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Abstract

Throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries two powerful Islamic dynasties, the Mughal empire of India and the Safavid empire of Iran, forged a fascinating history of dynastic interaction. Sometimes allies, sometimes enemies, the Mughals and the Safavids encountered one another on a number of levels. From border disputes to itinerant poets, the history and culture of each dynasty impacted those of the other. The most direct form of interaction between the two empires was through ambassadorial parties dispatched in the interest of advancing political, mercantile, and military ventures. In this dissertation, I examine gifts, works of art in particular, exchanged between the courts of the Mughal emperor Jahangir (1605-27) and the Safavid emperor Shah Abbas (1588-1629) through official embassies. The types of gifts exchanged, the circumstances in which gifts were presented, and the consequences of giving and receiving equity among other lines of inquiry are analyzed towards a better understanding of relations between these two courts, the role and nature of gifting, and the values attributed to gifted works of art then and now.
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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AHT</td>
<td>Art History Trust, Lichtenstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMSG</td>
<td>Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>Ardebil Shrine, Iran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKB</td>
<td>Bharat Kala Bhavan, Benares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL</td>
<td>British Library, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLO</td>
<td>Bodleian Library, Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLVR</td>
<td>Baberini Library, Vatican, Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>British Museum, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMFA</td>
<td>Boston Museum of Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMNY</td>
<td>Brooklyn Museum, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN</td>
<td>Bibliotheque Nationale, Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBL</td>
<td>Chester Beatty Library, Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMA</td>
<td>Cleveland Museum of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPGA</td>
<td>Freer Gallery of Art, Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPL</td>
<td>Gulistan Palace Library, Tehran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUAM</td>
<td>Harvard University Art Museums, Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMC</td>
<td>Indian Museum, Calcutta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOL</td>
<td>India Office Library, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUL</td>
<td>Istanbul University Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRLM</td>
<td>John Rylands Library, Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLP</td>
<td>Kudabuksha Library, Patna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNM</td>
<td>Kuwait National Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCM</td>
<td>Lahore Central Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCEP</td>
<td>Museum of Culture of Eastern Peoples, Moscow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MG</td>
<td>Musee Guimet, Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML</td>
<td>Musee Louvre, Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMA</td>
<td>Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Private Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWM</td>
<td>Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAS</td>
<td>Royal Asiatic Society, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RASSP</td>
<td>Royal Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLR</td>
<td>Raza Library, Rampur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLWC</td>
<td>Royal Library, Windsor Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAK</td>
<td>Collection of Sadrudin Aga Khan, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJM</td>
<td>Salar Jung Museum, Hyderabad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TKS</td>
<td>Topkapi Seray Museum, Istanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAM</td>
<td>Victoria and Albert Museum, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAG</td>
<td>Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1
Introduction

On this day Aqa Beg and Muhibb Ali, the envoys of the rule of Persia, paid their respects and presented a loving letter from that noble brother, together with a black and white plume, valued by the jewelers at Rs. 50,000. My brother also sent me a ruby weighing 12 tank, which had belonged to the jewel-chamber of M. Ulugh Beg, the successor of M. Shah-rukh. In the course of time, and by the revolutions of fate, it had come into the hands of the Safawi family. On this ruby there were engraved in the Naksh character the words: "Ulugh Beg b. M. Shah-rukh Bahadur b. Mir Timur Gurgan." My brother, Shah Abbas, directed that in another corner they should cut the words: "The slave of the King of Holiness, Abbas." in the Nastaliq character. He had this ruby inserted in a jigha (turban ornament), and sent to me as a souvenir. As the ruby bore the name of my ancestors, I took it as a blessing for myself, and bade Sa'id, the superintendent of the goldsmith's department, engrave in another corner the words "Jahangir Shah b. Akbar Shah," and the current date. After some days, when the news of the conquest of the Deccan arrived, I gave that ruby to Khurram, and sent it to him.¹

In the history of Mughal-Safavid relations, the years 1605-1628 witnessed an unprecedented number of embassies sent between the courts of the fourth Mughal emperor of India, Jahangir (1605-27), and his contemporary, Shah Abbas (1587-1628), of Safavid Iran. A total of twelve official parties traversed dynastic borders in the interest of advancing political, military, and commercial agendas.² Among the items that accompanied an embassy were gifts, such as the ruby discussed above, intended for presentation from one emperor to the other. This practice, commonly referred to as gifting, is of course neither unique nor exclusive to the Mughal and Safavid dynasties. The

¹Jahangir, The Tuzuk-i-Jahangiri, ed. by H. Beveridge, tr. by A. Rogers, (Delhi: Low Price Publications, 1989 reprint), 195 (hereafter to be called Tuzuk. N.B. page numbers appended with the letter “a” are references from the second volume of the Tuzuk.) The event occurred in his 15th regnal year, 1029 A.H., 1620 C.E.

²Other types of official relations such as marriage alliances were not exercised.
offering of material and organic goods from one ruling party to another was and still is a common practice in any diplomatic encounter. Whether to curry favor, facilitate political ends, or to ensure the continuation of peaceful relations, gifts presented and received were an essential component of an embassy.

But what role, precisely, did gifts, particularly works of art, play in such encounters? What types of gifts were given? How, if at all, did gifts affect the success of an embassy’s mission? Where was value perceived in art presented as gifts—art recontextualized as political mediators? Such questions and their responses lie at the heart of this dissertation which considers cultural encounters, specifically gift giving, between the courts of Jahangir and Shah Abbas. But the objectives of this project are best illustrated by taking a closer look at the intriguing history of Ulugh Beg’s ruby.

In 1620, when Jahangir recorded the above entry in his autobiographical memoirs, the *Tuzuk-i Jahangir*, the ruby in question had recently been gifted to him by the envoys Aqa Beg and Muhibb Ali on behalf of Shah Abbas. Jahangir was especially fond of jewels. The presentation of such a large one was likely a calculated move by Shah Abbas to seduce Jahangir’s diplomatic sensibilities through his aesthetic ones. But the value of this particular gem did not rest in its physical properties alone, a fact which both Jahangir and Shah Abbas no doubt appreciated. Prior to its appearance at the Safavid court the ruby was owned by the Timurid emperor Ulugh Beg (d.1449), an ancestor of Jahangir. Jahangir’s proclivity for his Timurid ancestors’ antiquities ensured the ruby’s favorable reception.3

The envoys Aqa Beg and Muhibb Ali were not the first, but the second of four parties sent by Shah Abbas to Jahangir’s court in 1620/21. Of the twelve embassies exchanged between Jahangir and Shah Abbas over the course of their twenty-two year history, a disproportionate five were sent by Shah Abbas during Jahangir’s fifteenth and sixteenth regnal years (1620-22). Besides the ruby and the plume mentioned above, seven Persian horses and their trappings, silver ornaments, three camels, twenty-seven pieces of brocade, two mares with foals, a smelling bottle with ambergris, two pairs of carpets, and two woolen coverlets among other gifts were also presented to Jahangir by Safavid ambassadors during these years. Clearly, a great deal of attention was directed toward Jahangir by Shah Abbas.

Those familiar with political relations between the two dynasties in the succeeding two years attribute the accelerated rate of gifting as an attempt by Shah Abbas to campaign peacefully for control of Qandahar. Located today in Southern Afghanistan (fig. 1), the city of Qandahar was historically a common border shared by the two empires. Jahangir and Shah Abbas were not the first members of their respective dynasties to recognize the city’s strategic importance and vie to control it. As an outpost along major trade routes and a boundary marker for each empire, Qandahar was considered a prized possession. The city was contested as early as the reign of the first Mughal emperor Babur (d.1530) and the first Safavid emperor Shah Ismail (d.1534) and continued to be so into

---

4 Tusa, 197a, 198a, and 200a.

the eighteenth century. In fact, the city changed hands at least twelve times in that two
hundred-year period. 6

The first clash between Jahangir and Shah Abbas occurred while the city was
under Mughal subjugation. During the confusion of Jahangir's succession to the throne in
1605, Shah Abbas campaigned unsuccessfully to take Qandahar by force. In 1622, after
sending a plethora of embassies, he attacked the city again. This time, his attempt was
rewarded and the Safavid empire reclaimed Qandahar.

Despite a continuous succession of embassies and gifts, including a very valuable
and highly coveted ruby, Shah Abbas' heavy-handed attempts to coerce a peaceful transfer
of Qandahar came to naught. How, then, can the relationships among the imperial agendas
conceived, the embassies sent, the objects gifted, and the political objectives achieved or
failed be understood? In the exchange of equity, what responsibilities were incurred in the
presentation and acceptance of a gift? What was the duration of those obligations? How
influential were gifts in determining imperial policy? Did certain kinds of gifts prompt
particular responses? Were gifts presented through embassies with highly charged
missions of higher quality and greater value than those with peaceful intentions; or, were
gifts simply a facet of diplomatic encounters, a predictable ritual to sanction interaction? If
so, then how much were gifts, and by extension works of art, valued? If Ulugh Beg's ruby
was such a highly prized possession, why was it gifted and regifted? What does that
suggest about the appreciation for and collection of ancestral possessions? Why did each
emperor deem it important to inscribe his name on the ruby before gifting it?

6IPR, 14.
These questions, among others to be raised, address two inter-related foci regarding the practice of gifting at the courts of Jahangir and Shah Abbas. On the one hand are queries that relate to Indo-Persian relations. On the other hand are concerns which are more art historical in nature. Considered together, they conflate into one question which will be the primary thesis of this paper: what role, precisely, did the gift play in ambassadorial encounters and how does that information alter the way in which gifted works of art were construed then and are interpreted today?

In addition to my own intellectual curiosity about this particular era, privileging the issue of gifting between Jahangir and Shah Abbas is justified on a number of levels. First, the central query is a fluid one, a question that likely begets different, even opposing, responses based on the time period, participants, and political mood of the day. It is, therefore, necessary to create a tight, highly focused context within which to address it. To this end, I have chosen to examine only a very specific time period, that in which the reigns of Jahangir and Shah Abbas overlap (1605-27).

Of course, a good deal of contact, cultural encounters among others, between the Mughals and Safavids occurred prior to and following the reigns of Shah Abbas and Jahangir. Each or any of these periods is surely worthy of analysis just as is the period I have chosen to study. Although interesting for their own sakes, other eras will be discussed here only in as much as they illuminate the years targeted in this study. The amount of evidence extant on the issue of cultural exchange during the early seventeenth century alone necessitates a selective use of earlier and later material.
Further, the fortunes and failures of the Mughals and the Safavids were intimately connected to other influential dynasties of the day. Most immediate were neighboring foreign powers including the Uzbegs of Central Asia, the Ottomans of Turkey, and the Deccani states of Central India. To a lesser extent, relations with China and Europe, particularly England and Portugal, also played a role in foreign relations. It would be negligent to ignore the impact these empires exercised on the Mughals and Safavids, individually and as enemies and allies. Often, foreign policy towards one empire was guided by relations with another. In this respect, the topic selected for study is quite inflexible. Frequently, I was challenged to accommodate those secondary dynasties without sacrificing the detail ascertainable only through a very focused project. I have therefore included only the most immediately relevant material regarding subsidiary foreign relations.\(^7\)

Another reason for focusing on this period has to do with the agendas, the scale, and the number of embassies sent as well as the quantity and quality of gifts presented during this era. A cursory look at each aspect affirms that Jahangir and Shah Abbas exploited the full potential of embassies when implementing foreign policy. Both emperors seem to have excelled in using diplomacy to achieve their aims which makes an exploration of gift exchange through embassies sent during these two particular emperors’ reigns especially promising to investigate.

Earlier studies have also recognized the importance of studying relations between the Mughal and Safavid courts. In fact, publications by historians such as Riazul Islam,

\(^7\)Four comparative studies, however, will be discussed in Chapter 4 in order to inform the topic further.
Abdur Rahim, and N.S. Goreker are points of departure from which my own study springs. Islam in particular has provided the field of Indo-Persian relations with invaluable information in the form of both translations of primary documents and analyses of that data. In his study of encounters between the Mughal and Safavid courts, an expansion of Rahim's work from the 1930's, Islam reviews and examines each era of contact from the dynasties' foundings in the sixteenth century through to their declines in the eighteenth century.

Unlike those of earlier authors, my study will focus on one era only. This will enable me to treat the topic of gifting, which is not a central thesis in preceding studies, with the detailed attention it demands for understanding the complex relationships between art and politics so thoroughly intertwined at the Mughal court but only recently explored by scholars. Further, these prior studies by historians of Indo-Persian relations do not take visual evidence into account. My project not only employs objects as evidence but also privileges the information they illustrate. It is this focus on the object within the

---


10 I employ the word object throughout this project much more broadly than it is typically defined. It includes nearly all types of three dimensional and two-dimensional works of a wide variety of media and even other material and organic goods such as fur coats, bows and arrows, medicine, animals, and food.
context of exchange that makes my study both unique and art historical in intent. An emphasis on objects raises a different set of questions than those posed by historians ultimately providing an alternative understanding of Indo-Persian relations during the reigns of Jahangir and Shah Abbas. For example, instead of evaluating the success of each emperor’s foreign policy and his aptitude as a statesmen, I consider the object as gift and the artistic and political complexities that arise in the exchange of material culture.

Not only can a focus on the object in cultural encounters lead to greater awareness of the intricacies of Indo-Persian relations but the reverse is also apparent. Bringing the concerns of Mughal-Safavid encounters to the field of art history improves the way in which that art can be understood. Focusing on the issue of gifting at the courts of Jahangir and Shah Abbas justifies itself on a third level then, the art historical one.

Although art historical studies on the patronage of Jahangir or Shah Abbas are common, a review of the literature reveals that much of what are standard reference works on either emperor are over twenty years old. Art produced under Jahangir and Shah Abbas seems well covered not because of recent studies devoted to the era, but because the era permeates introductory studies on the history of Islamic art and surveys of Mughal

11 Although works of art presented as gifts will be favored in this study, all gifts known to have been given and received including other material and organic possessions will be considered in order to achieve a thorough analysis of official cultural exchange.

or Safavid art.\textsuperscript{13} After all, the two emperors are both recognized as notable connoisseurs and the period is replete with fascinating images and objects. It is that very appreciation that lends itself so agreeably to a study of gift exchange at this time.

Considering the attention both dynasties have received to date, there is some argument to be made for researching material that has never been studied before. Certainly there remains much within the fields of both Islamic and South Asian art that is unexamined. But I believe it is a worthwhile endeavor to reconsider the popular rhetoric on art during this era which stems from older studies, particularly through the lens of gifting which has not been previously applied, precisely because those ideas form the basis of any introduction to the field.

Though the occasional publication may speculate on the possibility of certain objects having been gifts, no serious investigation has been undertaken.\textsuperscript{14} It has been written, for example, ‘‘...the emperor Jahangir sent his favorite artist to Isfahan to record the exact likenesses of Shah Abbas I and Indian paintings found their way as gifts to the Isfahan court.’’\textsuperscript{15} But this and similar statements are based on presumption rather than concrete evidence.


\textsuperscript{15}A. Welch (1973), 100.
To date, studies that do focus on the issue of cultural exchange during the reigns of Shah Abbas and Jahangir predominately center on migrating artists. In particular, artists who traveled from Iran to India have been analyzed for the influence they might have exerted on artistic production in their new environment. Little is known about the objects that traversed those borders as gifts or otherwise. The fact that the issue of cultural exchange has been addressed at all demonstrates the range of studies that have been published on this period. It is only because prominent scholars have already documented the histories of the reigns, attributed dates and locations of production to works of art, and studied the movement of emigrating artists that it becomes possible to proceed to the next, and to my mind more interesting, level of analysis. In this case, it is the exploration of art historical appreciation of works produced at a particular court or which passed through it as suggested by evidence of the time. I examine, for example, the tastes and collecting strategies of each emperor. What types of objects were coveted? What might that reveal about each emperor and his vision of empire? An analysis of gifting as it evolved between the courts should enable me to achieve a more thorough and perhaps surprising analysis of the emperors’ artistic sensibilities.

This is only one of several art historical concerns of immediate relevance to the topic at hand. In addition to the relationship between art and emperor, understanding the value of art and the ways in which exchanged objects may or may not have affected subsequent artistic output are also important. Where was value or meaning found in gifted art that acquired a dual imperial provenance? What aspects of an object were valued;

---

provenance, craftsmanship, medium, and why? Did the emperor alone value gifted objects or did court artists also take an interest in them? Are elements of gifted objects apparent in the subsequent conception and production of works of art? How might responses to these questions affect the way we understand and attribute value to these works of art today? Such questions will help me determine how objects were appreciated beyond their initial import through to the present.

For, in addition, to typical art historical interests which consider the moment of production, whether that focus centers on the patron, the artist, the medium, or the context in which it was created, with this topic, it is possible to study the continuing histories an object acquires as it moves through space and time. In such cases, original meaning may be retained or deliberately erased. It may become secondary or obscured by other, later meanings superimposed on it. In this project then, all gifted objects acquire post-production histories of at least multi-imperial ownership and new contexts as tools of political negotiation. My interest in the continuing history of objects, particularly during this time period, is a less explored facet of both South Asian and Islamic art.

The most convincing reason to study gifting between Jahangir and Shah Abbas, however, is the evidence that survives on the topic. The era is rich in primary sources, both visual and literary, sources which themselves command consideration of the issue of gifting during this particular era by the very amount of relevant references. Contemporary paintings, particularly those that illustrate court life, are plentiful. Mughal paintings are especially well known for their highly detailed and documentary quality. Representations
of cultural encounters including ambassadorial receptions, imaginary meetings, and gifted objects in paintings by court artists inform my study on a very immediate level.\textsuperscript{17}

Actual objects exchanged between the emperors through embassies are another important type of visual evidence. In the initial stages of my research, I anticipated favoring such objects in my analysis of gifting for those works would seem to provide direct and detailed information, just as Ulugh Beg’s ruby does. Museum and private collections around the world were examined in person\textsuperscript{18} and through published catalogues\textsuperscript{19} for suitable material. At each institution, I examined photographic and written archives, object fact sheets, and objects themselves for relevant information.

Despite steadfast research, most objects officially exchanged between the courts of Jahangir and Shah Abbas remain undetected, if they survive at all. The reasons are twofold. First, an object’s history is atypically housed on itself; an unfortunate reality since inscriptive evidence is perhaps the most conclusive method towards the identification of

\textsuperscript{17}See Appendix B for a catalogue of visual evidence. Unfortunately only a few paintings intended as illustrations to the \textit{Tuzuk-i Jahangiri} are known today. None depict Indo-Iranian encounters. See M. C. Beach, \textit{The Imperial Image: Paintings for the Mughal Court} (Washington, DC: Freer Gallery of Art, 1981), 172-173 and M. C. Beach, “Jahangir’s \textit{Jahangir-Nama}” in \textit{The Powers of Art}, ed. B. Miller, (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1992), 224-234.

\textsuperscript{18}The following collections were studied:
In India: The Bharat Kala Bhavan, Benares; the National Museum, Delhi; The City Palace Museum, Jaipur; The Calico Museum and M.C. Mehta Gallery, Ahmedabad; The Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay; The Salar Jung Museum and the Jagdish Mittal collection, Hyderabad
In Pakistan: The Central Museum, Lahore
In Ireland: The Chester Beatty Museum, Dublin

\textsuperscript{19}See bibliography under catalogues heading.
an imperial Indo-Iranian provenance. Inscriptions like those on the ruby which provide so much information, including documentation of Ulugh Beg’s, Shah Abbas’ and Jahangir’s ownership, in addition to an entry in the Tuzuk, are aberrant. Second, written or external documentation of accession and ownership rarely follow a work through time. The histories surrounding objects are so easily lost prior to their contemporary housing in museums and private collections.

In addition to the ruby, other objects exchanged between the emperors may and probably do survive to the present, but it has become difficult if not impossible to identify them. In some cases, certain visual clues on an object may suggest exchange and as such were sought throughout the course of my research. For example, a manuscript executed in the style of one court but refurbished with illustrations, margins, or a binding in a style of the other court purports an Indo-Iranian provenance. A metal bowl whose shape typifies the style of one court but contains ornamentation in the style of the second has similar implications. But even when these types of objects could be identified, in most cases, it was impossible to establish if such amalgams were the product of official imperial exchange or some other form of cultural interaction. They, therefore, remain problematic.

20 In this paper I use the term Indo-Iranian to describe interaction that included both Indian (i.e. Jahangir) and Iranian (i.e. Shah Abbas) elements with no particular stress on either influence or conflation that the phrase sometimes implies.

21 A fair number of objects which contain Jahangiri inscriptions are extant but those that additionally declare the name of Shah Abbas are non-existent.

22 For example, a Mughal Iyar-i Dānesh (BKB 9069/2k) of c. 1580 has a doublepage frontispiece depicting a garden scene in a seventeenth-century Safavid style. Those painted folios, however, were patched into the manuscript at an unknown date.

23 India, cat. no. 119 (PWM 56.61).
as evidence from which to draw conclusions. Whether because their provenances have not been recorded on the objects or because the objects are no longer extant, it is, at this time, extremely difficult to locate particular objects which were officially exchanged. Ulugh Beg's ruby is one of only a few objects extant today which can be confidently ascribed an imperial Indo-Iranian provenance.\textsuperscript{24}

For a study that proposes to privilege the object this stumbling block presents a serious obstacle. The potential contribution of visual evidence in any study, particularly an art historical one, cannot be denied. But the quandary is not insurmountable, it only demands a reconsideration of that which is available. In fact, the absence of any significant number of actual objects exchanged forced me to question the way in which I was approaching the topic and the conclusions I had prematurely drawn. It prompted me to take a closer look at written evidence.

In terms of volume alone, the amount of primary written material that provides information on gifting dramatically eclipses the visual sources. Jahangir's memoirs, court histories, travel accounts of European visitors, and imperial correspondence are only some of the written sources available.\textsuperscript{25} Each resource imparts both specific and generic instances of imperial gifting. Some illuminate the type of gift or the intent behind it. Others discuss the context in which it was presented or how it was received.

\textsuperscript{24}See cat. no. 53 for more information about this object.

\textsuperscript{25}The predominance of gifting in Mughal and Safavid court life is clearly evident in the primary sources which have been translated into English. Many untranslated texts would, no doubt, also be of assistance in this project. However, I have found a significant amount of pertinent information in the former and do not believe that supplemental data from untranslated sources would alter significantly the detected patterns and their ensuing conclusions.
The amount of information on the topic of gifting in the written literature alone underscores how important gifts were. Even a cursory reading of the Tuzuk affirms that gifts were central to the progression of Mughal culture and politics. In this highly personalized revelation of his reign, Jahangir makes frequent, detailed notes of equity exchange and the circumstances in which such encounters took place. A quick estimate suggests that close to one-fifth of this most important written resource on the history of Jahangir's rule is dominated by carefully recorded references to gift exchange. Not all references relate of gifts presented to and by the Safavid court. Gifts from other courts are also reported. The most frequent references, however, are to internal exchanges between Jahangir and his courtiers. From land grants and titles bestowed on loyal subjects to gifts presented and received from foreign empires, the Tuzuk suggests, demands, and sustains a careful and thorough study of the role of gifting in the realms of both cultural and political maturation. In consequence of both this and my own curiosity, this study will be heavily weighted toward gifting under Jahangir.

But written sources should not and will not be taken at face value. Each author has his biases and prejudices, whether blatant or subtle. These must be taken into consideration in the reading and application of each text. Further, authors make unintentional errors in reporting the events of the day. John Seyller has recently noted discrepancies in Jahangir's own writings.26 This is not to say that written sources should

26J. Seyller, "The Inspection and Valuation of Manuscripts in the Imperial Mughal Library" in Artibus Asiae 57 (1997), 254. See also M. Farhad and M. S. Simpson, "Sources for the Study of Safavid Painting and Patronage, or Mejfrez-Vous de Qazi Ahmad" in Muqarnas 10 (1993), 286-291. In their study, the writings of the Safavid biographer Qazi Ahmed, whose reports occasionally contradict one other, are examined.
be cast aside. Rather these observations promote a critical reading, ultimately enabling me
to make the most of them.

Another difficulty in working with literary sources is the challenge raised by
translation including, for example, subtle vocabulary differences.\textsuperscript{27} Where terminology is
especially important for words such as “gift,” “give,” or “present,” I pay special attention
to nuances that might be glossed in translations.\textsuperscript{28} Otherwise, I rely on the work of
scholars whose knowledge of \textit{Farsi}, the court language of the Mughals and Safavids, far
exceeds my own.

Using the \textit{Tuzuk} in particular as a chief resource poses additional problems. None
of the original versions of the text survive to the present. All translations and printed
versions are based on later copies and recensions. Hence, scribal errors are a real
concern.\textsuperscript{29} Further, Jahangir is often silent in the \textit{Tuzuk} about events that would seem to
command discussion given their apparent significance to Mughal history. For example,
Jahangir dispatched the largest embassy in the history of Mughal-Safavid relations in 1613,
yet he has little to say about it.\textsuperscript{30} The consequences and possible inferences of this

\textsuperscript{27}The issue of transliteration is yet another challenge. I have tried to keep spelling as consistent as
possible without using a single transliteration system. Many of the names and words used in my own text
are actually introduced in quotes from other scholars. I follow each of their systems in my own references
in an attempt to minimize confusion.

\textsuperscript{28}This investigation of vocabulary will primarily be addressed in the Chapter 5.

\textsuperscript{29}In their translation, Rogers and Beveridge provide numerous footnotes detailing specific inconsistencies.
See also H. Elliot and J. Dowson, eds., \textit{A History of India as Told by its Own Historians} (New Delhi: Low

\textsuperscript{30}For brief, sporadic references to the embassy see \textit{Tuzuk}, 248, 370, 10a, 115a-117a.
shortcoming will be considered in the conclusion. Despite such drawbacks, the Tuzuk is a valuable resource that will be consulted in full whenever possible.

The most rewarding type of primary evidence, however, is available through a combined application of the visual and written resources available today. When references in literature to gifts exchanged are sought from the pool of objects that do survive to the present day, a vast amount of visual evidence is again available. In other words, if a written source records the gifting of a jeweled sword or a robe of honor, then examples of jeweled swords or robes were examined in my research, not as the actual objects exchanged, since that information is impossible to ascertain, but rather as examples of what might have been exchanged. Instead of limiting my analysis to only objects which can be definitively identified as gifts to and from the emperors, I additionally considered these object types.

This project works under the assumption that through in depth analysis of specific instances of exchange, patterns of behavior emerge which reveal the intricacies at work in the act of gifting and the appreciation of art. The organization of the dissertation is, therefore, fairly straightforward. In Chapters 2, 3, and 4, the primary and secondary evidence is presented and discussed. In Chapters 5 and 6, that evidence is brought together and analyzed within the context of my thesis statement.

More specifically, in Chapter 2, I compile and concisely review the primary evidence outlined above in an explanatory and exploratory summary of specific case histories of gift exchange which ensued under Jahangir and Shah Abbas. I review what types of objects were presented and in what circumstances they were exchanged, namely
embassies, paying particularly close attention to works of art. Missions, contents, and
protocol are also discussed to provide a richer setting within which to consider embassy
gifting. Altogether, this chapter affords a thorough overview of the primary written and
visual evidence immediately relevant to the topic at hand.

Chapter 3 deals with secondary evidence on the topic: scholarly studies on gift
exchange. Research which considers the period in question, or that focused on Islamic
societies generally or even that conducted by art historians would be invaluable to this
topic but is unfortunately scarce. Therefore, only recently published studies by art
historian Genevieve Warwick, South Asian historians Stewart Gordon and John Richards,
and Persian linguist Ann Lambton are considered.31 However, the number of potential
models that provide insight into the nature and consequences of gifting is still sizable.
Anthropologists, philosophers, and economists among others have submitted a number of
intriguing case studies and conclusions on the nature and function of the gift. Among the
most influential and attenuated studies is the work of Marcel Mauss explicated in his book
entitled in The Gift.32 In addition to Mauss, a selected sampling of works by other scholars
such as Pierre Bourdieu and Jacques Derrida is also undertaken.33

31 G. Warwick, “Gift Exchange and Art Collecting: Padre Sebastiano Resta’s Drawing Albums,” in Art
Ceremony” in The Indian Economic and Social History Review 33 (1996), 225-242; J. Richards, “The
Formulation of Imperial Authority under Akbar and Jahangir” in Kingship and Authority in South Asia,


33 P. Bourdieu, “Selections from The Logic of Practice” in The Logic of the Gift: Towards an Ethic of
Generosity, ed. A. Schrift, (New York: Routledge, 1997), 190-244; J. Derrida, Given Time: I. Counterfeit
Following that, a series of four adjunct case studies will be set forth in Chapter 4 for both comparative and contrasting information to gift exchange between Jahangir and Shah Abbas. There, I explore internal gifting at the Mughal court, gifting practices among other Safavid and Mughal emperors, exchanges between Jahangir and other foreign visitors such as the English, and trade relations between Jahangir and Shah Abbas. These brief investigations will help to separate the distinct from the commonplace in order to attain a better understanding of the topic at hand.

Altogether, visual and written sources both primary and secondary, impart a fascinating picture of the rich, multivalent interaction that evolved between the two houses as people and objects invariably traversed borders. With that in mind, I pull together in Chapter 5 all the evidence reviewed earlier into a unified, original discussion of gifting practices between Jahangir and Shah Abbas. For example, I follow up my close look at the scholarly literature on gifting by questioning its application to imperial Indo-Iranian relations and proposing original ideas regarding the nature of gifting in this particular context. Basically, I consider the concept and implications of gifting as it was shaped at the courts of Jahangir and Shah Abbas and is revealed through primary evidence.

In the conclusion, Chapter 6, works of art again become the focus for discussion. There, interest in and value(s) attributed to objects will be considered for what they might reveal about appreciation for art exchanged as gifts and as political tools. Some of the numerous questions which have been raised throughout the course of this introduction will also be considered. It would not be possible to answer or even address them all, however. But then again, that is not my purpose in raising them. Instead, my intent is to clarify my
interests, the goal I am working towards in analyzing the material at hand, and the methodology I will employ to reach it. The ideas raised in the preceding chapters will thus be further refined in the conclusion. Ideally, their accumulation will provide a better understanding of the impact of official cultural exchange, namely gifting, between the courts of Jahangir and Shah Abbas and the way in which works of art associated with or resulting from exchanges were perceived in order to supplement understanding of that art today.
Chapter 2
Embassies and Gifts: The Primary Evidence

(The Tuzuk-i Jahangiri) is a plain and ingenious record of all the author deemed worthy of note. The volume contains a good deal of matter quite uninteresting to a European reader, such as promotions and honours bestowed upon the emperor’s followers, and the presents he gave and received.\(^{34}\)

Initially, I conceived this chapter as a detailed description of each ambassadorial encounter between the Mughals and Safavids and of the various gifts exchanged. But it seemed that reading this information would be as tedious as writing it. I have chosen, therefore, to present references to specific gifts in an alternative format. With respect to Sir H.M. Elliot, whose opinion on the matter is quoted above, a detailed list of the gifts presented to Jahangir by Shah Abbas is located in Appendix A, Part 1. A list of the gifts presented to Shah Abbas by Jahangir can be found in Appendix A, Part 2. In this chapter, I discuss specific embassies and the nature of embassies as they are revealed in the primary sources and pay particularly close attention to relevant visual evidence.

Imperial Encounters

In 1609 Shah Abbas sent his first high-ranking ambassador, Yadgar Ali Sultan, to Jahangir. The embassy arrived at the Mughal court in 1611 as recorded by Jahangir in the Tuzuk.\(^{35}\) Although contact between the Mughals and the Safavids had occurred since the

\(^{34}\)Elliot, 6: 282.

\(^{35}\)Tuzuk, 193-196; R. Islam, A Calendar of Documents on Indo-Persian Relations (Tehran and Karachi: Iranian Culture Foundation; Institute of Central and West Asian Studies, 1979), J. 60, pg. 163. The duration of the journey between the two courts varied depending on the scale of the embassy.
founding of the dynasties in the early sixteenth century, this particular embassy
inaugurated official ambassadorial contact between the two emperors. In keeping with
tradition the embassy was sent with a dual purpose, that is, to console Jahangir on the
death of his father, the late king Akbar (1555-1605), and to congratulate him on his own
succession to the Mughal throne. These sentiments were, no doubt, conveyed orally.
They were also expressed in a letter from the Shah himself. Jahangir was so pleased with
the content of that letter that he copied it word for word into his autobiographical
memoirs. Full of flowery compliments and expressions of friendship, the letter conforms to
typical epistolographic conventions thus rendering it in Jahangir’s opinion worthy of
inclusion in the Tuzuk. No specific gifts are mentioned in the letter, but Jahangir notes that
“horses, cloth stuffs, and every kind of fitting present” were given to him through the
Shah’s ambassador.

Why Shah Abbas delayed four years in sending this embassy to condole and
celebrate events that occurred in 1605 is a bit problematic. In his letter, the Shah admits
his negligence was not in keeping with the historical amity between the two dynasties.
Expeditions in Azerbaijan and Shirvan had prevented him from sending his ambassador

36 Prior to his accession, Jahangir also corresponded with Shah Abbas. These interactions are covered in
Chapter 4 under the case study of trade since that seems to be the major type of exchange practiced.

v. 2, 1192 (hereafter called Shah Abbas.)

38 Tuzuk, 193-196.

39 The exact number of years that passed in between Jahangir’s accession and his reception of the Safavid
ambassador is not precisely clear. The problem arises partly from dates which are inconsistently recorded
in the primary sources and partly from a general lack of information on how long it took embassies to
travel from one court to the other. See footnote 54 for a discussion of these problems.
any sooner.40 However, as briefly discussed in the introduction, a contingent of Persian troops attacked Qandahar soon after Jahangir’s accession to the throne in 1605. Abbas denied any involvement in the affair, but scholars generally agree he orchestrated the attack.41 Riazul Islam has suggested that Abbas delayed sending an official embassy to Jahangir until he had recovered from the military defeat at Qandahar.

To complicate matters further, the emissary sent in 1609 was not in fact the first Safavid representative to travel to Jahangir’s court on Abbas’ behalf. In his second regnal year, Jahangir explains that the Shah sent his close companion, Husain Beg, to investigate the matter at Qandahar, then travel to Jahangir’s court with an explanation of the incident.42 Later, the envoy was given 10,000 rupees by Jahangir.43

Two undated letters from Jahangir to Shah Abbas proffer a somewhat different interpretation.44 In them it is stated that Husain Beg was directly dispatched to Jahangir’s court in order to deliver personally a letter from the Shah both dismissing the incident and disavowing any imperial sanction of the attack. Whatever the impulse in sending this individual, no gifts are known to have accompanied him. Following Jahangir’s tone in the two letters in which he repeatedly makes reference to the eminent arrival of a high ranking


40Shah Abbas, 2: 979; Calendar, J.60; IPR 70.


42Tüzük, 86.

43Tüzük, 90. In this reference, the envoy is called Hasan Beg. Despite the slight name variation, perhaps an error on the part of the translator, the two envoys are most likely one and the same.

44Calendar, J. 52 and 53.
diplomat from the Shah whom he likely considers the official representative, I too, am
privileging the arrival of Yadgar Ali Sultan as the first official encounter. \(^{45}\) Even at the
commencement of their official interaction, then, relations between the two emperors were
rather complicated, a pattern evident throughout the course of their interaction.

In his reply to the letter Yadgar Ali Sultan brought from Abbas, Jahangir himself
acknowledges and questions the Shah’s delayed opening of diplomatic relations.
Apparently, the incident at Qandahar and the Shah’s neglect in sending an envoy had
prompted gossip at the Mughal court; the fidelity of the Safavid alliance to the new
Mughal ruler was being questioned. \(^{46}\) Jahangir, however, seems to have accepted the
Shah’s explanation for the attack on Qandahar readily enough. \(^{47}\) In a somewhat ironic
twist, the official chronicler of Shah Abbas’ reign relates that upon the arrival of this
emissary in India and the completion of his duties, Jahangir was expected to restore the
disputed territory of Qandahar to the Shah. \(^{48}\)

At any rate, when Yadgar Ali Sultan finally arrived in 1611 he “...laid before me
the gifts Shah Abbas, my brother, had sent...After he had presented the gifts, on the same

---

\(^{45}\) According to protocol, the first embassy was expected to convey congratulatory and condolence
sentiments which were the mission for a higher ranking envoy, Yadgar Sultan Ali.

\(^{46}\) Typically, it was the responsibility of the longer-ruling emperor, in this case Shah Abbas, to initiate
ambassadors’ contact under the guise of condoling and congratulating his counterpart, here Jahangir,
upon his successor’s death and his own accession of the throne.

\(^{47}\) Calendar, I. 53. The letter is undated but probably from 1607 or 1608.

\(^{48}\) Shah Abbas, 2: 1193. This explanation of the ambassador’s ulterior agenda is given during the account
of the year 1621-1622, in which a long-winded and elaborate justification for attacking and acquiring
Qandahar in 1622 is made.
day I gave him a superb robe of honour and 30,000 tumans.”

Over the course of his two year residence at the Mughal court, the envoy was further presented with a jeweled dagger, a special wrap from Europe, 45,000 rupees, one gold muhr (10,000 rupees), a horse with a jeweled saddle, a jeweled sword, a sleeveless, gold embroidered vest, an aigrette with feathers, and a turban ornament.

When Yadgar Ali Sultan departed the Mughal court in 1613, Jahangir directed his boon companion, Mirza Barkhwurdar also known by his title Khan Alam, to accompany the Persian envoy’s return to the Safavid court. “On the same day Yadgar Ali ambassador of the ruler of Iran, and Khan Alam, who had been nominated to accompany him from this side, received their leave to go... on Khan Alam a jeweled khapwa or phul katara (a sort of dagger) with a pendant of royal pearls (were bestowed).” Khan Alam’s role is greatly underplayed here. He is referred to as simply an accompanist. In fact, greater attention is given to the gifts presented to him. In a letter Khan Alam carried from Jahangir to Abbas, there is a similar absence of detail about this appointment. Jahangir simply explains that the Khan’s family had served the dynasty for generations and he was thus requesting an early release following Khan Alam’s arrival at the Persian court.

Jahangir’s casual dismissal of his envoy is quite misleading, however. It is tempting to think that because there is no description of the size of Khan Alam’s embassy or its retainers, no details regarding its purpose, no directive for Khan Alam to wait on the Shah, 

---

49 Tuzuk, 193.

50 Tuzuk, 193, 200, 203, 206, 237, 248-249.

51 Tuzuk, 248.

52 Calendar, J. 63 and 64.
and no discussion of gifts sent to Abbas, that its sum importance was quite minor. But the lack of attention to the embassy in Jahangir’s own writings is by no means indicative of its scale and grandeur. In fact, that brief entry in the Tuzuk is just about the only account of Khan Alam’s embassy that does not rave about the spectacle.\textsuperscript{53} According to one source, there were so many Mughal constituents accompanying the ambassadors that, once leaving Lahore in 1613, it took over three years for the embassy to reach Qazvin, site of the first imperial reception, a journey typically undertaken in six months to a year.\textsuperscript{54} In the official court chronicle of Shah Abbas reign, the Tarik-e Alamara-ye Abbasi, the historian Iskandar Beg Munshi records:

I happened to be in Qazvin on the day when Khan-e Alam entered the city, and I saw the pomp and ceremony with which he arrived. Oldtimers said that never since the establishment of the Safavid dynasty had an ambassador from either Turkey or India come to Iran with such a magnificent retinue, and it is hard to imagine that, even in the days of Kosrows or Keyanids, any embassy to the Shah’s court that equaled the splendor of this embassy from India, come to do honour to Shah Abbas... When Khan-e Alam set foot on the soil of Iran, he had with him about a thousand royal retainers and personal attendants, not to mention servants. Included among his retinue were two hundred falconers and huntsmen. Some of these people were sent back from Herat to India, but, on the day when Khan-e Alam entered the city of Qazvin, he still had with him some seven or eight hundred retainers of the royal household, personal attendants, servants and zookeepers, together with ten huge elephants, equipped with gold howdahs, and embellished with all kinds of trappings, and a variety of animals, including tigers, leopards, antelope, Indian lambs, cheetahs, rhinoceroses, talking birds, and water buffalo which pulled various types of litters.\textsuperscript{55}

\textsuperscript{53}Calendar, J. 63. Islam comments that this was the biggest embassy sent by Jahangir and by any Mughal emperor.

\textsuperscript{54}IPR, 204-205. The arrival and departure dates of Khan Alam’s embassy are contested in primary sources. Islam, who sorts through the different accounts, concludes the embassy arrived in Qazvin in 1616 and returned to the Mughal court in 1620.

\textsuperscript{55}Shah Abbas 2: 1159-1160.
According to other contemporary sources, animals, particularly rare ones, in the care several hundred attendants were included in the embassy as were a significant number of gifts, 200 falconers, huntsmen, war-horses, birds (including birds that talked), Gujarati cattle, deer, ornamented chariots (or rhinoceros) and palanquins.\textsuperscript{56} Pietro Della Valle, an Italian traveler in residence at the Shah’s court during the Khan’s arrival, says that somewhere between 1000 and 1500 retainers accompanied the ambassador at the time he was granted an elaborate audience with the Shah in the city of Qazvin.\textsuperscript{57} On this occasion, the central square was closed for a formal reception and parade of the gifts.\textsuperscript{58} The Shah spent that first night drinking with the Khan alone to the neglect of his own courtiers. Other preferential treatment towards the Mughal ambassador included permission to smoke tobacco against the imperial ban, an invitation to hunt, and the bestowal of a special titles, Jan Alam (Soul of the World) and \textit{Ba’i} (My Brother).\textsuperscript{59}

\textsuperscript{56}\textit{IPT}, 74. Islam mentions the first two components but does not site his source. The remaining elements are listed in S. Awrangabadi, \textit{The Maargir-ul-Umara}, tr. by H. Beveridge and B. Prasad (Patna, Bihar: Janaki Prakashan, 1979) 390. There, Prasad annotates that the word \textit{gardunna} (chariot) may be a scribal error of the original word \textit{karkada} (rhinoceros).

\textsuperscript{57}\textit{IPT}, 74. The embassy had similarly received warm and elaborate receptions in Herat and Mashhad.

\textsuperscript{58}Components of Khan Alam’s embassy which are clearly described as gifts in the primary literature are listed in Appendix A, Part 2. To my mind, however, there is a great deal of ambiguity between elements that were intended as gifts and those that were intended as spectacle, at least in Iskandar Beg Munshi’s description of the embassy and the \textit{Maargir-ul-Umara}. What, for example, was the status of the elephants and their trappings? W. Blunt, \textit{Pietro’s Pilgrimage} (London: James Barrie, 1953), 177 says Della Valle identifies the transports, camels and elephants, as gifts but that intention is less certain I believe since neither the \textit{Tuzuk} nor the imperial correspondence list gifts of this type for the Shah. However, one ambassador from the Shah, Robert Shirley (discussed below), writes that he was given elephants and three antelopes by Jahangir for the Shah. See Appendix A, Part 1.

More elaborate festivities and favors were bestowed on Khan Alam when the embassy moved on to Isfahan. At this time, several other foreign embassies had arrived or were about to arrive at the Safavid capital city including representatives from the Deccan, Turkey, Russia, Spain, and England. In accordance, grand feasts and nighttime entertainment were arranged to mark the unprecedented occasion. The spectacle of the Indian and other embassies can be appreciated best perhaps through Della Valle's description of their formal entry into Isfahan. In Daulatabad, seven miles outside the capital, the six embassies awaited procession into the city. Sixty thousand gaily dressed Safavid subjects were appointed to line the streets and greet the visitors. An entire day was required to advance the embassies those seven miles. Later, more subjects streamed into Isfahan, so many that it became difficult for the Shah to escort his visitors around the city simply because of the sheer mass of humanity that packed its limits. 

Jahangir's motives in sending this embassy are essentially a matter of speculation since he makes no reference to it in his writings. Likely, the embassy was sent, in part, to impress the Safavid court of the wealth and splendor of the Mughal empire it represented. Iskandar Beg Munshi notes that the grandeur of Khan Alam's embassy was a reflection of the esteem with which Jahangir held Abbas. According

(Cambridge: Harvard University Art Museums, 1995), 260-263. To what extent Della Valle's comments were based on his own agenda is difficult to ascertain.

60 To what extent the convergence of so many different foreign representatives was orchestrated is unknown.

61 Blunt, 183-184.

62 Shah Abbas, 2: 1159.
to Safavid sources, the Shah took the opportunity to speak with Khan Alam about
the question of Qandahar. Della Valle corroborates those conversations and
provides his own take regarding the mission of the embassy. According to him, the
Khan was attempting to recruit Safavid subjects into the Mughal army. A farman
was issued by the Shah prohibiting all Persians from accompanying the ambassador
back to India.

Whatever the agenda, the Shah seems to have doted on Khan Alam, for he
personally accompanied the embassy upon its departure from Isfahan. In addition
to presents for Jahangir, Khan Alam himself “...was furnished with a magnificent
robe of honor, munificent gifts of cash, quantities of precious stuffs and Arabian
horses. The value of what he was given when he left Iran, plus the value of
everything he had been given during his stay in the country, amounted to more than
15,000 Iraqi toman.” The Shah even sent a letter at a later date telling the Khan
how much he missed his company, a most unusual gesture from an emperor to an
ambassador.

__________________________

63 Shah Abbas, 2: 1193-1194.

64 Edwards, 263. I have not been able to locate an extant farman of this nature.

65 Frederick Asher has suggested, with regard to Delle Valle’s comments, that Abbas may have
accompanied the embassy’s departure to insure that no Safavid subjects traveled to Mughal India to
become members of Jahangir’s army.

66 Shah Abbas, 2: 1172. According to Shah Abbas, 2: 1160, Khan Alam was also given a falcon which had
been presented to the Shah by the Russian ambassador.

67 Calendar, J. 81. Edwards, 262, says Della Valle had his own interpretation of the relationship between
Abbas and Khan Alam. Though presented with many favors, he was also humiliated with insulting names
like old cuckold and hearty slaps on the back.
The Meeting of Shah Abbas and Khan Alam

If primary written sources suggest a range of attitudes, receptions and impressions evoked by Khan Alam's embassy, so too does the visual evidence surrounding it. By fortune, a rather extraordinary number of extraordinarily diverse paintings depicting the meeting of Shah Abbas and Khan Alam survive. Altogether, twenty-one paintings have been identified, a list of which can be found in Appendix B, Part 1. Each depicts the same central action, Shah Abbas passing a wine cup to Khan Alam, though not every painting necessarily portrays the same moment in time.

A number of scholarly studies have drawn attention to this curious group of paintings. To date, these investigations have focused on discerning originals from copies, artists' hands, dates, and other identifications. B.W. Robinson was the first to compile and organize a list of the then-known paintings noting salient features, the likenesses apparent, and the authenticity (or lack thereof) of each. Rosemary Crill published an additional painting unknown to Robinson and reconsidered some

---

68 I believe these paintings were intended as single page paintings rather than as illustrations for manuscripts. They do not seem to link to any particular text.

69 Das, 194, has interpreted a reverse action, that the cup is being given to the Shah by Khan Alam. In most representations, however, the Shah's arms extend to a length more suggestive of giving than receiving. Also, it seems more likely that a king would offer to share his wine cup with a noble as a mark of respect than that a noble would offer to share his wine with the king. That reverse action would be inconsistent with the hierarchy of class relations.

of his conclusions based on this new evidence. More recently, Ernst Grube and Eleanor Sims examined the paintings within a general discussion of portraits of Shah Abbas. They also provide a scholarly historiography for each painting.

Despite the contributions of this prestigious group of scholars, as of yet, no authoritative conclusions have been accepted regarding the chronology of the paintings’ execution. Many of the paintings are very precisely executed copies to the extent that keeping track of the different paintings proves a bit baffling. Fortunately, my interests here are somewhat different than those of earlier scholars. I do not rely exclusively on conclusive evidence attesting time and place of production in my analysis of the paintings. Instead, I consider the subject matter itself, the popularity of the subject, and what either aspect reveals about ambassadorial encounters between Jahangir and Shah Abbas and gifting practices.

Typically, the paintings are assigned to three groups based on the subject matter and composition of each. For the purposes of this investigation, I have further subdivided the groups by style or origin of the work and, in addition, appended a fourth group of paintings previously not associated with the meeting of Shah Abbas and Khan Alam. Group A consists of three paintings (cat. nos. 1-3). Each depicts Shah Abbas and Khan Alam standing in an outdoor setting. These have all been identified as Persian in origin,


73 Reproductions of these paintings are located at the end of the dissertation. Each reproduction is identified by its cat. no.
primarily by inscriptive evidence. Only the most pertinent figures have been depicted: Shah Abbas, Khan Alam, and one or three attendants likely present to establish the Shah’s imperial status.

This minimalistic presentation is characteristic of paintings in Group B (cat nos. 4-10) as well. In these seven paintings, Shah Abbas and Khan Alam sit in an exterior setting attended by only one Safavid subject. Oddly, this group is the most consistently similar even though it is the only one where paintings are of both Persian and Indian origins.

By contrast, the seven paintings which comprise Group C (cat nos. 11-17) contain a good deal more activity than those in the two previous groups. Shah Abbas and Khan Alam still sit in an exterior setting and though the central action remains the passing of the wine cup, several more figures are introduced into the composition as witnesses. High ranking courtiers sit closest to the key players while a horse and his attendant, falconers and other huntsmen stand farther away. In addition, a plate of food is included. While a seemingly minor detail, the expansion of the scene generally and this element in particular suggest a more specific moment is now being depicted. Perhaps it is not an actual historic moment that is recorded, but the idea of representing a type of moment, here a leisurely repose after hunting, is different from the generic encounters of Groups A and B.  

Catalogue numbers 16 and 17 feature entertainers as well. All the paintings are of Indian origin.

The last four works, Group D, are also of Indian origin (cat. nos. 18-21). Here

---

74 See Appendix B, Part 1 for the translations of these inscriptions.

75 See above where Khan Alam’s preferential treatment, including a hunting outing with the Shah, is noted.
Shah Abbas and Khan Alam are seated in an interior setting with several attendants. Like Group C, the paintings of this final group contain significantly more visual information than do the first two groups. The interior setting of these paintings suggests a more formal occasion than those of the other groups.

To date, these paintings have not been considered representations of the meeting, probably because their compositions are somewhat different from generally accepted depictions of Shah Abbas and Khan Alam. However, in my research at the Bharat Kala Bhavan, I encountered a previously unknown sketch (cat. no. 18) which bridges Group D to Groups A, B, and C. In that sketch, a figure with Shah Abbas’ distinctive mustache and hat passes a wine cup to a foreigner.\footnote{A close look at the left edge reveals traces of Shah Abbas.} The three other paintings in this group take liberties with the details of that work. For example, Shah Abbas becomes increasingly difficult to identify to the extent that in catalogue number 21, likely the latest of the paintings, he does not seem to be present at all. Though all the participants may be Indian, the central action, the passing of a wine cup, as well as the setting, the presentation of gifts, and the Abbas mustache are still depicted as they are in the other three paintings of this group. The remaining two paintings are heavily Persianized in feeling (cat. nos. 18 and 19), a common stylistic choice during Jahangir’s reign.\footnote{L. Leach, \textit{Mughal and Other Indian Paintings in the Chester Beatty Library} (London: Scorpion Cavendish, 1995), cat no. 3.72, dismisses an inscription on this painting that states “Likeness of Shah Abbas.” She attributes it to Shah Jahan’s reign and references a similar painting in the CMA. L. Leach, \textit{Indian Paintings and Drawings: The Cleveland Museum of Art} (Cleveland: Cleveland Museum of Art, 1986), cat. no. 22, considers several other paintings, primarily Akbari manuscript illustrations, as potential models for the painting.}

Though I have suggested that different moments may be represented in these
paintings, I do not believe they are intended to correspond to specific historic events. Rather, the specificity or ambiguity apparent is more characteristic of artistic interests in Mughal India and Safavid Iran (respectively) during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. A focus on the historical possibilities of an event, catalogue numbers 11-21 for example, typifies paintings from India whereas in Iran a hyper-awareness of the major participants (cat. nos. 1-10) was preferred. I do not believe that these tendencies were predicated on imperial patronage. They seem to be relevant at all levels of artistic sponsorship.

But, if the preferences typical of certain stylistic traditions are at work, so too are other cultural phenomena. Specifically, it seems to me that the high percentage of Indian paintings depicting the encounter in comparison to Persian representations is likely a product of artistic iconographic traditions. Islamic Indian patrons and artists developed an interest in depicting historical events and persons on paper early in the genesis of the art, an interest that is typified in this set of paintings.\textsuperscript{78} In contrast, Persian painting in general tended to idealize and romanticize iconography and as such the recording and re-recording of a momentous encounter did not stir the imagination as notably as it did in India.\textsuperscript{79}

Finally, cultural mores are also evident in the intimate relations typical of all the paintings; Shah Abbas and Khan Alam directly and actively interact with one another. In each painting it is clear that relations are cordial and informal. This seems to have been in

\textsuperscript{78}Several illustrations in The \textit{Nimatnama} (IOL Persian Ms. 149), a recipe book of c. 1495-1505, feature the patron, Nasir ad-Din Shah of Mandu. See J. Losty, \textit{The Art of the Book in India} (London: The British Library Board, 1982), cat. no. 41.

keeping with Persian protocol and will be noticeably different from later Indo-Iranian
ambassadorial receptions that I address below.

If the paintings are revealing of diplomatic practices and painting conventions, they
are uninformative about gifting practices, for no such exchanges are illustrated. Though it
may appear an object is being presented, it seems overly analytical to suggest the passing
of a wine cup could be interpreted as a gift. Therefore, I limit my examination of the
paintings to Indo-Iranian relations and artistic traditions alone.

Portraits of Shah Abbas

At the time when I sent Khan Alam to Persia, I had sent with him a painter
of the name of Bishan Das, who was unequaled in his age for taking
likenesses, to take portraits of the Shah and the chief men of his state, and
bring them. He had drawn the likenesses of most of them, and especially had
taken that of my brother the Shah exceedingly well, so that when I showed
it to any of his servants, they said it was exceedingly well drawn.80

So Jahangir speaks of one small but important facet of his 1613 embassy. As an aesthete
of portraiture it should not be surprising that Jahangir wished to procure representations
of his “brother” and his “brother’s” courtiers and so sent one of his best artists to capture
them in paint. But Jahangir was not alone in his interest of his neighbor. The likenesses
produced in his own time continued to be recreated as a favorite subject for painting both
at the Mughal court and other Indian artistic centers. In truth, a rather sizable number of
Indian paintings depicting Shah Abbas have been identified. In addition to the twenty-one
discussed above, another seventeen portraits of Shah Abbas are known to have been

80Tiawkh, 116-117a.
painted at Indian courts (cat. nos. 22-38, 51-52). This observation provides an interesting contrast to Persian portraits of Shah Abbas of which only twelve controversial ones are known to me (cat. no. 39-50).

Not every portrait of Shah Abbas dates to the reign of Jahangir nor were they all painted by Bishan Das. Many of the paintings may, in fact, date to the eighteenth or nineteenth centuries. Further, these later versions may not have been produced for an imperial patron as the originals were for Jahangir. Again, there is some disagreement among scholars as to which ones should be considered originals. The faithful renderings evident in so many of the portraits attest to an interest in reproducing originals as closely as possible. See, for example, catalogue numbers 28-34. Likely, the source was perceived as the most accurate likeness of the Shah. All the images are believed, whether or not they are originals, to be based on originals and thus still provide some clue as to what those might have looked like even if none of the originals survive to the present day. For the purposes of this paper, the creation of so many portraits, regardless of when they were produced, is of more interest than the particular hands which drew them.

How might Jahangir’s initial fascination and later patrons’ and/or artists’ continued interest in Abbas be interpreted? On a very immediate level (and it may go no deeper than that) Abbas’ appeal as a subject for portraiture is obvious. His distinctive appearance, both

---

81 See Appendix B, Part 2 for a complete listing (cat. nos. 22-38). In the Tuzuk, 161-162a, Jahangir says he directed a picture gallery be installed in his garden. “In the most honored positions were likenesses of Humayun and of my father opposite to my own, and that of my brother Shah Abbas.”

82 For example, Beach (1979), 109 believes cat. no. 11 to be a later copy of a work by Bishan Das while Crill, 332 says it is probably by Bishan Das and A. Das, Splendors of Mughal Painting (Bombay: Vakils, Feffer & Simons 1986), pl. 11 calls it “the finest and most authentic” of all the works depicting Khan Alam and Shah Abbas.
in terms of fashion and features, surely made for an interesting and challenging figure study, particularly for Indian artists intent on life-like observations. One European visitor described him in the following manner. “Abbas, the Persian Emperor, was of low stature, of a quick aspect, his eyes small and flaming, without any pauperae, or hair over them: he had a low forehead, but a high and hawked nose, sharp chin and after the mode of Persia was upon the chin beardless; his mustachios were exceedingly long and thick, and turned downwards.”\textsuperscript{83} Indeed, portraits of Abbas, particularly catalogue numbers 22-24, suit this description quite well.

Intriguing, powerful, successful, as a historical figure the Shah was also of note. Individuals of influence and uncommon appearance were choice subject matter in Indian painting during the era of the Mughal dynasty and beyond. Emperors such as Jahangir and his son, Shah Jahan, became apotheosized through the sheer number of representations that continued to be made in their likenesses long after death. Later paintings deviated little in composition or subject matter from those patronized by the emperors (see, for example, figures 2-4). Through them, the fame and importance of the emperors continued to be celebrated long beyond their own regnal years.\textsuperscript{84}

Portraits of Abbas would seem to belong to this painting trend, for he is often presented in a formula typical of the Mughal “ruler portrait” where the subject usually holds some symbol of kingship and is contextualized in an anonymous landscape. However, the Shah’s induction into the artistic pantheon of legendary Indian emperors

\textsuperscript{83}T. Herbert, \textit{Travels in Persia} (1627-29), (London: G. Routledge and Sons, Ltd., 1928), 212.

was not absolute. For example, he is not portrayed in Indian imperial dress or in strict profile, a most distinctive element of this tradition (compare portraits of Abbas with figures 2–4). He retains his unique dress and unusual three-quarter stance, hands tucked in his sash or else grasping a gun almost too large for his stature. In this manner, he maintains his foreignness and his identity as a signifier of Persian culture. He is apotheosized on his own terms, but in a format familiar to the Indian eye.

At first thought it may seem a bit peculiar that Indian patrons or artists would chose to aggrandize a foreign ruler and render him an artistic icon. But simply reviewing the numbers affirms that such prejudices are more my own than theirs. It is probably best to remember that nationalistic sentiments did not play a prominent role in the politics of culture at this time.85 In truth, Persian culture was immensely popular in Indian courtly settings. It was consciously or unconsciously appropriated by the many imperial circles that imitated Mughal culture, itself an adherent to Persian customs. Perhaps Abbas attained his artistic popularity as a representative of the Persian ideal, a temporally local one at that. However, the inclusion of the Shah in this time-honored painting tradition is most likely evidence of a general feeling of nostalgia for the glorious days of powerful empires and gracious living that dynasties in the late seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries increasingly lacked. Later copies of Shah Abbas and Khan Alam likely fall within the explanation as well.

Only a few representations, two of which are thought to be from the hand of Bishan Das himself since they are inscribed as such, actually contextualize the Shah in a

---

85 Similarly, it may be noticed that embassy gifts were not of nationalistic origin as is typical of diplomatic gifting today.
setting that is not anonymous.86 Two paintings in the St. Petersburg album depict the Shah either on horseback or in a garden (cat. nos. 36 and 37).87 Two additional paintings in the Freer Gallery of Art, discussed at length below, situate the Shah in an even more dramatic landscape (cat. nos. 51 and 52). Each of these four paintings is among the few in which the Shah's head is encircled with an imperial halo. Later artists were apparently most comfortable depicting Abbas uncontextualized, however, for there are no known copies of any of these four paintings. Then again, these images were once compiled together in the same album, an album whose provenance remains somewhat mysterious.88 Perhaps the paintings were simply inaccessible to the Indian artists. Clearly, speculation is the bottom line in analyzing the popularity and production of images of Shah Abbas.

Whatever their significance may be, it is very interesting that, like the representations of Shah Abbas and Khan Alam, solitary portraits of Shah Abbas maintained a strong hold on the Indian artistic imagination well beyond the court of Jahangir. This is particularly apparent in contrast to evidence from Iran. The number of Indian paintings of Shah Abbas and of Shah Abbas and Khan Alam far exceed the Persian ones known today.89 Indeed, some of those Persian portraits are not even accepted as representations of the Shah. For although the features and fashion of the Shah were


87S. Verma, Mughal Painters and their Works (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1994), 110-111. He believes that inscriptions with the name Bishan Das are attributions rather than signatures. He posits that the artist was unfamiliar with written Farsi and, therefore, unable to sign his name. This accounts for the paucity of paintings with Bishan Das' name on them from among the many that have been attributed to him by later owners and modern scholars.

88Beach (1981), 167.

89See Appendix B for a list of those known to me.
reproduced in figural paintings, it has been argued that these persons do not always represent the Shah himself. Instead, his distinctive look simply became a new type of idealized princely figure, a subject popular in Persian painting at this time (figure 5).  

The prevalence of this figure type must have filtered into India as well, or else historical figures groomed themselves in his manner, for a Shah Abbas-type is portrayed in a *Padshahnama* manuscript of circa 1640–45 (figure 6). Occasionally, however, even when the Shah was the intended subject, an older, idealized style was utilized in Persian paintings to depict the emperor instead of his own unmistakable appearance. In this case, he is indistinguishable but for identifying ascription (cat. no. 48).  

The differences evident between the number of Indian paintings and Persian paintings of Shah Abbas and Shah Abbas with Khan Alam should perhaps be taken as a marker of certain trends in painting rather than allegiance towards the individuals depicted or concern for a neighboring empire. Though the creation of so many portraits might suggest a political agenda or might become political in retrospect, as seems to be the case with the numerous postmortem portraits of Jahangir, the impetus behind the act appears to be evidence of artistic training or curiosity. In particular, this evidence is likely another example of the Indian proclivity to document and the Persian to imagine. If association was the intention then that sentiment stemmed, I believe, from the Shah’s status as a legendary Persian ruler, a cultural icon, rather than as a ruler of Iran, a political icon. In  

---


91CBL Ms. 279, f. 5b and Browne (1959), IV: pl. 2
that light, paintings of the Shah may have been commissioned or collected as trophies commemorating days gone by.

The paintings are, at any rate, a rather interesting by-product of material exchange. Altogether, the portraits of Shah Abbas, whether alone, with Khan Alam, or with Jahangir (discussed below) are among the few tangible outgrowths of Indo-Iranian ambassadorial encounters in the early seventeenth century. Even though it seems unlikely that such works were intended as gifts, at least between Jahangir and Shah Abbas, they are still an example of cultural exchange, or rather a product of it, during that time. But, even if these works of art are only tangentially related to gifting, they are essential evidence of ambassadorial receptions at this time and an important outcome of those very activities. These paintings, regardless of the various time periods in which they were produced, constitute the bulk of visual evidence that survives documenting interaction between Jahangir and Shah Abbas. They attest the splendor and importance associated with imperial foreign encounters in their own time and the fascination with those events in later eras.

The artistic implications of cultural exchange revealed by these paintings will be discussed in the conclusion. For now, it is simply noted that Jahangir's artistic fascination with his Safavid counterpart stimulated later patrons and artists to record their own Indo-Iranian activities. A few paintings of later Safavid ambassadors sent to Shah Jahan's court and Mughal ambassadors sent to Iran are known and are discussed in Chapter 4. Even in
consideration of this additional material, no other embassy or Mughal-Safavid encounter received as much attention visually and verbally as did Khan Alam’s.92

Just as Jahangir directed Khan Alam and his embassy to accompany Yadgar Ali Sultan, so too did Abbas send his ambassador Zaimbul Beg to escort Khan Alam on his journey back to the Mughal court. And, like the Khan’s embassy, Zaimbul Beg’s was quite grand. Probably it was intended to purvey the same impressions in India that the Mughal embassy had made in Persia. Included among its components were “a vast variety of valuables and rarities...a large train of servants and slaves...presents from the Persian nobles and the high officials of Khurasan for Jahangir.”93 Organizing this effort must have taken longer than anticipated for, in reality, the Safavid embassy did not accompany Khan Alam to India. Its departure from Isfahan was delayed.94

Long before Zaimbul Beg finally arrived at the Mughal court in 1620, Shah Abbas charged several additional representatives to wait on Jahangir, to present him with gifts, to bathe him indirectly with the Shah’s warmth and affection. The Englishman Robert Sherley, for example, was one such envoy. No Persian source, whether Mughal or Safavid, makes reference to this particular ambassador, but according to Sherley’s own account he arrived in 1614 on the tail end of his ambassadorial appointment to various courts in Europe. While he does not mention any gifts for Jahangir, he does note those he

92See Appendix B, Part 8, cat. no. 49 and cat. no. 80-84 for other ambassadorial portraits.

93IPR, 78.

94See footnote 54 for dates regarding this embassy. Shah Abbas 2: 1172 records the departure of the embassy in 1619-1620, but does not record its delayed departure. Also see Tizuk, 115a.
brought back for the Shah from Jahangir.⁹⁵ Mustafa Beg arrived next in 1615 with gifts for Jahangir. He was dismissed soon after with gifts for the Shah and for himself including cash, a jeweled waist dagger, and a robe of honor.⁹⁶ According to a letter from Abbas, Mustafa Beg was assigned to update Jahangir on the Shah’s victory in Gurjanistan.⁹⁷

About the same time that Khan Alam and his retainers reached Isfahan, yet another ambassador from Shah Abbas arrived at Jahangir’s court. In 1616, Muhammed Riza Beg waited on Jahangir for a period of about six months. Other than notice of the emissary’s arrival, departure, and gifts given and received, Jahangir has little to say about this Safavid envoy. Jahangir did, however, copy the letter Muhammed Riza Beg carried from Shah Abbas word for word into the Tuzuk. ⁹⁸ But the nature of the embassy, its mission, its scale—no information of this nature is deemed worthy of notice by Jahangir.

Fortunately, Sir Thomas Roe, King James’ ambassador to Jahangir, was in residence at court during the years 1615-1618 and recorded substantive accounts of his observations. Roe has much to say on the subject of Muhammed Riza Beg.⁹⁹ He writes

---

⁹⁵Edwards, 255. I have not been able to locate her reference in C. Danvers and W. Foster, Letters Received by the East India Company from its Servants in the East 2 (Amsterdam: N. Israel, 1968), 99. See Appendix A, Part 2 for this list.

⁹⁶Tuzuk, 284, 298, 299.

⁹⁷Calendar, I.68.

⁹⁸Tuzuk, 337, 343, 374; T. Roe, The Embassy of Sir Thomas Roe to India 1615-19 (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharal Publishers Pvt Ltd, 1990 reprint), 259, 356. During his tenure at Jahangir’s court, Muhammad Riza Beg was gifted a jewelled tiara, two robes of honor, an elephant, and 30,000 rupees. Tuzuk, 337, the letter is omitted in the Beveridge and Rogers translation.

⁹⁹Rivalry at court among the ambassadors was rampant. Therefore, Roe’s interpretation of events must be considered carefully. Jealousy likely caused him to misinterpret the treatment of the Persian ambassador. If Jahangir has little to say about the Persian ambassadors, he is completely silent regarding the embassy from England.
that the Persian ambassador arrived with a retinue of some 50 horses and 200 retainers
and a rather grand assortment of gifts for Jahangir.\footnote{Embassy, 258. Note in Appendix B, Part 1, year 1616 that Roe lists nearly eight times as many gifts presented by the Shah through his ambassador in contrast to Jahangir’s entry in the Tuzuk which is quite brief.} According to reports he had heard, Roe believed the ambassador had been dispatched to facilitate peace in the Deccan or perhaps to procure funds in support the Shah’s Turkish campaigns.\footnote{Roe does not seem to have any knowledge of Qandahar (its contention, or the ambassador’s agenda to speak with Jahangir about it) unlike Della Valle. Prasad, 345, says it might have something to do with Qandahar. IPR, 77, Islam is unclear about the purpose of the embassy, except as a means to procure gifts.} Dismissed in 1617, Muhammed Riza Beg died en route to Persia. His possessions and Jahangir’s gifts for the Shah were entrusted to a Persian merchant accompanying the embassy.\footnote{Tuzuk, 374, Jahangir says he gave leave for the Persian ambassador to depart on 21 Farawrdin (21 March 1617).}

Yet another embassy under the command of Sayyid Hasan arrived in 1619 with more gifts.\footnote{Calendar, 180; IPR, 77; Tuzuk, 93-94a, 101-102a. Hasan was presented with cash, a dress of honour, an elephant, and a jeweled turban ornament.} It is no doubt evident by this point that the dispatching of embassies was a rather lopsided affair. Indeed, relations continued in this manner over the course of the next several years during which all official embassies were of Safavid origin.

According to Iskandar Beg Munshi, each envoy, beginning with Yadgar Ali Sultan, was instructed either to allude or else to discuss directly with Jahangir the return of Qandahar to the Safavids.\footnote{Shah Abbas, 2: 1193} These sentiments are not conveyed in Abbas’ letters to Jahangir; likely such sensitive topics were left to the discretion and sagacity of the ambassador. Jahangir does not corroborate any such conversations with the Shah’s
representatives except, that is, with Zaimbul Beg. His mission, therefore, is the only one attested in various written sources.\textsuperscript{105}

After some correspondence regarding the time and location in which Jahangir would meet Zaimbul Beg’s delayed embassy, the two finally connected in 1620 when Jahangir reached Lahore after vacationing in Kashmir. During the interim, the ambassador was sent a robe of honor and 30,000 rupees for expenses. An additional 5,000 rupees were given to an intermediary who conveyed the items and was instructed to entertain the Safavid envoy.\textsuperscript{106} During his residence in India, Zaimbul Beg witnessed the arrival of at least five more Safavid envoys bearing additional gifts and greetings.\textsuperscript{107} Aqa Beg and Muhibb Ali, for example, arrived in 1621 carrying, among other items, Ulugh Beg’s ruby.

\textit{Ulugh Beg’s Ruby (cat. no. 53)}

One of the rare items was a turban decoration composed of egret’s feathers, the choicest that could be found, selected from thousands of feathers and studded with rubies and pearls. One of the rubies was of a size and luster not to be found in the treasury of any mighty king. Jewelers had appraised its value at seven thousand toman, if not more. On it was inscribed the name of Mirza Olog Beg b.Sharok b.Emir Timur Gurakan; it had passed into the possession of Shah Esma’il I, and since had been handed down to each of his successors and had been deposited in the royal treasury.\textsuperscript{108}

\textsuperscript{105}\textit{Tuzuk}, 244; \textit{Shah Abbas}, 2: 1194. However, in \textit{Calendar J.84} (a letter from Abbas to Jahangir carried by Zaimbul Beg), there is no discussion of the impetus behind sending Zaimbul Beg.

\textsuperscript{106}\textit{Tuzuk}, 178a, 186a, 198a, 201a, 202a, 211a, 230a. Zaimbul Beg was also given a superb dress of honor with a plume and jeweled turban fringe, a jeweled dagger, two \textit{muhars} of different weights, a special dagger, a jeweled sword, a village with a revenue of Rs. 16,000 and 80,000 \textit{darbs}.

\textsuperscript{107} \textit{Tuzuk}, 209a. In an entry from the year 1621, Jahangir says that the envoys Muhibb Ali and Aqa Ali, in addition to Haji Beg and Fazil Beg (the first references to the latter two) were dismissed. Robes, weapons, and cash suitable to the position of each were presented. About one week later, Qasim Beg arrived with more gifts.

\textsuperscript{108} \textit{Shah Abbas}, 2: 1172.
Iskandar Beg Munshi’s description is yet another account of the best documented gift exchanged between the Jahangir and Shah Abbas. Written sources are more copious about this one particular object than they are for practically all other gifts combined, consenting unanimously to its high value. Of the various written accounts, though, Jahangir’s is the only one that does not attribute a monetary value to the ruby.  

Given that the ruby had been part of the Safavid treasury for some time, it seems clear that the Shah selected the gift, the recipient, and the moment of presentation quite shrewdly. Just as Zaimbul Beg was delivering the last pitch for Qandahar, this rather spectacular present arrived. That its method of presentation was of vital importance is attested by a letter from the Shah to Zaimbul Beg containing instructions about how to present the gifts brought by Muhibb Ali and Aqa Beg, the ruby, no doubt, in particular.\(^{109}\) Apparently, Abbas judged it appropriate to send the ruby to Jahangir because he was a descendent of the House of Timur.\(^{110}\) It has been suggested, quite plausibly, that Abbas’ motive in sending the ruby to Jahangir was to demonstrate what was legitimately Jahangir’s, the ruby, versus what was not, Qandahar.\(^{111}\)

If the appeal of the ruby is obvious, its history of regifting is more puzzling; if, that is, appeal is equated with economic value and physical possession. For, not only

---

\(^{109}\)See quotes cited above from \textit{Tuzuk}, Islam, and \textit{Shah Abbas}. I discuss Jahangir’s evaluations of other gifts from Shah Abbas below in Chapter 6.

\(^{110}\)\textit{Shah Abbas}, 2: 1216.

\(^{111}\)\textit{Shah Abbas}, 2: 1216.

\(^{112}\)I am indebted to Catherine Asher for this interpretation.
did Shah Abbas forego possession of this precious object when he gifted it to Jahangir, but Jahangir himself regifted it to his son Shah Jahan soon after he received it. That gesture receives not one but two notices in the Tuzuk underscoring the importance attached to the act.\textsuperscript{113} Its receipt and subsequent placement on Shah Jahan's jeweled throne were later noted in Shah Jahan's official court history, the Padshahnama.\textsuperscript{114}

If the scenario set forth above, in which Abbas' motives for relinquishing the ruby were attributed to the notion of legitimacy, is accurate, then his willingness to gift it stems from his prioritizing Qandahar over the gem. If Jahangir recognized the significance of that gesture then he may have wished to renounce responsibility by regifting it to his son thereby divesting himself of direct obligation. Before each emperor relinquished his possession, however, he directed his name be inscribed on the ruby, as if attempting to sustain direct association with it, in the same manner instigated by its former owner Ulugh Beg, now that the ruby belonged to another. In both examples of regifting, it seems the gesture of giving and whatever it symbolized to the presenter were deemed of greater value than the object sacrificed. The notion will be discussed at length in Chapters 5 and 6.

Shah Abbas' last minute attempt to pull out all the stops in 1621 with this present

\textsuperscript{113} Tuzuk, 196a, 208a. Catherine Asher has suggested that the ruby was presented to Shah Jahan as a method of recognizing him as the legitimate successor to the Mughal throne upon Jahangir's death.

\textsuperscript{114} I. Khan, The Shah Jahan Nama, tr. Z. Desai and W. Begley (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1990), 147. "The throne was completed in the course of seven years, and among the precious stones used upon it was a ruby worth one lakh of rupees that Shah Abbas Safawi had sent to the late emperor Jahangir. And on this ruby were inscribed the names of the great Emperor Timur Sahib-i-Qiran, Mirza Shahrukh, Mirza Ulugh Beg and Shah Abbas—as well as the names of the Emperors Akbar, Jahangir, and that of His Majesty himself." Khan appears to have been misinformed about the inscriptions on the ruby. Only Ulugh Beg's, Shah Abbas', Jahangir's, and probably Shah Jahan's following his acquisition are known to have been inscribed.
and others did not produce their desired results. Receiving no words of encouragement from Zaimbul Beg regarding diplomatic negotiation of Qandahar, the Shah himself and his entourage traveled to the city in question on the pretext of a hunting expedition. The subsequent siege of the city and its capture in 1622 occurred too quickly for Jahangir to initiate a military response. Two ambassadors sent by Abbas, Haidar Beg and Wali Beg, arrived at the Mughal court soon after the attack with a letter of explanation from the Shah. No gifts are known to have accompanied them.

The Shah continued to show goodwill after the siege at Qandahar by sending Aga Muhammed in 1624 with a selection of the spoils Abbas had acquired during his victory in Baghdad, including a rare white falcon and a letter. Jahangir copied that letter as well as his response to the Shah in the Tuzuk. But relations, as might be expected, deteriorated. In fact, judging by certain letters extant today, it seems that Jahangir began to make overtures to, and was receptive to correlating sentiments from, the Uzbegs and Ottomans. But before any new alliances could be formed a series of internal conflicts occurred at the Mughal court distracting Jahangir’s attention from foreign relations. Soon

---

115 *Shah Abbas*, 2: 1216.

116 *Shah Abbas*, 2: 1191-1200. The Safavid history contains a very long, elaborate, and highly detailed justification of the events which prompted the Shah to attack Qandahar so that “historians avid for facts may be sated, and brave and chivalrous men of action may not regard the Shah’s expedition to Kandahar as a breach of friendship with the Mogul Emperor.”

117 *Tuzuk*, 239-240a. All ambassadors were dismissed soon after with robes and cash for their expenses.

118 *Shah Abbas*, 2: 1234; *Calendar*, 216-217. The reply Jahangir sent early in 1627 was quite warm and enthused at hearing from the Shah. *Calendar*, 218-219, one or two letters were subsequently sent. No gifts are mentioned.

119 *IPR*, 86-92.
after, in 1627, Jahangir died.

*Imaginary Encounters of Jahangir and Shah Abbas*

As might be inferred from the accounts above, Jahangir and Shah Abbas never met face to face. Their encounters were strictly limited to the movement of courtiers, letters and material culture. That did not, however, prevent artists at the Mughal court from imagining the possibility of such happenings and realizing them on paper. They captured their emperor’s fascination with his brother not only in the series of intriguing images of the Shah alone and with Khan Alam but also of the Shah with Jahangir.

There is nothing unusual about the fact that the two emperors never met in person in spite of their protestations of friendship and keen interest in each other’s courts. Few Islamic rulers encountered their contemporaries in foreign lands. However, the decision to represent such a meeting was unprecedented. But then again, it is in keeping with Jahangir’s amity towards his brother, his fascination with Persian culture, and his love of portraiture. Further, imaginary paintings, unlike historical meetings, were a much safer method through which to experience imperial interaction. The relationship between the two emperors could be defined completely on Mughal terms, within a Mughal imaginative scheme, but without concern for the will of the Shah’s character and authority. Such positions were well suited to Jahangir’s somewhat weak external authority.

Today, two paintings survive which depict Jahangir and Shah Abbas.\(^{120}\) Although undated, the paintings are typically attributed to the years 1618-1622— sometime after

---

\(^{120}\) See Appendix B, Part 3.
Bishan Das returned from Iran with his sketches of Shah Abbas and sometime before the second siege of Qandahar when relations with the Safavid empire declined. In both, the artists who designed these paintings went well beyond the uncontextualized landscapes or simple court settings seen in most of the paintings of Abbas.

Here the two emperors are located in rather fantastic settings and as such they are typically identified as allegorical paintings. Within the context of Indo-Iranian exchange, I prefer to think of them as imaginary encounters for in addition to their symbolism, they can be interpreted on a very immediate level. I will primarily consider the paintings for information about gifting and additionally interpret them within the context of gifting, an approach which to my knowledge has only been alluded.

Perhaps the painting most directly relevant to the topic at hand is that titled *Jahangir Entertains Shah Abbas* (cat. no. 51). Though the artist who created the painting is not known, he has provided a wealth of information about gifts and gifting relations between the two emperors. Here, Jahangir and Shah Abbas are seated on a throne flanked by two Mughal courtiers standing slightly below. On the left, Asaf Khan, Jahangir’s chief advisor and brother-in-law, holds a gold wine cup, a saucer and a bottle of perhaps Indian origin, while Khan Alam, on the right, holds a falcon and a European drinking vessel shaped to resemble Diana riding a stag. Jahangir himself has inscribed

---


122 Grace Guest has noted on the Freer Gallery of Art object sheet that the painting likely commemorates Khan Alam’s embassy.

"portrait of my brother Shah Abbas," "portrait of Khan Alam," and "portrait of Asaf Khan" on the painting beside the appropriate personages.

At the bottom corners of the painting two golden vessels, probably Venetian reliquaries, were likely used as incense burners. Placed between them on an Italian table are, from left to right, an Italian ewer, a tiny Chinese cup, an Indian vessel based on Persian prototypes, a Venetian glass, and another Indian vessel, as identified by Richard Ettinghausen. Above the emperors, two cupids support a sun-like genealogical listing of Jahangir's ancestors. Verses above and below state,

When king Jahangir and Shah Abbas, two fortunate kings, shadows of God, In happiness hold the cup of Jamshid (the world) and in rulership sit side by side, The world becomes populous through their justice. The people of the world are at peace when they meet as friend and brother. O Lord, may they enjoy together in rulership.125

Also present are assorted trays of food. Though much has been said about the objects depicted little, if any, identifications have been oriented towards the food. Yet, it is certainly an important aspect of the painting considering the amount represented. On the large, round tray green and purple grapes, apples, a melon, figs, and apricots among other fruits or possibly nuts can be identified. The square tray appears to contain plantains, tangerines or some sort of orange citrus, pears, lemons, apples, olives, and a pineapple. The smaller trays may hold sweet meats, homemade cookies, pistachios and other nuts.126


125Ibid.

126I am grateful to Professor Iraj Bashiri and Deborah Hutton for their assistance in helping me identify the food in this painting.
Clearly, there is much information present in the painting that lends itself to multiple interpretations. To date, scholars have primarily focused on the symbolic elements, likely a product of the non-historical nature of the event depicted. For example, the golden genealogical seals held by cupids are taken as affirmation of Jahangir’s heritage and right to the throne. Also of significance is Jahangir’s slightly larger, bejeweled physique which, in comparison to Shah Abbas’ simple attire and deferential pose, function to ensure the Mughal emperor’s authority.\textsuperscript{127}

Typically, the objects are considered in a similar light, as signs of the wealth and the cosmopolitan nature of Jahangir’s empire or as examples of items the connoisseurs coveted.\textsuperscript{128} The objects have not been identified as actual evidence of exchange, specifically as items that were gifted from one emperor to the other. The reasons for this are probably twofold. First, the painting is among the least historical of the representations of Mughal life produced by court painters and does not, as such, promote a non-fictional reading. But the very fact that Mughal painters and their patrons were particularly keen on representing the events of the day suggests that some elements of the painting may be historically grounded even if the event itself was not.\textsuperscript{129} Second, the works of art depicted cannot be attested in literary sources. Without that hard evidence, the painted evidence is considered problematic.

A review of the evidence in the painting, however, promotes a modified historical

\textsuperscript{127} Ettinghausen (1961b), 13; Okada, 54-55; Beach (1981), 170; Das (1979), 219; Esin Atil on FGA folder sheet #42.16a.

\textsuperscript{128} As recorded by Esil Atil on FGA #42.16 folder sheet. Also see Beach (1981), 171.

\textsuperscript{129} Those objects represented in \textit{Jahangir Entertains Shah Abbas} have been catalogued, therefore, as visual evidence of Indo-Iranian gifting in Appendix B, Part 4, cat. no. 55.
reading. In fact, based on the amount of relevant data, it is possible to locate the encounter within the realm of exchange, gifting to be specific, regardless of its overall imaginary quality. My point is that even though this event did not take place, there was an interest in representing that possibility and it makes sense to me that the moment would have been portrayed as accurately as possible. The combined depiction of Jahangir, Shah Abbas, and an ambassador, here Khan Alam, as well as European baubles and other high-end paraphernalia typically selected as gifts suggests that the event represented is closely related to imperial gifting. Analysis of the food represented in the painting also provides strong evidence in favor of historical gifting.

References to food in the Tuzuk are not uncommon. They are almost always accompanied by information about where the item was grown, for fruit of certain regions was superior to that grown in others.\textsuperscript{130} Exotic food, in addition to exotic objects, was highly desired. Jahangir says,

\begin{quote}
My father the late King was exceedingly fond of fruit, especially melons, pomegranates and grapes; but in his reign, the melons from Karez, which are the best quality, the pomegranates of Yazd, which are celebrated all over the world, and the pears of Samarkand, were never brought to India, and therefore, when I see and enjoy those luxuries, I regret that my father is not here to share them. \textsuperscript{131}
\end{quote}

For the purposes of this project, the most interesting citations to fruit are those which were gifted to Jahangir by Khan Alam during his tenure in Iran. Melons, grapes, apples,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{130}Tuzuk, 116, 270, 350, 397-98, 422, 435, 439, 145-146.
\item \textsuperscript{131}Elliott, 6: 348.
\end{itemize}
pineapples, pears, *kaula* (similar to an orange) and pomegranates are mentioned as gifts.\(^{132}\) Except for the pomegranate, all of these types would appear to be represented in the painting. Although the origin of the depicted foods can not be stated with certainty, many are Iranian crops. Even though specific objects are not mentioned in writing, it would appear that some elements in the painting, the various food items, are actually very closely related to entries in the *Tuzuk*.

If the food is of foreign origin and implies the practice of gifting, then it is worthwhile reconsidering whether or not the objects too are evidence of specific items exchanged. This necessitates questioning some of Ettinghausen’s object identifications, however. In particular, I would like to suggest that the metalwork he labeled Persianized Indian pieces might, in fact, be representations of objects of Persian origin. If that is the case, what may be at work in this painting is not a joint representation of exotic objects and Mughal hospitality items depicted to impress the Shah, but actual gifts from the Shah to Jahangir. To my mind, it seems much more plausible that Shah Abbas would be depicted in the role of honoring Jahangir with his gifts rather than the alternative, at least as represented by Mughal painters.

Perhaps the objects included in this painting were among those gifted to Jahangir by Shah Abbas through one of the many embassies, most likely Khan Alam’s, active around the years 1618-20. The objects portrayed are just unusual or unique enough to suggest a deliberate choice as to what was selected for representation. Logically, each piece ought to have a connection to each emperor, the most obvious link being a gift from

\(^{132}\) *Tuzuk*, 350, 435.
one to the other. For example, the falcon on Khan Alam’s arm has been taken as a sign of
his status as chief falconer.\footnote{Ethinghausen (1961b), 13; Esin Atil on FGA folder sheet #42.16a} However, a letter brought by Khan Alam from Shah Abbas
to Jahangir mentions the gift of a falcon of Russian origin.\footnote{Calendar, J.78.1. Islam finds the construction of the letter a bit peculiar but believes it to be genuine. The
gift is also mentioned in the Tuzuk, 107-108a.} Possibly, that is what is
represented here. The dagger on Jahangir’s belt may be the one with a spotted, walrus
ivory hilt that Khan Alam was given by the Shah and later regifted to Jahangir in 1619.\footnote{Tuzuk, 94a. “I greatly approved of it; in fact, it is a rare present. I had never seen a spotted one until now,
and I was much pleased.” Tuzuk, 96a, 98a, Jahangir continues to discuss the hilt at great length in the
following pages. See footnote 163 and 333.} Also, A.K. Das has suggested that the Chinese porcelain cup in the painting is a close
replica of actual pieces given by Shah Abbas as \textit{waqf} to the Arbedil Shrine.\footnote{A.K. Das, “Chinese Porcelain at the Mughal Court” in \textit{Silk Road Art and Archaeology} 2 (1991/92), 391.}

The strength of this circumstantial evidence, in my opinion, necessitates
questioning the value of privileging written evidence over visual evidence. Do objects, or
any other visual information, need to be backed by written sources to affirm their
historical validity? It is a question worthy of consideration whenever a Mughal painting
is reviewed. In this case, the answer seems to be no. In fact, equalizing written and visual
sources provides an interesting contrast of evidence. Whereas works of art given as gifts
are generally glossed over in written sources, items represented in this painting affirm
that individual objects were indeed presented as gifts and valued by their recipient.\footnote{See Appendix A, Parts 1 and 2 where textual references are cited.}
Instead, there is a discernible interest in depicting the unique, the unusual, and the exotic rather than the commonplace. Attention is given to the gift, to the work of art, in addition to the emperor. Whatever the motivation for this choice, the painting provides an alternative interpretation to that available through textual evidence.

In terms of the practice of gifting, the painting is much subtler. No object is presented directly by one emperor to another although such an obvious deferential gesture would be extreme for even a Mughal painting intent on implying Jahangir’s superiority. The key word is implying since the verse itself suggests a certain degree of equality. And, in fact, equality is somewhat important, for the greater the strength of his neighbor whom Jahangir calls friend and brother, the greater his own status becomes. Instead of depicting the moment of gifting then, an atmosphere in which exotic and coveted objects have already been presented is carefully created whereby both emperors’ profit from the wealth and influence of their empires. Ultimately, Jahangir’s is the more powerful, however, for the meeting takes place on his turf. Jahangir’s attendants and his genealogy locate the event in a Mughal space.

Though the subject matter is different in *Jahangir Embraces Shah Abbas* (cat. no. 52), its message is quite similar on several levels. The verse of the previous painting could well have been inscribed at the top of this one instead. Here, Jahangir and Shah Abbas are literally depicted as rulers of the world on which they stand. To emphasize that point, a map of the Asian continent was drawn to suggest jurisdiction over the cities identified across it. The prosperity and happiness that are manifest through Jahangir and Shah Abbas’ identities as brother and friend are illustrated by their affectionate hug and the lion
and lamb which rest peacefully below their feet. It has been noted, however, that Jahangir has been strategically portrayed as the superior of the two through the placement of the lion under his feet which covers a great deal more land and through his slightly larger, stronger physique.\textsuperscript{138} The sanction of God is present in the radiant halo, comprised of an aligned sun and moon held by two cupid figures, behind the emperors' heads. Significantly, the halo is exactly centered behind Jahangir.

While there is nothing directly relevant to gifting evident in this painting it may still be viewed as evidence of the affects of or enthusiasm for cultural exchange, ambassadorial parties in particular, during the years 1618-22. Using A.K. Das' discussion of the possible date of this painting as a point of departure, it is possible to demonstrate my thesis.\textsuperscript{139} Typically, the painting is dated to the years 1618-22, but Das has posed an alternative attribution. Based on inscriptions, he posits a date prior to Bishan Das' return from Iran. The inscription on the painting states that the artist Abul Hasan consulted with many individuals to determine whether or not his representation of the Shah was a good likeness.\textsuperscript{140}

Though Das' speculation is a possibility, it could also be the case that Bishan Das was parsimonious with his sketches and did not wish to share his work with other court artists. This may have been particularly true if images of the Shah were in high demand.

\textsuperscript{138}Ettinghausen (1961b), 12; Akimushkin (1996), pl. 201; Beach (1981), 169-70; FGA folder sheet #45.9.

\textsuperscript{139}Das, 193.

\textsuperscript{140}As translated by Wheeler Thackston on FGA folder sheet #45.9 "Since newroz was near it (the painting) was made in haste, and the blessed form of the shah was ascertained from a group who had seen him, and with the help of analogy and likeness of one who was like him, in short a likeness was made which most believe to be like him..."
following the return of Khan Alam’s embassy and the interest it sparked in contemporary Persia. A scenario such as this would have prompted Abul Hasan to consult others about the accuracy of his rendering for he, and other Mughal artists, would have been responsive to Jahangir’s interest in Persia, Persian things, and Shah Abbas despite their secondhand knowledge. It is important to remember that relations among artists in the imperial atelier may not always have been congenial and collaborative. Competition for the emperor’s favor must have been fierce, an aspect which seems to be overlooked in scholarly studies on the era. This painting may be an example of those attitudes. In Chapter 6, I reconsider this aspect of artistic competition since it directly stems, I believe, from internal gifting.

Though not specifically related to visual evidence in the painting, this theory still has important implications. Regardless of relations between the two artists, it is not hard to imagine that great excitement, celebrations, and stories would have accompanied the embassy on its departure and later return to the Mughal court. If his words are any measure, Jahangir was, in fact, much more interested in Khan Alam’s embassy when it returned than when it departed.

Of the favours and kindnesses conferred by my brother on Khan Alam, if I were to write of them in detail, I should be accused of exaggeration. In conversation he always gave him the title of Khan Alam, and never had him out of his presence. If he voluntarily stayed in his own quarter, he (Abbas) would go there without ceremony, and show him more and more favour...At the time Khan Alam took his leave, he seized him in the embrace of honour, and showed him great affection. After he had left the city, he went to his halting place, and made many apologies and bade him farewell...As for the beautiful and costly things that the Khan Alam brought, it was indeed the assistance of his destiny that gave such rare things into his hand.\footnote{\textit{Tuzuk}, 116a.}
In addition to Jahangir's own enthusiasm and tastes, which likely affected courtly circles in general, the embassy surely placed Persia, Shah Abbas in particular, in the spotlight. As a result, certain artists opted to capture and immortalize the mood of the day in their paintings. The various works on paper discussed so far, those of Jahangir and Shah Abbas as well as of Shah Abbas and Khan Alam and Shah Abbas alone, may all be evidence of that vogue.

The Nature of Embassies: Missions, Components, and Protocol

Because embassies were the only official contact between the Safavids and the Mughals, their missions and semblance, as representatives of each emperor and reflections of each empire, were highly significant factors in foreign policy. An embassy's scale, components, ambassador, and gifts all made very immediate impressions on the receiving court. The dignity, wealth, and power of the emperor were assessed by these very factors and likely affected the reception of the embassy's mission.\textsuperscript{142}

Though several attempts have been made, by myself and other scholars, to flesh out the exact purpose of the various embassies sent, it should be clear from the information presented above that the resources extant today do not provide substantive or satisfying data. This is primarily due, I believe, to the nature of communication between the ruling parties. The more sensitive sentiments were left to the ambassadors to express. In terms of procedure, this protocol is interesting. But for the particular objectives of this

\textsuperscript{142}IPR, 228.
project, the privileging of oral encounters over written ones does present challenges when trying to determine whether or not the objectives of a particular mission was realized. Mostly, it becomes the domain of the historian to speculate on what, if anything, an embassy accomplished.

To my mind, embassies seem to have functioned on at least two levels. The first might be expressed in the official letter carried by the envoy. That document contained what I consider the pretext of a mission: to console and congratulate, to share news regarding the state of the empire (to boast of its accomplishments and strength), to intercede for a third party (whether an individual or neighboring empire), to express appreciation for a gift, to encourage further requests for equity, to affirm love and friendship. These seem to have been the most common pretenses appropriate for epistolographic fodder.

The second level of the embassy's mission might be labeled its primary objective. From what can be gleaned, the primary agenda in sending an embassy might be one of the following: to initiate, stimulate and maintain good relations, to foster trade, to request monetary aid to fight the Turks, to prevent indebtedness or a Mughal-Uzbek-Ottoman alliance, to procure loyalty for a Mughal-Safavid alliance. In sum, these are most of the concerns sketchily referred to in non-correspondence sources such as the writings of European travelers or the various court histories. Certainly Qandahar was a primary agenda even though its exact role in various embassies, except for that of Zaimbul Beg's, is difficult to ascertain.

It is not necessarily the case that the primary purpose of a mission carried more
weight than the pretense, or that manifold missions were mutually exclusive. In some
cases, both were likely of equal importance. It might be more accurate to state, therefore,
that identifying agendas as primary or pretense is not necessarily indicative of their
importance to the emperor, only of the sensitivity of the issue at stake. But considering the
fact that an embassy might have more than one role, considerable effort must have been
directed in organizing that which would have the greatest influence on the receiving court.

Zeynal (Zaimbul) Beg therefore set about preparing an embassy that would
do credit to the Shah; he gathered together Arabian horses, jeweled
saddles, and saddles of gold and silver, which are the best ornament of
armies, jewelry of all kinds, and countless other luxury items. All this was
in the charge of large numbers of servants and workmen from the royal
workshops.143

The selection of the ambassador was crucial. Often, the appointment was given to
a high ranking courtier, one who was an astute judge of character and mood, and skilled in
conversation and entertaining. These credentials were presented in the letter which
accompanied the envoy thus assuring its imperial recipient that he was being appropriately
honored and served.144

Among the numerous additional components which often composed an embassy
were cooks, food, the official reporter, temporary housing and its constructors,
entertainers, the master of the hunt, animals and their keepers, artists and servants.
Individuals might be selected who could assist with the embassy’s journey, make an

143Shah Abbas, 2: 1215.

144IPO, 226-227; Islam also notes that racial or religious considerations might have affected the selection
of an ambassador. Persians or Sayyids, both of whom would command respect at a Shi’a court in Iran,
were often selected as envoys from the Mughal court.
impression on the foreign court, or serve the ambassador personally. Not all persons traveled in an official capacity, however. Frequently, merchants and immigrants joined an embassy for safety. Of particular interest here, however, is the position of Tahwilder, or keeper of gifts, cash, and accounts.\textsuperscript{145} The necessity for such a post underscores the importance and number of gifts that likely accompanied an embassy.

In reading through imperial correspondence, the movement of equity, gifts in particular, comes across as a major concern. Even if specifics regarding particular objects are not listed, the frequency with which the sentiments of give and take are recorded does attest their importance generally.\textsuperscript{146} And, it is known that lists documenting gifts were presented to officials at the receiving court for review.\textsuperscript{147} Gifts then were an essential component of the embassies sent between Jahangir and Shah Abbas.

\textit{External Objects Exchanged, Problematic Objects, and By-products}

Sadly, only a few of the many objects gifted between the emperors can be catalogued today. In addition to Ulugh Beg's ruby (cat. no. 53), one piece of Chinese porcelain located at the Ardebil Shrine (cat. no. 54) has also been identified.\textsuperscript{148} Unlike the ruby, however, that Chinese Hung-Chih dish is not mentioned in any primary written sources; likely, it was one of the many "suitable presents." The dish, therefore, is classified

\textsuperscript{145}IPR, 228.

\textsuperscript{146}See Appendix A, Parts 1 and 2.

\textsuperscript{147}Calendar, Ott. 411.

as an imperial gift based on internal evidence, namely inscriptions. On its underside the words Shah Jahangir Shah Akbar have been incised as has a waqf inscription of Shah Abbas.\textsuperscript{149} While there is no statement to the effect of the dish being a gift, I have accepted it as such on the basis of if not this particular piece, then something or many things of a very similar nature were gifted.\textsuperscript{150}

There are, in addition, representations of gifts exchanged between the emperors. Two such paintings are known. The first, catalogue 51, has already been discussed in depth. The items depicted in Jahangir Entertains Shah Abbas are included as evidence of actual objects exchanged based on my argument above. The second painting is Abyssinian Zebra by Mansur (cat. no. 56). The zebra depicted in this painting is known to have been given to Shah Abbas by Jahangir based on two inscriptions. The first is located on the painting itself. Jahangir writes that an unusual animal was brought to court in 1621 by some Turks. Precisely how the zebra became Jahangir’s possession is not clear. But not long after its arrival, Jahangir says, “As it was a rarity, it was included among the royal gifts sent to my brother Shah Abbas.”\textsuperscript{151} Because of the interest in visually recording historical events at court, each painting provides an additional type of evidence in support of actual gifts exchanged between Jahangir and Shah Abbas.

\textsuperscript{149}Throughout the early seventeenth century, Shah Abbas gifted personal and state possessions to his subjects. These gifts were housed or monitored by various religious institutions throughout Iran. The donations are known as waqf. See R. McChesney, “Waqf and Public Policy: The Waqfs of Shah Abbas” in Asian and African Studies 15 (1981), 165-190. It is interesting that in the two cases where actual gifted objects can be identified, the pieces have multiple histories of gifting following that to either emperor. The ruby was presented to Shah Jahan while the dish was gifted to a religious institution.

\textsuperscript{150}William Hawkins, for example, states that a Chinese dish was given to Jahangir by Shah Abbas. See Das (1991/92), 389.

\textsuperscript{151} Tuzuk, 201a
Though many attempts have been made to locate additional objects through internal or visual evidence, it appears that the documentation of a Jahangir-Shah Abbas provenance on an object itself was the exception rather than the norm at either court. Considering the fact that much of the equity which moved between the emperors was perishable (flora, fauna, drugs, textiles) or raw material (gems) that paucity is not altogether surprising.

There are, however, in addition to the pieces identified above, a few other objects which suggest an imperial Indo-Iranian provenance. However, the histories of these particular pieces cannot be confidently asserted. They have not, therefore, been catalogued as visual evidence. Among these problematic objects are several manuscripts and a few objects. One manuscript, for example, contains illustrations by the Safavid court artist Sadiqi Beg and a note by Shah Jahan stating that the book had been presented to Jahangir in 1618, but by whom is unknown.\(^1\) Two other manuscripts contain inscriptions from the hand of Jahangir and illustrations in a Safavid style.\(^2\) While Jahangir’s possession seems certain, Shah Abbas’ ownership, though suggested by the illustrations, is not unquestionably documented. Further, if Jahangir received the manuscripts from Abbas it seems likely he would have made note of that when he signed the book. A fourth manuscript contains seals of both Jahangir and Shah Abbas. Though seemingly plausible evidence, it also contains seals of Jahangir’s two predecessors, Humayun and Akbar, and his successor, Shah Jahan, a rather tight Mughal provenance. Some of the seals on this

---

\(^1\) *Arwari-i Suhayli* of Kashfii (SAK Ms. 40). I am grateful to John Seyller for assisting me with this identification and those of the manuscripts below.

\(^2\) *Divan* of Anvari (private collection); Anthology (Khadabakhsh Library, HL 1089).
manuscript may have been stamped at a later date, but which ones are unknown.\textsuperscript{154}

A.S. Melikian-Chirvani has noted that the shape of a particular wine bowl in the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay follows Iranian prototypes while its ornamentation is suggestive of Mughal hunting scenes (figure 7). Considered together, that evidence may point to a gift commissioned for the Safavid royal family.\textsuperscript{155} But, because there are no inscriptions to attest that supposition or that the participants were Jahangir and Shah Abbas in particular, the piece maintains its classification as a problematic object.

Another group of interesting but problematic pieces are those that contain the \textit{waqf} marks of Shah Abbas, yet can also be attributed a Mughal provenance. The most extraordinary work of this nature is the Safavid prince Sultan Ibrahim Mirza’s \textit{Haft Awrang} of 1556. Because it contains a \textit{waqf} seal of 1608-09, it is known to have been among the imperial possessions gifted by the Shah to various shrines throughout Iran.\textsuperscript{156} Manuscripts such as this one are said to have gone to the shrine at Ardebil.\textsuperscript{157} However, the \textit{Haft Awrang} also contains the seals of Shah Jahan, his son Aurangzeb, and other Mughal emperors suggesting that its tenure at Ardebil was brief. Was the manuscript stolen? Was it sold to raise money? Or, was it released upon the emperor’s request to gift

\textsuperscript{154}\textit{Divan of Shahi} (CBL Ms. 257). Its provenance has also been questioned by John Seyller (private correspondence of October 9, 1997).

\textsuperscript{155}Wine Bowl (PWM 56.61). See, \textit{India}, 190-191.


\textsuperscript{157}\textit{Shah Abbas 2}: 955.
as a special favor.\textsuperscript{158} The answer may never be known. However, other objects that contain both \textit{waqf} and Mughal seals have been documented.

A second example of \textit{waqf} items that were regifted is a porcelain dish (fig. 8) in the Guennol collection. It contains a \textit{waqf} mark of Shah Abbas and a seal of Shah Jahan.\textsuperscript{159} Further, a letter from Shah Abbas to Jahangir states that two sets of rubies were being sent to the Mughal emperor as per his request. Both required imperial directives, however, to release them from the shrines to which they had been first gifted as \textit{waqf} donations.\textsuperscript{160} Regardless of whether or not these rubies survive to the present, they do affirm a pattern of gifting in which Shah Abbas regifted items he had already given away. In this respect, official possession does not seem to have been equated with ownership.

Except for the rubies, when and how these pieces came to be housed in the Mughal treasury or library is unknown. It is tempting to suggest they were gifts from Abbas to Jahangir since the reception of the manuscript and the dish could very well predate Shah Jahan’s reign even though his are the only seals present. But without verifiable evidence they are not included in the list of objects gifted.\textsuperscript{161}

Also of interest is a rather intriguing painting located today in a private collection.

\textsuperscript{158} Other scholars have suggested that the manuscript may have been a loan, or perhaps that Abbas removed it from the shrine. See Simpson, 34-35 and Seyller, 285-286.


\textsuperscript{160} One set of rubies appear to have been gifts while a bill of sale accompanied the second.

\textsuperscript{161} The question of Shah Abbas’ regifting of \textit{waqf} donations is unfortunately beyond the scope of this paper which is weighted towards Mughal gifting rather than Safavid gifting practices.
(figure 9). Though technically not gifted to Jahangir by Shah Abbas it is included here because it was, allegedly, once in the Shah’s collection then gifted to Jahangir by Khan Alam following his stay in Isfahan. Jahangir says,

Among them [the gifts of Khan Alam] was the picture of the fight of Sahib Qiran (Timur) with Tuqtamish K., and the likenesses of him and his glorious children and the great Amirs who had the good fortune to be with him in that fight, and near each figure was written whose portrait it was. In this picture there were 240 figures. The painter had written his name as Khalil Mirza Shahrukhi. The work was very complete and grand, and resembled greatly the paint-brush of Ustad Behzad. If the name of the painter had not been written, the work would have been believed to be his...

Jahangir goes on to relate the circumstances in which the work was acquired by Khan Alam. Namely, the painting had been a prized possession of the imperial Safavid treasury, but a librarian had stolen the work and sold it. Eventually, it came to the attention of Khan Alam who purchased it as a gift for his patron.

Many components of the painting are in keeping with Jahangir’s description. For example, a marginal cartouche houses the name “Shahruki Khalil Mirza” and a conflated battle scene is depicted. Also present is a kingly figure, his defeated counterpart, and a large number of figures. The execution of the painting, however, does not live up to Jahangir’s high praise in my opinion. The rather simply drawn faces with their vacuous expressions do not bring to mind the sensitive hand of Behzad that Jahangir attempted to discern. Possibly then, this painting is a later copy of the work Khan Alam gifted to

---

162 I am grateful to Robert Skelton for drawing my attention to this work.

163 Tuzuk, 94a, 107a. In addition to this painting, Khan Alam also gave Jahangir a walrus ivory hilt and a falcon which Shah Abbas had gifted to the ambassador first.

164 Tuzuk, 116a.
Jahangir. Alternatively, Robert Skelton has suggested, and I agree, that the painting was probably produced in the twentieth century by an artist familiar with the Tuzuk who used that text as the basis for his composition.

Though not gifts per se, final consideration of visual evidence on this topic is devoted to a small group of paintings which fall into that large category of embassy by-products. Among the many portraits of Shah Abbas discussed above, two, or possibly three, paintings of Safavid courtiers also survive. These were most likely produced following Jahangir’s directive to Bishan Das to record the likenesses of Shah Abbas and his subjects. Each, however, poses something of a mystery. Catalogue number 57, for example, contains an inscription in Jahangir’s hand identifying the figure as Khudabaksha Mirza, Shah Abbas’ father, and the painter as Bishan Das. How Khudabaksha Mirza’s portrait came to realization is unknown since Bishan Das arrived at the Shah’s court ten years after the man’s death. Perhaps, like the artist Abul Hasan in regards to catalogue number 52, Bishan Das inquired after Khudabaksha Mirza’s appearance from those who knew him. The figure’s stance and clothing are typical of the manner in which Shah Abbas

---

165 Sotheby’s London, Persian and Indian Miniatures, Manuscripts, and Calligraphy, 24 June 1941, lot 21, page 12; Sotheby’s London, Oriental Manuscripts and Miniatures, 13 December 1972, lot 200, page 37. The sales catalogue entries do not connect the painting with the passage in the Tuzuk. However, an inscription on the back of the painting does attest to a history of copying. It has been translated, “...A scene in the illustrious reign of his Majesty Timur Gurgani, may his resting place be in paradise, this original drawing was executed by Ustad Bihzad for Khalil Mirza Shah Rukh in the fifteenth year of his accession; this slave of the court Farrokh Beg has made a copy of it.” Farrokh Beg is known to have made copies of both Persian and European works on paper. See Welch, India, 221-225 and R. Skelton, “The Mughal Artist Farrokh Beg” in Ars Orientalis 2 (1957), figs. 3-4.

166 Private correspondence.

167 See footnote 80.

himself was portrayed by Indian artists although Khudabaksha Mirza’s profile is quite
distinct as might be expected. Another portrait of a Safavid man (cat. no. 25)
demonstrates this familiar formula too and is also inscribed with Bishan Das’ name. The
figure has been variously identified as Shah Abbas and Isa Khan. 169 And, in comparing
his countenance to both of those men, a case can be made for either attribution (see cat.
no. 11 where the far left, middle figure is inscribed Isa Khan Qurchi Bashi). Not all
Safavids were portrayed in this manner, however. The portrait of Saru Taqi (cat. no. 58)
is significantly different by comparison. Ascribed to Bishan Das, this figure has
startlingly light eyes and a curious hand gesture. Individuality of countenance was valued
in these representations.

Other works of related interest are two portraits of Khan Alam. One small Mughal
painting (cat. no. 59) depicts Khan Alam in his position as chief falconer although the
work also evokes his representation in catalogue number 51. The frequency with which
falconry is suggested in paintings of Shah Abbas and Khan Alam (cat. nos. 12-17; 35-38;
51; 58) underscores the appropriateness of Khan Alam’s ambassadorial appointment. The
second work is a sketch of Persian origin (cat. no. 60). Though seemingly a preliminary
study, the drawing contains inscriptions identifying specific colors for the figure’s
clothing. It may well have been conceived as a study for a final version. To my know-
ledge this may be the only solitary Persian portrait of a historical Mughal figure up to

169 Compare B. Goswamy, Wonders of the Golden Age, Paintings of the Great Mughals: Indian Art of the
16th and 17th Centuries from the Collections in Switzerland (Zurich, Museum Rietberg, 1987), 70 with T.
Falk, ed., Treasures of Islam (Seacaucus, NJ: Wellfleet Press, 1985), cat. no. 141. For the most recent
attribution see S. Canby, Princes, Poets and Paladins: Islamic and Indian Paintings from the Collection of
Prince and Princess Sadruddin Aga Khan (London, British Museum, 1998), cat. no. 103. An inscription on
the painting identifying the figure as Isa Khan has been treated with both veracity and skepticism.
the time of its completion and even beyond.\textsuperscript{170}

Written evidence regarding embassy gifts, as noted earlier, is much more profuse than visual evidence. But as to the type of objects gifted, I admit I find a simple summary of their identities rather elusive. This is partly due to the nature of the transactions and the participants involved which can be difficult to ascertain. For example, it is not always clear in the written records whether gifts presented to Jahangir are from Abbas himself or from the ambassador alone in search of personal favor.\textsuperscript{171} Four horses with trappings were given through or by Zaimbul Beg to Jahangir, but it is uncertain which was the case.\textsuperscript{172}

More importantly, authors can be frustratingly perfunctory. For example, it will be noticed in Appendix A, Parts 1 and 2 that gifting notices in the Tuzuk are often given only cursory attention. Many presents are casually dismissed as “valuable” or “suitable.” Both Mughal and Safavid sources are somewhat stingy with regard to notices about specific types of gifts. Fortunately, accounts of European residents and the correspondence of Abbas and Jahangir are much more detailed. In general, the horses and textiles presented by Shah Abbas in his first embassy of 1609 were typical of the gifts he continued to send Jahangir throughout the course of their interaction. In addition to letters, fine cloth and animals, Safavid envoys, primarily dispatched between 1615 and 1622, presented European baubles, jewelry, stones, gems, drugs, clocks, and weapons among other objects. References to traditional works of art, however, are scarce. They are found in

\textsuperscript{170}E. Atıl, \textit{The Brush of the Masters: Drawings from Iran and India} (Washington, DC: Freer Gallery of Art, 1978), cat. no. 39. It should be noted that the identity of the figure is not recorded on the work. Esin Atıl has suggested the figure might be Khan Alam.

\textsuperscript{171}The relationship between an emperor and an ambassador is discussed below.

\textsuperscript{172}See Appendix A, Part 1.
imperial correspondence where, for example, Jahangir thanks Abbas for a rare *Quabnama* manuscript and something that is mysteriously called “figures drawn in stone.”

From Jahangir, Shah Abbas received cloth, several trees and a horticulturist to tend them, oxen, buffalo, weapons, chariots and other goods. Again, specific discussions of art are rare. Among the more unusual gifts were a new lid and saucer for the Shah’s crystal cup, a large animal tooth, 150 plus turbans and a three-legged goat.\textsuperscript{173} Both emperors seem to have gifted items that were generic products of their empires and ateliers as well as objects that were of much older or foreign provenance. Only a few pieces appear to have been commissioned specifically for the receiving emperor.\textsuperscript{174}

Gifts were transported on pack animals including camels or elephants or sometimes by a vehicle such as a cart or chariot. Whether or not the transports themselves were intended as spectacle or as gifts is less certain. This is typical of the writings of Iskandar Beg Munshi where elephants are mentioned as a facet of Khan Alam’s embassy but their final destination is not specified.\textsuperscript{175} Alternatively, Della Valle, states that the chariots present in this same embassy were intended as gifts.\textsuperscript{176}

The larger and grander the embassy, the more gifts that were likely to accompany it. As the size of the entourage and number of gifts grew, however, the pace of the

\textsuperscript{173}See Appendix A, Parts 1 and 2 for a comprehensive listing of gifts exchanged between the two emperors.

\textsuperscript{174}This tendency differs from a recent study on gifting conducted by Francisco Prado-Vilar. In his analysis of Spanish ivory caskets, Prado-Vilar determined that objects were consciously made to been given as gifts. Such pieces contained highly charged political messages. F. Prado-Vilar, “Caliphal Ivory Caskets from al-Andalus,” in *Murqarnas* 14 (1997), 19-41.

\textsuperscript{175}See footnote 58.

\textsuperscript{176}Blunt, 177.
embassy slowed. It is difficult, therefore, to estimate even a typical time-span required for traversing the courts since the exact size of any particular embassy is not attested. Khan Alam’s embassy seems to have taken the most amount of time, three years, although the inconsistencies in written sources regarding its arrival and departure dates compound the problem.\textsuperscript{177} Other major embassies such as Zaimbul Beg’s or Muhammed Riza Beg’s took about two years to complete the journey. Supplemental envoys, Muhibb Ali and Aqa Beg for example, probably moved much faster in smaller convoys. Their missions were constrained by speed rather than grandeur and probably took about six months to reach their destination, but these are very rough estimates.

Along the journey, an ambassador and his retinue were likely to be entertained by local nobility at the behest of the emperor he was traveling to honor. Khan Alam’s embassy was feted in both Herat and Mashhad before reaching the Safavid capital, Isfahan. Zaimbul Beg was hosted by nobles in Lahore during Jahangir’s absence from the city. Courts moved frequently throughout the course of a year, whether to capital cities located in climates suitable to particular seasons, to pursue a militaristic objective, or other reasons. For a visiting embassy, this frequently resulted in a delayed reception since the destination targeted as the endpoint of the journey was not necessarily the one the emperor inhabited. Sometimes the embassy proceeded to that alternate destination, sometimes it remained at the point of origin in anticipation of the court’s imminent return.\textsuperscript{178}

\textsuperscript{177}See footnotes 39 and 54.

\textsuperscript{178}\textit{Calendar}, J.85. In this letter from Jahangir to Zaimbul Beg, Jahangir explains his absence and invites the ambassador to join him in Kashmir or rest in Lahore until the court returned to that city.
In either case, the first moment of contact between the emperor and the ambassador was quite important in terms of establishing relations generally throughout the embassy’s residence at court. A particular day and time were selected for the ambassador to make his first court appearance in order to present the letter and greetings of his patron. The sooner an ambassador was received after his arrival, the greater the honor he was bestowed. Muhammed Riza Beg, for example, was granted an audience with Jahangir on the same day he arrived at court, a rare and honorable occurrence. In Khan Alam’s case, the emperor and the ambassador had already had several encounters before the embassy marched officially into Isfahan.

Once established, the ambassador was integrated into court life with varying degrees of favor. A Mehmandar, or official host, was appointed to assist the ambassador with his needs. At the Mughal court, where ceremony was observed in the most formal manner, the ambassador was assigned to a particular place among the courtiers who stood in attendance on the emperor. Architecturally, the public reception hall was divided by platforms and rails such that the rank and favor of each attendee could be easily deduced based on his proximity to the emperor (figure 10).

In the following statement, Sir Thomas Roe describes the gesticulations of Muhammed Riza Beg on his first day at court and his resulting placement.

---

179 Embassy, 258. “The Persian ambassador, Mahamett Roza Beag, about noone came into the towne with a great troup, which were partly sent out by the King to meete him with 100 eliphants and musiqued.”

180 Tzetuk, 242. Jahangir describes this arrangement as follow, “In the public audience hall there were two railings of wood. Inside the first, Amirs, ambassadors, and people of honour sat, and no one entered this circle without an order. Within the second railing, which is broader than the first, the mansabdarss of inferior rank, shadies, and those who had work to do are admitted. Outside this railing stand the servants and Amirs and all the people who may enter the Diwankhana.”
When hee approached, he made at the first rayle three teselims and one sizeda (which is prostrating himselfe and knocking his head against the ground)...after some few woords hee was placed in the seaventh ranck against the rayle by the doore, below so many of the Kings servants on both sides, which in my judgment was a most inferiour place for his masters ambassador but hee well deserved it for dooing that reverence which his predecessores refused, to the dishonour of his prince and the murmur of many of his nation.  

From Roe’s words, it is also possible to conclude that the manner in which an ambassador chose to interact with the emperor was primarily left to the discretion of the ambassador himself. In this case, Muhammed Riza Beg opted to follow Mughal court protocol of full submission before the emperor even though Persian ambassadors were excused from performing such humbling acts.

The circumstances of gift giving varied depending on the mood and interest level of the emperor. Typically, a few gifts were given during the ambassador’s initial visit to court. After that, the amount of gifts carried by the embassy (and likely their projected quality) could determine future presentation ceremonies. A portion of gifts presented over the course of several days appears to have been the most desirable method. Roe says of Muhammed Riza Beg on his first day at court, “This is but the first act of his presenting. The play will not be finished in ten dayes.”  

Khan-e Alam wanted to display all the gifts he had brought from India; his idea to display a few items each day to the Shah and in this way prolong the proceedings. However, the Shah had other ideas; he wanted to travel via Gilan to Mazandaran to take part in the bell-hunt which, as I have mentioned before, is peculiar to that province and takes place at a fixed time. Time was getting short if he was to get there in time, and so he could not fall in with Khan-e Alam’s plan. The baubles of this world were not so

---

181 *Embassy*, 258.

182 *Embassy*, 262-263.
important to the Shah as to justify his spending several days of his valuable
time inspecting them and as a result missing the hunting in Mazandaran. He
therefore allotted the Indian ambassador one day in which to display his
gifts, and instructed him to show a few choice articles in each category, and
to make a detailed list of the remainder and hand them over to the royal
workshops, so that he might inspect them at his leisure. The Indian
ambassador was extremely put out, but was forced to comply. He selected
some three hundred items, including items of jewelry, bizarre objects,
precious stuffs and so on, and paraded them before the Shah in the
Meydan-e Sa’adatabad. The Shah then left the royal workshops behind at
Qazvin and rushed off to see this special type of boar hunt called the bell-
hunt.\textsuperscript{183}

Sometimes lists of gifts were presented to the emperor instead of the objects themselves as
Munshi states above.\textsuperscript{184} In such cases, the gift might go straight to the treasury or other
storage area to be inspected at a later, more convenient, date. Cataloging gifts appears to
have been a fundamental aspect of the exchange on both the departure and receiving ends.
A list of gifts accompanied the embassy and was then presented to court officials by the
\textit{Tahwilder}. Once checked against the goods received the objects were no doubt recorded
in the official registry of the imperial treasury, stables, library or other suitable destination.

From the case histories presented above, it is clear that Jahangir was quite diligent
in bestowing gifts on visiting ambassadors. Sometimes gifts were of a practical nature such
as cash rewards intended to offset expenses accrued at court.\textsuperscript{185} Sometimes the gifts were
more personal items indicating imperial favor. In fact, the types of gifts presented to a
foreign ambassador were not all that different from the ones Jahangir gifted to his own

\textsuperscript{183}Shah Abbas 2: 1160.

\textsuperscript{184}Embassy, 259.

Conventional gifts such as a jeweled sword or robe of honor were given predominantly although unique gifts are occasionally evident too. This similarity might be attributed to either a strong sense of canon and weak imagination or, alternatively, to a strategic effort to assimilate those individuals outside court circles into the very systems that governed them. Further, generous rewards to a foreign ambassador were a direct method of ensuring an enthusiastic report from the envoy when he returned home. In addition to his placement in the reception hall, gifts from the emperor indicated the status of the ambassador at court. To ensure continued imperial support, an ambassador presented his own offerings in addition to those he gifted from his patron.

From the start, then, the ambassador and emperor established a personal relationship beyond that of emperor’s representative and emperor. Munshi says, for example,

When the Shah returned from Azerbaijan to Qazvin, he summoned Khan-e Alam. When the Indian ambassador neared the city, he was met by a group of emirs, who escorted him with honor into the city and saw him to his quarters in the Bag-e Sa’adatabad. The following day, while the Shah was enjoying polo and archery practice in the Meydan-e Sa’adat, Khan-e Alam was received and accorded an unwonted degree of royal favor.

If relations between an emperor and ambassador were extremely favorable or extremely negative, the embassy’s departure from court might be delayed. In most

---

186 This will be discussed further in Chapter 4.

187 IPR, 234.

188 Shah Abbas 2: 1159. In the Tuzuk, 115a Jahangir says, “Of the favours and kindness conferred by my brother on Khan Alam, if I were to write of them in detail, I should be accused of exaggeration. In conversation he always gave him the title of Khan Alam, and never had him out of his presence. If he ever voluntarily stayed in his own quarter, he (Abbas) would go there without ceremony, and show him more and more favour.”
cases, an early dismissal of the ambassador was requested outright in the letter he carried from his patron. However, the exact departure date was determined by the receiving emperor. In addition to friendly relations, political turmoil such as that which arose over Qandahar during Zaimbul Beg’s residence at court or the prestige of having foreign envoys in attendance also affected the ambassador’s departure date. As Francois Bernier, a mid-seventeenth century European visitor stated, “The Great Mogol is in the habit of detaining all ambassadors as long as can be reasonably done, from an idea that it is becoming his grandeur and power to receive the homage of foreigners, and to number them among the attendants of his court.”\footnote{F. Bernier, \textit{Travels in the Mogul Empire AD 1656-1668}, ed. V. Smith (Delhi: Low Price Publications, 1989 reprint), 128.}

This interest and pride in internationalism is evident in an illustration to the \textit{Tuzuk} (cat. no. 75) thought to depict Jahangir’s accession to the throne in 1605. The crowd celebrating outside the palace includes Europeans, possibly Sir Thomas Roe and his chaplain Father Terry, Safavids, Ottomans and other foreigners. It is unlikely, if not impossible, that some of these figures, Roe for example, were actually present at the event. Atmosphere, rather than realism, was privileged in order to suggest the emperor’s omnipotence.\footnote{Akimushkin (1996), pl. 176. Some figures have been identified by Robert Skelton who suggests the painting was either enhanced or created several years after Jahangir’s accession.}

Throughout this chapter specific encounters in addition to their missions, components, and protocols have been set forth in order to establish the specific context
within which gifting between Jahangir and Shah Abbas can be considered. Before proceeding with that objective, however, it is first necessary to refine that context through two more investigations. In the first, the notion of gifting as examined by certain theorists is explored. In the second, four adjunct case studies are considered. These undertakings should help to elucidate patterns of activity, or lack there of, present in both the narrative and statistical portions of this dissertation, and help to distinguish gift giving between Jahangir and Shah Abbas from similar activities. Altogether, this essential evidence, in addition to that listed in the appendices, is the basis from which relations between the two emperors, the nature of gifting, and the value of the gift can be analyzed.
Chapter 3
Theories of Gifting: The Secondary Evidence

The practice of gifting is neither exclusive nor unique to the Mughals and the Safavids. It seems to permeate all cultures and has fascinated academics for some time. However, within the Islamic world, gift exchange is evident all over including Spain, Turkey, North Africa, and Central Asia. However, an understanding of the meaning and role of the gift both within an Islamic context and within an art historical one remain in the most nascent of stages.

In this chapter, the works of selected scholars will be reviewed for their theories of and conclusions on the nature of gifting. How gifts have been defined, problematized, in what context, using what methodology and by whom, these are my primary lines of inquiry. In Chapter 5, I critically appraise and apply those ideas to my general discussion of gifting between Jahangir and Shah Abbas. Ideally, my conclusions will not only contribute to the fields of art history and Indo-Iranian relations, but to gift theory as well.

The selections analyzed here represent only a fraction of the work that has been undertaken on gifting. It is possible, therefore, to discriminate from the outset and review only those publications which have the most to contribute my study. Further, even within the studies that have been selected for examination, only the ideas which seemingly have a certain resonance to this context will be examined. Presenting numerous critiques on

---


gifting studies with unrelated foci would seem to detract from the purpose at hand rather than inform it.

A good case in point is the work of Lewis Hyde. In *The Gift: Imagination and the Erotic Life of Property*, Hyde attempts to relate the notion of gifting to the genius of the artist’s creative output. While at first this work might seem especially fruitful for an art historical focus, in fact, my interests center on the post-histories of an object and those who own it, not the moment of an object’s production or the market to which it is presented. Thus, Hyde’s discussion of gifting will not be addressed here.

Similarly, a study of gifting practices in India is not necessarily of immediate relevance. I have found this to be the case with Gloria Raheja’s discussion of contemporary, rural village life in India. In *The Poison in the Gift*, Rahaja constructs an argument, based-on first hand observations, in which she advocates gifting without obligation. It is a unique position within gifting studies and one that I find contrary to the evidence I have collected. Because neither her context nor her conclusions are applicable, Rahaja’s work does not receive a full critique below.

In addition to working with texts that have immediate application to my own work, I have tried to select studies that represent a variety of disciplines, methodologies, contexts, and agendas. Diversity, I hope, will provide the necessary comparative material.

---


As a result of my approach, however, there is little that directly links the studies presented here, except those that were influenced by Mauss. Therefore, they are discussed in chronological order.

Marcel Mauss

Nearly every study on gifting begins by examining the work of Marcel Mauss and so too will mine. Mauss, an anthropologist, has become, if not the focal point, then the departure point, for subsequent studies on gift exchange. Though not the earliest publication on gifting, his highly influential *Essai Sur le Don* of 1920, is certainly the most discussed.\(^{195}\) Likely, this phenomenon has become self-generating.

Utilizing his own fieldwork, that of his colleagues, and ancient texts, Mauss constructs a theory of the gift whereby reciprocity, rather than disinterestedness or voluntary beneficence, is fundamental to the act throughout numerous eras and cultures.\(^{196}\)

As is often the case in anthropological studies, Mauss’ observations mainly stem from tribal, or archaic, cultures such as the North America Indians, the Polynesians, and the Melanesians. In reviewing the way gifts work in particular cultures, he says, it becomes possible to understand a great deal about their social, economic and political systems.

“The whole society can be described by the catalogue of transfers that map all the obligations between its members.” \(^{197}\) Mauss posits that gifts establish social and economic

---


\(^{196}\)Mauss, 3.

\(^{197}\)Mauss, ix.
hierarchies, or conversely, may reveal them depending on the perspective of the observer.\textsuperscript{198} Affirmation of honor, high visibility, and public drama characterize gift exchanges in contrast to other types of transfers.

As a positivist, Mauss never really questions his own methodologies or assumptions. He commences with a case study where his system of gift exchange is already practiced then refines his conclusions through application of his observations to a variety of other cultures. He then pushes his conclusions, struggling to understand not only that gifts must be returned, but also why that is the case and what force motivates it. Further, he seeks to understand what the impetus is that impels both the originary act of giving and the secondary of receiving. The answer he posits, the \textit{hau} or spiritual matter of the object, is not relevant here. However, his basic project is as important to my study as it appears to be for all gifting studies. For example, his emphasis on human relations that are intrinsically bound up in the act of gifting seem well suited to the evidence of Mughal-Safavid relations as is the notion that gifting is completely tied into economic and political systems. That a gift must be reciprocated, that it is not disinterested or pure, all are significant notions that play a role in my own investigation. Almost as important as his own work though is the number of studies his publication spawned providing a rich pool of studies from which to examine the notion of the gift.

John Richards

As an authority on Mughal history and politics, John Richards has noted the importance of domestic gift exchange to the Mughal system of governing in his article, “The Formulation of Imperial Authority under Akbar and Jahangir.” He does not address foreign exchange. However, on an immediate level, Richards sets a precedent for discussing certain transactions at the Mughal court, domestic ones at least, as evidence of gift exchange.

Richards does not focus on the theory or practice of gifting per se. Rather, he analyzes the various facets that comprised the Mughal emperors’ claim to authority and the resulting power they exercised over their subjects. He focuses mainly on the construction of the system under Akbar, but he also considers how it was honed during Jahangir’s reign. Several factors were involved in the successful governing of Mughal India. In addition to the glorification of the emperor’s person, the construction of a new capital city known as Fatehpur Sikri, and the exploitation of the dynasty’s lineage, the practice of gifting also ensured loyalty. As Richard’s interprets the system, a subject’s status and income were quite dependent upon relations with the emperor. By varying the degree of favor he expressed towards each subject, the emperor was able to control his subjects through their desire to be recognized and rewarded. Those closest to the emperor were treated like disciples.

---


200 Richards, 253, 255-256, 260-266, 273.

201 Richards, 267ff.
Creating a capital city or sensationalizing a genealogy were the tools through which the emperor inspired respect. Through gifts, that relationship of authority and submission was sustained. Gifting was a tangible expression of more abstract principles. Richards interprets the relationship between gifting and honor as follows. He says, “After the sovereign uttered formal verbal confirmation of promotions, new titles, postings, etc. he favored the officer with a full or partial robe of honor, a horse or elephant, jewelled weapons, money, or other artifacts. Most of the gifts for personal use thus bestowed could be constructed to have some symbolic reference to the body and person of the king: e.g. the robe of honor, if not actually worn by Jahangir, was brushed momentarily across his shoulder.”202

In essence, Richards argues that the Mughal emperors ruled through personal relationships with their nobles. The nobility employed similar methods in ruling their own constituents so that a very clear hierarchy of command was instituted.203 Authority was the key to legitimacy and strength. Gift giving revealed the status of each participant and, at the same time, it re-enforced the central structure of the governing system because it promoted personal relations.

In terms of both evidence and analysis, Richards’ article has much to offer. In addition to establishing a pattern of gift exchange at the Mughal court, he also recognizes the value of the practice and its contribution to Mughal court life. However, this facet is

202 Richards, 273.

203 Richards discussion of the courtier Mirza Nathan is especially revealing in this respect, 270-77.
discussed primarily within the realm of political authority. It is my objective to develop his argument within other areas of courtlife, in particular, art patronage and production.

Jacques Derrida

For Jacques Derrida, a theoretically influential voice, gifts are a paradox. In Given Time, he attempts to reconcile, as Bourdieu will, the inherent contradiction whereby gifts are, on the one hand, altruistic gestures, and, on the other hand, reciprocal obligations. For him the only gift that can truly be considered a gift is that which neither giver nor receiver recognizes as such. If either perceives generosity or experiences gratitude or indebtedness then the nature of the gift is violated and it is no longer a gift. What distinguishes a gift, if such a thing exists, from other types of exchange is the lapse in time between its presentation and restitution in the form of a counter-gift. "The difference between a gift and every other operation of pure and simple exchange is that the gift gives time."

While Derrida presents many interesting discussions on the nature of gifting, for the purposes of my study, his is primarily an academic exercise. For, in contrast to his work where the concept and definition of the gift are divorced from any particular context, my study is firmly rooted in a specific case history. Whether or not Derrida
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205 Derrida, 7.

206 Derrida, 40–41.
considers an act of exchange a gift encounter is less important than whether Jahangir or Shah Abbas would have.

The strength of his essay, therefore, lies not in his speculations or conclusions but in the questions he raises. His methods provide a starting point which ensure a firm foundation. For example, it is clearly important to question at the start what exactly a gift is and whether or not that definition appropriately describes certain types of exchange encounters documented within it.\textsuperscript{207} Were the objects exchanged between the Mughal and Safavid courts through embassies considered gifts by the participants? Or conversely, does the concept of exchange as practiced by the two dynasties suit the notion of gifting? And, if that is the case, what distinguishes gifting from other forms of exchange?

One method towards resolving this question, which will be taken up in Chapter 5, is revealed in Derrida’s own approach, namely his playfulness with words and semantics. Language is crucial to understanding gift theory; in fact, Derrida critiques Mauss in particular for his somewhat careless application of the word gift to various exchange relations. In this respect, I make passing reference to the work of Emile Benveniste who has also undertaken study of the importance of vocabulary to gifting.\textsuperscript{208} Benveniste determines, for example, that the etymology of “to give” and “to take” stem from the same verb in many Indo-European languages.\textsuperscript{209} But instead of relying on Derrida’s definition of

\textsuperscript{207}Derrida, 26.


\textsuperscript{209}Benveniste, 34.
impossibility and paradox, or any other scholar's for that matter, a suitable definition of gift will be posited as it suggests itself in the literature and the visual records of the time.

Ann Lambton

The work of Ann Lambton will be of some assistance in attempting to address the challenges raised by Derrida. In her study entitled, "Pishkash: Present or tribute," Lambton considers the historical meaning of certain Persian words connoting gift in Iran during the thirteenth through nineteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{210} She is not a theorist and her essay is not theoretically driven regarding the nature of gifting. Nevertheless, Lambton makes important observations regarding the practice and description of gifting and as such, her ideas and evidence are essential to my own project.

Gifting is clearly a common and fundamental practice in Persian culture. Simply consulting the number of words used to describe the act including, for example, pishkash, 'atiya, tuhfa, nawruz, and in'am among other terms, affirms that phenomenon.\textsuperscript{211} The more the act was practiced and began to take on certain nuances, the more words were employed to accommodate its accretion. Pishkash, one of the terms most frequently applied to describe gifting in the Tuzuk, is a commonly used word in Persian cultures generally. Although Lambton analyzes this evidence in terms of domestic Iranian gifting, rather than foreign gifting, its pervasiveness is noteworthy in any respect.


\textsuperscript{211}Lambton (1994), 145.
Based on her examination of several primary written sources, Lambton finds the practice of giving and receiving equity, at times, a spontaneous gesture and, at other times, an imposition. To some extent, gift giving became a conventional practice that insured continued circulation of wealth and the economic welfare of the empire. At this point, gifts acquired the sense of tax whereby subjects were expected to pay a specific amount of equity at a particular time. Lambton summarizes, "Pishkash which may originally have had a fairly neutral meaning, came to mean a present from someone of an inferior status. In the ninth/fifteenth century, if not before, it came to be used also in the sense of a due or tribute paid to the ruler of his officials." 212 It is interesting to note that the word pishkash was also applied to gifts exchanged between foreign rulers, although the implied power relations in this context would have been much subtler.

Though her focus and conclusions are primarily discussed within the context of Iranian dynasties, the implications of her study rather than specific analyses are of value. She concludes, "In the absence of security as is given by an impartial system of justice, it was generally recognized that, since power was personal and arbitrary, 'protection' must be sought on a personal basis. Further, it was generally understood that 'protection' and leadership, whether by a government official or a private individual, could not be given or exercised without material support. Hence the all-pervasive nature of pishkash." 213

One overriding assertion can be drawn from her work; namely, that these words used to describe certain types of exchanges have a great deal of fluidity throughout time.

212Lambton (1994), 145.

213Lambton (1994), 158.
and space. In other words, historically, the nuances of definition change constantly such that it is impossible to maintain a strict definition even for a particular place and time. Further, it cannot be stated with certainty that an author employed a word correctly or understood its meaning in the overarching sense of the time, if such a thing existed at all. While addressing the meaning of words within a specific context is certainly an important step, it cannot be the base upon which a theory is constructed for its basic nature is too variable as Lambton’s work demonstrates.

Stewart Gordon

Stewart Gordon, in his study on the presentation of robes of honor, seems quite conscious of problems inherent in studying gifts and hence uses the term “transaction” most frequently while placing words such as gift or gifting in quotes.²¹⁴ He is more intent in describing the act, its implications, and the objects of exchange than in coming to terms with the complexities of gift exchange. His study, therefore, provides an important alternative to some others that have been or will be discussed. Namely, he works very much from the context and only marginally with the theory instead of the other way around. Like his work, my own is also heavily grounded in a particular context. Methodologically then, Gordon deserves attention.

A second methodological approach of note is also apparent in Gordon’s work. Though a historian by training, he advocates a multidisciplinary analysis of material. For

example, charting developments throughout time can be tempered by the tendency to apply specific evidence to broad theories, as might an anthropologist, or by the comparative and visual inclinations of art historians.\textsuperscript{215}

Further, the context in which Gordon chooses to explicate robes of honor is, in fact, very closely related to my own, Mughal India. Instead of focusing on a particular era of the Mughal dynasty, however, he traces nuances of robing ceremonies throughout the reigns of various Mughal emperors and, in addition, those of preceding and succeeding dynasties and attempts to account for them. Though tentative about investigating the notion of the gift, Gordon, nevertheless, has targeted an area which clearly could be explored through this lens. Although he does not address the need or practice of bestowing countergifts, Gordon continually refers to the honor and loyalty extracted in receiving equity, in other words, personal ties. It will be my agenda, therefore, to propel his work and conclusions, supplementing them with my own research and work, into the realm of gifting.

\textit{Genevieve Warwick}

Quite recently, Genevieve Warwick noted that despite significant contributions to gift theory by anthropologists, sociologists, economists, and philosophers among others, art historical studies were noticeably lacking.\textsuperscript{216} This is particularly curious given that the

\textsuperscript{215} Gordon, 226.

\textsuperscript{216} Genevieve Warwick, “Gift Exchange and Art Collecting: Padre Sebastiano Resta’s Drawing Albums” in \textit{Art Bulletin} 79, 4 (December, 1997), 630-646.
heart of exchange is frequently an object, and whether or not it might be considered "art,"
the ability to read and interpret visual media and its role in culture is the domain of the art
historian. Warwick's essay demonstrates the important contribution art historical studies
can make to the field of gift theory.

Using the drawing albums compiled by Padre Sebastiano Resta as her primary
evidence, Warwick explores gift exchange as it was conducted in late seventeenth-century
Roman aristocratic circles. Resta was an avid collector who encouraged artists to gift him
their drawings which he then amassed into beautiful albums and regifted to wealthy
aristocrats, often royalty. They, in turn, were expected to donate significant sums of
money to Resta's charity. To complete the circle, each artist was rewarded with the
possibility of new patronage. Many levels of gifting are apparent in this case study
including, for example, alms giving in the interest of achieving spiritual merit. Clearly,
reciprocity was an essential facet to the success of these exchanges. Each gift was invested
with a great deal of self-interest.

Warwick's conclusions are quite intriguing and quite relevant. She observes, for
example, that the manner through which works of art were collected was itself a sign of
social status. Gift giving was a more gracious method of acquiring art for it circumvented
"the impropriety of valuing art in monetary terms."217 But more than that, she finds in
Mauss' work the most suitable differential between gifting and other types of exchanges.
Namely, social aspirations rather than economic systems define the gift.218 And further,

217Warwick, 642.

218C. Gregory, Gifts and Commodities (London: Academic Press, 1982). Gregory, makes a similar point
with a slightly different nuance. Commodity exchanges establish relations between objects while gift
she posits that while material gain is the same as it might be in any exchange system, immaterial benefits such as promotion, rank, honor and influence are found in gift transactions alone. In order to receive such rewards, one must first give. This, Warwick believes, ensured the circulation of wealth through equity.

But on a more personal note, "...these feelings of love and indebtedness to the giver were transferred to the object given; the successful transaction was one in which the art object was seen as the fruit of their affections and the embodiment of their tie." Gift transactions and objects, therefore, should not be reduced to the realm of pure calculation. The notion of and expectation of reciprocity is not in itself negative or adverse. In sum "...art (within the system of gifting) functioned as a status symbol and consequent focus of love and desire whose value could be traded in return for friendship, patronage and service."

Pierre Bourdieu

Of the different notions of gifting proposed, that of sociologist Pierre Bourdieu seems best suited to the work at hand even though he does not attempt to situate his study

---

exchanges establish relations between the subjects. It might, at first, seem more productive to work on commodity exchanges because the object is the objective of exchange. However, I am interested in the subtleties of how objects and people interrelate. As Schrift, 3 notes in his introduction, "...should anaylsis focus on the object given, on the relationship between the giver and the receiver, or on the inextricable interconnections between these objects and relations?" It is the latter that interests me here. Even though objects are the focal point, they do not exist in a vacuum.

219 Warwick, 632-633.

220 Warwick, 645.

221 Warwick, 645.
in a particular context. His study is more theoretically than empirically driven. But because he primarily works from a socio-political perspective, I have found much of value in his writings. In *The Logic of Practice* Bourdieu’s central struggle is with the ambiguity, or the dual nature, he observes in gift exchange; while intention may be conceived or perceived as a gesture of generosity, it does not come without strings.223

What makes the gift possible, he believes, is a collective misrecognition of the nature of this particular form of exchange. Participants overlook the obligation of reciprocity when they receive and later disguise it through a counter-gift which is both different and deferred.224 A lapse in time allows for both the illusion of generosity and the obligation to return while simultaneously distinguishing the gift from other forms of exchange such as barter, swap, or lend which obligate more immediate restitution.

Instead of framing the gift in economic terms alone, as do many of his colleagues, Bourdieu advocates the transformation of the gift into symbolic capital. In this case, it is not the economic value that defines the exchange, but the ties produced in giving and receiving equity. This is another difference between the gift and other types of exchange.225

---


223 Bourdieu, 231.

224 Bourdieu, 198.

225 Bourdieu, 216.
Bourdieu then asks a particularly important question. He queries not how gift exchange is theoretically possible or if it is or what it is, but why it is. What impels a society, nearly every society at that, to maintain and propel this type of interaction which permits both self-disregard and self-interest in a single act? Within the realm of politics, he posits that delusion is necessary and nurtured as domination becomes increasingly indirect. Disguised forms of influence are the foundation for maintaining control. However, they must be misrecognized in order for each participant to relinquish willingly his personal autonomy. This is possible through participation in gift exchange. Leaders “...cannot appropriate the labor, services, goods, homage and respect of others without ‘winning’ them personally, ‘tying’ them, in short, creating a bond between persons.” While Bourdieu’s point of departure is more theoretical, his attempt to define the need for gift exchange is an important undertaking.

---

226 Bourdieu, 240.

227 Bourdieu, 215.

228 Bourdieu, 219.
A variety of methodologies, ideas and conclusions submitted by different scholars working on the nature and practice of gifting have been discussed. They provide an introduction to the theoretical side of gift exchange as well as several models from which to work in seeking to understand gifting practices between Jahangir and Shah Abbas. In Chapter 5, I debate the application or rejection of different theories raised here as possible evidence towards an understanding of gifting in the Mughal-Safavid context. But before advancing to that proposal, four related case studies will be discussed, for each sheds further light on the period in question.
Chapter 4
Adjunct Case Studies: Four Contrasting Scenarios

Internal Gifting at Jahangir’s Court

In my father’s time it had become established that one of the great nobles should prepare an entertainment on each of the 17 or 18 days of the (New Year’s) festival, and should present his Majesty the king with choice gifts of all kinds of jewels and jeweled things, precious stuffs and elephants and horses, and should invite him to take the trouble to come to his assembly. By way of exalting his servants, he would deign to be present, and having looked at the presents would take what he approved of and bestow the remainder on the giver of the entertainment.220

Jahangir’s explanation of one facet of internal gifting, the festivities at New Year’s, as practiced at the Mughal court is very revealing. He establishes a precedent for receiving gifts from his subjects by referencing the actions of Akbar and provides some information about the types of gifts he was given, the circumstances in which such events could occur, and the proper protocol for participants. The acceptance, assessment and return of gifts presented to the emperor, for example, were quite common.231 But the frequency with which gifts were exchanged in a domestic setting far exceeded the annual festivities at New Year’s. Congratulatory gifts were also presented to honor imperial births, birthdays,

---

220In this case study, I follow the lead of J. Richards who also considers internal exchanges as gift. The applicability of that label and the nature of this practice will be discussed in Chapter 5 as it relates to external exchanges.

230Tizuk, 49.

231There are many references to this practice in the Tizuk among which the following are a sampling: 166-168, 171, 188, 192, 207, 235, 249, 280-283, 317-319, 413, 43a, 50a, 154a, 188a, 200a, 215a, 292a.
weddings, and military victories, at feasts and visits, as tribute, alms and so forth.\(^{232}\) Most frequently presented were gifts given as offerings to Jahangir by his courtiers and those given as rewards and distinctions to courtiers by Jahangir.

The Mughal state was a highly centralized autocracy where the fortunes and failures of the empire, in addition to those of each subject, were intricately interwoven with the judgment and strength of the emperor. He alone advanced honor through the dispensation of office and rank. Gifts, therefore, that accompanied a promotion such as robes of honor, jewels, cash, elephants, horses and weapons receive the most notices in the *Tuzuk*. Each is mentioned over one hundred times.\(^{233}\) Because they significantly outweigh all other references, it is important to consider them carefully despite the fact that they appear to be conventional gifts. That is to say, as stock types, they seem to reveal a facet of gifting that more unusual gifts lacked.

Conventional gifts visually located all participants, whether presenter, recipient or witness, within a common system of behavior which ensured a communal reading of each act of gift exchange. That is, consistency breeds clarity and conditions understanding. The meaning behind the gift stayed constant; the intent, I believe, was to inform each recipient of his place at court and make him beholden to it. To be certain, each stock type was appropriately tailored to suit the station of the recipient; those gifts were in fact a symbol

---

\(^{232}\)Any number of such references can be found throughout the *Tuzuk* including 78, 144, 188, 189, 335, 32a, 187a-188a, 276a. R. Khosla, *Mughal Kingship and Nobility* (Delhi: Idarah-i Adabiyat Delhi, 1976), 273 says wives were also expected to give gifts to each other.

\(^{233}\)See Appendix A, Part 3.
of rank.\textsuperscript{234} Thus a prince might receive a jeweled dagger, while a lower ranking courtier was presented with a less elaborate weapon. Ornamentation on a subsequent dagger or the quality of the gems inlaid in it likely grew as the honor and rank of the recipient increased.

It may be the case that some of these conventional gifts were chosen by historical precedent. Though a visitor at Jahangir’s court and only a temporary subject, Mutribi al-Asamm Samarqandi relates that Jahangir gave him four gifts over the course of a few days. Three of these gifts—cash, clothing, and a horse—are the same ones, legend has it, for which Jahangir’s legendary ancestor Timur (d.1405) and the poet Hafiz (d.1390) negotiated.\textsuperscript{235} The story was frequently recounted so it is quite likely Jahangir was familiar with it and may even have derived his own gifting practices from those of his revered ancestor. As Richard Foltz has stated, “Mutribi’s association of the story with his own experience with Jahangir is certainly an intentional reflection of the Mughal emperor’s attachment to the Timurid legacy.”\textsuperscript{236} On Jahangir’s lunar birthday, Mutribi was given “two trayloads of tangas, an almond of silver, folios of miniature paintings, all in all nearly two thousand things, which he poured into my bag with his own Justice-Worshipping hand.”\textsuperscript{237}

In contrast to robes and horses, other gifts, for example, jewelry, falcons, or

\textsuperscript{234}Gordon, 234, draws a similar conclusion.

\textsuperscript{235}Foltz, 18-21. The fourth gift Jahangir offered was a slave boy.

\textsuperscript{236}Foltz, 21 n.55.

\textsuperscript{237}Foltz, 36.
manuscripts, are mentioned only a few times, mostly as additions to stock types rather than as substitutes for them. One-of-a-kind gifts permitted Jahangir to express personal favor exclusive of his identity as “the state.” In this way, he cemented a bond of personal obligation, a protective measure should internal mutiny arise. Through public presentation of gifts to his courtiers, Jahangir ensured continued loyalty to both the state and himself. But just as important, gifts were a key facet to governing success, for the existence and growth of the empire was contingent upon the satisfaction each participant experienced in giving and receiving equity. For example, in order to offset any ill will that might result from the gift, Jahangir implemented certain rules including the following. “It had been the custom that when the gift of an elephant or horse was made to anyone, the naqibs and the Masters of the Horse took from him a sum of money as jilawana (bridle-money). I gave orders that this money should be paid by the government, so that people might be freed from the importunities and demands of that set of men.”238

The case of the Rana of Mewar and his son, Karan, is especially interesting to consider in light of this discussion on internal gifting. When Mughal forces defeated the Rajput ruler in 1614, the Rana “produced as offerings a famous large ruby that was in his house, with some decorated articles and seven elephants, some of them fit for the private stud, and which had not fallen into our hands and were the only ones left him, and nine horses.”239 The Mughals reciprocally bestowed gifts of honor on their newest courtiers. But the sense of equality in this example of internal gift exchange was soon eclipsed by the

---

238Tuzuk, 46.

239Tuzuk, 275-276.
blitz of gifts Jahangir gave to Karan once the latter officially took up residence at court.

Over the course of about three and a half months Karan received many pieces of jewelry including a pearl necklace worth 50,000 rupees, six weapons, golden vessels, perfumes, cash, cloth stuffs, carpets, twelve deer, ten Arabian dogs, three elephants, 123 horses, and two robes of honor among many other presents. Nearly all the gifts are qualified as special or jeweled.

By way of explanation Jahangir states, "As it was necessary to win the heart of Karan, who was of a wild nature and had never seen assemblies and had lived among the hills, I every day showed him some fresh favour." Jahangir no doubt realized that if rebellion to Mughal imperialism was instigated it would be at the behest of Karan, son of the defeated ruler. Therefore, Jahangir immediately inducted Karan into the system of gift exchange at an exponential rate of presentation in order to capture the young man's loyalty and indebtedness, to create personal ties, as soon as possible. To that end, Karan also received presents from the ladies at court including Nur Jahan, Jahangir's wife, who presented a rich dress of honor, a jeweled sword, a horse and saddle and an elephant. If any gifts were presented to Jahangir by Karan following the initial tribute from Mewar, the memoirs are silent about their reception.

---


241 *Tuzuk* 277.

242 *Tuzuk* 278.

243 See, for another case study on internal gifting, Richards (1981), 252-284. He considers the writings of Mirza Nathan, a courtier of Jahangir.
Although a subject depended on imperial favor to determine his standard of living, he could play an active role in its improvement. In addition to good deeds, gifts to the emperor might curry favor or incite promotion. Similar to his courtiers, Jahangir received personal gifts of jewels and state gifts of cash, elephants and horses, a reflection of the combined identity of emperor and empire. Though these four types were given most frequently, the number of one-of-a-kind gifts presented to Jahangir is particularly striking. There are nearly twice as many notices for unique gifts presented to Jahangir as there are for unique gifts presented by Jahangir. This suggests to me that while convention was clearly essential in the practice of gifting to courtiers, in the case of the emperor, one-of-a-kind pieces produced results.

To what extent a gift influenced imperial decisions is less certain. At the very least, gifts were part of the process on which negotiation and favor were built. No courtier was heard who did not submit some gift suitable to his position and ambition. Most likely a decision might be weighted, but not based on, pleasure taken in a gift. This is particularly true, I believe, at Jahangir’s court. Noted for lavish promotions, Jahangir seems to have allowed personal fancies frequently to override decisions affecting the state. “...All men ryse to greater and greater seignoryes, as they rise in favour, which is only gotten by frequent presents both rich and rare,” says Sir Thomas Roe.\textsuperscript{245}

\textsuperscript{244}W. Hawkins, \textit{The Hawkins Voyages}, Hakluyt Society Travelers ser. 1, v. 57 (London: Hakluyt Society, 1878), 409. The English representative of the East India company relates, “When I saw my time I made my petition unto the king (Jahangir). In this space I found a toy to give, as the order is: for there is no man that cometh to make petition, who cometh empty handed.”

\textsuperscript{245}Embassy, 105.
Internal gifting between Jahangir and his courtiers operated within a tightly organized system. Gifts presented by Jahangir to his subjects were an exercise of power, a means through which to ensure the state’s maturation and a subject’s solidarity.\textsuperscript{246} The systematic transactions of give and take promoted stability, discipline, involvement and submission in courtiers, factors imperative to the success of the emperor and his empire. Internal gifting, then, was more or less an affirmation of the emperor’s authority and a courtier’s subordination.

John Richards characterizes gift relationships between the emperor and his courtiers as “illusion” or “pretense.”\textsuperscript{247} If by illusion he means false sentiment, to me, that seems difficult to judge. If he means the transactions were not meaningful or substantive, I disagree. The case of Karan is indicative of the system’s fruition. The Mewar court remained loyal to the Mughals until the rule of Shah Jahan’s son Aurangzeb (r.1658-1707).\textsuperscript{248} Further, there are several entries in the \textit{Tuzuk} which speak of subjects who, after deviating in their loyalty to the emperor, could later reaffirm their solidarity to him by accepting his gifts.\textsuperscript{249} In order for the system, and the empire, to flourish the participants themselves had to subscribe to and endorse gift exchange for all of its aspects — symbolic, material, practical. But, the reverse was also possible. For example, Munshi states that the Mughal courtier Mahabat Khan did not receive the rewards he

\textsuperscript{246} \textit{Tuzuk}, 58. Here Jahangir states that the leader of a contingent of army rebels in league with Jahangir’s son Khusrau was a given a sum of money “to distribute amongst their men and make them hopeful of the Jahangiri favor.”

\textsuperscript{247} Richards (1981), 273.

\textsuperscript{248} Prasad, 244.

\textsuperscript{249} \textit{Tuzuk}, 265, 287, 402, 441, 59a, 214a, 294a.
expected for his service to Jahangir and so allied himself with the rebellious Shah Jahan.\textsuperscript{250} The number of references to internal gifting affirm that emperor and courtiers partook in such transactions regularly and thus, it becomes problematic to describes such events as “illusions.”

\textit{Representations of Internal Gifting and Internal Objects Exchanged}

Unlike the dearth of illustrations representing foreign gifting, numerous paintings survive which depict domestic gifting.\textsuperscript{251} A variety of contexts, participants, and object types are evident, however, making it somewhat difficult to ascertain patterns from which to propose conclusions. In some paintings Jahangir is depicted presenting gifts to his courtiers (cat. no. 68, 72, 73) while in others, Jahangir is the recipient (cat. no. 65-67, 70-71). In the case of catalogue numbers 69, it is unclear who is the giver and who is the recipient.

A variety of individuals take part in the painted exchanges with Jahangir. For examples, in two images Jahangir receives royal gifts from his father, Akbar (cat. nos. 65-66). The types of objects most often gifted from one emperor to another, a falcon, crown, or other symbolic item, have come to be associated with kingship and their exchange taken as an exhibition of legitimate rulership.\textsuperscript{252} By far the most blatant examples of this practice are seen in paintings produced under the patronage of Shah

\textsuperscript{250}\textit{Shah Abbas 2}: 1292.

\textsuperscript{251}See Appendix B, Part 7. This particular compilation is not intended as a comprehensive listing of paintings illustrating domestic gifting but as a useful sample for comparative purposes.

Jahan where Akbar presents a token of kingship directly to Shah Jahan, ignoring Jahangir's presence (cat. no. 74). The fact that royal gifters are typically staged in an anonymous or mystical setting with few, if any, witnesses present suggests that it is an extraordinary event rather than an ordinary, historical record being illustrated. And, in fact, the paintings are commonly interpreted in this manner.\(^{253}\)

By contrast, painted representations of gifting between Jahangir and his subjects are situated in a court setting (cat. nos. 68, 70-73). These examples seem to underscore the importance of official locale and ritual in certain types of exchanges. Also, the range of subjects represented—princes, intellectuals, nobles, and peons—affirms that the practice took place at all levels of society. Even the most humble of subjects may be given gifts on special occasions as can be seen at the bottom of *Festivities on the Occasion of the Accession of Jahangir* (cat. no. 75) where coins are scattered to a greedy crowd.

Though several types of objects are gifted in the paintings, including jeweled turban ornaments, a falcon, coins, food, jewelry, weapons, and cloth stuffs, the objects most frequently depicted in my sampling of paintings are books (cat. no. 68-70). One painting, in fact, can be linked to a particular passage in the *Tuzuk* where Jahangir mentions gifting manuscripts, or books. “On Tuesday the 16th, I again presented the Shaikhs of Gujarat, who were in attendance with robes of honour and maintenance-lands. To each of them I gave a book from my special library...I wrote on the back of the books the day of my arrival in Gujarat and the day of presentation of the books.”\(^{254}\) It is

\(^{253}\text{See, for example, Okada, 32.}\)

\(^{254}\text{*Tuzuk*, 439-440.}\)
noteworthy that in this painting and others where books are internally gifted, Jahangir’s partners are mystical figures such as the sufic poet Sa’di (cat. no. 70) or Shaikh Husain, the head of a celebrated shrine (cat. no. 69). Likely such men were the most prestigious source for book acquisition given their academic and spiritual leanings.

This aspect of internal gifting provides an interesting contrast to the case of foreign gifting where manuscripts, whether in textual sources or visual ones, are poorly represented. The interest in giving books internally is demonstrated in paintings and entries in the Tuzuk. It is also apparent in actual objects exchanged. As can be seen in Appendix A, Parts 3 and 4, specific notices to the gifting of books are not uncommon. Certainly they do not receive anywhere near the attention of conventional gifts, but among the more unusual pieces books hold their own. Further, among the actual objects exchanged internally that can be identified, all four are books (cat. nos. 61-64). The possible importance of the prominence of the book in internal gifting will be addressed in the conclusion.

Gifting between Akbar, Shah Jahan, and the Safavids

The second case study set forth for review considers Indo-Iranian embassies sent just prior to and just after those of Jahangir and Shah Abbas. Because Shah Abbas’ reign outlasted Jahangir’s on both sides, it is possible to study gifting patterns between him and

---

255 Seyller, 286, 287, 329, 331, 335, 338. Other books are known to have been internally gifted among the Mughal family including one Jahangir received from his father while still a prince (see Seyller, 325). A particular piece of Chinese porcelain also suggests internal gifting. The name “Salim” (Jahangir’s princely appellation) and phrase “this plate belongs to the most humble well-wisher of the State, Khan-e Khanan, servant of Akbar” are inscribed on a dish in the Bibi Maqbara Dedication, Archaeological Museum, Hyderabad. See, Das (1991/92), 391, 394. Because the dish predates Jahangir’s rule, however, it has not been included as evidence.
other Mughal emperors, namely Jahangir’s father, Akbar, and Jahangir’s son, Shah Jahan. However, unlike Jahangir, both Akbar and Shah Jahan conducted diplomatic relations with more than one Safavid emperor during the course of their reigns. Hence, their interest in pursuing relations at any particular moment had a certain fluidity, likely based on the strength and influence of the Safavid emperor in power. These policies are best judged by the number of embassies sent to and received from each emperor.

Throughout Akbar’s fifty year rule, embassies were sent as follows by the reigning Safavid emperor; two by Shah Tahmasp (r.1524-1576), none by Ismail II (r.1576-78), one by Sultan Muhammed Khudabanda (r. 1578-88), and three by Shah Abbas. Akbar sent only two envoys, both of those to Shah Abbas.256 The missions of the embassies appear to have been fairly standard—to congratulate and console, to share news of the empire, to secure an ally. References to gifts exchanged through them are less satisfying. “Choice presents,” “choice horses and other presents,” “gifts from the Turkish campaigns,” and “101 choice Iraqi horses, choice mares, 300 pieces of brocade, carpets, coverlets, splendid paintas, also, Turkish pavilions, embroidered mattresses, various seeds and 9 goats...other rarities and 500 Turkamans in rich dresses” seem to be the sum collection of references in written resources regarding gifts to Akbar from various Shahs.257 “Rarities of the country” and “camels bearing gifts” were given by Akbar to Shah Abbas.258


257Only the major translated sources relating to this time have been consulted. Calendar, A.44; Akbarnama 3, 893, 1112-1113, 1120; Shah Abbas, 723 describes a similar catalogue of gifts to Akbar. Calendar A. 35, there is, in addition, a letter to Akbar from one of his courtiers which reports Shah Abbas’ intention to send 60 horses, valuable presents, 100 Uzbegs, and 100 Uzbeg heads.

258Calendar, A.36; Akbarnama 3, 1013, 1237; Shah Abbas 2, 706.
Fortunately, a passage written by Iskandar Beg Munshi survives to paint a vivid picture of relations between Akbar and Shah Abbas and their effect on the practice of gifting.

The Shah received the Indian ambassador and Manueehr Beg in his camp beneath the walls of Erivan. The gifts sent by the Emperor were piled on top one another at the entrance to the royal pavilion, waiting for the Shah to inspect them, but the Shah was too busy with the prosecution of the siege to look at anything except the sword, that portent of good fortune. The Indian embassy waited four months in the bitter cold of the Erivan winter, keeping constant guard on their gifts in the royal pavilion. Finally, after the fall of Erivan...the presents from the Mogul emperor were finally presented to him, and the Shah distributed them among his officers and governors according to their rank.²⁵⁹

The lack of attention to gifting in the court histories and the lack of interest in commenting on specific gifts in imperial correspondence suggests the practice of gifting was not as keenly undertaken as it was between Jahangir and Shah Abbas. That is not to say that the importance of sending gifts was ignored or that gifting ceased during this time. Rather, I conclude the attention they received from the emperor was not as significant nor were embassies themselves as highly valued during this earlier era when judged by numbers alone.

Were it not for the words of Iskandar Beg Munshi, even a brief investigation of gifting between Akbar and Shah Abbas might prove completely fruitless. However, a few conclusions can be drawn already from the information presented thus far. First, the

²⁵⁹Shah Abbas 2, 838. In the Akbarnama 3, 1236-1237, Abul Fazl puts a charitable gloss on the events that transpired, no doubt one similar to that which was reported to the emperor. “The Shah had received him with great honour...The presents had been spread out and he (Shah Abbas) personally inspected all of them. He had for two or three days sent the ambassadors of Garjistan and the Sirdars of Turkestan and other strangers to inspect them. He had marvelled at beholding these rarities which were objects of admiration to all.”
stinginess of evidence on gifting from this period renders that which survives from the succeeding positively copious. That underscores the appropriateness of studying gift exchange during the reigns of Jahangir and Shah Abbas. Second, no primary written sources from the following era speak outright or subtly hint at unfavorable ambassadorial receptions such as Shah Abbas showed the Mughal envoy at Erivan. This suggests that relations between Jahangir and Shah Abbas were probably on the best terms two competitors could be.\textsuperscript{260}

Shah Jahan was a more active diplomat than either Jahangir or Akbar. Both the amount of correspondence and the number of embassies he sent to Iran significantly outweigh those of his father and grandfather. For every Persian embassy sent to wait on him, Shah Jahan reciprocated by sending his own delegate to accompany it. Shah Safi sent three embassies to Shah Jahan. Shah Jahan sent two to Shah Safi (1629-42) while his third arrived at the court of Shah Safi’s successor Shah Abbas II (1642-66). Two more embassies were sent to Shah Abbas II who sent one in return.

Like many princes, Shah Jahan initiated diplomatic contact with Iran before his actual succession to the throne. Generally, the Mughal princes, Shah Jahan included, sought advocates in anticipation of the war for succession or rebellion against the current emperor. Jahangir too had established correspondence with Shah Abbas prior to his accession.\textsuperscript{261} Object exchanges are only mentioned once in the early correspondence

\textsuperscript{260}Calendar, J. 47. While still a prince, Jahangir received a letter from Abbas in which the Shah complained of Akbar’s treatment of his ambassadors, their long detentions at court, and his general negligence in conducting proper diplomatic relations. The letter encourages the prince not to abide by his father’s model.

\textsuperscript{261}See section on trade below.
where Shah Jahan notes that various sample products from India accompanied his letter as was proper diplomatic procedure. In particular, booty from the Deccan and goods from Gujarat of the combined value of two lakhs, 50,000 rupees were sent.\textsuperscript{262} Whatever the Shah admired, Shah Jahan would continue to supply. The sentiments have an overtone of mercantile interest, but use of the word \textit{yadbud}, meaning remembrance or souvenir, which is used to describe the objects does contain enough ambiguity to conclude they might have been intended as gifts.\textsuperscript{263}

As emperor, Shah Jahan's interaction with Shah Abbas was minimal. In 1628, the Shah sent what might be characterized best as a scout rather than an envoy to the Mughal court to determine whether or not rumors of Jahangir's death could be confirmed.\textsuperscript{264} Soon after the scout's arrival news of Shah Abbas’ death reached the Mughal court. Shah Jahan sent his own scout to Iran to ascertain the validity of this news. Thus, the first missions to and from Shah Jahan make no mention of gifts.\textsuperscript{265}

This is typical of later correspondence between Shah Jahan and his Safavid contemporaries. Their imperial letters rarely mention the inclusion of gifts much less particular objects. Even though gifts are not mentioned, it goes without saying that they did accompany later embassies. Gifts were as an essential element of proper diplomatic conduct.\textsuperscript{266} The important point is simply that, similar to Akbar’s interactions with the

\textsuperscript{262}Shah Jahan Nama, 9.  
\textsuperscript{263}Calendar, Sh.100-106.  
\textsuperscript{264}Calendar, Sh. 107.  
\textsuperscript{265}Calendar, Sh. 107-108.  
\textsuperscript{266}Calendar, Sh. 127, for example, mentions continued goodwill and exchange of gifts.
Safavids, gifts were not considered worthy of mention. An embassy or an ambassador may be recognized in the text, but the bulk of the letters are dedicated to military undertaking.\textsuperscript{267} In reading through the correspondence, the primary purposes in sending embassies seems to have been to gather intelligence about the other’s activities, especially in regard to foreign policy, and to boast of victorious campaigns.\textsuperscript{268}

As to the specifics of gifts themselves, court histories, namely Shah Jahan’s \textit{Padshahnama}, mention a costly jeweled dagger and sword, a jeweled sword and sheath worth 50,000 rupees, and a pitcher, cup and salver valued at 50,000 rupees given to Shah Safi by Shah Jahan.\textsuperscript{269} Inayat Khan records an interesting event in the \textit{Padshahnama} regarding Shah Jahan and gifting. He notes that Shah Jahan gave his ambassador four lakhs of rupees to purchase presents for Shah Safi.\textsuperscript{270} Can it be concluded from this notice that Shah Jahan was so uninterested in gifting that he relied on his ambassador to select gifts for an imperial recipient? Or, was his directive common practice?

From Shah Safi, Shah Jahan received three lakhs of choice presents; 20 Iraqi horse, some camels, mules and rarities; and 12 horses and three guns taken from the booty of Erivan.\textsuperscript{271} The envoy of the ambassador Muhammad Ali Beg (cat. nos. 80-82) presented

\textsuperscript{267} \textit{Calendar}, Sh. 114-236. Following Mughal reoccupation of Qandahar, relations between the two empires became strained to the extent that highly placed officials, rather than the emperors, supervised diplomatic correspondence.

\textsuperscript{268} Though several histories survive from Shah Jahan’s reign, many of those are untranslated and unpublished. In keeping with my reasoning in footnote 25, only the major translated histories, namely the \textit{Shah Jahan Nama} of Inayat Khan, as well as correspondence and \textit{Shah Abbas} have been used.

\textsuperscript{269} \textit{Shah Jahan Nama}, 34, 207, 252.

\textsuperscript{270} \textit{Shah Jahan Nama}, 94.

\textsuperscript{271} \textit{Shah Jahan Nama}, 63, 122, 244.
50 horses and rarities.\textsuperscript{272} Shah Abbas II was gifted jeweled articles and 5,000 pieces of various costly manufactures from the empire valued at 3 lakhs 50,000 rupees and a jeweled sword and belt.\textsuperscript{273} Altogether, this listing is rather modest when compared with that cataloged in Appendix A, Parts 1 and 2.

\textit{Representations of Later Embassies}

Unlike the few scattered \textit{Tuzuk} illustrations extant today, a noteworthy number of illustrations from imperial copies of the \textit{Padshahnama} survive to the present.\textsuperscript{274} Two events chosen for representation from the Windsor Castle manuscript were receptions of Safavid embassies. In the first, Shah Jahan receives Muhammed Ali Beg, ambassador of Shah Safi (cat. no. 76). The ambassador is placed outside the red railing that distinguished highly esteemed personages within it from those secondary ones outside it (see figure 10 for an architectural depiction of this staging). Shah Jahan seems much more interested in conversing with his advisors than in acknowledging either the ambassador or the gifts he brought.

Although the artist depicts Shah Jahan as uninterested in his gifts, the artist himself has given them some attention. Gifts indifferently described by Inayat Khan in the text of the \textit{Padshahnama} as choice presents valued at three lakhs 50,000 rupees are more


\textsuperscript{273}\textit{Shah Jahan Nama}, 338, 364.

\textsuperscript{274}Beach and Koch, 15. It is difficult to ascertain how many copies are extant today. Beach asserts there are no missing illustrations in the Windsor Castle \textit{Padshahnama} which suggests at least one more copy survives as several dispersed folios have been catalogued. See for example, M. Beach, \textit{The Grand Mogul: Imperial Painting in India: 1600-1660} (Williamstown, MA: Sterling and Francine Clarke Art Institute, 1979), 84.
detailed in the painting. At the bottom, Safavid subjects, recognizable by their clothing and headgear, hold trays containing textiles primarily, but also a ceramic vase and saucer and a golden cup and vessel.\textsuperscript{275}

Ebba Koch has suggested that this may not be a literal depiction of the events that transpired at the reception of the Safavid ambassador, but a subtle representation of Indo-Iranian ambivalence. Shah Jahan’s lack of attention and Muhammed Ali Beg’s ranking in the painting were probably intended to degrade the Safavid empire.\textsuperscript{276} So too, the gifts depicted here may not be the exact ones presented on this occasion but a sampling of those typically sent, especially since there is nothing particularly unique about that which is represented. This conclusion provides an interesting contrast to the items represented in \textit{Jahangir Entertains Shah Abbas} (cat. no. 51) where each piece, whether the small Chinese cup or the Italian table, is unusual and certainly based on a specific prototype. Again, there would seem to be a difference in both the attention to and the appreciation for gifted objects between the courts of Jahangir and Shah Jahan, a difference that influenced the painters themselves in their commemoration of exchanges.

In a second painting, Yadgar Beg, ambassador of Shah Safi, is received by Shah Jahan (cat. no. 77).\textsuperscript{277} His reception is more congenial for Shah Jahan’s gaze is directed towards the ambassador who stands inside the railing demarcating distinguished courtiers.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[275] Beach and Koch, 52, 176-177. Beach has suggested that the book held by a Mughal courtier on the left side of the composition was probably intended as evidence of foreign gifting practices.
\item[276] Beach and Koch, 176-177.
\item[277] Beach and Koch, 221. The Persian in attendance of Shah Jahan has most recently been identified as Yadgar Beg by Beach. Previously, the figure was thought to be Ali Mardan Khan. See, for example, \textit{Shah Jahan Nama}, pl. 5.
\end{footnotes}
Yadgar Beg is depicted raising his hand deferentially to his head. Horses mentioned in the text are represented below while presents which could fall into the category of rarities are on the left. Again the artist has elaborated on the imprecise text, but has still chosen fairly common gift types. Among the items in the trays are jewels and jeweled objects such as knives, vessels, bracelets and necklaces. Mules and camels, though noted in the text, are not depicted.

Although text and image in both cases contain somewhat different information regarding the types of gifts presented to Shah Jahan, none is particularly specific about what those gifts were. Instead, generic descriptions of rarities, choice goods, Iraqi horses and generic representations of jeweled things, textiles, and horses predominate. For both the historian and the artist, attention to this sort of detail was not a primary concern. It might be inferred, therefore, and imperial correspondence would tend to corroborate the conclusion, that documentary interests followed those demonstrated by the emperor. In other words, Shah Jahan was more interested in policy, protocol, information and the way gifts affected each of those designs than in the objects themselves. Court artists responded in kind.

Two additional, slightly later paintings on the subject of Indo-Iranian relations, survive as well. In each, a Persian artist has depicted the meeting of Shah Abbas II (r.1642-66) and an ambassador of the Mughal emperor Aurangzeb. They are reproduced here as catalogue numbers 78 and 79. Unlike the ambassadorial encounters depicted by Shah Jahan's court artist, however, these images seem less politically charged. In fact, the
paintings are more in keeping with the earlier ambassadorial paintings of Shah Abbas and Khan Alam than with the later encounters illustrated under Shah Jahan.

In contrast to Mughal representations of Persian ambassadors (cat. no. 76-77), encounters between an ambassador and a Persian emperor (cat. nos. 1-21, 78-79) are much more intimate in terms of setting, the closeness of the two key figures, and the degree to which they acknowledge one another. Gifts are depicted when the Mughal emperor is present, but not when a Safavid one was. Likely this comparison is more telling of Safavid reception practices than of any direct artistic influence from one generation to the next. Though not so divulging of gifts or gifting practices, the observation nevertheless imparts an important difference between the two dynasties in terms of protocol and official representations of the emperor.
Gifting between Jahangir and the English

Knowing the custome of these Moors, without gifts and bribes nothing would either goe forward or bee accomplished, I sent my broker to seeke out jewels, fitting for the King's sister and paramour and likewise, for this new vizier, and his sonne. Now after they had my gifts, they beganne on all sides to solicit my cause...the great vizier asked me what toy I had for the King, I showed him a ruby Ring I had gotten, at the sight of which he bade me make readie to goe with him at Court time and he would make my petition to the king and told me that the King was alreadie wonne.278

The Mughal court, and the Safavid court too for that matter, conducted diplomatic relations with other empires in addition to each other. Both sent and received representatives from the Deccani states in India, the Ottomans in Turkey, and the Uzbegs in Central Asia. European travelers, clergy and diplomats were another prominent contingent at court. Of different cultures and ambitions, European foreigners nevertheless had a much greater, long-term impact on the courts they visited than many of the embassies recognized in their own time as more influential. For example, Sir Thomas Roe, ambassador of the British Crown and first negotiator for the East India Company, planted the seeds for England's colonial presence in India in later centuries.

In some ways, an understanding of the period under investigation is better gained through the words and experiences of European travelers than the dynasties' own court histories composed concurrently. Because their encounters in India were both novel and interactive, and more importantly, because their words survive to describe those experiences, European travel accounts are a significant source for seventeenth-century court life. Therefore, it is worth considering how diplomatic relations and the notion of

278Hawkins, 414-415. However, his petition was denied after protests and debate by certain Mughal courtiers.
gifting were construed by Europeans, English envoys in particular, as they compare and contrast to the histories recorded under Jahangir and Shah Abbas.

On the European side, information regarding gifting practices, as can be seen from my discussion in Chapter 1, is fairly strong. This includes writings by travelers such as Roe and Della Valle commenting on both European and non-European, in other words Safavid, participation in exchanges with the Mughals. Persian sources such as the Tuzuk, however, are completely fruitless when it comes to investigating policy, embassies and gifting with Europeans. The court histories and memoirs that have been consulted at length up to now are mysteriously silent about European visitors at the Mughal court. It is difficult, therefore, to locate moderation in the opinions expressed by Europeans since there are few sources to counter them.

With their naïveté of local customs, European writers often misconstrued that which they observed and reported in such a way that reveals more about the author than about what he writes. Alternatively, European sources tend to provide more details of daily life and extraordinary events that indigenous writers may have overlooked as commonplace. The frustrations and revelations, the insights and ignorance, the aversions and pleasures characteristic of foreign encounters are all present in the sources and provide an interesting lens through which to examine Anglo-Indian gifting.

But beyond the bias of words are the actual experiences these individuals had and recorded. Among those was gifting for which European sources, the English especially, have some interesting observations to share. Two voices in particular, those that represent official English encounters, will be considered here: Captain William
Hawkins (1608-13), the first representative of King James at Jahangir’s court and his
ambassadorial successor, Sir Thomas Roe (1615-19).

In his statement at the opening of this chapter, Hawkins reveals that gifts not only
had to be presented to the emperor in order to have requests heard, but to anyone of
influence at court. These pre-gift gifts ushered in the next stage of presentation whereby
the emperor’s gifts were inspected for suitability. It is probably the case that the English
had to lobby for acceptance much more strenuously than their previously established
counterparts, the Safavid ambassadors, to catch the attention and interest of their Mughal
patrons. I believe that Persian ambassadors were not filtered through the chain of
command in order to receive an audience with the emperor as were the English.279

It is interesting and noteworthy that Hawkins, who was multi-lingual, calls the
items given gifts. Certainly the nuances of translation are not an issue here, as they are in
the Tuzuk thus providing some verification that the transactions conducted by foreigners
and subjects at Jahangir’s court fall within the realm of gifting. Alternatively, it could be
the case that this particular Englishman and others who use the word gift did not grasp the
nature of the exchange. And, in fact, Hawkins refers to the act as both a gift and a bribe,
contradictory yet closely linked descriptions. I think, however, that gift rather than bribe is
closer to the ideology behind the presentation and expectation of equity. There was
nothing illegal or underhanded about conducting such transactions. Instead, I sense that in
presenting a gift, a gesture of friendship was initiated which was then returned by the

---

279 See, for example, my discussion in Chapter 2 regarding embassy protocol where I noted that
Muhammad Riza Beg was granted an audience with Jahangir upon his arrival at court. This seems to
preclude any intermediate advocates.
recipient through willingness to support the presenter’s cause. Hawkins makes a similar assessment,

His cousome is that when you petition him for anything, you must not come empty handed but give him some toy or other, whether you write or no, by the gift you give him, he knoweth that you demand some thing of him: so after enquiry is made, if he seeth it convenient, he granteth it.\textsuperscript{280}

Finally, it seems from Hawkins’ statements that gifts were quite influential in determining policy and that a decision was likely based on the quality of the piece to be presented. This is affirmed by another statement he makes in which it is revealed that Jahangir accepted gifts and agreed to a petition from Hawkins only to revoke it later when feted with gifts and counter council from the Portuguese. “Upon receiving and reading of this, the king went againe his word esteeming a few toyes which the father had promised him more than his honour.”\textsuperscript{281}

In addition to his revelations regarding Anglo-Mughal gifting, Hawkins also provides insight into internal gifting. He explains the practice of gifting as exemplified by the Mughal courtier Mocre-Chan and Jahangir as follows.

After newes came that Mocre-Chan was approached neere, the King presently sent to attach all his goods, which were in abundance, that the King was two months in viewing them, every day alloting a certaine quantitie to be brought before him and what he thought fitting for his owne turne he kept and the rest he delivered againe to Mocre-Chan.\textsuperscript{282}

Hawkins’ observations are in keeping with other evidence considered earlier. Jahangir’s eagerness to receive gifts, the practice of viewing gifts over a period of time so as to

\textsuperscript{280}Hawkins, 440.

\textsuperscript{281}Hawkins, 410.

\textsuperscript{282}Hawkins, 406.
extend the ceremony, and his habit of returning that which did not please are each evident.

Similarly, the writings of Sir Thomas Roe are revealing of gifting practices at Jahangir’s court. But, unlike Hawkins’ occasional choice quotes, Roe’s journals and letters are perennially preoccupied with his attempts to obtain high quality gifts through which to promote his negotiations with Jahangir. Roe pleads in most of his letters to the East India Company to send more, and more impressive gifts, maintaining that no progress could be made without them. Not only was the honor of England, King James, and Roe himself on the line because of the poor showing, but trade negotiations floundered until such a time when good presents could be gifted.\footnote{Embassy, 76-77, 161, 352.} Roe says, “He (Jahangir) accepted your presents well; but after the English were come away he asked the Jesuyte whether the King of England were a great Kyng that sent presents of so small valewe...”\footnote{Embassy, 99 in a letter to the East India Company describing Jahangir’s opinion of English gifts.} Often, Roe’s interactions with the nobility and the imperial family were contingent upon his selection of presents to give, or lack thereof.\footnote{Embassy, 332, 386. On 454, Roe notes a Spanish ambassador was refused audience with Jahangir because his gifts were not of high enough quality.}

Roe even went as far as to make future recommendations regarding the types of gifts to send. Jewels, paintings and pictures, fine textiles, wine, table knives and swords, armor, beautiful clothing and anything rare were among the items he deemed fit for the emperor.\footnote{Embassy, 99, 312, 458-459.} The last was especially important. “These people are very curious and can
judge workmanship well; but you must fitt them with variety, for they are soone cloyd with one thing.”

Time and again Roe notes how eager Jahangir was to receive presents, continually pressing the ambassador to present them, to report the types of gifts being sent, or their progress from England. Roe attributed this proclivity to greed and, while that is certainly a fitting description, it does obscure some nuances at work I believe. For example, it is clear from Jahangir’s own writings that he had a genuine curiosity for the unusual and love of beautiful art. The fact that all political negotiations were appended with the presentation of unusual and beautiful equity must have fed his own interests, promoted his natural inclinations.

Courtiers, among them princes, in imitation of the emperor’s lifestyle and tastes, would also have desired to possess esteemed objects, mostly obtainable through gifts. The pool of objects available and the opportunity to acquire them, then, amounted to a great competition. This is particularly apparent in an incident recounted by Roe where presents intended for Jahangir which had recently arrived in Surat from England were seized by the prince Shah Jahan, governor of the region. Eventually, the goods found their way to Jahangir who sorted through them and selected what he admired, rather than

---

287 *Embassy*, 312. Roe, 449, also says (in a moment of supreme frustration no doubt) “The presents yow sent are in their kynds some good, others ordinarie. Noe man can tell what to advise for; they change every yeare their fancy.”


289 *Embassy*, 227, 427.
waiting for Roe to arrive and present his own selection as gifts.290 Roe was furious, understandably, at his resulting exile from the exchange, his only lifeline to court politics.

Unlike the Persian ambassadors who visited Jahangir's court, Roe's expenses were not covered by the Mughal emperor. Though a few gifts, primarily food obtained through hunts as well as a portrait coin and a jeweled dish, were presented to Roe throughout the course of his residence at court, he was not given funds to maintain his embassy as the East India Company had hoped.291 The practice was, after all, a typical aspect of Mughal protocol. How then can this oversight be explicated?

While it might be attributed to Jahangir's lack of interest in fostering relations with England, I think an alternative conclusion could also be drawn. Roe himself spurned the opportunity afforded him. He was not willing to humble himself, as did Muhammad Riza Beg for example, in order to please Jahangir. He did not wish to submit to Jahangir's authority, whatever form that might take, but particularly as symbolized through gifting. "I have shuffled better out and escaped and avoyded affrounts and slavish customes clearer then ever did. I am allowed rancke above the Persian, but he outstripps mee in rewards..."292 Whenever Roe was asked to name his gift, as was common practice at the Mughal court, he refused by answering something along the lines of whatever Jahangir

290Embassy, 345-347.

291Embassy, 88, 120, 214, 220, 225.

292Embassy, 318. See also 264.
wanted to give him.\textsuperscript{293} Sometimes he refused to accept gifts as an individual at court except on behalf of King James I.

\begin{center}
Have not I (Jahangir) the best, and have I not told you what soever you desired. I thanked His Majestie, but I held it not civilitie to trouble him in such trifles, especially as a begger. He replied it was noe shame to ask of him, and bad mee speake at all tymes freely; pressing mee to ask some what. I answered I would not choose my guife...\textsuperscript{294}
\end{center}

Roe must have recognized, to some extent, that participating in the system of Mughal gifting would completely compromise his honor and loyalty to the British Crown. He would lose personal autonomy if he submitted to Jahangir’s strategy for submission symbolized in the giving and receiving of equity between two individuals. Roe was probably correct in his assessment of the implication of gifting. However, in not wishing to allow Jahangir too much influence over his path, and preventing Jahangir from doing so by refusing to participate in gift exchange other than as King James’ representative, Roe additionally renounced imperial support for his embassy.

Though Roe and his European counterparts seem to have grasped the necessity of gifting and the meaning behind the act, certain nuances of the practice escaped them ultimately hindering their objectives in traveling to court. This is most insightfully realized by Roe towards the end of his appointment in India where he states in a letter to the East India Company,

\begin{center}
...for our trouble is all aboute the presents....This counsell Asaph Chan first gave, telling me we were foole and had brought up a custome to our owne hurt: the King expected nothing of merchants but to buy, and at entrance (as fashion) a toy, and when anie petition, the like: that when we gave in
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{293}Foltz, 19, 37. “Mutribi” al-Asamm of Samarkand, for example, was quite comfortable asking for the most expensive items possible.

\textsuperscript{294}Embassy, 200-201.
gave in the name of the King it should be seldomer, and then befitting his honour. He demanded who practized this course but yourselves (i.e. the Company), neither Duitch, Persians, nor Armenian merchants; neither did the King expect it. I know this both wise and thriftie counsell...295

This explains, in part, the difficulty the English experienced in trying to follow the custom of gift exchange. In attempting to gain respect through affiliation with the English King, the company raised Jahangir’s expectations to an imperial level, one they were not prepared to ascend materially. Ironically, the company defeated its own agenda by failing to conform with that set of Mughal gifting practices whereby gifts worthy of imperial participants were exchanged. Instead, Jahangir was honored only with the name of King James and denied the presents befitting that title.

In comparison with any Persian ambassador who had the advantage of historic diplomatic contact between the dynasties, familiarity with customs, serving a known, liked and respected patron, and of a much closer homeland, it is not surprising that the English fought and suffered for their nescience. Roe struggled to grasp and resolve those differences he did not understand. He discovered that art presented as gifts to Jahangir was subsequently interpreted both on its own terms and as reflections of the English empire and its ruler. For, in fact, those works of art gifted to Jahangir were central to the ways in which the empires understood one another. Where oral or written contact proved fruitless or inhibiting, the quality and beauty of visual culture spoke its own language.

---

295Embassy, 459.
Roe's thoughts above affirm that Jahangir was cognizant of differences between mercantile activity and official ambassadorial missions and expected those differences to be respected in foreign relations. The subtle difference between trade relations and imperial gifting and how either functioned within a general system of transfers will therefore be the subject the final case study, primarily as such activities were practiced by Jahangir and Shah Abbas.
Trade relations between Jahangir and Shah Abbas

Of the four adjunct case studies, mercantile activity between Jahangir and Shah Abbas is perhaps the most difficult to flesh out. This is due mainly to the lack of distinction made between gifting and trade that is occasionally evident in written sources, both primary and secondary. Nevertheless, it is my objective here to distinguish one from the other to some extent. For, if there is no difference, then the notion of gifting is not relevant to the context of Indo-Iranian encounters. Some other type of cultural and economic exchange is at work.

The emperors frequently dispatched merchants to foreign countries in search of exotic, unusual, and highly coveted equity. Sometimes, these merchants were directed to visit the courts of foreign rulers, serving as unofficial ambassadors to their hosts. When an embassy was not officially appointed to convey the regards and gifts of one emperor to another, a merchant could become an interim carrier. Jahangir, in fact, frequently sent gifts to Abbas through merchants. It will be recalled that Shah Abbas sent several official envoys and embassies to Jahangir, but Jahangir sent only one embassy to Shah Abbas. Otherwise, gifts were sent through Abbas’ returning envoys or merchants rather than Jahangir’s own representatives.

Jahangir says, for example, “I sent off Muhammad Husain Chelebi, who understood the purchase of jewels and collecting curiosities, with money to go by way of Iraq to Constantinople and buy and bring for the Sarkar curiosities and rarities. For this

---

296 Tuzuk, 237-238, 270, 310, 24a.
purpose it was necessary that he should pay his respects to the ruler of Iran." Merchants as envoys probably were not entrusted with sensitive missions; primarily they sustained good relations. For the purposes of this project, however, it is worth noting that they were provided with gifts for presentation from both sides.  

Jahangir continues his narrative,

Briefly, he saw my brother, Shah Abbas, in Mashhad, and the king inquired from him what kinds of things should be brought for his master’s Sarkar. As he was urgent, Chelebi showed the list he had brought with him. In the list there were entered good turquoise and mumiya (bitumen) from the mines of Isfahan. He told him that these two articles were not to be bought, but he would send them for me.  

If a second-hand report is considered a reliable source, than it is possible to conclude that there was a difference between gifting and trading, but that the two were closely intertwined too. This difference is also apparent in Safavid activities. In one case, the Safavid ambassador Denghiz Beg Rumlu was executed for gifting his sample of silk to the Portuguese king instead of selling it as mandated by Abbas. In addition to presenting gifts on behalf of an emperor, a merchant presented his own gifts. He too was required to participate in court protocol in order to facilitate his own agenda, namely to sell and purchase goods abroad.

---

297 Tuzuk, 237-238.
298 Tuzuk, 310.
299 Tuzuk, 237-238.
301 Merchants, like ambassadors, were expected to pay personal homage to the emperor.
Among the earliest references to trade are those found in an imperial letter from Shah Abbas to Jahangir prior to the latter’s accession to the throne. In it, the Shah insists the prince send his merchants through official channels when entrusted with buying missions. Pieces were not to be acquired from the marketplace, but from the imperial storehouses.\footnote{Calendar J.47.} Probably, Shah Abbas wished to keep abreast of the needs and interests of his forthcoming rival in India. Abbas was able to demonstrate amity and goodwill at the same time overseeing and presumably dictating what would or could return to the Mughal prince.

Jahangir himself was quite amenable to receiving the Shah’s personal attention in such matters as he relates in one of his letters.\footnote{IPR, 72.} In fact, this preferential treatment enabled Jahangir to request goods that could only be procured through the Shah’s intervention. For example, certain items on Jahangir’s lists were not products of Iran. As a result, the Shah ordered the items from wherever they derived, Venice or other European cities, a task Jahangir’s own merchants would have undertaken with great expense and difficulty.\footnote{Calendar, J. 77.}

At what point items requested for trade became gifts or retained their identity as commerce is often obscure. In correspondence, both emperors were repeatedly encouraged by their counterpart to request particular items.\footnote{Calendar, J. 56, 61, 62, 70, 76, 77.} From Abbas, for example, Jahangir desired an astrolabe that had once belonged to his ancestor Ulugh Beg. The Shah
ordered a replica made of the one in his collection and sent the original to Jahangir.\textsuperscript{306} As a side note, it is quite interesting that the emperors were familiar enough with the contents of the other’s treasuries that it became possible to request specific items. It is not always clear, however, if these requested objects were gifted or purchased.\textsuperscript{307} The following incident, documented in an imperial letter, demonstrates both were practiced. Jahangir’s request for rubies gleaned two sets from Abbas. One group with Timurid inscriptions appears to have been gifted while a bill of sale accompanied the second.\textsuperscript{308} Oddly, all the rubies were among Abbas’ \textit{wargf} donations and thus required special attention to release them from the shrines they had been gifted to first.\textsuperscript{309} What can be made of a gift sent at the request of the receiver, not at the initiative of the presenter? This type of inquiry will be addressed in Chapters 5 and 6.

If merchants were considered envoys, it is also the case that ambassadors could be merchants. In most cases the ambassador did not carry a joint position as official trader and ambassador, but sometimes he participated in unofficial trading.\textsuperscript{310} Typically, taxes were imposed on land trade and on sea trade controlled by European merchants. Ambassadors, however, were exempt from such fees and permitted to carry personal

\textsuperscript{306}See Appendix A and B for additional examples qualified by the word requested.

\textsuperscript{307}\textit{IPR}, 73, n.3. Islam, in his own translations, also notes a certain ambiguity between the two types of exchanges.

\textsuperscript{308}\textit{Calendar}, J.70 and J.71.

\textsuperscript{309}Those rubies referenced in J. 71 may or may not have been \textit{wargf} donations. The letter simply states the gems were originally prepared for the shrine at Mashhad and the \textit{ulama} had agreed to their release and sale.

\textsuperscript{310}\textit{IPR}, 228.
property duty free. Hence, it became quite profitable for an envoy to import and export goods. Employees of the East India Company, cognizant of the practice, were frustrated by their inability to collect taxes on such items.\textsuperscript{311} Riazul Islam speculates that kings themselves and other highly placed courtiers may have quietly participated in import/export ventures through their ambassadorial representatives.\textsuperscript{312}

Though it is clear from the ideas set forth above that there was a difference between trading and gifting, an attempt to associate certain types of objects within either category is a futile undertaking. It appears that the distinction was more at the discretion of the emperor than determined by the actual object itself. And, in fact, the same type of object could be reconciled to both categories based on the circumstances of its acquisition as was the case of the rubies discussed above. As a result, I have included objects that are not clearly designated trade items in my compilation of gifts in Appendix A.

If objects traded and gifted suggest certain similarities, so too do the roles of both traders and ambassadors. Partly, this can be accounted for by the great distances that separated the courts. It would have been expedient to command a traveler to serve more than one function.

As for the emperors themselves, the possible reasons for conducting both trade and gifting relations are manifold. For example, trade produced an opportunity to procure resources, goods and possessions not available at home and not offered through ambassadorial gifting. Trade also underscored the emperors’ shared interest and


\textsuperscript{312}\textit{IPR}, 234.
appreciation for antiquities and unusual objects. The degree of discussion regarding objects, whether those sent, received, requested, purchased, or gifted comes across as a major preoccupation in the letters of Jahangir and Shah Abbas, especially in comparison to those of Shah Jahan and his assorted counterparts in Iran. Among them, gathering intelligence was a major objective.

The re-enforcing of their shared appreciation of objects through imperial trade strengthened relations between Jahangir and Shah Abbas on levels that were both political and personal. Each began to know the other better through his artistic tastes and sensibilities. Likely any inside understanding of a counterpart’s character assisted in the formulation of foreign policy. For example, Abbas, increasingly cognizant of Jahangir’s interest in ancestral items, capitalized on the Mughal emperor’s appreciation when attempting to manipulate his actions with objects such as Ulugh Beg’s ruby. Although gifting made such insights possible as well, trade increased the frequency of exchanges generating well-informed perception. Finally, trade enabled the emperors to procure high quality goods without becoming indebted to the source.
Each of these four case studies could surely be expanded on its own terms with significant analytical possibilities. For even the abbreviated investigations presented here reveal interesting evidence. Seen through the lens of gifting between Jahangir and Shah Abbas, to be undertaken in the following chapters, some degree of information about internal gifting, trade relations, gifting between other Mughal and Safavid emperors as well as between Jahangir and the English can be gained. But more importantly for the purposes of this project, each of the four case studies significantly shapes the way in which gifting between Jahangir and Shah Abbas can and should be understood. Taken together with gift theory and the primary evidence, it is now possible to play with the notion of gift exchange and the appreciation of equity as practiced by Jahangir and Shah Abbas.
Chapter 5
Gift Giving between Jahangir and Shah Abbas: A Proposal

“I value your friendship more than the whole world, and more than any gift.”

It was a conviction expressed by Jahangir to Shah Abbas in a letter of 1622-23, but was it true? What was the relationship between friendship and gifting, between political maneuvering and gifting? What did gifting works of art accomplish? Why were objects sent and received? What was the nature of gift exchange in this Mughal-Safavid context and how can the gift be defined within it? These types of questions and their answers will be the focus from this point forward as I analyze the primary and secondary evidence set forth in the preceding chapters in order to understand gift giving between Jahangir and Shah Abbas and the role of the object within it.

To begin with, it is necessary to determine whether gift giving is an appropriate term to describe and evaluate certain types of transactions conducted by Jahangir and Shah Abbas. I confess I am determined to address this basic challenge in the affirmative; otherwise, the work I have produced to date has no basis and the project would have to be abandoned. However, I would not have carried my investigation to this point had the information not led in this direction so my bias is not unfounded.

It is my objective to explicate here why I believe objects exchanged through ambassadorial parties can and should be identified as gifts, what gifting meant within that context, and how gifting impacted art. This chapter and the following one essentially
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address those three lines of thought, but breakdown as follows. In this chapter I address the theory, the action of gifting, and the role of art within it. In the latter I consider the gift, the object itself, and how the practice of gifting affected art.

There are two general methods through which to consider the basic query of what is a gift within the context of Mughal and Safavid relations. On the one hand, it is possible to construct a theory and apply it selectively to certain scenarios as evidenced by the work of Mauss, Derrida, and Bourdieu. On the other hand, context can be taken as the starting point and theories developed from it, the approach used by Richards, Gordon, and Warwick. Each method has the potential to contribute something valuable, but because I do not find them to be discrete entities, a conflated approach incorporating both is employed here.

In its simplest definition, a gift is more than just the presentation of equity with an immediate economic return. There is presentation, often characterized as an altruistic gesture, and there is still an expectation of return. However, unlike other types of transfers, the return is delayed. This creates a period of indebtedness during which personal ties are developed. As gifting has been studied, exchange is more than simple acquisition. It is, in essence, about relationships.

According to Mauss, the intent in giving a gift is to foster and nurture relations with the receiver through a cycle of mutual indebtedness. Warwick drew a similar conclusion when she stated that immaterial gain rather than material gain is the objective of gifting. And Bourdieu proposed that a gift is not simply an economic transaction, but a transformation of material goods into symbolic capital. Though not referring to robes of
honor as gifts *per se*, the products of internal Mughal exchange that Gordon acknowledged such as honor, reward, and promotion, could be characterized as immaterial gain. In sum, the gift embodies all sorts of aspirations and agendas. Like other types of exchanges, it demands some form of restitution appropriate to the condition it embodies. However, unlike other transfers, where the objective is economic or material profit, the gift allows for intangible benefit through the period of indenture that arises from delayed restitution.

With this working definition of the gift derived from various scholarly suppositions, I turn to the context under investigation. A review of several examples confirms that internal and external exchanges should be classified as gift transactions. To illustrate this point, I examine a few below. Each demonstrates that relations were a primary objective of the exchange and is, therefore, evidence of gifting.

It may be recalled that both Derrida and Benveniste advocated analysis of vocabulary, of the word “gift” itself, as the basis for constructing a more general theory about its nature. Two prominent scholars of the Persian language, Wheeler Thackston and John Seyller, agree that terminology in this context is rather straightforward.\(^{314}\) In the *Tuzuk*, Jahangir uses words such as *inayat* and *marhamat* to describe items he gifts to his subjects.\(^{315}\) Each translates generally as favor or honor. Receiving a present from the emperor, therefore, was about privilege, a method through which Jahangir could show favor. For gifts presented to Jahangir by his courtiers, *pishkash* is the most frequently

\(^{314}\) Personal correspondence.

employed word.\textsuperscript{316} As Lambton stated, that term connotes gifts from an inferior to a superior.

First and foremost then, the vocabulary of the gift suggests that exchanges were primarily meant to affirm the superiority of the emperor in every domestic encounter. Each object Jahangir received was from an inferior and he alone bestowed favor. In Jahangir’s case, it was not better to give than to receive or even vice versa since either action achieved the necessary end. Perhaps this is why paintings of internal gifting (cat. nos. 65-73) depict Jahangir in both positions. In this example, hierarchical relationships were the result of internal exchanges and as such they can be qualified as gift transactions.

With regard to foreign gift exchange with Shah Abbas, Jahangir’s writings are more ambiguous. In the \textit{Tuzuk}, he carefully avoids using verbs that suggest the power structures of gifting when discussing equity given to and from Shah Abbas. Instead of \textit{pishkash}, for example, the less loaded verb \textit{ferestadan} (to send) is used.\textsuperscript{317} The possible reasons for this choice will be considered later in the chapter. For the moment, it is worth noting that Jahangir seems to have been aware that some sort of relation was developing in exchanging gifts since, in his writings, he attempted to neutralize those power structures through deliberate word choices.

Although power relations are not explicitly present in the literature, they are suggested in the practice of gifting between Jahangir and Shah Abbas. In particular, those objectives are noticeable in regifting where an object received from one source was later

\textsuperscript{316} See, for example, \textit{Jahangirnama}, 142, 159, 348.

\textsuperscript{317} \textit{Jahangirnama}, 110, 140, 370.
given to a third party. For example, the Shah gave Jahangir items he had acquired through victory over the Ottomans while Jahangir sent him "jeweled things" offered by the Deccani states whose independence Abbas sponsored.\textsuperscript{318} Objects might be regifted to emphasize international influence and wealth, to flaunt relations with the original presenter, or to affirm subordination of a foreign power.\textsuperscript{319} Of course, regifting was also an excellent opportunity to divest the treasury of unwanted possessions.

Jahangir occasionally regifted items to his courtiers that he had originally received from Abbas. For example, a black horse from the Shah was later given to Mahabat Khan.\textsuperscript{320} Such objects were no doubt considered extraordinary favors. Not only was their quality exceptional, but they purveyed a dual imperial provenance. Ulugh Beg’s ruby is the most notable internally regifted object, although the motive for regifting it might have exceeded the desire to bestow great honor. It may have been the case that the value of certain pieces gifted by Abbas was too great to retain possession. The ruby may have symbolized a level of relations whose intensity Jahangir was not prepared to honor. The degree of indenture may have outweighed the degree of pleasure received from the gift. If so, the piece may have been regifted to pass along its liability, thereby lessening its control or at least using its control to ensure some counter source of obligation and regain a measure of authority. In terminology and practice, the acquisition and expression of

\textsuperscript{318}See Appendix A, Parts 1 and 2.

\textsuperscript{319}IPR, 229. In Abbas' case, regifting items acquired from other foreign powers might have been linked to the Shah’s waqf policies. The extent to which his treasury was depleted by those gifts to his empire is uncertain. The availability of high quality items may have been limited.

\textsuperscript{320}Tuzuk, 285.
hierarchical relationships were important by-products of internal and external exchanges, and therefore, are evidence of gifting.

The letters from Shah Abbas that Jahangir copied so carefully into the Tuzuk not only suggest that personal relations were a consequence, but prove it to be the case. It will be recalled that three of the Shah’s letters brought by various Safavid ambassadors were included in Jahangir’s memoirs. They receive a great deal more attention than the accompanying objects. Clearly, the immaterial relationship was privileged over the material gain.

To look at a specific internal example, the case of Jahangir’s courtier Karan, first discussed in Chapter 4, also demonstrates that personal ties rather than return goods were an objective of exchange. To him, Jahangir gave a sizable amount of equity, including conventional items such as robes of honor and swords as well as unique goods, and promotions. The young courtier, however, had done nothing as yet to earn his rewards. Jahangir received no material goods in return, but he captured the loyalty of his newest courtier. As Warwick concluded, the value of the gift could be exchanged for patronage, friendship, and service.321

To some extent, Shah Abbas played Jahangir in a similar manner. With increasing frequency, he sent numerous ambassadors to present gifts to the Mughal emperor. Abbas’ position was a sensitive one. He required Jahangir’s goodwill to prevent a Mughal-Ottoman-Uzbek alliance against the Safavids. At the same time, the Shah wished to regain possession of Qandahar. Abbas could not actively secure one without sacrificing the other.

321See footnote 221.
However, through gift giving and friendly sentiments expressed in his letters, Abbas worked diplomatically towards both ends, ultimately ensnaring Jahangir’s trust.

Similar to the loyalty Jahangir extracted in domestic exchanges, the Mughal empire became a solid ally for the Safavids under the guise of solidarity through brotherhood. Exploiting that allegiance enabled the Shah to attack and win Qandahar in 1622 to Jahangir’s incredulous disbelief. Whether or not the Shah negotiated successfully through diplomatic efforts to procure Qandahar is a matter of interpretation. In terms of actually enticing Jahangir to relinquish the city, Shah Abbas did not achieve his goals; but his efforts amounted, more or less, to the same thing. Abbas captured Jahangir’s confidence through diplomacy and gifts which enabled the Shah to repossess the city by force.

In each of these examples, it is clear there was more at stake in transactions than the simple movement of goods and as such the objects exchanged through embassies predominantly fall into the category of gift. Yet, there is more to gifting between Jahangir and Shah Abbas than the development of personal relations. In fact, I believe that gifting, in this context, is fundamentally different from gifting as it has been previously studied by other scholars. And further, the implications of this difference are vital to understanding the impact of gifting on the arts.

Generally speaking, most studies on gifting rest, or else return, to a central premise that the objective of the gift is immaterial gain. Little thought or attention is paid to material gain. Gifting practices between Jahangir and Shah Abbas, however, strongly

---
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suggest that each element is essential to gifting, one is equally as important as the other, and the practice could not have existed without both. Immaterial gain and material gain complimented one another in such a way that the benefits of both were advanced through exchange. My proposal then, is that gifting in this context was practiced not only to profit from personal relations, but also to acquire objects. And further, gifting was only possible when both facets were realized. The remainder of this chapter focuses on why material gain was as important as immaterial gain, how the two functioned together, and the implications of that merger for the arts.

As a mode to begin exploring the uniqueness of gift exchange between Jahangir and Shah Abbas, I return to the work of Derrida and Bourdieu. Each argued that the passage of time most dramatically separates gifting from other types of transactions. Time alone prompts personal ties through the period of indebtedness that arises out of delayed counter payment. In this context, however, a lapse in time was a natural consequence of the distance that separated the emperors’ courts. Distance made delayed return inevitable in any type of exchange including, for example, trade. While time is a feature of gifting here, it is not exclusively applicable.

But the issue of time is not merely one of expedience. What time represents is the actual crux. To repeat, time disguises, through the illusion of altruism, the obligation to return and simultaneously defines a period of immaterial gain. Yet the correspondence of Jahangir and Shah Abbas seems to acknowledge immediate restitution. Reciprocity is recognized rather than concealed. A single letter, for example, may mention
receipt of a gift and inclusion of return equity.\textsuperscript{323} Distance again probably necessitated countergifting at the next available opportunity in order to minimize the period of indebtedness. Still, if both sentiments could be expressed side by side, then Bourdieu’s theory that gifts require collective misrecognition under the guise of benevolence to mask restitution is not relevant. There would be no reason to pretend the gift was a free gesture when its countergift was identified in writing.

Jahangir himself was obviously aware that accepting gifts without returning them in full could weaken his position and indebted him to the presenter. He relates in the \textit{Tuzuk} that gifts to the value of Rs.100,000 were sent to the Shah, equivalent to what Abbas had sent him.\textsuperscript{324} Comparatively, this sensitivity is evident in domestic gifting where Jahangir selected only a portion of what was gifted and then rewarded his presenter by returning the rest. In a sense, the emperor’s period of indenture was quickly reversed using his subjects’ own gifts as immediate restitution. While he does not return gifts to Abbas, Jahangir does subsequently gift the equivalent through the next available agent. In both foreign and domestic gifting, Jahangir seems to be aware that gifts were not given freely and he very consciously ensured that he was not indebted to the presenter by returning gifts at the earliest moment possible.

Not everyone is comfortable with the idea that giving a gift, whatever the context or the culture, may not, probably is not, an altruistic or “free” gesture. Even so, that the gift produces a debt which must be returned has been the general thesis, point of

\textsuperscript{323}See J.78.1, for example, in Appendix A, Parts 1 and 2 or Calendar.

\textsuperscript{324}\textit{Tuzuk}, 374.
departure, or conclusion of nearly every scholarly study on the topic from the earliest investigations by anthropologists and others through to the present day. It is important to remember that however the gift is defined or the act of gifting is performed, there is nothing inherently negative about the obligation of reciprocity. Simply because altruism is portrayed as noble or generous behavior does not mean its absence must correlate in the negative. In fact, the ties established through delayed restitution are what most scholars conclude to be the true nature of the gift. As Warwick stated, "This was the paradox of the gift: its representation as disinterested in order to procure status, with its consequent bivalent intention to solicit a return and to create obligation." Benevolence, then, is simply an illusion that masks the obligation to return. Without return and debt, no ties bind the presenter to the receiver or vice versa thus rendering the act indistinguishable from other types of exchange such as trade. Perhaps the theoretically driven words of Derrida characterize the situation most accurately. He believes that gifts are given with generosity, not out of generosity.

The notion of altruism, however, appears to be absent in this context. As noted above, in the correspondence of Jahangir and Shah Abbas the commitment to countergift was readily acknowledged in writing. The obligation to return was not disguised. Unlike other studies of gift exchange then, in this case, there seems to have been no delusion about the true nature of the gift or its resulting egocentric interests on the part of the

325 Raheja, 249. It will be recalled that Raheja discerned no patterns of reciprocity in gift giving.

326 Warwick, 634.

327 Derrida, 162.
gifter. Or, to phrase it another way, participants in gift exchange were aware of the fact that the gift had an agenda, namely personal ties through indebtedness, and, as such, felt no need to mask that symbolic aspect with altruistic sentiments. William Hawkins, the English representative at Jahangir’s court, seems to have assessed the situation quite accurately. Through the gift, he says, the recipient knows something is desired of him.328 Ann Lambton draws a similar conclusion. She notes that a subject presented equity, whether in the form of tax or gift, because he required something, perhaps protection, and it was understood that support was acquired through material goods.329

To dismiss the delusion of altruism altogether, however, is rash. What it represents is essential to the gift in any context including this one. Altruism masks self-interest. Self-interest drives the desire to form and sustain personal relations whatever their nature. Even if altruism is not present, therefore, self-interest still remains. In gifting each party must believe his interests are categorically present in the act. Self-interest of a single participant alone, whether presenter or recipient, cannot drive the instinct to give and receive without damaging the personal ties the gift is meant to refine. What individual would incur a debt to another with whom he did not wish to foster a relationship?

At the heart of this disparity is intent, the motivation for presenting and receiving a gift. Derrida does not recognize intent as a facet of the gift. His paradox of the gift’s impossibility is founded on the duality whereby gifting is synonymous with benevolence

328See footnote 280.

329Lambton (1994), 158. N.B. Though gifting was practiced by women at court (see footnote 232), the vast majority of references known are to male participants. Hence, I employ gender specific pronouns throughout my discussion.
yet requires restitution. In other words, he sees an ambiguous amalgam of both self-disregard and self-interest. For him, intent cannot be present if gifting is possible only through total indifference and unconsciousness. But if the gift is not disguised as a “free” gesture, as seems to be the case at Jahangir’s court, then it is a very possible practice and Derrida’s paralysis need not inhibit this investigation. As a result, intent, if it is neither altruistic nor indifferent, is a relevant aspect of the nature of the gift for both giver and receiver. As Mauss noted, there must be a reason why the presenter initiates the gift and, in addition, why the recipient accepts it.

Any number of immediate responses come to mind when attempting to identify reasons why the emperors exchanged gifts. For example, gifts were given to procure trust, to sustain relations, to affirm power structures, to soften requests, to manipulate choices, or a host of other possibilities. Probably the notion of adab, or politeness, which underlay both Mughal and Safavid hospitality also played a role in the intent to gift and return objects. Although I have not been able to link convincingly the practice of gifting to the literature of adab, following the appropriate code of behavior in diplomatic relations would no doubt have extended to gift exchanges as well. Whether the presenter sought
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330 Derrida’s struggle regarding altruism and reciprocity is one that nearly all scholarly studies on gifting have attempted to reconcile See Cheal, Gregory, and A. Komter, ed., The Gift: An Interdisciplinary Perspective (Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam Press, 1996).

331 References to gift exchange seem to be scarce. D. Khaleghi-Motlagh, “Adab” in Encyclopaedia Iranica 1 (1985), 431-445, provides the most information although his source is the Shahnama which I consider problematic. He says for example, “Any possessor of riches can make a gift whenever, to whomsoever, and of whatever size he pleases, but there is a risk that his manner may embarrass or humiliate the recipient. The rules are therefore intended to instruct the giver on refinement of conduct so that he does not hurt the recipient’s feelings; this is why it is taught that the giver should be grateful to the recipient, not vice versa...” I also studied, Reuben Levy, tr. A Mirror for Princes: The Qabusnama by Kai Ka’us Ibn Iskandar, (New York: EP Dutton and Co. Inc., 1951). Even a primary source such as the Qabusnama is similarly unsatisfying in its application to this context. For example, a chapter entitled, “Hospitality and Duties of a Host” contains no references to gifting. The only reference I found was in
favor, loyalty, honor, patronage, influence, dominance, or friendship, gifting made extended interaction possible. Regardless of the particular reason or reasons, the presenter’s self-interest initiated the moment of exchange. But what compelled the recipient to accept the gift and incur the debt? Perhaps the receiver had his own agenda. However, I believe that in this context the recipients’ interests manifested more often in the form of material goods. This observation is the one that separates gifting at Jahangir’s court most distinctively from other contexts and simultaneously has important implications for the history of its arts.

The words of Jahangir are the primary clues that lead me to this conclusion. The enthusiasm with which gifts were anticipated and received is unquestionably present in exchanges and comes across as a major incentive for that practice. Jahangir says of a falcon gifted by Shah Abbas, “What can I write of the beauty and colour of this falcon? There were many beautiful black markings on each wing and back and sides. As it was something out of the common I ordered Ustad Mansur…to paint and preserve its likeness.” And also, “He laid before me a dagger the hilt of which was made of a fish’s tooth spotted with black that my brother had given to Khan Alam. As it was a great rarity, he (Khan Alam) had sent it to me. I greatly approved of it, in fact, it is a rare present. I had never seen a spotted one until now and I was much pleased.” In sum, gifts were

“The Conduct of Kingship” where the author encourages kings to be generous and discrete in their presentation of gifts, pg. 230. Though further investigation might prove fruitful, in the end, I think the emperors’ personalities played a greater role in gifting than texts. This facet is discussed below.

332See footnote 390 and Tuzuk, 108a.

333Tuzuk, 94a. On page 96a he continues, “I was so much delighted with a jewelled dagger hilt of piebald teeth which Khan Alam had got from Shah Abbas and sent to me that I appointed several skillful men to
given to provide a degree of pleasure that would result in non-material compensation
which, it will be remembered, was the premise of gift exchange as defined above. But
immaterial gain was only possible through a successful reception of the former. The
intrinsic qualities of the object had to satisfy enough to incite pleasure.

In an obvious way, a willingness to gift highly valuable or a great number of
possessions demonstrated the degree of the presenter’s need and the extent to which he
would willingly sacrifice to a greater cause, or what could be labeled the presenter’s self-
disregard. However, in this investigation, it is important to refocus on the recipient since it
is his interests that are enigmatically at stake. For it is not the presenter’s self-disregard
that is of interest. Without the illusion of altruism, the notion is not particularly relevant.
Instead, the recipient’s self-interest dominates. This seems to be a rather unusual dynamic
in gift exchange.

I believe the pleasure a recipient took in an object subsequently prompted similar
congenial feelings towards the giftor.\textsuperscript{334} This emotion, in turn, produced the necessary
disposition to advance the cause for which the gift stood. Of presents from Shah Jahan,
Jahangir says, “Such offerings had never been made during this dynasty. I showed him
much attention and favor; in fact, he is a son who is worth grace and kindness. I am very
pleased and satisfied with him.”\textsuperscript{335} Some aspect of the gift had to be engaging enough to
induce the recipient to accept the cause and his eventual obligation to reciprocate. The

\begin{footnotes}
\item[334] Warwick observes the same dynamic, only reversed, in her study. “...feelings of love and indebtedness
to the giver were transferred to the object given.” See footnote 220 for the full quote.
\item[335] \textit{Tuzuk}, 401.
\end{footnotes}
most straightforward explanation I can provide to explain why each participant would repeatedly commit himself to an endless cycle of gift and countergift is the integration of immaterial benefit with gratification for the gifted object. The reason why will be discussed in Chapter 6.

For the moment, it is worth reviewing a few examples to support the point. Objects, whether those received, presented, or requested, are a notable preoccupation of the emperors’ correspondence. It is clear from the data submitted in Appendix A that a significant amount of gifted equity crossed dynastic borders. Objects dominated the emperors’ writings to one another and the embassies they sent. A review of the various primary sources discussed in Chapters 2 and 4 affirms that items given as gifts were highly desirable commodities, appreciated and recognized for their intrinsic qualities. Of an emerald he receives Jahangir says, “it is of such a beautiful colour and delicacy as I have never before seen.”336 He later comments on a cup from Abbas whose, “Venetian workmanship was very fine and rare.”337

Official exchanges must have become a conduit through which to acquire unusual and intriguing gifts, a very acceptable practice for an eager collector. Both emperors, particularly Jahangir, are noted for their active support and interest in the arts. As an aesthete, each must surely have been tempted to participate in gifting simply to procure rare and valuable goods. In other words, the obligation to countergift could be exploited to satisfy the desire to acquire. And, with a pool of incredible, imperial resources (which

336Tuzuk, 400.

337Tuzuk, 310.
they seem to have been familiar with), the quality and quantity of goods available were unmatched. 338

Sir Thomas Roe reveals that his gifts from England were eagerly anticipated and coveted to the extent that proper political conduct was ignored and his role as English ambassador disregarded in the flurry of acquisition. In terms of Jahangir and Shah Abbas, Roe writes that gifts sent through Muhammad Riza Beg were ten days in their viewing.339 Though the drama of ceremony and the prestige of the Mughal emperor were likely the impetus behind the duration of that event, the amount of objects which received personal attention in that time had to have been sizable even if Jahangir does not share his reactions in his memoirs. In both cases, the intermingling of symbolic (here, political) and aesthetic elements of art given as gifts are evident.

In their own writings, both Jahangir and Shah Abbas are quite straightforward about requesting specific items or particular kinds of gifts from one another.340 Shah Abbas, for example, asked Jahangir for trees and other organic goods although those items do not fall within the category of art. Jahangir desired Shah Abbas' astrolabe, a replica of which was produced and the original sent to Jahangir.341 These solicitations for specific items are a clear indication that objects were more than symbolically relevant to the practice of gifting.

338See page 120.

339See footnote 182.

340See Appendix A, Parts 1 and 2.

341Calendar, J.74 and J.75.
It must be remembered, however, that the presentation of goods through embassies was not an option. It was an expectation, a convention of embassy protocol. Yet, the enthusiasm with which an emperor participated in this obligatory gifting certainly varied. This is clear, for example, in reviewing Shah Jahan’s response to exchange. As discussed in Chapter 4, the sources from his reign reference the act of gifting, but without much depth or enthusiasm, a noticeable contrast to the writing of Jahangir. In part, this may reflect a difference in the identity of each author. While Jahangir penned his own memoirs, an officially appointed courtier wrote the history of Shah Jahan’s reign.

Nevertheless, painted evidence underscores the initial point. In *Jahangir Entertains Shah Abbas*, the selection of gifts was carefully chosen. Individual pieces were carefully distinguished from one another and prominently displayed for the viewer’s benefit. In contrast, the paintings of Shah Jahan and Safavid ambassadors (cat. nos. 76-77) suggest little interest in individual pieces. Emphasis is placed on the act of giving and symbolic capital is privileged over material value. I believe that artists and historians were sensitive to the general interests of their patron and, hence, their labors are indicative of a general mood at court. This will be discussed at greater length in the following chapter.

Given the scenarios just discussed, I think it would be negligent to suggest that non-material gain, as often has been presented in gift theory, was the only intent behind gifting. In spite of my bias as an art historian, I believe the desire to procure objects was very much a reason to gift in the case of Jahangir and Shah Abbas. Objects were not just symbols, but implementers of the practice. It seems most accurate, therefore, to describe the motivation for giving and receiving equity in this context as one driven by both
material and non-material needs. The conclusion may seem obvious to some, yet it has not been recognized in previous studies.

The result of this dual agenda is a paradox of a different nature. Typically, the paradox of the gift is evident in the conflict of self-interest and benevolence. The paradox here, however, is grounded in the object. On the one hand, gifts were given out of obligation and received with this mindset. They were symbolic capital rather than material goods. In the Tuzuk, Jahangir himself uses dismissive words such as “suitable” or “fitting,” both of which imply a sort of expectation about gifting, to describe presents to and from Abbas.342 Similarly, a Spanish ambassador at Jahangir’s court was refused attendance because his gifts were of low caliber and fell below the expected standard of quality.343 On the other hand, gifts were highly anticipated and valued for their individual qualities. How could an object be simultaneously appreciated for its intrinsic merits such that it became the means through which gifting subsisted, yet at the same time an expectation whereby its symbolic level as a mediator was privileged?

In my discussion of internal gifting, I noted that objects fell generally into two categories, one-of-a-kind and conventional. I concluded that dualism was the result of the emperor’s joint identity as emperor and empire. Some gifts were given to appeal to his professional side and some to his personal. The same observation may be applicable here. That is, Shah Abbas also played on these two facets of Jahangir’s selfhood. On one level, the official level, some gifts were an expectation of embassy protocol—these were

342 Tuzuk, 193, 209a.

343 See footnote 285.
conventional gifts. Though particular items were unlikely to have been designated as such by the gifter and recipient, a certain amount of gifted equity fulfilled this obligation to give. These pieces became political props. They would have been perceived as obligatory, but not loaded with additional intention.

Of course, the fact that an embassy was sent at all would have been evidence enough that a sensitive mission was at stake. Therefore, an additional level of gifting was necessary to mediate convincingly for that objective. There had to be something in the exchange that enticed the participant to move beyond what was obligatory or symbolic to the level of actively embracing the agenda that it embodied. And this, I think, was the role played by the unique object and the reason why its intrinsic properties were so immediately relevant to the process. Again, pleasure taken in the gift would have been the major incentive to accept the agenda the item represented symbolically.

The place of objects here is more than just a matter of compartmentalizing items into categories such as unique or conventional. The Shah seems to have exploited the system of gift giving in order to manipulate Jahangir. By this I mean that Abbas may have realized in reading Jahangir’s letters how interested the Mughal emperor was in material goods. And, knowing that embassy gifts could be received with a conventional mind set, went one step further in selecting goods that would clearly incite pleasure beyond Jahangir’s expectations as the receiving emperor to his instincts as a collector, the personal appeal. Here, in particular, I think of the numerous Timurid antiquities the Shah gifted to Jahangir including Ulugh Beg’s ruby and astrolabe, the set of rubies with Timurid inscriptions, and other pieces that are not attested, yet likely existed.
In this way, two levels of interpretation regarding embassy gifts evolved. On the one hand were items of suitable quality to meet the requirements of protocol, conventional pieces, that symbolized good relations. On the other were objects that exceeded those expectations, unique goods. They, in fact, would have been the gifts that cemented personal ties through the gratification they incited in their imperial recipient. No particular object types—whether jewels, textiles, or manuscripts—fell into these categories as happened internally, but the categories are still relevant. In utilizing both types each emperor sought not only to maintain relations, but also to ensure the personal investment of his counterpart both as an individual and as the representative of his empire.344 It was only because gifted objects had dual identities that relations were possible in this context.

To summarize briefly, in terms of the object, several levels of interpretation regarding its role are evident. The type of object sent had implications to the practice of gifting, yet the gift made the practice possible as the mark of emperors’ self-interests. It brought pleasure through its inherent value, but could downplay the seriousness of the obligation by the very expectation to receive. Ultimately, the object as gift functioned as a symbol of personal ties, but the depth of the personal ties was judged by the quality of the object itself, its non-symbolic value. Though I have suggested it above, the object played a greater role in exchanges than just as a symbol. Only through appreciation of an object’s value was the practice of gifting possible. As Roe and Hawkins discovered, the identity and quality of the gift was the political lifeline to court. If gifts were merely symbolic, then Roe would not have had so much trouble with his gifts and negotiations. But then again,

344 The numerous references the emperors make to being brothers or to calling one another such suggest a similar personal appeal.
the symbolic level of submission and immaterial gain that derived from accepting gifts was certainly taken seriously. Otherwise, Roe's expenses would have been covered during his stay at the Mughal court. 345

At this moment, my investigation is replete with elements which constitute gifting, but whose relationships may not be altogether clear. Conventional gifts, unique gifts, the symbolic level of an object versus its intrinsic merits, the joint identity of emperor and empire, indebtedness, personal ties, restitution, time, protocol, political agendas, altruism and self-interest have all been discussed. But how do these ideas relate to one another, reveal and define the notion of the gift? In general, they are points along the path of a pendulum that continually swung back and forth until something dramatic, such as death, interrupted the flow of give and take. At either end, the participants alternated identities as gifter and recipient. One initiated the practice to realize a specific agenda, probably political but perhaps commercial or military, that could only be obtained through personal ties with the other. In order to entice the recipient to receive initially and accept the ensuing relationship (an objective known to be present although its exact nature might be obscured), some element of the exchange had to embody the interests of both parties.

The acceptance of the gift, I proposed, was intimately linked to the inherent quality of specific items. Some goods, routine or conventional pieces, were simply included to honor the emperor as his title required. Others, however, went further and spoke to the man on a more personal level through his appreciation of high quality or ancestral or unusual equity. The beneficiary, receiving pleasure both in the form of honor and

345See, for example, footnote 291.
aesthetics, accepted the gifts and thus became indebted to the presenter until such time as he returned his own. Those items would have been selected with the foresight to mediate the beneficiary’s agenda. The direction of obligation was thereby reversed. The specific identity of the gift—or its categorization as conventional or unique—took whatever form was necessary to ensure each party derived satisfaction to sustain the relationship. This nuanced reading accounts for how the inconsistent elements of expectation, obligation, immediate reciprocity, flagrant self-interest, and the objects’ dual identity as symbol and self-referent can all be present in the context of Mughal-Safavid ambassadorial exchanges, yet still fall within the realm of gifting as it is typically construed.

Of course, any consideration of the benefits of material gain must be balanced by those of immaterial gain since both, I proposed, were essential to the gift. Above, the Shah’s mission in sending embassies to procure both Qandahar and Jahangir’s loyalty was described, yet Jahangir’s position is less certain. What, for example, can be made of the fact that he sent only one official embassy in response to Abbas’ lopsided deluge? Why did Jahangir maintain close relations and continue to exchange gifts with the Shah through merchants if he did not have political objectives delicate enough to mandate an imperial envoy? Abbas clearly sought immaterial gain through gifting. But what did Jahangir seek, in addition to objects?

Perhaps Jahangir sensed the Shah’s ambivalent position and relaxed in the knowledge that his favor was coveted. Alternatively, he might have known that sustaining cordial relations was the only viable ploy to prevent Abbas from attacking Qandahar again. If Jahangir neglected his obligation to return Abbas’ gifts, then he violated the nature of
the gift, the consequences of which he could not afford. First, he would become indebted
to the Shah for not returning what he had accepted in good faith, a very weak position
with Kandahar at stake. Second, he risked offending Abbas if he refused to accept those
gifts, a move likely to provoke an attack on the city in retaliation. Either way, he was
committed to participating in Indo-Iranian encounters. For, ties can only be sustained if
the recipient presents his own gifts after a period of time and resets the imbalance of
indebtedness. Once the initial gift is given, the process becomes self-generating. Arresting
the flow of goods has consequences, either perpetual indenture or the implied desire to
terminate personal relations, either being likely to cause backlash.

Did Jahangir opt to maintain relations because he realized, insightfully, he could
effortlessly participate in gifting by returning equity through merchants instead of the
expense and production of official embassies? If so, then Jahangir managed to offset the
gifts Abbas kept sending and the obligations he kept incurring through easy, inexpensive
channels. At the same time, Jahangir satisfied his desire to procure objects that could not
be readily acquired domestically.

It could be concluded from this observation that Jahangir was a fairly astute
politician, more so than he is typically credited as being. Somehow, he managed to
synthesize his instincts as an emperor, a connoisseur, and a diplomat in his official
interactions with the Safavid empire. Granted, he did fail to hold Kandahar. But was it
because he was duped by the Shah’s blitz of friendly relations and gifts or because losing
the city was inevitable given the Shah’s determination to repossess it? If the latter is the
case, then Jahangir managed to delay that event for over seventeen years. The tenacity
with which Shah Abbas conducted diplomatic relations in contrast to Jahangir's correspondingly cavalier approach to foreign affairs can perhaps be understood in this respect.

In receiving Abbas' gifts was Jahangir committed to oblige the Shah's agendas for which they mediated? It is a question that is important, yet difficult to answer since the exact mission of most embassies is unknown. If Qandahar was the primary objective, then apparently Jahangir did not feel that accepting Abbas' gifts required him to relinquish the city to the Safavids. As mentioned earlier, Jahangir went to great lengths to ensure he was not indebted to any source by quickly gifting the equivalent of that which he had accepted. In returning goods, he must have voided his responsibility to support the cause they represented—unless the cause was one that suited his own agenda and therefore, convenient to endorse.

Generally speaking, data related to foreign gifting, although intriguing, does not promote clear patterns of behavior and intent as was evident in internal exchanges. The variety of gifts given, the casual neglect in listing specific pieces versus the attention shown to objects in paintings, the deluge of embassies from Abbas, the motivation for sending embassies, and the intent behind gifting among other traits I have attempted to deal with above are more puzzling than revealing. I think a large part of that unpredictability was related to the unstructured nature of gifting itself. While the practice was clearly called for in diplomatic contact, no rules regarding what or how much to send or how often or when to respond seem to have been followed. The way in which gifting ensued under Jahangir and Shah Abbas was probably not recorded in a step by step
manual, yet they had to have been cognizant of how it functioned in order to achieve the ends that made their participation both requisite and rewarding. Gifting, I believe, evolved as it was practiced moment by moment. What was best for the empire or the emperor at any given moment drove the instinct to give and receive.

Though dynastic embassy gifting preceded and succeeded their reigns, the system that played out between the emperors was very much fashioned by and to suit these two men who adhered to it at this time. The reason it operated in this particular manner had everything to do with the personalities of the two men who worked it. If gifting as it was practiced between Jahangir and Shah Abbas seems anything but simple, then, the explanation for that complexity is enmeshed in the objective of gifting: the ambivalent interpersonal relations of the two emperors. It is an interesting contrast with other gift studies where, typically, an individual is controlled by a greater-gift society. In this case, however, individuals controlled the system while the greater society heeded their decisions.

The extremes that typify Jahangir's character, for example, his capriciousness, connoisseurship, susceptibility to suggestion, intelligence, and curiosity directly impacted the way he participated in gifting. Each played out on both an imperial and individual level in both public and private realms. Whichever trait happened to be most prominent at any given moment would likely have affected his gifting decisions precisely because of the personal nature the practice itself promoted. Because Jahangir is recognized as a noted patron of the arts, it should not be too surprising that objects became a fundamental facet of gifting during his rule.
Jahangir penned his own history of his reign. Therefore, it is much easier to gather a sense of his personality and the role it played in gifting than it is for Abbas. Presumably, the Shah too practiced gifting according to his character. I believe, however, political instinct for Abbas was a higher prerogative than it was for Jahangir, thus propelling the Shah to capitalize on the potential of ambassadorial encounters. In contrast, Jahangir seems more materially oriented and as such he profited by the Shah’s recourse. In essence, gifting, in this context, was very personality driven.

The ambiguity evident in external gifting can perhaps be explained further by the two emperors’ relatively coequal positions. Gifting between them would not have been an expression of authority and submission as it was domestically; however, I do think it was still about power. Jahangir’s reluctance to be indebted by the gift and his efforts to return commensurate equity at the earliest moment are evidence of the shifting power relations that gifting provoked. Regifting objects from tertiary dynasties also reflected power struggles. Among his own courtiers, Jahangir’s authority was unquestionable regardless of his agency in the exchange, that is, whether he presented or received. But in foreign exchanges with an obvious equal, his response called for greater sensitivity to his tenuous supremacy. This facet of the practice played out in Jahangir’s writing. It will be recalled that, in the Tuzuk, objects were “sent” and “received” rather than “gifted.”

I do not think that every foreign exchange was a power struggle, however. Even though a presenter might have a long-term or immediate agenda, imperial correspondence and passages in the Tuzuk reveal a genuine amicability between Jahangir and Shah Abbas that simply could not be sustained due to the nature of their competitive positions.
Through their tenuous friendship, the emperors were predisposed to a certain pleasantness which gift exchange would have reinforced. However, the practice of gifting and the types of gifts exchanged between them would also have been a product of their ambivalent tension and thus it becomes difficult today, as it must have been then, to grasp its exact nature.

In fact, it seems likely that the general equality between the two emperors was just as important as their ability to manipulate one another. To my mind, the Shah alone was the obvious peer for Jahangir in his position as leader of the Mughal empire. Abbas was the only person befitting the address of brother and one whom he could share a common interest --antiquities, unusual equity, and beautiful objects-- that was advantageous on both an immaterial and material level. No subject in Mughal circles could be treated with commensurate attention without risking rivalry for the throne. In reading the Tuzuk it is clear that Jahangir was a man who liked to share his thoughts and insights. Who else was a suitable companion but Abbas who, himself, encouraged intimate relations?

The imaginary encounters discussed above (cat. nos. 51 and 52) seem to reveal this very fine balance between equal and inferior, friend and rival in a visually immediate way. For example, verses at the top of Jahangir Entertains Shah Abbas speak of the emperors’ close friendship yet the deference with which Shah Abbas is depicted demonstrates contentious power relations. Abbas complemented Jahangir’s authority enough to raise Jahangir’s own position. In the end, however, Jahangir could be recognized as superior. Typically, the latter aspect is emphasized in scholarly writing, but
it seems a more moderate reading of the emperors' relations is also possible. 346

At the beginning of this chapter Jahangir's feelings for Abbas in relation to gifts was quoted. The fact that Jahangir thought it appropriate and necessary to express his conviction that Shah Abbas' friendship was more important than any gift is in itself important regardless of whether or not it was true. The emperors' relationship was heavily defined by objects.

Working from an anthropological or sociological perspective, gift exchange has been defined as a method of ensuring interpersonal relations, rather than the movement of equity. 347 This element demarcates gifting from other types of exchanges such as barter where the object is the primary objective of interaction. The physical manifestations of those intangible relationships are the gifts that parties exchange with one another. In other words, the object in the gift is not in fact the object, but the relations that are created through the presentation of the object, its reception, and restitution.

As an art historian, I temper that conclusion by returning agency to the object. At the same time, I acknowledge the importance of the relations that are promoted through it. In the case of Jahangir and Shah Abbas, objects themselves were a pivotal component for any successful interaction because there were neither conventions of exchange nor regimented rules regarding quality or quantity of gifts.


347Mauss, vii.
As discussed above, gifts were the primary tools through which participants and negotiations could commence. The choice of what to send and when to send it was fundamental to establishing and maintaining relations. The decision must have been carefully weighted. As a symbol of the emperors’ relationship, an object’s inherent characteristics were directly indicative of that bond and thus of great importance. Objects had to be suitable and to please. Otherwise, negative repercussions would likely result.348

It is essential, therefore, to focus investigation on the items of exchange themselves. If objects were as fundamental to the practice of gifting as I have argued then it goes without saying that those gifted objects were themselves fundamentally affected by their inclusion in exchange. The contribution of gifting to art history must be explored if a more precise understanding of art associated with this era is desired. This endeavor will conclude my discussion of gifting between Jahangir and Shah Abbas.

348 This facet of gifting challenged Sir Thomas Roe’s activities at Jahangir’s court.
Chapter 6
Conclusion: The Object in the Gift

To devote an entire chapter, the conclusion at that, to the actual objects impacted by exchange is an infrequent undertaking in gift studies. Why that should be the case is unclear to me for certainly the object, as revealed in the proposal above, played a pivotal role in gifting. It could symbolize the strength or weakness of relations. It could manipulate opinions and decisions. Conversely, the practice of gifting affected the way in which objects were received and appreciated. But how and to what extent did this phenomenon occur, especially for those gifts that fall within the category of art?\textsuperscript{349} What, if any, long-term influence occurred in artistic production due to the movement of goods and individuals through ambassadorial parties? In this chapter, I will continue to discuss how objects were appreciated and why certain objects were more desirable gifts than other items. I will then consider how gifting affected subsequent artistic production. Pursuing such thoughts ensures a most comprehensive understanding of both art and gifting during this time.

In order to proceed in these directions, it will be useful to consider to what extent art, as a subset of my generic term object, is relevant to the practice of gift exchange. It should be clear from the evidence submitted that not every item exchanged falls into the category of art no matter how loosely defined that notion. For example, medicine, animals,

\textsuperscript{349}Though the question of “what is art” is an interesting one, it is not a central thesis of this project. Therefore, I follow its general application within the field of Islamic art. Art includes not only painting and architecture, but also objects that are sometimes referred to as craft such as ceramics, textiles, armor, metalwork, and the lapidary arts, among others.
and food are mentioned in the written sources. Proportionally, art, animals, and generic references ("valuable goods") are cited most frequently as gifts between Jahangir and Shah Abbas. In terms of number of notices, items that could be considered art were the most popular item for exchange; however, in terms of sheer numbers overall, animals were probably given most often. Nevertheless, the statistical evidence affirms that works of art were important to the practice of exchange.

Two interrelated questions spring to mind from that conclusion. Why were certain objects considered better gifts than others and what can be concluded about the resulting values attributed to art? The answers, I believe, are linked by the notion of display value. In order to investigate display value as well as how and why pieces were appreciated, the context within which they were given must be refined first. Specifically, the reason why gifted art was so important should be addressed. The most informative way to approach the query is to analyze it within the context of domestic exchange; for, I believe much of what occurred in foreign policy developed out of domestic activities. Also, the system of internal gifting was more straightforward. Its influence on the arts, therefore, is readily discernible. As I interpret the situation, a cycle of dependency evolved in which Jahangir, his courtiers, and ultimately Shah Abbas were intrinsically linked by what I call the three C’s: collecting, competition, and connoisseurship. Altogether, the three C’s appear to be a major reason why works of art were gifted and received and, as such, they suggest ways in which objects were appreciated.

To review briefly, I described above how gifting underlay the Mughal system of governing. Jahangir bestowed objects on his courtiers to show royal favor and to improve
their economic and social positions. In this way, a courtier’s loyalty and continuing
support of the emperor were, for the most part, ensured. The more valuable the gift, the
greater the honor and individual wealth. An object’s intrinsic qualities, therefore, would
have been indicative of both a symbolic gain and a material gain. As a result, the identity
of the gifted object was crucial. Two types of objects have been identified, conventional
gifts and unique gifts. Depending on the situation of the recipient, either type could
produce the dual benefit of symbolic and material enhancement.

As markers of status, the conventional gifts Jahangir gave his courtiers—robes,
weapons, jewels, and animals—could be said to have direct display value. In other words,
it was possible to know something about the individual who possessed such items simply
by his physical association them. Their attributes conveyed information about an
individual’s status while their portability rendered that data easily accessible. While such
observations are also relevant for a book or painting, the process by which either
promoted social or political mobility was much more subtle and hence, unfavorable. An
immediate impression could be made through art that adorned the body, for example, an
honorary robe or jeweled dagger. In the case of internal gifting, conventional objects
displayed a subject’s rank, favor with the emperor, and his social and economic welfare.

In contrast to his courtiers, Jahangir primarily received rare objects and items from
all over the world. These, too, had display value. The variety of pieces suggested the
influence and power of the emperor. Unlike courtiers’ gifts, the identity of those objects
was not limited to conventional items. In fact, international power could only be displayed
through unusual gifts. However, court life operated in the emperor’s spaces. Therefore,
any object could acquire display value simply by placing it in a locale associated with the emperor. In contrast to his courtiers, Jahangir’s arena of status was not limited to what he wore at court, but how he ornamented his court.

Clearly, the quality of any display value gift was essential to the individual whom it revealed. As a result, the acquisition of objects through gifting was a central concern for both the emperor and his subjects. For this reason, among others that will be discussed below, I think it is accurate to identify gift exchange—both internal and external—as a method of collecting where, typically, it might be considered a more passive method of acquisition.\footnote{Because of its symbolic association with status, gifting would have been actively practiced simply to collect return goods, those with display value that would elevate the recipient’s position. The need for gifts and the greed for gifts ensured the involvement of many faithful participants. Fueled by their desire to receive, participants gave their own gifts thus cementing a continuous cycle of give and take.}

At the peak of the status pyramid, Jahangir determined the standards of quality and value. When he accepted and returned gifts to his courtiers, Jahangir set precedents for what was fashionable and worthy of collection. Subjects likely aspired to imitate the emperor’s lifestyle. As they mimicked his tastes, they developed their own connoisseurship skills. Each courtier profited who was able to evaluate the items he received from the imperial studio and, in addition, those that he selected for presentation to Jahangir. Not only did this bind the subject closer to the emperor in the quest to serve and receive, but it also expanded appreciation of the arts, both conventional and unique, well beyond the

\footnote{That notion is further suggested by the ease with which pieces were deaccessioned from collections through regifting.}
emperor to his court in general. All of these factors enabled Jahangir to acquire the high quality gifts that he desired for his own collection. They also permitted him greater control over his subjects.

The enthusiasm with which Sir Thomas Roe’s gifts were anticipated suggests, however, that a limited pool of objects was available for collection through internal gifting. What that amounted to, then, was a great demand, a competition, for objects. Shah Abbas, who lived outside the system, must have become a significant resource through which to acquire goods. In some instances, Jahangir may have attempted to procure items through trade. However, Abbas had his own reasons for supplying the requested objects as gifts. By the nature of protocol and courtly etiquette, a gift that was specifically solicited could only be denied by the gifter at the risk of damaging the personal ties the object was understood to embody. In this respect, it could be said that the symbolic level of the gift, which the participants knew to be present, was exploited as a method to guaranteed collecting. It is interesting to me that personal ties, made possible through the gift, seem to have been subsequently taken advantage of in order to procure objects themselves through gifting. It was with this relationship in mind that I proposed the importance of the object in gift exchange between Jahangir and Shah Abbas

If either emperor was offended by his counterpart’s manipulations to obtain goods such attitudes do not manifest themselves in the correspondence. If anything, requests were encouraged both in writing and in practice. Abbas’ initiative to send an agent to Venice and points beyond to acquire more European figures “drawn in stone” for Jahangir

351 See, for example, Appendix A, Part 1, year 1613
is just one example.\textsuperscript{352} It seems that the greater the realization that equity itself, in addition to non-material gains, could be acquired through gifts, the more important the identity of the gifted object became. In this way, I propose that gift giving became a central method through which to acquire objects, almost to the neglect of the relations they were intended to represent. It is also the case, however, that the more gifts were collected or exchanged, the more intimate the emperors’ relations became through their shared identities as collectors and connoisseurs. Further, the consuming interest in objects, in the end, strengthened the bond of indebtedness inherent in the gift no matter how well masked it was by the very spectacle of objects that represented it. If those two observations seem overly complicated and contradictory, it should be remembered that relations between the emperors developed exactly along those lines and their gifting practices, as well as the gifts themselves, by definition must also fall within those boundaries.

If objects could be readily collected through foreign gifting, what can be made of the absence of physical or written evidence for the arts of the book? Paintings, calligraphies, and manuscripts, typically valued today among the most important and preferred arts, are poorly represented in external exchanges. Given that the best way to please would be to gift a particularly desirable object, it is odd that Jahangir would not include such items in his collecting strategies. Partly, the bias for book arts is a product of both contemporary and Western values.\textsuperscript{353} However, the arts of the book are well

\textsuperscript{352}Calendar, J.76 and J.77.

\textsuperscript{353}J. Brown, 10.
represented in internal exchanges. There, extant evidence, painted evidence, and literary
evidence all point to an interest in gifting books both to the emperor and by the emperor.
But the evidence is noticeably lacking in the case of external gifting. Considering the
resources of the Shah, the conditions for gifting a requested object, and the fact that
Jahangir seems to have been aware of some of the items in the Shah’s collection, it seems
likely that Jahangir would have solicited manuscripts if they were not sent directly.

A few manuscripts gifted between Islamic courts and between Islamic and
European courts do survive to attest to the practice of foreign book exchange. The
Safavid emperor Shah Tahmasp, for example, presented his superb Shahnama to the
Ottoman Sultan Selim II in 1568. Shah Jahan gifted a copy of Sa’di’s Gulistan to the King
of England in 1628-1629.\textsuperscript{354} But for the most part, concrete data is lacking. Without solid
evidence, experts on manuscript production are forced to speculate on book gifting.\textsuperscript{355}
Even a collection as promising as that at the Topkapi Seray Museum apparently lacks
manuscripts which contain inscriptions denoting certain books were acquired as foreign
gifts.\textsuperscript{356} John Seyller has undertaken a thorough examination of inscriptions in Mughal-

\textsuperscript{354}Shah Tahmasp’s Shahnama of c. 1532 is now widely dispersed. It is discussed in R. Hillenbrand, “The
Iconography of the Shah-nama-vi Shah” in Safavid Persia, ed. by C. Melville, (London and New York:
I.D. Tauris and Co. Ltd., 1996), 53-78. Hillenbrand, footnote 16 mentions that a Quran, allegedly written
by Ali, may also have been sent by Shah Tahmasp at this same time. The Gulistan is housed in the CBL,
Ms. 22. I know of two additional examples. A Shahnama manuscript of 1648 (RLWC Holmes 151 A16)
was gifted to Queen Victoria by the Persian Prince of Herat, Kamran Shah, in 1839. A Quran (in the
Hyderabad Museum) was gifted to Shah Jahan by Malik, Shah of Tur. See M. Ghouse, Catalogue of the
for the last reference.

\textsuperscript{355}See footnotes 14 and 356.

\textsuperscript{356}F. Cagman and Z. Tanindi, “Remarks from the Topkapi Palace Treasury in the Context of Ottoman-
Safavid Relations” in Muqarnas 13 (1996), 132-148. For example, the authors discuss seals and
inscriptions of an Asar-i Mazaffar (H. 1233), a Divan of Hafiz (H. 986), and a Jami al-Tawarikh (H.
owned manuscripts. Of those 250 or so manuscripts that were once a part of the imperial Mughal libraries, none contains words or seals outright documenting or even persuasively hinting at a Jahangir-Shah Abbas imperial provenance. In fact, no manuscript he catalogued appears to contain information regarding the gifting of books between any Mughal and Safavid emperor.

Four possible conclusions regarding the gifting of manuscripts and albums can be submitted: those that were gifted do not survive, they are unknown today, they were never given, or they were not identified as gifts by inscription. This last explanation I find somewhat difficult to accept. Spectacular manuscripts, whether because of their contents or their source of acquisition, would have deserved some comment. The Mughals, at least, were prolific critics, historians, and accountants in regards to their libraries as Seyller’s work demonstrates. Given that Jahangir writes frequently about the Shah’s friendship in the Tuzuk, it seems more than plausible that he would have annotated his feelings in a manuscript gifted by Abbas. Yet, it would be risky to suppose that books were never sent simply because such evidence is not extant today. Therefore, the possibility that the manuscripts do not survive or have not been identified is probably the most likely. After all, Jahangir gifted a sizable number of books to a group of Shaikhs in Gujarat and though

---

1654) but presume them to be gifts in the absence of written evidence. They note that internal documentation is sketchy for TKS manuscripts, 142.

357 See footnotes 152-154.

358 A possible exception may be a manuscript formerly in the collection of Major D. Macaulay sold at Sotheby’s c. 1935. Its present location is unknown. According to Macaulay an inscription on the flyleaf states the manuscript was a gift from the King of Persia to Shah Jahan who in turn regifted it to one of his courtiers. The inscription is purportedly in the hand of that courtier. See Seyller, 338.
an illustration of this incident survives (cat. no. 68), the books themselves remain unknown.\textsuperscript{359}

Although it may be difficult to understand why paintings and manuscripts should receive so little attention in foreign exchanges, the observation clearly suggests the need to reconsider the value attributed to this art in its own time, at least as it is resonates in the gifted object. It is particularly relevant when the arts of the book are compared with other types of gifted equity; for, whatever the explanation may be, books were not the most highly sought objects. That distinction easily goes to jewels and gems, the most valued commodity at court.

In the \textit{Tuzuk}, Jahangir evaluates a notable manuscript of Jami's \textit{Yusef and Zulaykha} at 1,000 \textit{muhars} (10,000 rupees).\textsuperscript{360} Individual rubies, however, were assessed at 4,000 rupees up to 125,000 rupees. John Seyller has suggested that monetary evaluations found in the \textit{Tuzuk} are rather inflated versions of actual valuations, at least in the case of manuscripts, but probably for other equity as well.\textsuperscript{361} But even in consideration of that evidence, proportionally, high economic regard for the arts of the book falls distinctly short of that held for the lapidary arts. Jonathan Brown has recently noted a similar privileging of luxury items, including jewels over paintings, at European courts contemporary to that of Jahangir.\textsuperscript{362} Perhaps the material value of a jewel or of gold or

\textsuperscript{359}See footnote 254 where Jahangir states he inscribed the date of his arrival in Gujarat and the date of each book's presentation. See Seyller's translations which do not seem to contain any comparable information.

\textsuperscript{360}\textit{Tuzuk}, 168.

\textsuperscript{361}Seyller, 269.

\textsuperscript{362}J. Brown, 8 and 228.
silver was the basis from which assessments derived. Paper would not have been as highly appraised as a gem no matter how carefully ornamented.\textsuperscript{363}

Jahangir’s high economic valuations ensured that a significant portion of gifts given to him by his courtiers were jewels, jeweled objects, or jewelry. His monetary evaluations were clear indications of his preferences and appreciation. Ultimately, these choice items fashioned specific gifting and collecting trends. They probably affected foreign gifting practices as well.

Jewels are fairly well represented in the gifts of Jahangir and Shah Abbas.\textsuperscript{364} More were probably given than the entries suggest, however, since the small size of a jewel would have prevented meticulous, yet second-hand observers like Roe and Della Valle from ascertaining their presence. As courtiers imitated the emperor’s tastes, the demand and value of gems fed on itself. This phenomenon may have prompted Jahangir to look to outside sources, such as Shah Abbas, for additional pieces. Jahangir is known, in fact, to have requested jewels and jewelry from the Shah.\textsuperscript{365} In theory and in practice, a gift such as Ulugh Beg’s ruby became an obvious vehicle through which Shah Abbas might manipulate Jahangir. Here again, the intrinsic qualities of the gift were essential to the practice of exchange, yet intimately connected to symbolic level of relations and, no doubt, to political conquest as well.

The practice of evaluating gifts monetarily is striking in its frequency, especially with regard to the gifts Jahangir receives in domestic exchanges. In contrast, Jahangir

\textsuperscript{363}J. Brown, 229.
\textsuperscript{364}See Appendix A, Parts 1 and 2.
\textsuperscript{365}Calendar, 1.69 and J. 70.
never attributes economic value to the gifts he presents in domestic exchanges, except to family members and Karan. In Safavid writings, the wealth evident in the Mughal embassy is taken as evidence of the great esteem Jahangir held for Abbas.\textsuperscript{366} I think the same might be concluded for Jahangir’s economic preoccupations. Value assessed in a gift was likely taken as a mark of the presenter’s esteem for the emperor and thus worthy of inclusion in the \textit{Tuzuk}. If the notion of tax, as Ann Lambton has suggested, is relevant in this case, then the economic valuations of courtiers’ gifts could also have been a type of bookkeeping.

Gifts to and from Shah Abbas are rarely attributed monetary worth. In fact, Jahangir is the only one who does not ascribe an economic value to Ulugh Beg’s ruby.\textsuperscript{367} Jahangir’s directive to return the equivalent of what the emperor had gifted him is the only real sign that economics and indebtedness were just as carefully monitored in foreign exchanges as they were in domestic ones.\textsuperscript{368} In this manner, the honor of the emperor and economic value, similar to ancestral or political value, overshadowed aesthetic appreciation of the gift—or perhaps aesthetic appreciation was guided by such factors.

The synthesis of money and art can be a troubling one, particularly when a third dynamic, the gift, is introduced into the formula even though the notion of “pure gift” has already been discarded. The process of assessments probably provided each participant with a clear account of the extent to which his particular gift indebted. Or, if tax is a more

\textsuperscript{366}See footnote 62.

\textsuperscript{367}See footnote 109.

\textsuperscript{368}\textit{Tuzuk}, 374.
appropriate description of the process of gifting at this time, then economic assessments of equity, including art, were a naturally occurring result of that practice.

However, the role of money and art and gift is not that clear cut. For example, financial assessments on ambassadorial gifts were not uncommon. Khan Alam’s gifts were valued at 15,000 Iraqi tomans.\textsuperscript{369} The stories an ambassador brought back of the emperor’s magnanimity and the wealth of his empire may have been an impetus behind presenting expensive gifts and alerting the ambassador to that fact. But Roe provides an odd account that suggests envoys may have been responsible for reimbursing the total amount that was gifted. He recounts that upon Muhammad Riza Beg’s departure, the ambassador’s representative:

...uttered the truth that the ambassador was not sicke, as he pretended, but receiving no content from the King in his businesse, he suddenly tooke leave; and having given thirty faire horses at his departure, the King gave in recompence three thousand rupias, which he tooke in great scorne; whereupon the King prized all that the ambassadour had given him at meane rates, and likewise all that the King had returned since his arrivall, even to slaves, drinke, mellons, pines, plantanes, hawkes, plumes, the eliphant and whatsoever at extreme high rates, and sending both bills made it up in money.\textsuperscript{370}

Perhaps these assessments were made on mercantile ventures rather than gifts.

However, Hawkins reports that money was closely tied to the practice of internal gifting as well. He says of nawruz gifting,

The king where he doth affect, commeth to his noblemens roomes and is most sumptuously feasted there and at his departure is presented with the rarest jewels and toyes that they can find. But because he will not receive

\textsuperscript{369}See footnote 66.

\textsuperscript{370}Embassy, 364. Also, compare Roe’s three thousand rupees with Jahangir’s thirty thousand in footnote 98.
anything at that time as a present, he commandeth his treasurer to pay what his prayseres valew them to be worth, which are valewed at half the price. Every one and all of his nobles provide toyes and rare things to give him at this feast: so commonly at this feast every man his estate is augmented.\textsuperscript{371}

Combined, the two statements by English observers suggest that economic evaluations on gifts were more than just symbolic assessments of the esteem with which the recipient was held. If the observations of Roe and Hawkins are accurate, then, in some way that escapes my comprehension, gifts, works of art, had a very real relationship with the economic workings of the empire.\textsuperscript{372} It does not seem as likely that gifts could be a form of tax if Jahangir was, in fact, paying his courtiers for them or, alternatively, being reimbursed for those he presented. Rather than questioning if the exchange of equity in Mughal India should actually be labeled gifting, I follow the words of Warwick’s patron of art and commerce. Resta once wrote, “Perhaps it appears that I give and you pay. But I can give and you can pay as a form of gift.”\textsuperscript{373} That sentiment seems appropriate to this context as well.

The relationship between art as gifts and money has other possibilities as well. For one, the ability and desire to evaluate goods is a sure sign of connoisseurship.\textsuperscript{374} If the accuracy of those values are inflated or deflated in particular circumstances, Jahangir’s eye and consistent interest in evaluations are still of note. Further, the interest in assessing the economic value of gifts does fall, to an extent, within Jahangir’s general tendency to

\textsuperscript{371}Hawkins, 439.
\textsuperscript{372}Economically, the give and return of equity ensured the circulation of wealth, a facet of gifting noted by Warwick, Mauss, and others.
\textsuperscript{373}Warwick, 635.
\textsuperscript{374}Warwick, 643, has noted a similar phenomenon in her study.
evaluate all equity whether gifted, purchased, or previously possessed.

On another track, the Italian Giulio Mancini penned a guide to collecting in 1621 in which he observed that gift exchange was the best method of acquisition for princely or noble collectors.\textsuperscript{375} His concern, I believe, was to remove the stigma of money from the purity of aesthetic expression that was thought to embody the production and appreciation of art. Gifting, as the purest form of exchange, complemented the nature of the arts. In the case of Jahangir, gifting also suited aesthetics, but money was closely tied to the appreciation of both.

It should be clear, from the discussion above, that the manner in which individual objects were appreciated varied greatly. Depending on the participants, the object in question, the circumstances in which it was presented, courtly fads, and no doubt a range of other factors the value of an object had a certain fluidity. Judging from Jahangir's reactions, some items made very significant impressions and were appreciated for their intrinsic qualities. These objects managed to rise above the baggage inherent in the gift to a level at which their artistic values were esteemed. Others retained their symbolic identity as gifts to the neglect of the pieces themselves. These items fulfilled the obligations of embassy protocol whereby some gifts were just a facet of opening and sustaining cordial diplomatic relations. Many goods appear to have been received with exactly that mindset of conventional practice—the symbolic one that indicated relations. This is particularly apparent when considering the many gifts given only cursory or even no attention in writing.

\textsuperscript{375}Warwick, 632.
It will be recalled, for example, that my initial search for actual items exchanged was crippled by a lack of inscriptional evidence that attested an object had been a gift from one emperor to the other or at the least had been owned by both Shah Abbas and Jahangir. I presumed to label such works as object types in the introduction, but it may in fact be the case that these pieces really were just that. In the context of gifting, they did not command attention beyond their roles as political mediators. For example, of the many Mughal jeweled swords known today and the many references to jeweled swords in the Tuzuk, no sword was given enough individual attention to permit a direct correlation between written reference and extant object. Perhaps the lack of attention given to many of the objects presented as gifts several hundred years ago is the very reason it is difficult to identify them today. Or, to reverse the thought, the fact that these items are difficult to identify may have something to do with how they were appreciated when they were originally gifted.

Similarly, Jahangir frequently refers to gifts sent by Abbas as “valuable” or “suitable” with no additional descriptive information or apparent interest. In fact, Jahangir is more forthcoming about equity gifted to Shah Abbas’ ambassadors than he is to the Shah himself. Immortalizing objects that were presented as gifts through the written word must not have been of key importance. It is tempting to suggest that those perfunctory or silent descriptions of equity, works of art in particular, evident in both Safavid and Mughal accounts is indicative of the value ascertained in such gifts. After all, Jahangir went to great lengths to record three of Shah Abbas’ letters while less attention

---

376 This suggests that the symbolic level of power relations was a very real phenomenon.
was paid to the accompanying gifts. That casual indifference is particularly notable when compared with the highly detailed accounts provided by European visitors. Overall, the writings of both Sir Thomas Roe and Pietro Della Valle are by far the most detailed regarding gifts presented through embassies. Though foreigners may be more attentive to daily details than indigenous writers overlooking the commonplace, elaborate foreign embassies were hardly mundane.

The question becomes then, can vagueness in the Tuzuk, imperial correspondence, or Shah Abbas be interpreted as evidence of the appreciation for certain gifted objects? When is it appropriate or accurate to interpret silent testimony or cursory attention and when is that practice detrimental to drawing conclusions? A comparison between internal and external gifting is of some assistance here. In the Tuzuk, Jahangir frequently records detailed accounts of the gifts presented and received through internal exchanges. He is less attentive to external ones. Perhaps that difference is a reflection of the amount of equity that was presented in either action. Alternatively, lists of gifts, it will be recalled, were made by both receiving and presenting parties. The Tuzuk was not necessarily the most suitable place for a full inventory. The difference may also be indicative of the systemization of domestic gifting and the ambiguous power relations of foreign gifting. To some extent, therefore, the absence of information on gifted equity in the Tuzuk should not be taken as evidence of the objects’ appeal.

In general, I believe a moderate reading is the best approach. For example, the fact that gifts receive minimal attention suggests to me that much of the time aesthetic appreciation for an object was subsumed by the act it represented. This was not a negative
judgment on objects presented as gifts, but rather a heightened awareness or favoring of their new identity as mediators of political negotiation. In some cases, such as the gifts of Sir Thomas Roe, I think novelty and the source commanded awareness of a particular piece and distinguished it from the general category of gift. Beyond any initial interest, however, those gifts were relegated to the treasuries, perhaps to be regifted at a later date, while courtly attention was redirected to the anticipated arrival of the next lot of goods. A third group of objects, including Ulugh Beg’s ruby and Khan Alam’s walrus ivory hilt from Shah Abbas, merited genuine appreciation, enough to supersede the level of symbol and return attention to the object itself.

Allowing for all three readings in regard to the appreciation of objects given as gifts not only follows evidence in the Tuzuk, or lack thereof, but also acknowledges capricious reactions that seem so much apart of Jahangir’s character. Thus, when a question such as were works of art given as gifts appreciated as such is asked, the answer must be both yes and no. Given my proposal above where I determined that both identities were crucial to the possibility of gifting, it should not be surprising that that duality plays out in the appreciation of gifted objects too.

What does become clear, in reviewing the evidence and analyses set forth in this chapter, is that works of art, not just objects as I have generically employed the term, drove the instinct to give and receive. Whatever the level of appreciation, the notions of art, quality, and value were essential to the practice of gifting. In consequence, a consideration of gifting is fundamental to understanding art. Gifting could change the way an object was valued—whether economical, social, or aesthetic. It might
lessen an object’s perceived intrinsic qualities or, alternatively, heighten them. Whichever way, gifting affected the desirability and appreciation of certain types of art.

The potential impact of gifting on the arts is not limited, however, to consideration of only those items that were exchanged. It is also evident in subsequent artistic production in regards to both objects and, I believe, artists themselves. An obvious example comes to mind in the production of objects at the Mughal court. If the number of gifts discussed in the Tuzuk is to be believed, then a large percentage of items produced in the imperial studio must have been intended as gifts for domestic exchange. Robes of honor, swords, daggers, animal trappings, and the lapidary arts would primarily have been created to present as gifts. Moreover, such items were likely designed with the demands of gifting in mind. I do not believe that specific pieces were fashioned for particular individuals to whom they would be presented. Rather, the demands of conventional and unique gifting necessitated a range of decorative styles be contrived in such a way that the status of the receiving individual could be clearly read.

There arises an interesting, perhaps unusual dynamic from the desire to procure conventional items. Contained patterns of production, which the word convention implies, are typically cast into passive realms of stagnant artistic traditions by scholars. But the lifeless, uninspired artistic ambiance that commonly spurs such descriptions is not evident in this scenario. Instead, this artistic environment was guided by an active competition to collect the conventional gifts that symbolized the immaterial gain of status. Artists must have been challenged in their creation of objects to allow for the highly controlled, yet necessarily varied appearance of conventional works. Stylistically, these objects were no
doubt suited to the tastes of the day, but they would have been tailored to meet the
demands of gifting. It is unlikely that the appearance of a particular gifted piece affected
subsequent production; however, the general prevalence of the practice played its part in
the appearance of most of the objects created. Although the majority of arts produced
under Jahangir cannot today be specifically associated with the individuals they honored, it
should nevertheless be recognized that such pieces were fashioned with gifting in mind.

With respect to foreign gifting, the conclusion has a certain relevance. It would
appear from the evidence collected that only a few of the many objects exchanged
between Jahangir and Shah Abbas were specifically commissioned for either.\(^{377}\) Instead,
ready-mades, whether those produced in the court atelier, those stored in the imperial
treasuries, or those regifted from a third party were gathered. Such items would not,
therefore, have been created with a specific imperial recipient in mind. Instead, a range of
items varying in quality, style, and nature would have been available for selection just as
they were for domestic exchange. In general, it seems that objects were created to suit the
needs of gifting, but rarely for a particular individual.

The impact of particular objects received through exchanges on the production of
specific three-dimensional works of art is much more difficult to assess. First, the practice
itself was less systematized so the context in which to read objects is less solid for drawing
conclusions. Second, few objects actually exchanged can be identified today so the
possible stylistic influence of certain pieces on subsequent production cannot be analyzed.
The popularity of organic equity also removes foreign gifting from any widespread post-

\(^{377}\) See footnote 174 for a study on a gift presented in Islamic Spain that was specifically commissioned to send a message to its recipient.
exchange influence in the arts. Further, external gifting was not practiced on the scale of internal exchange rendering its overall impact less significant.

The possible implications of gifting on subsequent artistic production are most promising with respect to the arts of the book precisely because these items were not earmarked as the most popular gifts of exchange. Painters had a greater arena of artistic freedom than other artisans such as textile designers or metalworkers who created conventional items. A painter's labors, for the most part, were submitted to the king rather than his courtiers. Convention, therefore, would not have been a guiding force in the production of paintings and they were probably not designed with the demands of gifting in mind. However, the more abstract influences of exchange resonated in the medium. As documents of both historical and artistic happenings, paintings were doubly affected by gifting.

Above, I suggested that continued interest in portraits of Shah Abbas was spurred by the emperor's unusual appearance and strong personality which would have appealed to artists and patrons respectively. But ambassadorial exchanges infiltrated painting on a much greater scale than just images of Shah Abbas or a gifted zebra. For example, there seem to be distinctive Mughal-like elements in some Safavid paintings which postdate Bishan Das' stay in Isfahan. These paintings may, in fact, reflect his influence on local painters. In Iran, there seems to be an increased interest in depicting historic events and historic personages after 1620. While portraits of Persian rulers certainly predate the early seventeenth century, the number of Persian paintings which depict Shah Abbas seems quite unprecedented (see cat. nos. 1-6, 39-50).
The majority of the known Persian paintings of Shah Abbas are dated or attributed to the period of 1620 to 1690. Bishan Das arrived at the Safavid court in 1616. Because Mughal painters are noted for their interest in depicting historical events while Persian artists, in contrast, are typified by their tendency to represent idealized images, the influence of a Mughal painter seems a likely source for this trend. Bishan Das would not have introduced the concept of depicting historical moments or individuals to Iran, but he may have stimulated an unusual degree of interest in representing them. What may be at stake here is evidence of the impact Mughal art had on Safavid art where, typically, influence flows in the opposite direction, at least as scholars have studied it.

It has been suggested, quite plausibly, that the existence of any Persian paintings depicting the meeting of Shah Abbas and Khan Alam is evidence of the influence Indian painting traditions had on Persian ones. Robinson posits that Shah Abbas directed his own court artist, Riza Abbasi, to commemorate the meeting following Jahangir’s directive to Bishan Das to return with visual records of the Safavid court.378 The earliest Persian version of the meeting extant today (cat. no. 1) was not a royal commission, but produced at the behest of a court physician.379 Whether that painting was copied after an imperial commission or stimulated later ones, the fact remains that historical portraiture at the Safavid court increased significantly not long after Bishan Das’ residence in Isfahan.

Perhaps taking representations of the meeting of Shah Abbas and Khan Alam

378See footnote 80

as a point of departure, Persian artists began depicting Abbas in other contexts. They adapted that singular influence to other types of historical events. For example, Shah Abbas is often shown relaxing with courtiers (cat. nos. 40-41). In these examples, the Shah's distinctive features were carefully and frequently represented. In contrast, earlier representations of Persian emperors tended to be idealized.

As might be expected, trends at court affected regional tastes too. For example, frontispiece illustrations to two manuscripts commissioned in provincial Shiraz circa 1628 feature the emperor holding court (cat. nos. 45 and 47). Another double page frontispiece from Shiraz from about the same time features a unique composition of *Shah Abbas with Turkish, Indian, and European Ambassadors* (cat. no. 49). No imperial model is known for this subject. Perhaps the popularity of cross-cultural encounters stimulated imaginations outside the capital as well as those who witnessed them firsthand. It is tempting to conclude that the excitement over foreign embassies hinted at in *ʻuğba* sources was also present in Iran.

Following the rise in popularity of imperial portraiture, later Persian rulers also commissioned paintings of themselves. A few portraits of Shah Abbas II are known, two of which are catalogued as numbers 78 and 79, as are a few paintings of Safavid nobles. To some extent, foreign encounters as subject matter for paintings also continued to be of interest to the Iranian emperors who succeeded Shah Abbas. Wall paintings at the Chihil Sutun in Isfahan created under Shah Abbas II are examples. Four paintings depict Safavid emperors--Shah Ismail, Shah Tahmasp,

---

380 There is a portrait of Shah Abbas II on horseback in the FWM (15.224). See A. Soudavar, *Art of the Persian Courts* (New York: Rizzoli, 1992), cat. no. 150 and 153 for two portraits of Safavid nobles.
Shah Abbas (cat. no. 42), and Shah Abbas II—hosting a foreign emperor or dignitary. The images have received a great deal of scholarly attention, particularly in regard to the dates of production and the stylistic influences.\textsuperscript{381} What might be worthy of additional consideration is the subject matter.

The paintings may be indicative of a heightened awareness of historical encounters and their depictions following the meeting of Shah Abbas and Khan Alam and its numerous representations. In fact, many of the Persian paintings of Shah Abbas and Khan Alam were produced in the mid-to-late seventeenth century, about the same time that the Chihil Sutun works were commissioned. Concurrently, representations of later ambassadorial meetings, specifically of Shah Abbas II and a Mughal ambassador (cat. no. 78 and 79) were made. The idea of foreign interaction was probably popular as it revealed the strength and dominance of the Safavid empire in relation to its neighbors.\textsuperscript{382} The initiative to represent it, however, may have stemmed from the multitude of similar images created during the reigns of Jahangir and Shah Abbas.

The degree of Mughal influence in Persian painting does not seem to have been all that profound beyond such paintings. In fact, following initial interest in depicting Abbas, some artists simply reverted to the older style of idealizing and

\textsuperscript{381}It has been suggested, for example, that the European style evident in some of the paintings arrived via Indian influence. See R. Hillenbrand, “Safavid Architecture,” in \textit{Cambridge History of Iran: The Timurid and Safavid Periods}, vol. 6, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 812.

\textsuperscript{382}See, for example, S. Babaie, “Shah Abbas II: The Conquest of Qandahar, the Chihil Sutun and its Wall Paintings” in \textit{Muqarnas} 11 (1994), 125-142.
distorting the royal countenance to an indistinguishable type (cat. nos. 43 and 48). Others appropriated Abbas’ features to create a new type of idealized figure. Illustrations in a Shahnama of 1648 and a Habib al-Siyar (fig.5), for example, feature various epic figures in the guise of Shah Abbas. Thus, Mughal interests which spread to Iran were later adapted to a more Persianized aesthetic. In a manner somewhat different to that seen in India, but perhaps resulting from Indian influences, Abbas became an artistic icon in Iran as well.

Though painting trends in India seem to have influenced the subject matter of some Persian paintings, that does not seem to be the case stylistically. It might, for example, be expected that stylistic differences in the works of individual artists such as Bishan Das and Riza Abbasi would be evident following their likely cross-cultural encounters. However, no changes of this type are apparent in the succeeding years. And though some paintings from Jahangir’s court could certainly be characterized as Persianate, this trend began long before he sent his artist to Iran. In Persia itself, Indian stylistic influence does become prevalent, but well beyond the reigns of Jahangir and Shah Abbas.

---

383 See footnote 91.

384 B.W. Robinson, “Two Manuscripts of the Shahnama in the Royal Library Windsor Castle-II: Holmes 151 (A16)” in Studies in Persian Art 2 (London: Pindar Press, 1993). A copy of the Habib al-Siyar in the AMSG (fig. 5), which has figures of the Shah Abbas type, has been attributed a date of 1590-1600. In lieu of other conclusive evidence, this manuscript and others may merit re-evaluation of their production dates based on the observations made here. Also, see footnote 90 and figure 6.

385 See studies by Das (1971), Canby (1996), and Verma, 110-111.

386 See Soudavar, 365-379.
However, an interest in depicting ambassadorial encounters in paintings developed in India, as it did Iran, following the era of Jahangir and Shah Abbas. It was not so much the gifts that were deemed suitable subject matter, but personages associated with the embassies. Prior to the seventeenth century, during the time of Akbar, foreign entourages were generically represented in court paintings, particularly in historical texts such as the Akbarnama. Foreign delegates can be identified through their distinctive clothing and their act of homage to the emperor. Their features are rarely individualized.

An interest in ambassadors as individuals, however, is clearly evident under Shah Jahan and probably began under Jahangir. In the Padshahnama, for example, diplomatic personages such as Muhammad Ali Beg and Yadgar Beg are recognizable (cat. no. 76 and 77). This individualization is part of a larger trend in which the ambassador himself, like a celebrity, captured popular attention. Individual portraits of foreign envoys from and to the Mughal empire became a popular subject for paintings. For example, three representations of Muhammad Ali Beg (cat. nos. 80, 81, and 82), the Persian envoy to Shah Jahan, are known. So too is one of Shah Jahan’s ambassadors to Persia, Lashkar Khan (cat. no. 83). A portrait of the Turkish ambassador sent to Shah Jahan was recently sold at Sotheby’s (cat. no. 84). Perhaps the solitary depictions of Khan Alam (cat. nos. 59-60) were early experiments along this line, evidence of a fascination with the diplomatic core and the famous locales to which they traveled.388

---

387See, for example, CBL Ms. 3, f. 27v; 53v-54r; 247v-248r.

388There also survives a realistic Persian portrait of a Russian ambassador to Iran, dated 1716, in the SAK collection. See Welch (1973), cat. no. 86.
Something along the lines of a souvenir of diplomatic personalities eventually evolved from this fad of heightened interest in depicting diplomatic interaction, or so an intriguing nineteenth-century album of portraits would suggest. At this time, a delegation of ambassadors was sent to the Persian emperor Fath Ali Shah by the Ottoman sultan Mahmud II. According to Ivan Stchoukine, portraits of the key players, including an ambassador from Yemen, were painted on the walls of Negaristan Palace in Tehran. From them, copies were produced by an artist named Mas'ud. The images were then compiled into a book with a suitable introduction by Tahir Munif Pasha and brought back to share in Istanbul. At least two of these volumes survive.\textsuperscript{389}

I do not believe any direct correlation exists between portraits of Khan Alam and other seventeenth-century ambassadors to these nineteenth-century albums. Instead, it seems that the trendiness of embassy culture likely stemmed from the era of Jahangir and Shah Abbas. The scale and frequency of ambassadorial appointments during the seventeenth century prompted a number of painted remembrances and aroused interest in foreign cultures and encounters to a degree that sustained awareness long afterwards. The subject matter of the four paintings at the Chihil Sutun suits this explanation as do the Mughal portraits of later ambassadors. Though not particularly revealing of gifting practices or gifts themselves, the portraits are indicative of a trend in which ambassadorial parties came to have certain intrigue of their own, not just as mediators for their empires.

The most disturbing absence of painted evidence on the topic of embassies and the arts is the complete lack of images depicting Persian ambassadors sent to Jahangir's court.

\textsuperscript{389}TUL. YILDIZ 8643 and 8614. See I. Stchoukine, Les Manuscrits Orientaux Illustres de la Bibliotheque de l'Universite de Stamboul (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1933), 28-29.
Why is it that there are so many versions of Jahangir’s embassy to Abbas, but none of Abbas’ embassies to Jahangir? Certainly scholarship in general and my topic in particular suffer from unbound, incomplete, dispersed, and later versions of the Tuzuk where Persian embassies and ambassadors would most likely have been depicted. But it does seem odd that of the hundreds of extant paintings produced during Jahangir’s reign, not one recalls the succession of embassies sent by Abbas to honor Jahangir. Perhaps the dominant image of the Shah himself in paintings of this time rendered secondary and tertiary Persian representatives less appealing as subject matter. Whatever the explanation, this aspect of foreign gifting is likely suited to the somewhat peculiar nature of the act as Jahangir and Shah Abbas shaped it.

As might be expected, the influence of internal gifting on painting at Jahangir’s court is quite strong. In addition to those paintings which directly depict the emperor receiving or presenting equity with his subjects (cat. nos. 67-73), gifting is present in many Mughal paintings produced under Jahangir’s patronage. The numerous portrait paintings of Jahangir’s courtiers extant today reflect the concern for status and the importance of gifting works of art such as display items (cat. nos. 85-88). 390

Some paintings explicitly represent the action of gifting. For example, the influential courtier Abdur Rahim Khan-i Kahanan was depicted gifting jewels on a dish (cat.

390 Paintings of animals, particularly those by the artist Mansur, might seem a promising direction to pursue in consideration of gifts and painted evidence since animals were popular presents. There is little concrete visual evidence, however. Aside from catalogue number 56, animals which receive individual attention in Tuzuk and for which paintings survive were not given as gifts. For example, Alam Guman, an elephant, was taken as booty from the Rana (pg. 260) while a much discussed turkey was bought in Goa (pg. 215). The remaining paintings and literary references, I believe, are too generic to permit a one to one correlation. It should be noted, however, that Verma (1994), 261 speculates that a certain painting of a falcon by Mansur (MFA 14.683) is the same one that Khan Alam gifted to Jahangir. See Tuzuk, 108a.
Jahangir is not depicted, yet his presence is understood by the nature of the subject matter. More subtly rendered portraits of individual courtiers, however, also demonstrate evidence of gifting (cat. no. 86-88). Unlike the painting of Abdur Rahim Khan-i Khanan, the majority of courtier portrait paintings suggest, not giving, but receiving from the emperor. Looking closely at these types of paintings, a marked difference in the courtiers’ accouterments is evident. Swords, shields, guns, shawls and robes—these conventional objects are present in the paintings, yet sufficiently distinct to exhibit the status of the man depicted. The size of items, the number of items, and the ornamentation of the items are not mindlessly duplicated, but differentiated. Whether or not the depicted accessory was actually gifted to the particular courtier by Jahangir is debatable, even unlikely. What is important is that items of this type were given and that gifting underlies the essence of the paintings’ meaning. That is, the subject became prominent, could be recognized as such in paintings, through his participation in gift exchange and it was necessary to maintain those standards in painting the courtiers for posterity. In fact, the paintings may have commemorated the rise in rank.

Further, these symbols were so essential to a figure’s identity that what was conventional in practice became individualized in painting since standard gifts were the tools through which rankings could be read. In other words, portrait paintings of courtiers must be read through the lens of the gift in order to understand their most basic message. This observation requires a level of analysis that is not always acknowledged in reviewing such works. Each image, on the surface, seems formulaic and is easily passed over. But

391 Numerous paintings of this type are known. Only a few examples have been catalogued here.
analyzing the portraits in consideration of gifting prompts a second, closer look—as Mughal and Persian paintings generally do. Though details in paintings today, the gift and its resulting aggrandizement of each courtier must have been readily apparent and extremely significant to a seventeenth-century viewer. Portraits of courtiers immortalized the act of gifting yet, at the same time, gifting allowed courtiers, through their painted image, to become immortalized favorites of the court.

Consideration of gift exchange may also help to clarify the exact role of the patron in the production of paintings, an issue that has been often discussed yet remains unresolved. I believe the environment of status and honor, which court artists lived within, had a direct impact on the production of paintings. Competition for the emperor’s favor, evident among subjects in general, was likely present among court painters as well. For, like other courtiers, artists were also given rewards, sometimes titles, sometimes gifts.392 Jahangir writes, “Bishan Das, the painter, was honored with a white elephant.”393 Painters, too, aspired to the king’s favor and the material and social compensation that resulted from it.

With this scenario in mind, I propose that the relationship between painter and patron was rather indirect, more so than it is typically construed.394 As I see it, Jahangir would have been an infrequent participant in the production of images or oversight of the

392 The artist Abul Hasan, for example, was given the title Nadiru-i-Zaman (The Wonder of the Age) and the artist Mansur received the title Nadiru-i-Asr (The Miracle of the Age), Tuzuk, 20b. See also, Verma (1994), 13-15 for a discussion of artists’ titles.

393 Tuzuk, 117b.

394 As stated earlier, painters, unlike other artisans, had an unusual degree of freedom in the creation of their works because their labors were not intended as gifts for courtiers, but rather for the emperor.
atelier. More often, artists would have presented their completed paintings to him
designed in a manner that they hoped would procure his favor. Jahangir then gave special
rewards to the works that pleased him. Those paintings that were favored set a standard
for other artists to follow whether in terms of subject matter and/or style. The desire to
please and receive rewards ensured that the emperor’s tastes and interests were realized in
paintings. Although the direction of patronage was reversed, Jahangir ultimately
controlled what was produced in the imperial atelier through the enticement of gifting and
the resulting eagerness to please.

I utilized this premise earlier when I interpreted several paintings. For example, in
my discussion of Jahangir Embraces Shah Abbas (cat. no. 52) I argued that the painting’s
inscription was indicative of competition among artists. I proposed the artist Abul Hasan
sought assistance in drawing Shah Abbas because he, unlike Bishan Das, had never seen
the man in person, yet wished to create his likeness to please Jahangir. Competition arose,
therefore, as artists vied for the emperor’s favor. In this case, Jahangir’s interest in Persian
culture and personalities was the catalyst.

I also suggested this pattern of patronage when I discussed the painting The
Persian Ambassador Yadgar Beg Received at Lahore (cat. no. 77). Here, types of gifts or
generic items rather than unique pieces are depicted. I proposed that this was likely in
keeping with Shah Jahan’s own interests, or lack thereof, in collecting through gifting. In
consequence, this painter, vying for the emperor’s favor, focused on the relationship
between Shah Jahan and the Persian ambassador rather than the gifts exchanged between
them. Jahangir, in contrast, seems to have been quite interested in works of art acquired
through gifting. Therefore, paintings from his reign reflect the point. In *Jahangir Entertains Shah Abbas* (cat. no. 51) the artist has made a very deliberate choice in his representation of gifts. Perhaps this occurred because the objects were drawn from actual gifted pieces. Or, maybe the decision was based on the pleasure Jahangir would have taken in seeing the exotic goods spread before him when viewing the painting. The presence of Shah Abbas, rather than an envoy, must have necessitated an extraordinary amount of attention to the objects. Nothing conventional would suit the moment represented. Routine objects would have reduced the encounter, and by extension the emperors, to a routine level. Neither outcome would have pleased Jahangir.

Because gifting was so pervasive in the operations of the Mughal government in general and its court life in particular, the impact of gifting on the arts can be examined from several interrelated perspectives. Artists’ working environment, the appreciation of gifted objects, the role of money in art and gifts, the form of the object, the competition for objects, each of these among other facets of the relationship between art and gifting has been investigated. Though definitive conclusions may be absent, it is clear that art and gifting are intrinsically linked in the internal and external relations of Jahangir’s court and provide a rich subject matter for analysis.

At the beginning of Chapter 2 Sir H.M. Elliot was quoted, somewhat ironically, for his general dismissal of gifting as uninteresting. Whether or not its study is boring, the prominence of gifting in Mughal culture and the importance of both studying it and understanding it should, at this point, be obvious. As Mauss recognized many years ago,
gift exchange is the essence of any culture—and Jahangir’s court is no exception whether viewing internal or external exchanges. It is not surprising that if political, economic, and social forces are caught up in or even help to define the act of gifting that artistic ones should permeate it too. By extension, an awareness of gifting in consideration of art and aesthetics at this time can only improve the ways in which objects are understood.

When I first began this project, I wanted to learn how certain objects, such as albums, came to acquire the provenances they had or when and how images ended up where they did because of the impact they had on later cultures. Often, an object’s Indo-Iranian provenance is attributed to Nadir Shah’s raids on Delhi in the eighteenth century. I hoped to establish an alternative explanation for objects that left India and went to Iran. I wondered if objects arrived at court through official channels or some other manner, for this might affect the subsequent influence they had on artistic production. Also, I was curious to learn more about the influence of Indian art in Iran which is less studied than its corollary, Iranian influence on Indian art. I had not planned to focus on gifting exclusively, but rather envisioned consideration of cultural encounters more generally. I hoped to acquire concrete evidence about the post-histories of extant objects, provide stronger provenances for those whose stories have been lost, and then consider them in those new contexts.

Bringing those assumptions to the project, however, prevented me from initially appreciating what does survive. Eventually I realized I had to stop focusing on what did not. In this way, the topic of gifting, so obviously present in the extant visual and literary evidence began to take on increasing importance. In turn, gifting changed the way I
looked at and thought about Mughal painting. For example, this investigation emphasized the role historical events played in Mughal painting, not just as subject matter, but their continuing infiltration of culture, the repercussions of which slowly impacted the arts. In particular, I think of the ambassadorial and Mughal courtier portraits that became choice subject matter for paintings during this era and beyond.

Prior to pursuing this study, I routinely avoided arts from this period that resembled any number of similar pieces, instead searching out anomalies or unique pieces. But that type of bias is not in keeping, I now believe, with the function and appreciation for such works in their own time. Swords and daggers, animal trappings, and other pieces were not only an essential product of the Mughal courts and therefore, of its arts, but they affected the way in which the entire governing and social system functioned. In order to appreciate either, gifting must be taken into account. The same holds true for paintings that represent these types of objects and the courtiers who sport them.

I also learned that the Tuzuk is deceiving. It is possible to extract specific statements, to work with them independently, and to believe that the new context within which they are quoted accurately reflects the intended meaning. But only through analysis of a subject that resonates and dominates most of the text, such as gifting, do important subtleties arise. For example, I neglected to appreciate how closely money was linked to the admiration of art and to the governing of the empire. An occasional reference to the value of a manuscript, when situated against other equity, forced me to question what values I attributed to works and whether or not they were consistent with the aesthetics of
the day. And, in the same way, the number of references to specific types of items provided a clearer picture of what really was coveted in courtly circles.

Above all, Jahangir's instincts and sensibilities as a connoisseur of stuff, not just art, is revealed. Frequently, an analysis of the emperor's connoisseurship is based on two or three statements in the Tuzuk where Jahangir reveals his ability to discern the hands of certain artists or his liking for painting.\(^{395}\) In introductory classes or textbooks, these statements are repeatedly quoted as the essence of the man and the art from his reign. But it seems to me that he is fascinated by, analytical towards, and evaluative of just about everything that passed under his gaze. Statements, when taken in isolation, suggest that painting was a significant aspect of his patronage. While I do not deny that they say something about his appreciation of the arts, I believe that they stem more from his general curiosity and intelligence than from an intense interest in painting. Early in this project, I promised a colleague not to employ those quotes which, as it turns out, is the only way to do justice to the material. In order to understand how object oriented this man was, it is important to acknowledge that connoisseurship spread to every element of his life and the equity that passed through his court. It should not be surprising that a man who meticulously documented his observations should appraise art he collected as thoroughly as he appraised horses, elephants, food, or promotions.

These observations should affirm how much the study of gifting has to offer the arts not only in raising their importance to the daily and successful workings of the empire but also in the way subsequent artistic production flourished and functioned. In examining

\(^{395}\) Tuzuk, 20a, 116a-117a.
how gifting evolved cross-culturally, those conclusions were enriched. To what extent this observation applies to other Islamic cultures is unknown, but its successful application in this context suggests the topic merits consideration more generally. I would encourage others to analyze the role of gifting and how it affects the arts when reviewing Islamic dynasties, eras, and regions. Not only that, but also to expand discussions of the interaction of Islamic cultures beyond investigations of stylistic influences. Though Mughal-Safavid cultural interaction has been noted and discussed for a number of years, there is clearly a great deal that remains to be understood, that needs to be understood, beyond the movement of certain artists across borders. It is likely those possibilities are relevant for other Islamic cultures as well.
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Appendix A
A Catalogue of Written Evidence

Part 1 - Gifts Presented to Jahangir from Shah Abbas (or his Envoys)¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Tuzuk-from Shah Abbas</th>
<th>Roe- from Shah Abbas</th>
<th>Islam- from Shah Abbas</th>
<th>Munshi- from Shah Abbas</th>
<th>Tuzuk- from envoys</th>
<th>Tuzuk- Uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. 1606</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J.51; (thru Shahsawar Beg Shamlu) letter, falcon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1609 or 1611</td>
<td>193: (received in 1611 from YAS) letter, good horses, cloth Stuffs, every kind of fitting present (thru Yadgar Ali Sultan)</td>
<td>J.59, J.60: (sent in 1609 thru YAS): letters</td>
<td>979: (sent in 1609 thru YAS) Letter, 50 horses of various types from the royal stables, brocade and velvet horse blankets, 3 black, long haired Russian fur coats, 1500 pieces of precious stuff-brocaded velvets w/ gold and silver thread; brocade squares; European and Chinese satins+ velvets; precious stuffs from Yazd+ Kashan; other gifts of quality comparable to status of the two parties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613</td>
<td>238: (thru J's merchant Muhm. Husain Chelebi)</td>
<td>J.61 (thru Uwaisi Beg) Letter from J thanking for Horses,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹NB: numbers at the beginning of each entry refer to page numbers from that reference.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter, Turquoise, Bitumen (medicine)- requested</th>
<th>Medicine, Valuable gifts</th>
<th>283: (thru Mustafa Beg) Letter, several horses, Camels, Stuff from Aleppo, gifted from Rum, 9 large European hunting dogs (requested)</th>
<th>J.62.1: (thru Khwaja Mhmd Quli) Letter, Crystal watch (regift from Farahabad-Spain)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1615</td>
<td></td>
<td>285: black piebald horse from Abbas regifted to Mughal courtier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310: (thru J's merchant A. Karim) Yemeni cornelian rosary, Venetian cup</td>
<td>J.69: (thru Khwaja Karim Gilani) letter, 2 agate rosaries - requested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1616</td>
<td>259/262: (thru Mhmd. Reza Beg) letter, 27 Persian+Arabian horses, 9 mules, 2 sutes-European arras-Venetian velvet hangings, 7 camels w/velvet, 2 chest-Persian cloth, 1 cabinet rich, 40 muskets, 5 clocks, 1 camel w/ Persian cloth of gold, 8 carpets of silk, 2 rubies ballast,</td>
<td>J.70: (thru Mhmd. Reza Beg) letter, farangi box, rubies w/Timurid inscriptions, from Shrine at Najaf (given as wagr) (requested)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1617</td>
<td>21 camels w/wine, 7 inlaid daggers, 5 inlaid swords, 7 Venetian looking glasses, quiver of bows, arrows, artificial fruits in dishes, European embroidered silk folding purses, knacks of leather, embroidered shoes, great glasses inlaid in frames, embroidered velvet square, trinkets, Italian pictures of the king + queen of Venice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1618</td>
<td>J.71: (thru Mhmd. Rida Chalapi) letter, 5 rubies from Shrine at Mashhad (requested- purchased waf) precious stones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1618</td>
<td>J.74, J.75: (thru ?) letter, intent to send astrolabe of Ulugh Beg (requested)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a: (thru Haji Rafiq) letter</td>
<td>J.76, J.77: (thru Haji Rafiq) rare quabnuna, European figures drawn on stone (agent sent to Europe/Venice to procure more)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620</td>
<td>372: (from Hussain Beg) 2 horses, 9 pieces of Deccani + Gujarati cloth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24a: (thru Abdul-</td>
<td>J.78.1: (thru Khan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24a: (thru Abdul-</td>
<td>2a: (from Haji Rafiq)Tipchaq horses (to J's private stables), fine cloth stuffs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karim) letter, trifling presents</td>
<td>Alam): letter, piebald falcon gifted from Russia, gifts selected by Khan Alam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94a: (thru Sayyid Hasan) new box, crystal drinking cup w/ruby 94a (thru Hafiz Hasan) walrus tooth (gifted by Abbas to Khan Alam, regifted to Jahangir)</td>
<td>1172, 1215-16: (sent in 1619 thru Zambil Beg) letter, jewelry, precious stuff from Turkey, Europe, Russia and Iran, rare items from many places, countless numbers of Arabian Horses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107a: (thru P.B.M. Shirkar) falcon of good color</td>
<td>186a: (thru/ from Zambil Beg?) 12 Abbasi coins as nazar, 4 horses w/ trappings, 3 white falcons, 5 mules, 5 camels, 9 bows+s scimitars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186a, 187a: (thru Zambil Beg) letter, presents</td>
<td>1172: (thru Aga Beg, Muhibb Ali) turban decoration with Ulugh Beg's Ruby, gifts from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. 81: (thru ?) letter, opium</td>
<td>195a: (thru Aga Beg, Muhibb Ali) letter, gifts from Rum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. 86: (thru Aga Beg) letter, gifts from Rum</td>
<td>198a: (thru/from Aga Beg, Muhibb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Recipient</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulugh Beg's ruby (regift to Shah Jahan)</td>
<td></td>
<td>the Ottoman ambassador</td>
<td>Ali) 7 Persian horses w/ trappings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197a</td>
<td>(thru Aga Beg, Muhibb Ali) 4 horses, silver ornaments, cloths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621</td>
<td>200a: (thru Aga Beg, Muhibb Ali) 2 mares with foals</td>
<td>200a: (thru Muhibb Ali, Aga Beg) 24 horses, 2 mules, 3 camels, 7 greyhounds, 27 brocade pieces, Case of ambergris, 2 carpets, 2 wool coverlets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1622</td>
<td>209a: (thru Qasim Beg) letter, royal gifts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625</td>
<td>239a: (thru Haidar Beg and Wali Beg) letter</td>
<td>J.90: (thru Haidar Beg and Wali Beg) letter</td>
<td>1196: (thru Haidar Beg) letter, two gold keys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J.94: (thru Aqa Mhmd.) letter, rare white falcon</td>
<td>1234: (thru Aqa Mhmd.) letter, spoils from Baghdad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part 2 - Gifts Presented to Shah Abbas by Jahangir

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Tuzuk</th>
<th>Islam</th>
<th>Delle Valle</th>
<th>Munshi</th>
<th>Sherley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. 1611</td>
<td></td>
<td>J.60.1 (thru ?) letter from Shah Abbas requesting as gifts as purchases? Myrobalan tree, other plants, horticultrist to tend, ginger root, Bengal rice seed, Indigo, Indigo-planter, dye-maker, oxen drawn wagon, buffalo, quiver made of buffalo bone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1612</td>
<td>239: (thru ?) letter, court appointment (requested+granted)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1613</td>
<td></td>
<td>J.62: (thru Uwaysi Beg) letter, court appointment, drinking cup w/lid, saucer, wine cup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1614</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edwards, 261: 2 elephants, 8 antelope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1616</td>
<td>374: (thru Mhmd Riza Beg) letter, jewelled gifts from the Deccan, Abbas' crystal cup fitted w/lid+saucer, cloths, rare things valued at 100,000 Rs., equivalent to what SA sent him</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1618</td>
<td>9a: (thru ?) diamond ring from Qubl-mulk (gift from Jahangir to Shah Jahan who regifts to Shah Abbas), other gifts</td>
<td>J.76: (thru Haji Rafiq, ca. 1617-18) letter, Venetian wine cup (regifted from ?)</td>
<td>Blunt, 183: (thru Khan Alam) 29 camels (w/cloth?), large tent w/gilt poles, many jewelled swords, other arms, 29+ turban cases (5-6 per)</td>
<td>1159-60: (thru Khan Alam) 300 items including jewelry bizarre objects, precious stuffs, so on (possibly also 10 elephants w/gold)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1619</td>
<td>102a: (thru ?) cock-shaped jeweled jug</td>
<td>J.78.1: (thru ?) letter from Abbas thanking for presents, golden bird, (gold birds, horned buffalo, nilgai, buffalo horn for making bow-requested)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621</td>
<td>201a: (thru ?) wild ass, royal gifts</td>
<td>209a: (thru Aga Beg, Muhibb Ali, Haji Beg, Fazil Beg) suitable gifts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221a: (thru SA’s ambassador) golden birds (requested)</td>
<td>howdahs – trappings, tigers, leopards, Indian lambs, cheetahs, rhinos, talking birds, water buffalo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Part 3 - Gifts Presented to Courtiers by Jahangir

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books from special library</td>
<td>multiple</td>
<td>See cat. no. 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quran</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of Jahangir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahangirnama</td>
<td>4, multiple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemstitch composed by Jahangir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farman</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash-rewards</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash-multiple</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash-poor</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robe of honor</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robe-multiple</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robe-Saub-kurta</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>to fakirs (pg. 297)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robe-winter</td>
<td>multiple 8x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robe-special</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1 private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robe-nadiri</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6 special, 1 worth 41,000 Rs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robe-shawl (parmnaarm)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8 special, 1 private, 1 from J's body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robe-w/jewels, embroidery</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 worth 50,000 Rs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turban</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turban-special</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>jewelled, from J's head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Arabian dogs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses-multiple</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses-from private holdings</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>to Khan-i Khanan (pg. 58a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses-regifted from Shah Abbas</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses-Iraqi, Turkistani</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2 w/jewelled saddles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses-special</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2 worth 100 muhars apiece, 8 w/jewelled saddles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses to Karan over 3 days</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephants</td>
<td>238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephants-special</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1 from Adil to J then to Rana, the best with trappings, 1 to religious institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephants-w/ talayir</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephants-Jahangir's</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephants-multiple</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 cheetahs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falcons</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Falcons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Hawks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Hawks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons-Turkish Gun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons-sword</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30/51 jewelled swords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>multiple</td>
<td>8/51 jewelled waist swords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons-dagger (khapwa + phul-katara)</td>
<td>75,</td>
<td>63/75 jewelled daggers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>multiple 2x</td>
<td>2/75 ornamented daggers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 w/pendant of royal pearls,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/75 jewelled waist daggers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons-special dagger or sword</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1 enemy piercing,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 private (1 from waist),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 of Mazandaran fashion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapon belts</td>
<td>8,</td>
<td>1 jewelled belt w/sapphires+rubies,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>multiple</td>
<td>2/8 jewelled dagger belts,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4/8 jewelled sword belts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelled inkstand + pen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelled pen holder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfumes in vessels of gold</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signet ring of Jahangir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plume</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruby plume</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuirass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewels-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewels-multiple</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cups</td>
<td>multiple 3x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarpich of rubies + pearls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bracelet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruby</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 historic (409)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruby w/pearls</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearls (for earrings)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>in Jahangiri fashion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>worth 30,000 Rs total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring-ruby</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring-emerald</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring-diamond</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring-jacinth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring-sapphire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring-cat's eye</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosary-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosary-pearls</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosary-pearls, rubies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpets, cushions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tugh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The offering of Monday</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal gifts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presents-multiple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice goods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable rewards</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abundant treasures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favor-multiple</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many favors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Souvenirs-mult</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold drums, silver instruments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drums</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsetail banner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flags</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flags, drums</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaktail standard</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palanquin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English carriage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold seat for elephant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat of mail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati carts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parasol</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mace of gold</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold throne w/jewels</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gift</td>
<td># of Times</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash-1,000 ashrafis + 1,000 Rs.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash-100 ashrafis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>given as nazar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash-1,000 muhars + 1,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2/9 given as nazar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2/6 given as nazar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash-100 Muhars</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2/9 given as nazar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash-100 Muhars + 100 Rs.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10, 000 Rs; 200 Muhars + 2,000 Rs; 81 Muhars, 1,000 Muhars (x2); 400 Rs; 1,000 Rs. (x2); 5, 000 Rs; 500 Muhars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash-1,000 Muhars + 1,000 Rs.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash-other nazar donations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting of Timur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>from KA or SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quran w/jewelled cover</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>from Kkhanan, RLR?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compendium of Humayun’s handwritings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>from Abdus-Sattar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustrated Khamsa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>from Governor of Thatta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustrated Shahnama</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>from Governor of Thatta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustrat. Yusuf+Zulaykia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>from Khan-i Khanan; 1,000 Muhars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare things</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beautiful,unique presents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offerings fit for a nazar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All kinds of things</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offerings/gifts/presents</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30,000; 130,000; 167,000; 40,000; 7,000; 200,000; 60,000; 32,000; 17,000;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offerings/gifts-multiple</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good offerings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilt/plain things</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable offerings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuable things</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarkable offerings of rare and choice things from all countries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various kindesses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuable presents from Kabul</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengal stuffs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things of gold</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelled ornaments</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornaments, jewels, dresses and goods</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel of precious stones and jewelled vessels</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casket of jewels and jewelled things</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>offered as pishkash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuable jewels</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewels</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tray of jewels</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewels + jewelled things</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>as pishkash (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sapphire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubies</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1 unique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100 (1 gift)</td>
<td>1 Egyptian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91 (1 gift)</td>
<td>2 w/extended histories (285, 394)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133 (1 gift)</td>
<td>variously valued: 100,000; 22,000; 100,000; 80,000; 65,000; 125,000; 60,000; 4,000; 60, or 75,000; 25,000-2x; 40,000;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamonds</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamonds-several</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeralds</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearls</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>270 (1 gift)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>103 (1 gift)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 (1 gift)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearls-Royal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46/47 given as 1 gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearls-several</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearls-large</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piece of jewelled urbasi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigrette</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigrette-jewelled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigrette-w/rubies+pearls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewellery</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring -ruby signet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>offered as nazar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring-emerald</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring-diamond</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring-3 w/great stone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring-topaz</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring-ruby</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Rings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Rings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Rings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Rings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring-jewelled thumbstall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold tray</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 jewelled roses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankish crystal box of great</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>taste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelled fish drinking cup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>tailored to Jahangir's allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelled water jug</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelled sparrow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelled horse statue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelled opium box</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorated jar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European vessels in gold and silver</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inlaid vessels</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelled vessels</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelled and decorated vessels</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>given as one present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two European boxes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulugh beg’s jade jug</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelled box of betel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelled belt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect tooth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 veined fish teeth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain from China and Tartary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>cups/plates, 1 present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 porcelain? aqiri</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane’s plumes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White china cup on stand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandalwood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pods of musk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloes wood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Elephant tusks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver throne</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver throne-gold/w/tigers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelled throne or signet</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venetian sword w/sapphires</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelled sword/dagger</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50,000; 100,000; 6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sword</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiver bound w/velvet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 guns</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daggers</td>
<td>multiple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sword hilt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaqut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankish jewelled saddles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankish hats</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silk cloths</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sable gowns</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold brocades-delicate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold brocade</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>one present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marten skins</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengal cloths</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 black fox skins</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brocaded satin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100+ brocade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian robes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deccani cloth</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnatic cloth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 g兹 of milkmel (satin)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>as footcarpet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sash</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European tapestry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloths</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloth</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloth</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 cloths</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloth- fine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati cloth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraqi cloth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiger</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting animals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawks and falcons</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elephants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephants-several given as 1 gift</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2/58 offered as pishkash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>one w/fittings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>one from abyssian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 elephants; 6; 8; 11; 15; 22; 25; 28; 30; 32; 34; 40; 44; 49; 60; 90, many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>value 241,000 Rs./to special house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephants-special</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephants - to private stables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bengali</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bengali</td>
<td>named Bansibadan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bengali</td>
<td>one gift, 2/3 to private stables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>with silver housings, without tusks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1 gift, 1/20 to private, rest regifted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bihar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 gift, 2/8 to private, rest regifted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bengal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7/50 to private, rest regifted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2/30 given as pishkash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 good horses immediately regifted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>multiple 2x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses-several given as 1 gift</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses-Iraqi</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9 horses 6x; 12; 18-4x; 40; 45-2x; 50-2x; 63, 100 poor-2x; 1000;many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabian dogs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>both Iraqi and Turki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Arabian dogs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several rams or muslins</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting dogs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tame ibex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 strings of camels</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 strings of camels</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 camel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 camels</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 camels</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 camels</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 camels</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 camels</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>given as charity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bullocks + cart</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>regifted to Shah Jahan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold boat, Silver boat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eunuchs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Eunuchs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abyssinian slaves</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomegranates, quinces</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jars of pickles, preserves</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>regifted to courtiers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B
A Catalogue of Visual Evidence

Part 1 - The Meeting of Shah Abbas and Khan Alam

Group A (in which a few participants stand in an exterior setting)

Persian

1) Shah Abbas and Khan Alam with an Attendant
   Signed Riza-i Abbasi, dated 1633
   28.5 X 17.5 cm
   RASSP Album ruk. Dorn 489, f. 74r
   Grube & Sims (1995), 16; Loukonine (1996), 212; Canby (1996), III.54
   Inscription: By order of my master, my lord, the one close to the king, His holiness, the
   Galen of the time, the physician Shamsa Muhammad, may the Mighty God protect him
   from the misfortunes of time. This picture was finished on jum’a 17th of the month of
   Rajab al-murajjab, the year 1042 [29th of January, 1633]. Drawn by the most humble
   servant Riza ‘Abbasi, may God pardon him.¹

2) Shah Abbas and Khan Alam with an Attendant (double page composition)
   Signed Mu’in after my master Riza-i Abbasi, dated 1702
   BN Arabe 6077, 10v-11r
   Blochet (1926), CVII; Grube & Sims (1995), 17; Robinson (1972), A2
   Inscription: In the year 1022H./1613 my master Riza-i Abbasi executed this portrait. The
   most humble Mu’in the painter completed it in the year 1113H./1702 (on 10v). This
   portrait of Khan Alam, the ambassador of Hindustan sent by Shah Salim (that is
   Jahangir) to the court which is the asylum of the world, was executed by my master Riza-
   i Abbasi in the year 1022H./1615, and the most humble slave Mu’in the painter
   completed it in the year 1113H./1702 (on 11r).

3) Shah Abbas with an Attendant (perhaps facing painting of Khan Alam is lost)
   Attributed to Muin, dated 1710-11
   23.1 x 10.8 cm
   HUAM 1960.48
   Welch (1981), 85, Grube & Sims (1995), 18
   Inscription: The portrait of one of the servants of God, His highness, the most noble, the
   most high, the most holy Shah Abbas Safavi Bahadur Khan. It has been finished in the
   year 1122H./1710-11.²

¹ All inscriptions follow translations by Manijeh Bayani in Grube & Sims (1995) unless otherwise noted.

² On the back of the painting S.C. Welch has translated the date 1042H./1632-33.
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Group B (in which a few participants sit in an exterior setting)

Persian

4) Shah Abbas and Khan Alam with an Attendant
   Signed Riza-i Abbsi, attributed to Mu‘in (after Riza), late 17th century
   20.2 x 14.6 cm
   JRLM Album I.D. 12, f. 9r
   Robinson (1972), B2; Grube & Sims (1995), 10

5) Shah Abbas and Khan Alam with an Attendant
   Attributed to Mu‘in, third quarter 17th century
   18.9 x 12.3 cm
   Present location unknown
   C.29.4.70.111; Grube & Sims (1995), 9; Robinson (1972), B3

6) Shah Abbas and Khan Alam with an Attendant
   Isfahan, mid 17th century
   21.8 X 10.7 cm
   Present location unknown

Indian

7) Shah Abbas and Khan Alam with an Attendant
   Late 17th century
   Present location unknown (formerly of the Schulz collection)
   Gangoly (1920), 2; Grube & Sims (1995), 11; Robinson (1972), B4
   Inscription: The portrait of the deceased Shah Abbas and Khan Alam. That which is
   brought by the sincere servant Khayratkhan.

8) Shah Abbas and Khan Alam with an Attendant
   Late 17th century
   25 x 13.9 cm
   BM 1974-6-17-02 (04)
   Grube & Sims (1995), 12; Titley (1977), 26.4
   Inscription (possibly later): Shah Abbas the Great.

9) Shah Abbas and Khan Alam with an Attendant
   C.1680, Golconda
   32 x 19 cm
   Present location unknown
   S.4.3.57.49.f.24; Grube & Sims (1995), 13; Robinson (1972), B5
   Inscription: Shah Abbas the Great

10) Shah Abbas and Khan Alam with an Attendant
    Second half 17th century
    Present location unknown
    S.11.10.91.779

---

3 On abbreviations for sales catalogues: S=Sotheby’s, C=Christie’s followed by the date, month, year and lot number of the item.

4 The painting is typically attributed to Isfahan, but I believe it is closer to Indian examples.
Group C (in which many participants sit in an exterior setting)

Indian

11) *Shah Abbas and Khan Alam with Courtiers*
Signed Bishan Das, c. 1620 (or perhaps a later copy of a lost painting)
37 x 25.2 cm
BMIA 14.665
Okada (1992), 192; Grube & Sims (1995), 5; Robinson (1972), B1
Inscriptions (identify figures as): Shah Abbas, Isfandiyar Beg, Khan Alam, Isa Khan
Qurchi Bashi, and Niyyazamand Khan. Work of Bishan Das.

12) *Shah Abbas and Khan Alam with Courtiers* (sketch)
Attributed to Bishan Das, c. 1615-18 (or perhaps a later copy of a lost sketch)
Present location known (formerly of the Tagore Collection, Calcutta)
Gangoly (1920), fig. 1; Grube & Sims (1995), 3, Robinson (1972), C1

13) *Shah Abbas and Khan Alam with Courtiers*
Signed Bishan Das, c. 1620
28.1 x 15.5 cm
Present location unknown (1985 anonymous loan to VAM)
S.17.10.83.64; Grube & Sims (1995), 4; Crill (1985), 1
Inscription: Work of Bishan Das who went to Iraq accompanying Khan Alam the envoy.

14) *Shah Abbas and Khan Alam with Courtiers*
19th century
27.4 x 16 cm
VAM IS 219-1951 (formerly of the Rothenstein collection)
Robinson (1972), C2; Grube & Sims (1995), 7; Crill (1985), 2
Inscriptions (identify figures as): portrait of Shah Abbas, portrait of Khan Alam, Mehtar
Haji, Kwajah, ....? Khan, Yusef Agha, portrait of Mirza Beg Tatar, Isfandiyar Beg.

15) *Shah Abbas and Khan Alam with Courtiers*
Late 17th century
16.2 x 12.5 cm
Present location unknown
S.28.4.81.30; Grube & Sims (1995), 6

16) *Shah Abbas and Khan Alam with Courtiers*
18th century
29.1 x 17.4 cm
BM 1974 6-17-015 (37)
Grube & Sims (1995), 14; Robinson (1972), C3; Titley (1977), 39.11
Inscriptions (identify figures as): Shah Abbas, Khan Alam.

17) *Shah Abbas and Khan Alam with Courtiers*
Signed Lekhrraj, possibly from Kashmir, 18th century
MCEP
Tyulayev (1955), 26; Grube & Sims (1995), 15; Robinson (1972) C4
Inscriptions: The banquet of Shah Abbas, the vali of Iran. The picture of Khan Alam, the
envoy of Shah Jahan. The picture of the vazir. The picture of Ray Bhchitr, the painter.
The work of Lisgraj, the painter.
Group D (in which many participants sit in an interior setting) [Indian]

18) Pavillion Feast (sketch)
   17th century?
   BKB 6904m
   Unpublished

19) A Feast in a Pavillion Setting
   C. 1620
   23.4 x 14.6 cm
   CMA 20.1966
   Leach (1986), 22
   Inscription (later, in Hindi): Babur.

20) Two Persians Feasting
   C. 1630-50
   15 x 10 cm
   CBL 32.1.9 (formerly of the Wellesley collection)
   Leach (1995), 3.72
   Inscription (on back): Shah Abbas

21) A King Holding Court
   18th century?
   15.8 x 10 cm
   BLO Ms. Ouseley add. 175, f.3r
   Bodleian picture books (1953), 17
Part 2 - Portraits of Shah Abbas

Indian

22) Shah Abbas (sketch)
Attributed to Bishan Das, c. 1617
14.9 x 11.7 cm
PC
Hodgkin (1983), 2; Grube & Sims (1995), 19

23) Shah Abbas (sketch)
A page from the Barberini Album
Attributed to Bishan Das, c. 1617
17.8 x 11.2 cm
BLVR Barberini Or. 136, 1r
Kurz (1967), 7; Grube & Sims (1995), 20

24) Portrait of Shah Abbas
Attributed to Bishan Das, c. 1613-19
18.1 x 9 cm
BM 1920-9-17-013-2
Rogers (1993), 60; Grube & Sims (1995), 21
Inscription: Shah Abbas.

25) Portrait of Shah Abbas (or Isa Khan)
Signed Bishan Das (perhaps a later ascription), c. 1613-19
15.8 x 8.1 cm
SAK
Goswamy (1987), 70; Grube & Sims (1995), 22; Canby (1998), 103
Inscription: The portrait of Isa Khan. Bishan Das

26) Portrait of a Young Shah Abbas
17th century?
BM, unregistered
Titeley (1977), 168; Grube & Sims (1995), 31
No reproduction known

27) Portrait of Shah Abbas
17th century?
IMC
Brown (1975), 152 (ref); Grube & Sims (1995), 23
No reproduction known

28) Shah Abbas with a Gun
A page from the Gulshan Album
Attributed to Bishan Das, c. 1613-19
18.3 x 9.4 cm
GPLT
Godard (1937), 68; Grube & Sims (1995), 24
29)  *Shah Abbas with a Gun*
A page from the *Baberini Album*
Attributed to Bishan Das, c. 1613-19
19.3 x 11.3 cm
BLVR Barberini Or. 136, 8r
Kurz (1967), 8a; Grube & Sims (1995), 25

30)  *Shah Abbas with a Gun*
A page from the *Baberini Album*
Attributed to Bishan Das, c. 1613-19
19 x 11.8 cm
BLVR Barberini Or. 136, 7r
Kurz (1967), 11; Grube & Sims (1995), 26
No reproduction known

31)  *Shah Abbas with a Gun*
A page from the *Warren Hastings Album*
C.1700
18.9 x 11 cm
Present location unknown (formerly of the Phillips collection)
S.23.5.86.28; S.27.11.74.811; Grube & Sims (1995), 27

32)  *Shah Abbas with a Gun*
18th century?
LCM
Grube & Sims (1995), 28

33)  *Shah Abbas with a Gun*
Late 17th or early 18th century?
BLO Douce.Or.a.1, 28v
Unpublished

34)  *Shah Abbas with a Gun and Powder Horn (drawing)*
17th century
15.6 x 10.3 cm
BM 1974 6-17 09 (23d)
Titley (1977), 31.1 (ii); Grube & Sims (1995), 29
No reproduction known

35)  *Shah Abbas with a Falcon*
A page from the *Polier Album*
C. 1640
17 x 9.6 cm
BM 1920 9-17 044
Rogers (1993), 72; Grube & Sims (1995), 30; Titley (1977), 395.68
36) Shah Abbas on a Horse
A page from the St. Petersburg Album
Attributed to Bishan Das, c. 1615
26.2 x 19.5 cm
RASSP Album E-14, 36r
Ivanov (1962) 16; Grube & Sims (1995), 34; Akimushkin (1996), 79

37) Shah Abbas in a Garden
A page from the St. Petersburg Album
Attributed to Bishan Das, c. 1615
26.5 x 14.5 cm
RASSP Album E-14, 37r
Ivanov (1952) 15; Grube & Sims (1995), 36; Akimushkin (1996), 102

38) Shah Abbas on a Horse
17th century
26 x 19.5 cm
BMFA 14.643
Coomaraswamy (1929), 84; Grube & Sims (1995), 35

Persian
39) Shah Abbas with a Page (drawing)
Signed Muhammad Qasim, dated 1627
25.5 x 15 cm
ML, MAO 494
Grube & Sims (1995), 32; Soustiel (1986), 24
Not reproduced here
Inscription: He (God) may your fortune be to take from three lips: the lips of the beloved, the lips of the brook, the lips of the cup. It was written on jum'a, the 24th of Jamadi al-thani, the year 1036 (Friday, the 10th of February, 1627). Drawn by the mean, humble Muhammad Qasim, the painter.

40) Shah Abbas with a Woman (drawing)
A page from the Riza-i Abbas Album
Signed Riza-i Abbasi, dated 1638
12.4 x 9 cm
FGA 53.27
Atil (1978), 30; Grube & Sims (1995), 33
Inscription: He (God) on Wednesday, 17th Safar, it was finished in excellence and success, the year 1(0)48 (30th June 1638). This painting was finished. Drawn by the humble Riza-i Abbasi.

41) Shah Abbas with Companions
Wall painting
C. 1647
Ispahan, Chihil Sutun
Grube & Sims (1974), 5; Grube & Sims (1995), 1

---

5 The painting is typically attributed to Persia, but I believe it is close to Indian examples.
42) **Shah Abbas Receives the Vali Muhammad Khan**  
Wall painting  
C.1647  
Isfahan, Chihil Sutun  

43) **Shah Abbas Orders an Execution**  
An illustration to a Safavi History  
C. 1670  
CBL ms.279, f. 5b  
Arberry (1959-62), 279, pg. 51  
No reproduction known

44) **Shah Abbas with Imam Quli Khan**  
An illustration to the *Jarunnama*  
C.1697  
BL Add. 7801, f.15v  
Grube & Sims (1995), 39; Titley (1977) 226.2  
No reproduction known

45) **Shah Abbas and his Court (right half of a doublepage frontispiece)**  
An illustration in the *Khamsa* of Nizami  
C. 1628, Shiraz  
14.6 x 7.3 cm  
JRLM Ryl Pers. 35, f. 2a  
Robinson (1981), 669

46) **Shah Abbas and Courtiers Hunting (doublepage finispiece)**  
An illustration in the *Khamsa* of Nizami  
C. 1628, Shiraz  
14.6 x 7.3 cm  
JRLM Ryl Pers. 35, f. 318b-319a  
Robinson (1981), 670

47) **The Amir's of Shah Abbas (right half of a doublepage composition)**6  
C. 1640  
WAG no. 10.691  
Brend (1984), 1

48) **Shaykh Abdal Pir-zada Presenting a Captured Horse to Shah Abbas**  
An illustration to the *Silsilatu'n Nasab-i- Safawiyya*  
C. 1660  
Library of E.G. Browne, H. 12, f. 80r  
Browne (1959) IV, pl. 2

---

6 Shah Abbas would have been portrayed on the missing left half.
49) Shah Abbas with Turkish, Indian and European Ambassadors (doublepage frontispiece)  
An illustration in the Kulliyat of Sadi  
Dated 1624, Shiraz  
18.5 x 11 cm  
IOL Johnson ms. 843, f. 1b-2a  
Robinson (1980), 514

50) Shah Abbas with his Courtiers (doublepage painting)  
An illustration to the Recueil des poesies d'Anvari  
C. 1620's, Isfahan  
BN ms. 514, f. 2b-3a  
Blochet (1926), 135-36
Part 3 - Imaginary Encounters of Jahangir and Shah Abbas

51) *Jahangir Entertains Shah Abbas*
A page from the *St. Petersburg Album*
C. 1618-22
25 x 18.3 cm
FGA 42.16
Beach (1981), 17c; Ettinghausen (1961b), 13; Grube & Sims (1995) 38
Inscription: When Shah Jahangir and Abbas Shah, two felicitous kings and shadows of God, take to hand in joy Jamshid’s cup and sit next to each other in fortune, the world flourishes through their justice and the people of the world are at peace. When firend and brother are worthy of each other, O God, may they enjoy the fruits of each other in good fortune....Portrait of His majesty Nuruddin Jahangir Padishah son of Akbar Padishah son of Humayun Padishah son of Babur Padishah son of Umar-Shaykh Mirza son of Sultan Abu Said Mirza son of Sultan-Muhammad Mirza son of Mirza Miranshah son of Amir Sahibqiran (Timur)....(in Jahangir’s hand) a portrait of my brother Shah Abbas, portrait of Khan Alam, portrait of Asaf Khan.7

52) *Jahangir Embraces Shah Abbas*
A page from the *St. Petersburg Album*
Signed Abul Hasan, c. 1618-22
23.8 x 15.4 cm
FGA 45.9
Beach (1981), 17b; Ettinghausen (1961b), 12; Grube & Sims (1995), 37
Inscription: The contents of a dream His Majesty had at Chashma-i Nur, and he composed this line of poetry....Our Shah came in a dream and made me happy. He who woke me from my sleep is an enemy to my dream.....Since nawroz was near it was made in haste, and the blessed form of the Shah was ascertained from a group who had seen him, and with the help of analogy and likeness of one who was like him, in short a likeness was made which most believe to be like him. (God) is the omniscient giver of form....Done by the devoted muridzada Nadiruz-Zaman son of Aqa Riza (Abul Hasan)....(several countries and regions indicated on globe).

7 Translations for cat. nos. 46 and 47 by Wheeler Thackston from FGA folder sheets.
Part 4 - External Objects Exchanged

Extant Objects

53) Genealogical Ruby
Fifteenth century
KNM
Unpublished

54) Hung-Chih Dish
Porcelain blue and whiteware
C. 1488-1505, China
AS
Pope (1956), pg. 56

Representations

55) From catalogue number 51:
Falcon, walrus ivory hilt dagger, European drinking vessel (Diana riding a stag), 2
Venetian reliquaries, Italian table, Italian ewer, Chinese cup, 2 Persian? vessels, Venetian
glass, grapes, apples, melons, figs, apricots, plantains, tangerines, pears, lemons, olives,
pineapples, sweetmeats, pistachios, other nuts.

56) Abyssinian Zebra
A page from the Minto Album
Signed Mansur, dated 1621
26.8 x 38.7 cm
VAM IM 23-1925
Welch (1978), 93; Verma, (1994), 267
Inscription (in Jahangir’s hand): A *gur-khar* (wild ass) which the Turks who came with
Mir Jafar brought from Abyssinia in the year 1030 A.H. (1621). This picture was drawn
by *Nādir-al-Asri* Ustad Mansur in the 16th year of the reign.
Part 5 - By-products of External Exchange

57)  *Portrait of Khudabuksha Mirza*
A page from the *Gulistan Album*
Signed Bishan Das, c. 1615-18
15 x 7.5 cm
GPL, folio 51
Godard (1937), fig. 98
Inscription (in Jahangir’s hand): Portrait of Khudabaksha Mirza, father of Shah Abbas, my brother. Work of Bishan Das. 8

58)  *Portrait of Saru Taqi*
Attributed to Bishan Das, c. 1613-1619
15.4 x 8 cm
FGA 1997.30
Lawton (1998), 186-87
Inscription: In the likeness of Saru Taqi. Bishan Das.

59)  *Portrait of Khan Alam*
C. 1618
14.9 x 7.3 cm
ML 7.180
Stchoukine (1929), 25c

60)  *Portrait of Khan Alam* (sketch)
A page from the *Riza-i Abbasi Album*
Dated 1641 (incorrectly)
9.9 x 6.7 cm
FGA 53.14
Atel (1978), 39
Inscription: Tuesday 12th of Shawal 1050 (January 1641).

8 Translated into French from the original Persian by Y. Godard
Part 6 - Internal Objects Exchanged

Extant

61) *Al-Hashyat Ala Sharh al-Matali*
Copied by Gada-yi, dated 994H/1585
18.4 x 11 cm
SJM acc. 146-32
Seyller (1997), 344; SJM Arabic cat., 6, no. 1705
No reproduction known
Inscription: The volume of *Sharh* was a gift of a son of Nawab Shahnawaz Khan, and entered the imperial library *awwal* on the date of the twenty-seventh of Shawwal 1026 (18 October 1617) by order of Salim Khan.9

62) *Panj Ganj* of Jami
Copied by Sultan Ali Mashhadi
C. 1520; illumination c. 1603
32.2 x 20.1 cm
CBL Ms. 20; colophon, C.18.10.94.8
Leach (1995), cat. 5.177-5.306; Seyller (1997), 300
Inscription (on f. 1a): This *Panj Ganj* of Mawlana Abd al-Rahman Jami which the late Sultan Ali Mashhadi has written...Verily it appears to be his calligraphy. In the matchless area of Kashmir in the year 20 of the propitious reign, 1034 Hijri (1624-25), (this book) from the books of Abd al-Rahim entered the library of this supplicant of the Divine Court. Written by Nur al-Din Jahangir Shah, son of Akbar......In the year 929 (1522/23) it entered the library of His Successful Highness Ismail Safavi as (a present-*armaya*) from Mirza Ali Beg b. Amir Muhammad Barla in the region of the (minar) of Shaikh Jam (peace be) upon him.10

63) A Religious Tract of Abdullah al-Ansari Haravi
Copied by Sultan Ali al-Mashhadi, dated 921
RLR
Suhrawardu (1917), cxxxxiv
No reproduction known
Inscription: It states (in Jahangir’s hand) that the valuable manuscript was given as a present (pishkash) by the Khankhanan in 1023 A.H. (1614). There is also a note in Shah Jahan’s hand that says he acquired the manuscript on the day of his accession to the throne, the 28th day of Jumada, 1037 A.H. (1627). A third note in the hand of Abd al-Rahim Khankhanan states that he acquired the manuscript in 998 A.H. (1589). Contains seals of Shah Jahan, Alamgir, and the Khankhanan.

9 Translations for cat. nos. 54, 55, and 57 by John Seyller in *Artibus Asiatic* (1998).

10 Second translation from Leach, pg. 567.
Quran
Copied by Yaqut Musta’sami, dated 687H/1283
25.3 x 16.7 cm
SJM Nm. 238
Seyller (1997), 344; SJM Arabic cat., 2, 2
No reproduction known
Inscription (on f. 1a): This supplicant of the divine court sends (this book) to the best
model of the divine men and the light of piety, Hasan Khwaja, on the date of the first of
the Ilahi month Shahriwar, corresponding to 2 Ramazan 1029 (1 August 1620) as a
present. Written by Nur al-Din Jahangir, son of Akbar Padshah Ghazi. In the name of
God, the Compassionate, the Merciful. This Holy Koran, which his Majesty Jannat-
Makani (Jahangir) had sent as a present to Khwaja Hasan Juibari, is taken from the afore-
mentioned Khwaja by Imam Quli Khan. The aforementioned Khan had given it in turn to
his younger brother, Nazar Muhammad Khan. In the year 20 of the blessed reign, cor-
responding to 1056 Hijri (1646-47), after the conquest of victory of the House of Victory
Balkh, Nazar Muhammad Khan fled from there to Iraq to take refuge with Abbas Mirza.
All of the belongings of the aforementioned Khan entered the (library) by the grace and
favor of God. Written by the second Lord of the Conjunction Shah Jahan, son of Jahangir
Padshah, son of Akbar Ghazi. I have given this Holy Koran the glorious Furqan to the
offspring of the eminent saints and the essence of the great God-fearing men, graced by
the favors of the Divine Creator. Al Khwaja Muhammad Ya-qub, son of al-Khwaja
Muhammad Yusuf, son of al-Khwaja Hasan al-Juibari in conformity with God’s words:
“Surely God commands you to make over trusts to those worthy of them.” The writer of
these words is one who hopes for the intercession of the Hijazi Prophet, Muhammad
Awrangzeb, son of Shah Jahan Padshah Ghazi.
65) *Akbar Giving a Sarpich to Jahangir*  
A page from the *Late Shah Jahan Album*  
C. 1650  
36.9 x 25.2 cm  
AHT 129a  
Soudavar (1992), 311

66) *Akbar giving a Falcon to Jahangir*  
A page from the *Kevorkian Album*  
Signed Balchand, c. 1630  
38.9 x 23.4 cm  
MMA 55.121.10.10v  
Welch (1987), 100; Okada (1992), 30

67) *Jahangir Receives an Aigrette*  
A page from the *Late Shah Jahan Album*  
C. 1650  
44.9 x 33 cm  
AMSG S86.407  
Lowry (1988), 171

68) *Jahangir Giving Books to Shaikhs*  
An illustration to the *Jahangirnama*, a page from the *St. Petersburg Album*  
C. 1620  
47.9 x 33 cm  
FGA 31.20  
Beach (1981), 17d; Akimushkin (1996), plate 124

69) *Jahangir Preferring a Sufi Shaikh to Kings*  
A page from the *St. Petersburg Album*  
Signed Bichitr, c. 1615-18  
47.9 x 33 cm  
FGA 42.15  
Beach (1981), 168; Akimushkin (1996), pl. 205; Ettinghausen (1961b), pl.14  
Inscription: Shah Nur-ud-din Jahangir, son of Akbar, the emperor. He is emperor in form and spirit through the grace of God. Although to all appearances Kings stand before him, He looks inwardly towards the dervish (for guidance)....(on the throne) O Shah, may the span of your life be a thousand years.  

---

11 Other paintings known to me are of *Prince Khurram offering precious stones to his father Jahangir at Urdi in 1607* from a *Dhvan* of Hafiz of c. 1610 in the BL Or. 7573 (see Pinder Wilson, 95h) and *An Audience of Jahangir* of c. 1620 from the *Tizuk-i Jahangiri* in a PC (see Pinder Wilson, 113).

12 At least two more versions of this composition survive. One is located in the Ehrenfeld Collection (Ehnbom, 21) and the other is in Bucharest (Oprescu, 106).

13 Freely translated by Richard Ettinghausen.
70) *Darbar of Jahangir (Presentation of a Book by Sadi* (doublepage painting)
Signed Abul Hasan, c. 1615
16.9 x 12.3 cm
FGA 46.28 (right half); WAG W.668, f. 37 (left half)
Beach (1981), 20; Etinghausen (1961a), fig. 3
Inscription (upper right of right half): The emperor of Rum.

71) *Jahangir Receives Pearls*
C. 1610
VAM IS 114-1955
No scholarly discussions known

72) *Jahangir Dispensing Food in Ajmer*
An illustration to the *Jahangirnama*
C. 1615
20.8 x 31.8 cm
PWM
Beach (1981), 173; Wirgen (1987), 76

73) *Jahangir Weighing Prince Khurram on his Sixteenth Birthday*
An illustration to the *Jahangirnama*
Ascribed to Manohar, c. 1615-25
26.6 x 20.5 cm
BM 1948-10-9-069
Skelton (1982), 40; Okada (1992), 147; Rogers (1993), 92

74) *Akbar Hands his Imperial Crown to Shah Jahan*
A page from the *Minto Album*
Signed Bichitr, dated 1631
29.7 x 20.5 cm
CBL Ms. 7, no. 19
Okada (1992), 32

75) *Festivities on the Occasion of the Accession of Emperor Jahangir*
An illustration to the *Jahangirnama*, a page from the *St. Petersburg Album*
Signed Abul Hasan, c. 1605 or 1615
22 x 37.8 cm
RASSP, Album E-14, f. 21r
Akimushkin (1996), 176
Part 8 - Representations of Later Embassies

76) Shah Jahan Receives the Persian Ambassador, Muhammad-Ali Beg
An illustration to the Padshahnama
Attributed to the Kashmiri painter, c. 1633
30.7 x 20.2 cm
RLWC Ms. 1367, f. 98v
Beach (1997), 17; Welch (1987), 258

77) The Persian Ambassador Yadgar Beg Received at Lahore
An illustration to the Padshahnama
Attributed to Payag, c. 1640
34.5 x 23.8 cm
BLO Ms. Ouseley Add. 173, no. 13
Topsfield (1994), 14; Beach (1997), fig. 149

78) Shah Abbas II and the Mughal Ambassador
Attributed to Muhammad Zaman, c. 1663
8 x 12.5 cm
SAK
Welch (1985) cat. no.100; A. Welch (1973) cat. no. 63

79) Shah Abbas II and the Mughal Ambassador
Signed Shaikh Abbasi, dated 1663-64,
9 x 5.5 cm
Collection of Mehdi Mahboubian
A. Welch (1973) cat. no. 62
Part 9 – Portraits of Ambassadors and Courtiers

80)  *Muhammad Ali Beg*
     C. 1660
     17.8 x 10.7 cm
     BL 1920 9-17 -13 (5)
     No scholarly discussion known

81)  *Muhammad Ali Beg*
     A page from the *Kevorkian Album*
     Ascribed Hashim, early nineteenth century
     38.9 x 25.4 cm
     MMA 55.121.10.27v
     Welch (1987), cat. no. 87
     Inscribed: Portrait of Muhammad Ali Beg, ambassador, by Hashim

82)  *Muhammad Ali Beg*
     A page from the *Minto Album*
     Signed Hashim, c. 1630
     38.5 x 26.4
     VAM IM 25-1925
     Guy and Swallow (1990), 69

83)  *Lashkar Khan, Ambassador to Persia*
     C. 1660
     18.7 x 11.4 cm
     BL 1920 9-17 -13 (5)
     No scholarly discussion known

84)  *Portrait of the Turkish Ambassador to the Court of Shah Jahan*
     C. 1651-54
     22.8 x 11.2 cm
     S.22/23.10.93.503

85)  *Khankhanan Abdur Rahim*
     A page from the *Kevorkian Album*
     C. 1625
     38.9 x 25.4 cm
     FGA 39.50a
     Welch (1987), cat. no. 20
     Inscribed: (in Shah Jahan’s hand) a good likeness of Khankhanan the commander, work of Hashim.
86  Portrait of Raja Suraj Singh Rathor
A page from the Kevorkian Album
C. 1600-15
38.9 x 25.4 cm
MMA 55.121.10.7r
Welch (1987), cat. nos. 29
Inscribed: (in Shah Jahan’s hand?) a portrait of ... Raja Suraj Singh Rathor, done by Bishan Das.

87)  A Portrait of Rup Singh, son of Ray Chanda
A page from the Kevorkian Album
C. 1600-15
38.9 x 25.4 cm
MMA 55.121.10. 8v
Welch (1987), cat. nos. 30
Inscribed: (left in Shah Jahan’s hand?) a portrait of...Raja Suraj Singh Rathor, done by Bishan Das.
Inscribed (Probably in Jahangir’s hand) a portrait of Rup Singh, son of Ray Chanda (sic), done by Govardan.

88)  Four Portraits
A page from the Kevorkian Album
C. 1610-15
38.9 x 25.4 cm
MMA 55.121.10.29r
Welch (1987), cat. no. 26
Inscribed: (Upper left in Jahangir’s hand) Raja (name illegible), (in Shah Jahan’s hand) work of Balchand.
(Upper right) Inayat Khan, ascribed to Daulat.
(Lower left) Abdul Khaliq, work of (?) (perhaps Balchand).
(Lower right in Jahangir’s hand) work of Jamal Khan Qarawal, Murad (original inscription on the right in Shah Jahan’s hand defaced).
Appendix C
Supplemental Visual Evidence
List of Figures

1. Map of the Mughal and Safavid Empires
   From Riazul Islam's *Indo-Persian Relations*, finispece

2. *Jahangir Holding a Falcon*
   Attributed to Manohar, c. 1600-10
   14 x 8.6 cm
   BMNY 87.234.7
   Poster (1994), 36
   Inscribed: Emperor Jahangir

3. *Prince Salim as a Young Man*
   A page from the *Minto Album*
   Signed Bichitr, c. 1635
   25 x 18.1 cm
   VAM IS 28-1925
   Okada (1992), 201

4. *Shah Jahan*
   A page from the *St. Petersburg Album*
   C. 1645
   12.3 x 17.2 cm
   RASSP, Album E-14, f. 29r
   Akimushkin (1996), 64

5. *Nushirwan Enthroned*
   An illustration to the *Habib al-Siyar*
   C. 1590-1600
   38.7 x 23.8 cm
   AMSG S86.201
   Lowry and Beach (1989), 211

6. *The Surrender of Qandahar*
   An illustration to the *Padshahnama*
   C. 1640-45
   34.1 x 24.2 cm
   MG MA3318
   Okada (1992), 51
7. Wine Cup
Copper with engraved frieze
First quarter of the 17th century
16.5 (height) x 34.6 (diameter) cm
PWM 56.61
Welch (1985), 119

8. Dish from the Household of Shah Jahan
Porcelain with blue and white decoration
Chinese, early 15th century
43.3 (diameter) cm
PC
Skelton (1982), 402

9. Timur Celebrates a Victory
Ascribed Farrukh Beg, early twentieth century
21.2 x 31.3 cm
PC
S.13.12.72.200
Inscribed: He is (God)! Thanks be to God, the Most High: A scene in the illustrious reign of His Majesty Timur Gurgani, may his resting place be in paradise. This original drawing was executed by Ustad Bihzad for Khalil Mirza Shah Rukhi in the fifteenth year of his accession. This slave of the court Farrukh Beg has made a copy from it.

10. Shah Jahan Honors Religious Orthodoxy
An illustration to the Padshahnama, a page from the St. Petersburg Album
C. 1635
30.5 x 23.1 cm
FGA 42.17
Beach (1981), 17e
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