto and a full verso. It is attached to folio 19 containing illustration 10.

In our earlier publication (p. 180), I had noted that text from folio 179 was visible in an old Archives Photographiques photograph of folio 174 with illustration 36, "Alexander coming out of the Land of Darkness" and had assumed that the text was pasted to the folio. Now I realize that this was another, incomplete and unruled text folio of the central column type which was visible below illustration 36 because the folio had not yet been repaired with the strip of text now pasted along the left margin.

Demotte then had all the folios remargined, using a cream colored paper slightly lighter than the original brown one. The paper he chose bears the watermark 1839 π γ, perhaps indicative of a Greek origin¹⁴. The watermark occurs in the margins of all types of folios - regular, unaltered ones and altered ones (split, pasted-on, and unusual format text pages)¹⁵. Furthermore, in one of the text folios with unusual format in the Chester Beatty Library (folio 20), the watermark occurs not only in the margin, but also in the written area, thereby proving that the unusual - format text pages are contemporary with the remargining of the manuscript¹⁶.

We had been puzzled why Demotte had commissioned these text folios with unusual format and could only suggest (p. 10) that it was because he had offered the entire manuscript for sale. It seems improbable that Demotte had envisioned recopying the entire manuscript. Examining the manuscript's gatherings offers more insight.

The 12 known text folios survive in six collections. While those in the Freer Gallery of Art and the Chester Beatty Library are now detached, those from four collections (folios 16 and 166 from the Vever Collection now in Washington, folio 147 from the Marteau Collection now in the Bibliothèque Nationale, folios 145 and 173 from the Pozzi Collection now in Geneva, and folio 179 once in the possession of the Countess de Behague and now in the Keir Collection) are joined with other regular, illuminated folios into bifolios.

The six bifolios all consist of one text page joined by an overlapping gutter to one illuminated folio. One has a regular, full text page: folio 166 in the Sackler Gallery attached to folio 171 with illustration 32. The other five bifolios have fake text pages with blanks: folio 16, attached to folio 19 with illustration 10; folio 145 attached to folio 144 with illustration 18; folio 147 attached to folio 142 with the illuminated frontispiece; folio 173 attached to folio 180 with illustration 40, and folio 179 attached to folio 174v with illustration 36.

All of these bifolios form quaternions and we can suggest that text folios from the two other collections (the Freer Gallery of Art and the Chester Beatty Library)

were simply detached from their partners still in the same collection. According to museum records, folio 163 in the Freer Gallery was "found under" folio 158 with illustration 26, "Darab in the Vault" when it was acquired from C. Edward Wells, and the two form an appropriate bifolio. Likewise, folio 20 in the Chester Beatty Library forms one with folio 15, the cut-up text page in the same collection.

Using these eight bifolios as guidelines, we can neatly divide the manuscript into 30 gatherings (appendix)¹⁷. Volume one, folios 1-141, would have filled 18 gatherings. Volume two, beginning with folio 142 and extending to folio 233, would have filled gatherings 19 to 30, but the complete manuscript probably extended to gathering 36 or even 37. Folios survive from seven quires of volume I (1-5, 7, and 15) and from eleven quires of volume II (19-28 and 30). In each volume extra folios might have been used to fill the first quire: in volume II a blank folio would have preceded folio 142 with the illuminated frontispiece on the verso; in volume I the first three folios could have been blank or could have contained the preface to the epic before the double page frontispiece on folios 1v-2r in the middle of the quire¹⁸. This quire must have been almost totally destroyed, for only the last folio, folio 5 with illustration 1, survives and even it is badly damaged.

When he needed new text pages for his split miniatures, Demotte must have given the end quires of volume I to his calligrapher to copy, for all but one of the altered pages attached to split miniatures (folios 27, 28, 30, 33, 35, 36, 46-51, and 100-115) come from the end of quire 4 and quires 5, 7, and 15¹⁹. These seem to have entirely textual quires, without any known or posited illustrations and strengthen our earlier argument about the uneven nature of the illustrative cycle²⁰.

In contrast, all the text folios of unusual format (folios 16, 20, 145, 147, 163, 173, 179 and 189) were copied from other sections of the manuscript. They come from the beginning of volume I (quire 3) or from volume II (quires 19, 20, 21, 23 and 25). Another peculiarity of these text folios of unusual format is that all but one of them form bifolios with extant folios. Demotte ob-

14. Marjorie Cohn, Paper Conservator at the Harvard University Art Museums, tells me that she has never seen such a watermark, but that it might indicate a Greek origin for the paper.

15. One can determine the watermark only when the folio is unframed and can be held up to the light. Of the pages I have examined, I have recorded watermarks on those in Geneva (folios 26, 173, 180), the Freer Gallery of Art (folio 178), Dublin (folios 10, 11, 20, 36, 112, 165, 189, 190, 211) and the Louvre (folio 156). Other folios may also have watermarks, but I was simply not able to tell.

16. My thanks to David James, Curator at the Chester Beatty Library for re-checking these watermarks for me.

17. These bifolios are obviously modern for they were made after remargining, but they so neatly divide the paginated folios into quires that it is difficult not to believe they reflect the original gatherings.

18. The older prose preface is not used in the Freer "small" *Shāhnāma*, but does occur in the 1330 and 1341 manuscripts done in Shiraz (Simpson, p. 63). Only the list of kings from the end of the preface is preserved in the 1333 manuscript in Leningrad (A. T. Adamova and L. T. Giuzal'ian, *Miniature Rukopisi Poemy "Shaxname" 1333 Goda* (Leningrad, 1985).

19. The exception is folio 150 with illustration 33 pasted-on. It will be discussed below.

20. The "historic" section of the epic was much more highly illustrated than the "heroic" one; the opposite is true for the 1333 *Shāhnāma* manuscript now in Leningrad (see Adamova and Giuzal'ian, "Shaxnama" 1333 Goda).

viously valued bifolios, for he sold one to Henri Vever with a real text folio (folio 166) attached to an illustrated one (folio 171 with illustration 32, "Taynush before Alexander and the Visit to the Brahmans"). He must have wanted to make other bifolios to sell, for it was a popular arrangement to mount an illustrated page beside a text one to give the impression of an open book²¹.

Demotte thus gave the calligrapher the folios that were pairs to other extant folios. The original text folios must have had blank spaces for miniatures, for there is insufficient text to fill the sides. The calligrapher looked for ways to stretch out the text. He tried the central column format, but in one case (folio 163v in the Freer Gallery) the lines of text did not end up symmetrical. He also tried the checkerboard arrangement, but ruling these pages was obviously very time consuming.

The rulings confirm the hypothesis of Demotte's commissioning the text folios of unusual format to make bifolios. Two of the unusual-format text folios are unrul-ed. One (folio 20 in the Chester Beatty Library) forms a bifolio with folio 15, a real text folio also in the Beatty Library which was cut up and pasted on two other miniatures, 36 and 44, after they were photographed by the Archives Photographiques. The other unrul-ed text folio (179v, once in the Behague collection) forms a bifolio with 174, which originally contained miniatures 35 and 36 but was split and now an irrelevant text side (folio 113r) has been pasted to the back of 174v with miniature 36. In other words, the partner to each of these two fake text folios was no longer available (in one case it was cut up and in one case it was a pastiche) and Demotte could not make these two fake text pages into bifolios, so the calligrapher abandoned ruling these two fake text pages because they were no longer needed.

The problem of making bifolios is evident in the one altered text page with pasted-on miniature that does not come from the text quires: folio 150 with miniature 33 pasted-on, now in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts. As mentioned above, all other text pages with split

miniatures were copied from the text quires at the end of volume I; only this folio was copied from volume II, the section from whence the unusual-format text page were copied. In the reconstructed manuscript, it forms a bifolio with folio 155, originally containing miniatures 23, "Rustam Slaying Shaghad" in the British Museum and 24, "Picture of Rustam and Zavara's Bier" in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts. Having ordered folio 155 split, Demotte must have put aside its counterpart, folio 150, for a bifolio. Somehow folio 150 got mixed in with the pile of folios from text quires 4, 5, 7, and 15 and used as a model for a fake text folio on which to paste miniature 23. The folio ended up in the same collection as its partner from the original bifolio, and the two may even have been paired originally²².

It is easy to see why Demotte got tired of this time-consuming process of splitting, recopying, and remargin-ing folios and soon turned to the more profitable business of selling. According to Kelikian, Demotte acquired the manuscript around 1910²³; he started selling individual folios ca. 1915. Some of the first buyers were French. Georges Marteau died in 1916, bequeathing his three illustrated folios to the Louvre and later the illuminated one with attached text folio to the Bibliothèque Nationale²⁴. M. H. Vever was another early buyer. He seems to have acquired most of his folios before Demotte held an exhibition in 1918 in his gallery at 27, Rue de Berri²⁵. Dikran Kelekian also claimed to have had an early choice, picking the four best miniatures (16, 41, 53, 56)²⁶ but at least two were still in Demotte's hands in this early exhibition.

Demotte moved his galleries to New York and North American collectors soon entered the scene. The 22 exhibited at Burlington House, London in 1931 included all eight from the Vever Collection and six still in the hands of Demotte, New York (miniatures 5, 11, 22, 45, 51, and 57). The remaining eight were in American and Canadian collections: Edward Forbes had bought three (19, 30, 47, now at Harvard); E. Wells,

21. H. Khan Monif apparently mounted the folios of the second "small" *Shāhnāma* manuscript in this fashion (Simpson, p. 89). She notes that the text folios do not follow sequentially with their illustrated partners, but one wonders whether some of them were bifolios like those from the "Demotte" manuscript. The two folios from Brooklyn (L63.9.76), for example, come from the same story.

22. The Boston Museum of Fine Arts acquired the two folios at different times, one (folio 155 with miniature 24) directly from Demotte in 1922 and the other (folio 150 with miniature 33 pasted-on) from Dennison Ross in 1930. However, knowing how closely Ross worked with the museum, it is quite possible that in 1922 Ross initiated the acquisition of the whole bifolio with two illustrated folios, keeping one half for himself and having the museum take the other.

While these two, then, might have formed a bifolio originally, there is one unusual-format text folio which does not form a bifolio: folio 189 in the Chester Beatty Library. In the reconstructed manuscript, it is joined to folio 196, a missing folio but one whose text fills the space between two known folios, folio 195 with illustration 46 and folio 197 with illustration 47. I have no idea why Demotte set it aside for recopying.

23. Letter to John Thatcher dated October 14, 1937 in the archives of the Harvard University Art Museums. The date makes sense historically, for Malayan could easily have acquired the manuscript in the confusion following the Constitutional Revolution in Iran.

24. My thanks to the Conservators in the Oriental Department of the Louvre who informed me that the three miniatures were bequeathed to the museum on December 20, 1916.

25. Chahryar Adle kindly provided a copy of the catalogue by Galeries G. J. Demotte, *Exposition d'Art Persan* (Paris, [1918]). The only one of Vever's miniatures which was on show is our 32, "Taynush before Alexander and the Visit to the Brahmans", listed as number 18 and according to penciled notes in the catalogue, sold for 20,000 [francs]. Marteau's three miniatures were also not part of the exhibition.

26. Letters to John Thatcher dated October 14 and November 2, 1937.

New York had bought two (12 and 21, now at the Boston Museum of Fine Arts and Harvard); Mrs. Rainey Rogers had bought one (49, now in Cleveland); one (50)

had already entered the collection of McGill University²⁷. By this time we are no longer talking about a manuscript, but rather individual miniatures.

APPENDIX

Reconstructed Quires of the "Demotte" *Shāhnāma*

Underlined numbers indicate known paginated folios in Type 2

Boldface numbers indicate known altered folios in Type 1 script.

x indicates a blank folio.

VOLUME I			
x quire 1	38 quire 6	157 quire 21	197 quire 26
x	39	<u>158</u>	198
x	40	<u>159</u>	199
1	41	160	200
2	42	161	201
3	43	162	202
4	44	163	203
5	45	<u>164</u>	<u>204</u>
6 quire 2	46 quire 7	165 quire 22	205 quire 27
7	47	<u>166</u>	206
8	48	<u>167</u>	207
9	49	<u>168</u>	<u>208</u>
10	50	169	<u>209</u>
11	51	170	210
12	52	<u>171</u>	<u>211</u>
13	53	<u>172</u>	<u>212</u>
Seven quires missing			
14 quire 3	110 quire 15	173 quire 23	213 quire 28
<u>15</u>	<u>111</u>	<u>174</u>	214
16	112	<u>175</u>	215
17	113	176	216
18	114	177	217
19	115	178	218
20	116	179	219
21	117	<u>180</u>	220
Three quires missing			
End of volume I			
VOLUME II			
22 quire 4	x quire 19	181 quire 24	221 quire 29
23	<u>142</u>	182	222
24	<u>143</u>	183	223
25	<u>144</u>	184	224
26	145	185	225
27	146	186	226
28	147	187	227
29	148	188	228
30 quire 5	149 quire 20	189 quire 25	229 quire 30
31	<u>150</u>	<u>190</u>	<u>230</u>
32	151	191	231
33	<u>152</u>	192	232
34	<u>153</u>	193	<u>233</u>
35	<u>154</u>	194	234
36	<u>155</u>	<u>195</u>	235
37	<u>156</u>	196	236
Another six or seven quires to end of Volume II			

27. The eighth miniature (Binyon, Wilkinson, and Gray, 29(t), "Battle Exploit of Isfandiyar") is also listed as being in the collection of Edward Forbes and lent through the Fogg Art Museum. However, it cannot refer to "Isfandiyar's Son being Killed by Rustam's Brother and Son" (19), for this is number 29(u). Perhaps it refers to 20, "Rustam and Isfandiyar testing each other", now in Kansas City.