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Considering the *Shāhnāme’s* importance as a monument of Persian literature as well as a work constitutive of Iranian national identity, the quality of bibliographical information available about the *Shāhnāme’s* printed editions is highly unsatisfactory. Research until quite recently has dealt predominantly with the work’s manuscript copies. Its goal has been either to establish a faithful and reliable text as close as possible to the author’s presumed original version or to praise the artistic merits of refined illumination. While the existence of printed editions was acknowledged as a convenient means of making the text available, the critical editions prepared by Western orientalist scholars were preferred over the indigenous production: the numerous Indian and Persian editions of the *Shāhnāme* have so far not been regarded as deserving attention in their own right. Even though Iranian scholars such as the indefatigable Iraj Afshār dedicated some effort to collecting the available information on printed editions,² still today neither the total number of different editions of the *Shāhnāme* ever published nor the exact nature of the known editions has been thoroughly explored. As recently as 1996, the Persian ethnographer Javād Safinezhād, in an article devoted to a comparison of two early editions, lamented the lack of reliable information about the early history of printing in Iran.³ As if to demonstrate this point, shortly afterwards a European sales catalogue considered the edition published in Bombay 1272/1855 to be the “fifth lithographed edition of the famous Persian epic”⁴ (while reckoning the previous editions as Calcutta 1208, Paris 1217, Bombay 1849 and Teheran 1265–1267). Even though the quoted statement erroneously takes into account the *Shāhnāme’s* first two editions printed in movable type, ironically its evaluation may eventually prove to be correct (reckoning the lithographed editions Bombay 1262/1846, Bombay 1266/1849, Teheran 1265–67/1851–53 and an unidentified edition Bombay 1270/1853). Yet mistakes such as the one quoted show that a thorough bibliographical survey of the *Shāhnāme’s* printed editions is long overdue. Such a survey should take into account the available bibliographical data from various sources. Unfortunately, a number of the *Shāhnāme’s* Indian editions, particularly the later ones, are not listed in the available catalogues of major collections such as those in Istanbul,⁵ London,⁶ St Petersburg ⁷ or Islamabad.⁸ At any rate, even the most extensive bibliographical documentation cannot replace an *in situ* examination necessary to determine to which degree, if any, the relevant lithographed copy diverges from other known copies of the same edition. In this respect, it
is useful to remember that due to the specific circumstances of lithographic printing, each copy of a given edition is potentially unique.

Taking into account the current state of research, the present essay may also be considered as a contribution towards the bibliographical documentation of the Shâhnâme’s Persian editions.9 Its main focus, however, lies in introducing the illustrations included in the Persian editions, as well as discussing the models from which they derive. In this respect, the present essay supplements the broad scholarly activity concerning the illustration of the Shâhnâme in illuminated manuscripts.10 To begin with, the major points in the history of printing in Iran are commonly acknowledged as follows:

- The first book printed in movable type in Iran during the Qajar period was produced in 1233/1817.11
- The first book printed in Iran by way of the lithographic technique invented at the end of the 18th century is a copy of the Qoran published in Tabriz, dated either 1248/183212 or 1250/1834.13
- The first illustrated lithographic book produced in Iran is a copy of Maktabi’s Leili va Majmun published in 1259/1843,14 illustrating lithographic books became a current practice in Iran only as of 1263/1847.
- In about 1270, printing in movable type ceased altogether; for about two decades up to about 1290/1874, all books published in Iran were produced by way of lithographic printing.
- No exact date has been discussed so far as for the introduction of lithographic printing to India. Judging from the available data, this process probably was initiated not much earlier than the introduction of lithographic printing to Iran.

As is well known, after only a single volume of a projected complete edition of eight volumes had been published by Matthew Lumsden in Calcutta in 1811, the first complete edition of the Shâhnâme printed in movable type was prepared by Turner Macan and published in four volumes in Calcutta 1829. Besides the editio princeps, other 19th-century editions printed in movable type were published by Jules Mohl (Paris 1838–1878) and Johann August Vullers (Leiden 1877–1879), respectively. The vast majority of editions of the Shâhnâme, however, were printed by way of lithography. As already mentioned, the exact number of lithographic editions of the Shâhnâme remains unknown. Starting with the edition Bombay 1262/1846 probably some 30 lithographed Oriental editions of the Shâhnâme were published, most of them in Indian cities such as Bombay, Lucknow and Cawnpore. Before the first Persian edition, and besides the first Bombay edition, one more Indian edition was published, notably by the same publisher, in Bombay 1266/1849. After that date, a total of five lithographed editions were published in Iran up to and including the famous large-sized edition prepared by order of Hosein Pâshâ Khân Amir Bahâdor known as Shâhnâme-ye Bahâdori (Teheran 1319–1322/1901–1904). The bibliographic details of the two early Indian editions as well as those of all the Persian editions are as follows:15
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For reasons of comprehensiveness and clarity of argument, the Shâhnâme-ye Bahâdori is excluded from the following analysis. The Shâhnâme-ye Bahâdori differs from all other Persian editions in several regards. First, it is larger than any other Persian edition of the Shâhnâme, in terms of size being the largest lithographic edition ever produced. Second, the illustrative program of the Shâhnâme-ye Bahâdori is less voluminous than any of the previous editions, comprising altogether only 41 illustrations. And third, its illustrative program as well as the style in which the illustrations are executed differ decisively from the traditional style prevalent in all of the previous editions. Moreover, the illustrations are not presented as an integral part of the text. In all previous editions, illustrations were incorporated into the same sheet as the related narrative passages. In the Shâhnâme-ye Bahâdori, they have been printed on separate single sheets that were inserted into the volume only before binding. The size of the illustrations (24.5 × 34 cm) is roughly the size of the space of written text. Although treating traditional topics, the illustrations are prepared in a European style, taking account of the characters’ individual expression, realistic representation of landscape and perspective. Another prominent feature in the illustrations in the Shâhnâme-ye Bahâdori is the fact that instead of filling empty space with dots or lines, such as previous artists had customarily done, large areas of the illustrations are absolutely void of any decoration. All of the three artists participating in the preparation of the pictures illustrating the narrative parts of the Shâhnâme were popular artists of the time. ‘Ali-Khân and Hosein-‘Ali both illustrated numerous works of narrative literature, while Mohammad-Kâzem al-Hamadânî is known to have signed two contemporary lithographic single leaf prints representing scenes from the tragedy of Kerbelâ.16
As for the characteristics of the remaining four Persian editions of the above list, I propose to discuss an exemplary sample of six illustrations. In order to demonstrate my point as unambiguously as possible, I have chosen six illustrations relating to the Rostam-cycle which, by way of their iconographical representation, are recognizable instantly to anyone familiar with the tales and episodes of the Shâhnâme. The illustrations in Plates 1–6 are presented as sets taken from each of the respective editions, i.e. the editions Bombay 1262/1846, Bombay 1266/1849, Teheran 1265–67/1851–53, Tabriz 1275/1858, Teheran 1307/1889 and Tabriz 1316/1898. The six illustrations chosen are:

1. Young Rostam kills the wild elephant.
2. Rostam slays the white demon.
3. Rostam mourns Sohrâb.
4. Rostam pulls the Khâqân from his elephant.
5. The Div Akvân carries Rostam away.
6. Rostam slays Shaghâd and dies.

Since detailed comments on the various styles and techniques of illustration would tend to be repetitive, a few remarks concerning specific characteristics of each edition shall suffice.

The artist of the first Indian edition (Bombay 1262/1846) is particularly notable for the formal clumsiness in representing facial details. Even though a certain stiffness and immobility are general characteristics of Persian painting, the figures here appear as if they were taken from patterns rather than being designed for the specific scene. Backgrounds in this edition are filled either with innumerable tiny dots (scenes 1, 4) or simplified bushels of grass (scenes 2, 3, 5, 6); the foreground is given prominence by parallel lines on the bottom of the page (scenes 2, 5) or by other contrasting designs such as a vaguely indicated mound (scenes 3, 4).

The second Indian edition (Bombay 1266/1849), illustrated by a certain `Ali-Akbar, does not follow the iconographical pattern of the first Indian edition. Though the illustrated action is essentially the same, in all but one instance (scene 6): the artist here articulates a different tradition both in terms of general features and individual representation. Most obvious, his figures convey a stronger degree of emotional expression, notably in scene two, with Rostam having jumped on the back of the white div who appears to be wailing in anticipation of his imminent death; although Rostam’s steed is not involved in the action, it is neighing in an outburst of emotional participation. Backgrounds in this edition are often filled with arrangements of dots indicating cloudy skies (scenes 2–6) or bushels of grass on an uneven ground; foregrounds are pointed out by closely arranged parallel lines bent in order to indicate varying levels of elevation.

In contrast to the second Indian edition, Mirzâ ‘Ali-Qoli Khu’i, the artist of the first Persian edition (Teheran 1265–67/1851–53) follows the iconographical lead of the first Indian edition with little variation. In scene 1 he has added a background of buildings in order to indicate the urban context of the illustrated action, in scene 2 he supplies an additional div instead of the previous human onlooker, and scene 6 renders the model with inverted sides (a feature that can easily be explained by the consequences of copying). In all other instances he appears to copy the illustrations from the first Indian edition rather faithfully, particularly in rendering the dotted backgrounds or the foregrounds in scenes 2 and 5. On the other hand, a higher degree of artistic refinement is evident. As I have pointed out in a recent paper discussing the production of this artist, Mirzâ ‘Ali-Qoli Khu’i pays particular attention to details, such as stereotype renderings of beauty (scenes 1, 3), and to
emotional features such as depicting agony, imminent death or wrath by exposing the respective characters’ teeth (scenes 1, 2, 5). Even though Mirzâ ‘Ali-Qoli Khu’i’s figures share the dignified immobility of traditional Persian painting, their charmingly detailed and lifelike representation conveys a high degree of concern enabling the spectator to become emotionally involved in the illustrated action.

The second Persian edition (Tabriz 1275/1858), illustrated by an artist known as Ostád Sattâr, also follows the iconographical lead of the first Indian edition. Surprisingly, the artist appears not to have used the previous Persian edition at all. Instead, in most cases he copied the illustrations from the first Indian edition even in minute details such as the div’s severed leg in scene 2 or Rostam’s discarded sword in scene 3, details that had been rendered differently by Mirzâ ‘Ali-Qoli Khu’i. On the other hand, the artist in a number of cases has interpreted his model with a certain degree of liberty, such as in scenes 4, 5 and 6. Notably in scene 6, the action is rendered much more imminent and threatening, with the div Akvân staring directly into the spectator’s eyes while having to bend his legs in order not to overrun the illustration’s frame.

Mostafâ, the well known painter illustrating the Shâhnâmeh’s third Persian edition (Teheran 1307/1889) appears to be profiting from the second Indian edition, even though only to a limited extent. While most of the scenes (4–6) follow the model of the 1266/1849 edition relatively closely, notably the first two scenes depart from the model to such a degree so as to appear as independent compositions. In order to appreciate the position of these illustrations in tradition, it is necessary to take into account other previous Indian editions, some of which have already introduced variations of the original models. Thus, the exact model for scene 1 (Rostam attacking the heavily wounded elephant from the right) is already available in the Indian editions of 1276/1859 (calligraphy by Mohammad Ebrahim b. Mohammad-Hosein Khân Ouliyâ’ Sami; illustrations by Mohammad b. Mirzâ Kázem al-Hoseini al-Shirâzi) and 1306–1308/1888–90 (calligraphy by Seyyid Nâzem-Hosein Rezavî Muhâni); and scene 3 (the Khâqân, while being pulled off the elephant’s back, stretches his right leg up into the air) besides the two editions just mentioned can also be traced in an Indian edition of 1275–76/1858–59 (calligraphy by ‘Abd al-Karîm b. Mohammad Ebrahîm al-Tabâtabâ’î al-Esfahâni al-Ardestâni and Mirzâ Mohammad Rezâ b. ‘Ahm Mohammad Hosein Khvosh-nevis Shirâzi). Neither of these editions can, however, be regarded as a direct model for all of Mostafâ’s edition, since other illustrations are executed quite differently (such as scene 2, which in the edition 1275–76/1858–59 is a faithful copy of the original while the above-mentioned editions 1276/1859 and 1306–08/1888–90 contain a side-inverted adaptation). The most prominent feature of Mostafâ’s style is his vivid and lifelike rendering of characters. Moreover, by liberally interpreting the traditional models, he manages to convey movement and action to a hitherto unprecedented degree.

The last Persian edition to be discussed (Tabriz 1316/1898) is the only one whose illustrations have been prepared by two artists, signing as ‘Abd al-Hosein and Kerbelâ’i Hasan Naqqâsh, respectively. This edition is a hybrid in several respects. The most obvious feature is the fact that even though both artists follow closely an iconographical program such as laid out in Mostafâ’s edition, the items prepared by the latter artist constitute minute copies of Mostafâ’s originals without the least alteration. ‘Abd al-Hosein, on the other hand, in several cases (scenes 1, 2) takes his model from editions predating Mostafâ’s, thus bypassing Mostafâ’s influence. In one of the instances discussed here, considering the position of the vanquished div in scene 2, he even appears to copy from a model belonging to the tradition of the first Indian edition.
The results to be drawn from the above observations in terms of iconographical tradition can be summarized as follows. In general, there is little variation in the illustration of traditional topics in the Shāhnāme, although variation increases the more often specific items are reproduced. The two early Indian editions initiated two different iconographical traditions of illustrating lithographic editions of the Shāhnāme, both of which were later taken up by Persian illustrators. While both of the early Persian editions follow the first Indian edition of 1262/1846 closely, both of the later Persian editions can be shown to belong to the second strand of iconographical tradition. Yet they most probably did not take their inspiration directly from the Indian edition of 1264/1849; rather, they appear to be inspired by a yet-unidentified specific Indian edition that in its turn constitutes a creative adaptation of earlier models. Out of the 14 Indian editions that according to bibliographical references were published between the 1266/1849 and 1307/1889 editions, the present author has managed to examine seven, all of which contain specific peculiarities. In order to demonstrate the strands of tradition in a more effective visual way, the discussed illustrations have been arranged according to topic in Plates 7–12. The way in which the two traditions are related is represented in the diagram below.

Obviously, discussing only a limited sample does not necessarily lead to representative results. A comprehensive comparison of the complete illustrative programs of the editions concerned is bound to supply a more differentiated evaluation. Even though the data accessible to the author allow a detailed assessment, it is beyond the scope of the present essay. Thus, a few remarks will have to suffice.

While all of the four early editions discussed here contain a total of 57 illustrations, it is interesting to note a number of divergences in their respective illustrative programs. As a result of analyzing these divergences, the strands of tradition sketched above emerge, supporting the relationship already perceived by way of analyzing the given sample of illustrations. To demonstrate this point, one might mention the illustration of “Ferdousi and the court poets in the presence of Soltān Mahmud” that later belongs to the standard illustrative program of all Indian editions surveyed. This illustration is, however, not contained in the edition Bombay 1262/1846 or in any of the early Persian editions; on the other hand, it is first rendered in the Bombay 1266/1849 edition and comprised in all editions since, including both of the later Persian editions. In a number of similar cases illustrating closely related scenes of the text, the first group of editions contains illustrations rendering specific scenes not included in the second group, and vice versa. This holds true in five instances altogether, including such clearly identifiable scenes as “Bahārām Gur and Āzāde” (second group only) against “Bahārām Gur hunts lions” (first group only). Whereas only the second group contains the illustration of “Ferdousi and the court poets in the presence of Soltān Mahmud” inserted before the beginning of the Shāhnāme’s actual text, only the first group includes the scene “The Musician Barbad plays for Khosrou” towards the end of the text. In general, it is to be noted that illustrations included in the first group only are restricted to this group and are not contained in any other edition of the Shāhnāme surveyed.

In a similar way, it is possible to determine the close connection between the two later Persian editions. In general, the 1316/1898 edition contains the same illustrations as the 1307/1889 edition. In nine instances altogether, and increasingly so towards the Shāhnāme’s end, the specific topics have even been introduced by the 1307/1889 edition and have never been rendered in lithographic illustration before that date. Besides this particular feature, both of the later Persian editions more or less constitute suitable successors to the Indian illustrative tradition.
It has been the aim of the present survey to discuss and classify the illustrated Persian lithographed editions of the *Shâhnâme*. The strands of tradition according to which the illustrations contained in these editions were designed can be sorted quite clearly. However, a number of questions remains unsolved. First and foremost, the original models of inspiration remain unknown, since no attempt has been made to relate lithographic illustration to the contemporary practice of illuminating manuscripts.  

Besides other areas such as painted tiles or oil paintings on canvas known as “coffe-house painting” (*naqqâshiyé qahve-khâne*), the art of manuscript illumination is bound to have served as a major source of inspiration for artists active in lithographic illustration. Meanwhile, it should be emphasized that the methodological approach of contrasting Indian lithographed editions with Persian ones does not imply a national connotation in the present sense: after all, a large number of the Indian publishers, calligraphers and artists were of Persian, often of Shirâzi, origin; sometimes books were even written in Iran and then printed in India; besides, a certain amount of Indian book production was undoubtedly sold to Iranian customers. The extent of this international cooperation, its mechanisms and consequences remain to be studied. Moreover, the history of the *Shâhnâme* in print needs to be explored in detail. Although this chapter in the *Shâhnâme*’s history was undoubtedly inaugurated by colonialist scholars in India, neither this fact nor the new historical consciousness bestowed to the expatriate Pârsi communities in India account adequately for the overwhelming production of lithographed editions of the *Shâhnâme* in India as compared to Iran. Seen from the present distance, it is an interesting detail in the historical attitude towards the *Shâhnâme* that neither Fath-‘Ali Shâh (1212/1797–1250/1834), in whose days the *Shâhnâme* was first printed, nor his successor Mohammad Shâh (1250/1834–1264/1848), who witnessed the introduction of lithographic printing to Iran, were interested in applying the new techniques to guarantee a wider distribution of the Persian national epic. Even though Mohammad Shâh commissioned the luxurious lithographic production of a major work of classical Persian literature, instead of the *Shâhnâme* he chose Nezâmi’s *Khamse*. It remained for young Nâser al-din, Iran’s last traditional monarch, to commission the *Shâhnâme*’s first Persian lithographed edition after his ascension to the throne in 1264/1848. And still, even though two more Persian editions were prepared during his reign, India remained the Persian national epic’s major production site.
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Notes

1. A preliminary Persian version of this essay has been presented at the Second Ferdowsi Conference sponsored by ILEX Foundation and the Center for the Great Islamic Encyclopedia in Teheran, August 21–28, 2000, and an extended English version has been read at the meeting of the Shahnama Project in Cambridge, January 5–7, 2001. An album containing full documentation of the lithographic editions discussed here is currently in print in Teheran. For the general background of the present discussion see Marzolph, U., Narrative Illustration in Persian Lithographed Books, Leider 2001.


21. I am grateful to Iraj Afsâhâr for pointing out this important desideratum during the discussion following the oral presentation of this paper. Unfortunately, only very few illustrations from copies of the Shâh-nâme prepared during the 18th and 19th centuries have been published; see, e.g. Majâles-e Shâhâmâne/Shâhânâme Album, Teheran 1354/1975 (illustrations from a Shâh-nâme dated 1268/1851, one of them signed by Mîrzâ Mahdi); Ghazbânpur, J. and Æ. Aghâdâshlu, Aqä Lotf-Ali Suratgar Shirzâ, Teheran 1376/1997, pp. 120–172 (illustrations from the so-called Shâhâmâne-yê Dâvari, prepared 1273–80/1857–1863); Emami, K. (ed.), Golestan Palace Library: Portfolio of Miniature Paintings and Calligraphy, Teheran 1379/2000 (reproductions from an undated manuscript known as Shâhâmâne-yê Râshidî probably prepared in the 17th century).

23. See, e.g. the lithographed *Shahnâmeh* of 1308/1890, whose calligrapher Mir Baraqânî Mortazâ al-Hoseini at the bottom of the first page mentions his residence as Esfahan (dâr al-saltane-ye Esfahân).
