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Abstract

Mughal painting achieved its finest glory and refinement during the reign of Jahangir (1605-1627). Born in 1569, he grew up in an atmosphere conducive to the development of a lively interest in artistic pursuit. An attempt has been made to trace the evolution of his complex personality which exerted a great influence on the development of Mughal painting. The establishment of an independent atelier, called here the Salim Studio, and its achievements have been noted in Chapter 3.

After becoming emperor Jahangir continued the tradition of MS-illustration for a few years. The large number of pictures collected by him since his early years were mounted on the large folios of a set of sumptuously produced albums. Then his leading painters, Farrukh Beg, Daulat, Abu'l Hasan, Manohar, Mansur and Bishandás, settled down to produce a series of remarkable portrait-studies and genre scenes. Many of these were used as illustrations of the emperor's autobiographical work called the Jahangirnâma. Chapters 4 to 8 are devoted to the study of these different phases of Jahangirî painting.

The complicated political events of the later years of his reign cast a shadow of gloom on Jahangir's mind. Coupled with his sickness and a number of other factors these events made him contemplative and fearful of his destiny. Abu'l Hasan and Bichitr prepared a series of allegorical drawings to illustrate his inner agonies. In order to evolve the iconographical symbols they drew heavily on the European engravings. Chapter 9 deals with the series of allegorical drawings, while Chapter 10 is concerned with the whole question of European impact.

The reign of Jahangir also witnessed the beginning of the decadence of the Mughal style and a rapid decentralisation of artistic pursuit.
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Preface

The present study deals with a large number of MSS and miniatures deposited in museums, libraries and private collections throughout the world. Many of them are unpublished. Lack of communication and absence of proper recording and publication prove a great hindrance to their identification and study. I was however fortunate to be able to examine many of them in India, the U.K., Ireland and Europe, including the U.S.S.R., Czechoslovakia, Hungary and East Germany. I am indebted to the authorities of the public and private institutions in these countries for providing me with help and facilities, specially Dr. Hayes and Mr. Zichy of the Chester Beatty Library. My inability to examine the rich treasures of Jahangiri paintings in the American Collections has been made up to a large extent through the publications of Professor R. Ettinghausen and Mr. S.C. Welch and the personal help of Dr. Dorothy Miner and Mr. Milo C. Beach.

To present the mass of materials thus collected in the form of a thesis was not an easy task for me. I would express my sincere gratitude to my Supervisor Mr.
J.G. Burton-Page, who took charge of my work from Professor K. de B. Codrington when he retired, for his inspiring guidance and sympathetic help in every stage of my work. I have been encouraged and assisted throughout the course of my research in the University of London by my friends and colleagues. I am much indebted to Mr. Simon Digby for reading and translating many difficult inscriptions and giving help in various other ways. Mr. R. Pinder-Wilson, Mr. D. Barrett and Mr. G. Meredith-Owens of the British Museum, Mr. R. Skelton of the Victoria and Albert Museum and Mrs. M. Archer of the India Office Library, who took keen interest in my work, put forward various suggestions, discussed many difficult problems arising out of my work and gave me every opportunity to facilitate my study for which I am grateful to them. I should also like to thank Miss Maureen Collings, Mr. Paul Fox, Mr. R. Majumdar and Mr. P. Jangla for their help.

It would never have been possible for me to complete my study without the scholarship awarded by the Association of Commonwealth Universities for which I am deeply grateful to the Association. The Board of Trustees of Indian Museum, Calcutta was kind enough to grant me leave for the entire period, and to them also my thanks are due.
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Introduction

The period of Jahāngīr's reign from 1605 to 1627 was politically unremarkable. After the dramatic situation leading to the foundation of Mughal rule in India by Bābar, the period of unsettled fortune of Humāyūn and the spectacular success achieved in the battlefield and outside it by Akbar, it was nothing more than a colourless interregnum. Jahāngīr's easy-going nature proved no match for the adventurism or ability of his predecessors. However, Jahāngīr was neither a weakling nor an unworthy administrator, and the basic political structure of the enormous Mughal empire did not undergo any drastic change during his reign.

Jahāngīr's real interest lay not so much in enlarging his political fortune as in stabilising and integrating into a coherent shape the fortunes already accumulated. He was essentially a lazy man, slow and languorous, who was more interested in good food and easy life, with poetry, wine, women and sports. He was a real aristocrat with the eye of a naturalist, the vision of a poet, the taste of a connoisseur and the philosophy of an epicurean.
This slow and languorous nature made Jahângîr a great patron of all kinds of creative arts. His interest in novelty and curiosa and discriminating taste were ideal for the development of any art. The Mughal School of Painting had already established itself as one of the most successful and thriving schools of art in India when Jahângîr was beginning to take interest in painting. In the mass-producing Akbarî atelier, however, there was no set standard, no hard means test, as a consequence of which the finest Basâwans were not infrequently found along with third-grade pictures. It was left to Jahângîr to infuse new meaning, dimension and refinement into Mughal painting. With his critical mind, connoisseur's eyes, sophisticated taste and penchant for details the pictures produced under his patronage were remarkable for their refinement and quality.

My purpose here is to trace the background of the patron as well as the pictures produced in his atelier in order to show how the style of these pictures depended on the mood and temperament of Jahângîr. When Jahângîr was young and restless, the miniatures showed the restlessness in a variety of ways and glorified the cult of youth. When Jahângîr became emperor and the heavy burden of political
responsibility made him more conscious of his position, the painters produced masses of portraits and pictures showing the emperor, his daily life, his favourite sports and pets, his sons, entourage of nobles and friends and so on. When at the end of his reign Jahangir became weak and contemplative, the painters flattered and eulogised him by picturing him as a great ruler, benefactor and just short of a deity. Attracted by the growing splendour of the court and the living interest of the emperor in rare, valuable and beautiful objects, artists, craftsmen and traders came to the court in large numbers and provided it with rare glimpses of the outside world. The painters took full advantage of this situation and knowing the emperor's tolerant religious views and demand for absolute quality and refinement they did their best to produce pictures of unsurpassable subtlety and beauty. We have tried to show how this was achieved by his leading painters.

In order to put in a chronological sequence the pictures produced in Jahangir's atelier emphasis has been focussed on the identification of their contents. A large number of well-known pictures could thus be accurately dated. Pictures exhibiting apparent stylistic resemblance have also been included in the same category. Attention
has also been drawn to the contents of the murāqqa's which mirror Jahāngīr's taste and preserve the different types of materials fancied and collected by him. Unfortunately, in spite of my best efforts I could not examine the Gulshan album nor could I procure even a full photographic record of its entire content, and I had to depend mainly on the insufficient notices made in exhibition catalogues and reproductions of poor quality appended by L. Hájek and H. Goetz.

In order to limit the scope of this work my plan to re-examine the whole problem of the so-called Popular Mughal School had to be curtailed and I restricted myself to the productions of the imperial atelier. Although I have tried to incorporate as many plates as possible I have selected only those which illustrate the points discussed in the text.
PART ONE        THE INHERITED TRADITION
Jahângîr was born on 30th August, 1569, to Akbar's chief queen, the daughter of Râjâ Bhâr Mal of Amber. His birth is said to have been accompanied by mystical signs and portents, and followed years of yearnings and pilgrimages by Akbar and resort to the intercession of recluses and dervishes. According to the Tûzuk, the memoirs that Salîm wrote after becoming emperor, Akbar approached the venerated Shaîkh Salîm Chishtî for a child. The Shaikh assured the emperor by saying "the Giver who gives without being asked will bestow three sons on the emperor." Hearing this the emperor made a vow to cast his first son "on the skirt of the Shaikh's favour", to which the Shaikh agreed. As a result of this, when the Rajput princess showed signs of motherhood she was sent to the humble abode of the Shaikh at Sikri, a small village near Agra. When the child was born

he was named Salīm after the name of the Shaikh. Akbar always called Salīm as Shaikhūji or Shaikhū Bābā, a nickname which alludes to his birth at Shaikh Salīm's intercession.

Two other sons quickly followed Salīm's birth and made Akbar happy. At that time he was at the height of his power. The troubled throne of Hindustan that he inherited from his father Hūmāyūn was made secure and the empire enlarged and strengthened to a great extent. As the humble residence of Shaikh Salīm had acquired for him an atmosphere of sanctity and auspiciousness, he decided to build his new capital in its vicinity. A city of immense size was constructed in only a decade. To commemorate the brilliant victory of Gujarat, Fathpur, "City of Victory", was added to the site-name Sikri. For eighteen years it remained the Mughal capital, after which Lahore was selected as the seat of government for other overwhelming considerations.

In spite of his preoccupation with the affairs of state Akbar kept a careful watch over the proper upbringing of his sons. Having neglected his own education in his childhood at Kabul Akbar realised the need of proper education more than

2. Though not educated in the formal sense of the term, Akbar was certainly not illiterate. There is at least one example of his handwriting, authenticated by Jahāngīr's contemporary note, still surviving: T.W. Arnold, Bihzad and his painting in the Zafarnamah Ms, London, 1930, Pl.2 (facing Pl1). The Ms is now in the collection of John Hopkins University, Cambridge, Mass. Plate 150.
anyone else. The finest teachers and the most eminent scholars of the age were selected. Amongst the teachers appointed to look after Salim was the son of Bairam Khan, 'Abd-ur-Rahim Khan, who besides being a premier noble of the Mughal court, was a scholar and bibliophile, a well-known writer in both Persian and Hindi, a linguist, and an art connoisseur. Apart from studying Persian literature under him and Shaikh 

'Abdun-Nabi, Salim learnt Turkī and Hindi, and took lessons in history, geography and topography.

Even a cursory glance of his memoirs would show that he was well-grounded in traditional Muslim learning as regards both the natural sciences and theology. His knowledge of Turkī helped him to converse with the English traveller William Hawkins without an interpreter, to fill up the lacunae in the autograph copy of Babar's memoirs and to save his honour and life at the time of Mahābat Khan's coup de main.

---

3. Abu'l Fazl's record of Akbar's opinions regarding education is most illuminating as to his basic approach: "Every boy ought to read books on morals, arithmetic, the notation peculiar to arithmetic, agriculture, mensuration, geometry, astronomy, physiognomy, household matters, the rules of Government, medicine, logic, the Tabī'ī [physical sciences], Riyāzi [mathematics, astronomy, music and mechanics], and Ilāhi [theology], sciences and history, and all of which may be gradually acquired ... No one should be allowed to neglect these things, which the present time requires." - Ain, I, 289.

5. ETI, 11.
6. Tuzuk, I, 109-10. From the complex construction of the passage it is difficult to make out what actually Jahanī did, copying or making additions. In his characteristic way he adds, "Notwithstanding that I grew up in Hindustan I am not ignorant of Turkī speech and writing."

He developed a special interest in rare gems and precious stones and for all curious and out-of-the-way objects which were collected with enthusiasm and a perceptive eye; but perhaps more than any other rarities, unusual animals and birds appealed to him. He showed much interest in the arts in general and painting in particular, which concerns us here.

His education was not confined to formal studies. Akbar took him to the battlefields and entrusted him with responsible tasks even when he was very young. He was given the post of 10,000 mansabdâr when he was only eight, was informally acknowledged as the heir-apparent, and put in charge of the administration of criminal justice and registration of marriages and births as early as 1582. He was taken to the far-off provincial capitals and to places of pilgrimage. On the whole, Akbar's intention was to impart a comprehensive education and training to the heir-apparent.

Salîm was not an inattentive student and derived a good deal from his training. The entries in the Tûzk, though a record of personal impressions and reactions, testify to his knowledge and formal education. But being a favourite son he was rather too pampered by his parents and by the older members of the Zanâna, among them his grandmother Hâmîdâ Bânû, his great aunt Gulbadan Begam, and his stepmother Salîmâ Sultân Begam. This had a bad effect on the personality of the young prince.
His first marriage with Mān Bāī, daughter of Rājā Bhagwant Dās of Amber, was arranged before he was sixteen. The wedding was solemnised by both Muslim and Hindu rites and celebrated on a grandiose scale. This was the first of at least twenty marriages that he contracted before 1611, the year when he married Māh-un-nisā, the future Nūrjahan. Within two years of his first marriage Mān Bāī bore his first son Khusrau, in August, 1587, and obtained the title of Shāh Begam. Meanwhile, Akbar appointed Salīm to the unprecedented rank of 12,000 horse, perhaps hoping by this to give him a solemn sense of his responsibilities.

So even when he was in his teens Salīm was given enough power and responsibilities to earn him high position. But he did not grow up according to Akbar's ideals. He tasted his first cup of wine when he was 17 and from this time his consumption of alcohol steadily increased. The heavy addiction to wine and to opium may have magnified the faults of his character: he became frivolous, short-tempered, weak-minded and indecisive. Such qualities as sagacity, determination and perseverance which were so conspicuous in Akbar's character were absent in Salīm's. All attempts to persuade him to shoulder political responsibilities, to lead the army or to head the administration of important provinces failed. Instead of doing these he wasted his time in hunting and in frivolous revelries with a band of young friends and nobles.
He became jealous of his brothers, especially Murad, and hated Akbar's trusted counsellor and learned friend Abu'l Fazl. In spite of his large harem he still kept casting lustful eyes on beautiful maidens. Repeatedly he broke court etiquette and became the cause of Akbar's wrath and worry. At a time when Akbar was growing older, the lustre of the Mughal court was fading as many of the dazzling gems died, Murad and Daulat were wasting their lives in drinking and worthless occupations, and the attention of the court began to turn towards the most likely heir to the throne, Salim broke away from his father. Making Allahabad his headquarter he started behaving like a semi-independent king. No good counsel and lenient dealings of Akbar, no amount of intercession by Gulbadan Begam, Salima Sultan Begam and Mariyam Manani could bring Salim back to the right course. It was only because of the prudence and foresight of Akbar that no war of succession could break out and shake the foundation of the empire. When Salim finally came back to his fold, Akbar readily pardoned all the ill-conceived acts of his estranged son and in spite of strong opposition from the powerful nobles, selected Salim as his heir. The court intrigues to place Salim's young, handsome and popular son Khusrau on the throne after Akbar's death failed. After his accession to the throne, Jahangir, tried to be worthy of his title. His reign opened with a series of formal acts to
indicate this intention. He promulgated twelve rules of conduct known as the dastūr-ul-'amal and hung a golden Chain of Justice from his palace wall whose bell might be tolled by any suitor for justice, rich or humble. He remitted a number of extortionate custom duties for goods passing through different border points and also the demand of jilawāna. During his reign he issued farmāns prohibiting the making of eunuchs at Sylhet, and the sale of bang and būza (rice beer) in the open market and the smoking of tobacco and gambling. There was a strict order forbidding anyone who was drunk to come to the darbār or approach the king. He tried to introduce a new system of coinage and a new standard of weights and measures. He wanted to curb the power of the amirs, by issuing a series of rules called the A'in-i-Jahāngīrī, and put restrictions on wearing types of dress worn by himself. But, as his policies were guided by good intentions without any real effort, and his orders

9. ibid, I, 47, 107.
10. ibid, I, 46.
11. ibid, I, 150-51, 168.
12. ibid, I, 157.
13. ibid, I, 370-1.
14. Roe, 265-6; ETI, 331. Though Jahāngīr indulged in drinking and arranged frequent drinking parties, he was fully conscious of its ill-effects. He tried to decrease the number of his cups, and selected certain days for abstaining. He writes favourably about those who abstained from drinking. (Tuzuk, passim).
16. Tuzuk, I, 205.
17. ibid, I, 384.
were not backed by proper measures of punishment and strict supervision, most of these were of small practical value. He was a man of honest intention but of little effort. He was fortunate in inheriting a well-administered empire and an effective revenue system from his father, which brought a steady income to the state coffers, and financed his lavish expenditures. Though he tried to make occasional changes in the system of administration he was wise to leave the basic structure of Akbar's system undisturbed.

There is no means of assessing Jahāngīr as a military leader, because throughout his reign he himself did not fight a single battle. On the whole, his reign was peaceful. The only victories gained were Prince Khurram's subjugation of the Rānā of Chitor, the humbling of the ruler of Kishtwar and the annexation of the fort of Kangra. Jahāngīr gives such a lengthy and laudatory account of his son's triumph in Mewar in the Tūzuk, that the victory appears substantial, though in reality little was gained except prestige. On the other hand, his cherished hope of crushing Malik 'Ambar and subduing the Sultanates of the Deccan remained unfulfilled. The expense of huge sums of money and the appointment of the ablest generals and princes of his family proved futile. The only successes of his generals were elsewhere, in the annexation of the fort at Kangra and the crushing of the rebellions of his son Khusru.
of the Mirzâs in Gujarat, and in Bihar and Bengal. When within six months of his accession Khusrau suddenly rebelled against him, he was thoroughly shaken and nervous, as he was afraid of a general rising against him and of collusion between Khusrau and the powerful nobles such as Râja Mân Singh and 'Azîz Khân Koka. But his assumption was wrong, and the unplanned and ill-organised rebellion was crushed with little effort. When Qandahar was lost, Jahângîr with his limited political horizon could only regard this as the result of treachery of the Shâh of Itoan. As its timing coincided with his third son Shâh Jahân's rebellion, nothing could be done to recover that province. The rebellion of Shâh Jahân in itself may be considered as a direct result of Jahângîr's inherent weaknesses. Shâh Jahân was proud and obstinate, but, nevertheless, he was capable and devoted. But Jahângîr exaggerated the not very significant achievements of his son so much and depended so heavily on him, that Shâh Jahân became too conscious about his own power and position. When the emperor was guided and eclipsed by Nûr Jahân and her family, a clash of interests between the crafty empress and the proud prince was inevitable. It became, as the contemporary English ambassador Thomas Roe writes in his journal, a story of "a noble prince [Khusrau], his excellent wife [the daughter of Khân-û-Ázam], a faythfull counseller [Mâhâbat Khân?], a crafty stepmother [Nûr Jahân], an
ambitious sonne [Shâh Jahân], a cunning favorite [Âṣaf Khân]: all reconciled by a patient king, whose heart was not understood by any of all these.  

As days passed by, Jahângîr became increasingly addicted to wine and opium, to exhilarating parties and long hunting expeditions. Youthful indulgences and the heavy consumption of double-distilled wine led to an early breakdown of his health. Asthmatic 'shortness of breath' and other illnesses made him increasingly dependent on Nûr Jahân, whose treatments were thought by him better than those of the recognised physicians of the age, — Hakîm Ruknâ, Hakîm Qâsim Khânâzâd, and even Hakîm Šadrâ, Masîh-uz-Zamân. The increasing assumption of power by Nûr Jahân estranged the princes and made nobles hostile and subjects unhappy. Greed, intrigue and mutual distrust became rife in the court and the helpless emperor could only watch in silence, unable to interfere. The rebellion of Shâh Jahân did not bring the expected victory to the prince, but it could at best be contained, though not crushed by the imperial army.

Except for one brief period, in spite of his weaknesses Jahângîr was able to maintain his authority over the government and the empire. But although the huge empire painstakingly

19. Tuzuk, I, 226, 266-7; II, 12413, 212-4, etc.
built up by Bābar, Hāmāyūn and Akbar did not fall apart the inactivity of the central authority and prolonged internecine struggles certainly exposed signs of strain and weariness in it. Jahāngīr's credit lies in the fact that he survived.

Jahāngīr was a man of contrasts: he had impulses of a noble--heart, of sympathy, tolerance and understanding, yet he was whimsical, temperamental and at times, extremely intolerant. He was kind to his subjects, and strove to act for their welfare. The English ambassador Roe did not find much to say against Jahāngīr; he was impressed by the courtesy and kindness shown to him by the emperor. Edward Terry, the Chaplain of Roe, makes an accurate assessment of Jahāngīr when he writes, "The kings disposition seems composed of extreames: very cruell, and otherwhiles very milde; often overcome with wine, but severely punishing that fault in others." This strange admixture of savagery and kindness moulded his acts and deeds throughout his life. He took pity at the sight of his elephants shivering when being given a cold bath in winter, yet he watched the slaying of a man alive. There are many instances described in the Tuzuk which

---

20. ETI, 330-1.
21. Tuzuk, I, 410: He issued orders to heat the water to the temperature of lukewarm milk.
22. This happened in Allahabad, during the days of his rebellion. Akbar was horrified to learn of the barbarity of which the prince showed himself capable. In a letter of earnest
witness his variable temperament and unstable emotion. Most of his crueler actions were done in moments of frenzy when he had lost his temper or when he was drunk. Once he ordered the execution of a man but later when he changed his mind his order had already been carried out. Hearing this he instructed his officers to defer all executions till sunset, "if up to that time no order for release arrived, he should without fail be capitally punished." The corpses of many of those who supported his rebellious son Khusrau were kept on stakes on either side of the road, but the life of Khusrau himself was spared. The non-cooperation and systematic hostility of the powerful nobles favouring Khusrau were also tolerated. Thus his actions reveal an inherent lack of strength, and the absence of a determined policy. He remained perpetually temperament al and dependent on the crafty nobles and on their disinterested counsels.

footnote contd. from previous page ...
remonstrance he said that he could never bring himself to watch the flaying of a dead goat and wondered how his son could see the operation on a living human being."-BENIPRASAD, 59. An original Theodor Galle engraving of the ghastly scene of Flaying of Marsyas, is mounted on a folio (f8a) of the Jahangir Album, now at Tübingen. (A HAMZAN-AMA folio, recently acquired by the British Museum depicts a similar scene of a man being flayed alive.) There are numerous references to his cruelties in the writings of William Hawkins (ETI,108-10,113), Thomas Roe (Roe, 87,104,265) etc. Roe noted with surprise Jahangir's nature of watching the horrible scenes of execution,"some tymes [he] sees with too much delight in blood the execution done by his eliphants. ILLI MERU ERE: SED QUID TU UT ADDES? ('Doubtless they have merited their punishment; but why should you be present?"
(Roe,87).

footnote 24 overleaf ...
The paradox in Jahangîr becomes more apparent when he is compared with his predecessors, especially with his great-grandfather Bâbar and his father Akbar. He inherited some notable traits from them, yet in some respects his character was almost the reverse of theirs. By any standard Bâbar is an extraordinary character. As a man he was kind and generous; as a soldier brave, adventurous and daring; and as a statesman able and far-sighted. Behind the façade of his firm resoluteness and bravery Bâbar was a man who rarely omitted to notice an unknown bird or a beautiful flower even in times of adversity. He never lost his zeal or ideals, in fact, adversity made him resolute and firm in his single-hearted struggle. His lonely childhood was spent in all sorts of sports and games though he did not neglect his studies. His knowledge of Persian classics was excellent. The assessment of his cousin Mîrzâ Ḥâidîr, himself the author of the famous history Târîkh-i-Rashîdî, is worth noting:

"... In the composition of Turkî poetry he was second only to Amir 'Alî Shîr. He has written a Diwân in the purest and mostly lucid Turkî. He invented a style of verse called

---

24. Jahangîr writes in one place of his memoirs: "Although Khusraw had repeatedly done evil actions and deserved a thousand kinds of punishment, my fatherly affection did not permit me to take his life. Although in the laws of government and the ways of empire one should take notice of such disapproved deeds, I averted my eyes from his faults, and kept him in comfort and ease." - ibid, I, 122.
'Mubaiyan', and was the author of a most useful treatise on Jurisprudence which has been adopted generally. He also wrote a tract on Turki Prosody, superior in elegance to any other, and put into verse the Rasala-i-Validiyyah of his Holiness. Then there is his Vakâi or Turki History, which is written in a simple, unaffected, and yet very pure style. He excelled in music and other arts. In fact, no one of his family before him ever possessed such talents as his. Nor did any of his race ever perform such wonderful exploits, or experience such strange adventures as did he.  

Jahângîr did not invent any special script as Bâbar did, neither did he care to know and record who read the Shâhnâma or who could write good nasta'liq, but he did not fail to recognise poets and writers, learned teachers and ascetics. His handwriting, as appears on the fly-leaves of many MSS and on miniatures from his collection, is not elegant, but characteristically bold (Plate 150). His autobiography, the Tûzuk, though not perhaps comparable with Bâbar's excellent Turki prose, offers a good account of his straight-forward and rather naive thoughts and ideas as well as his penchant for small details. Like most Persian speaking rulers of the age he considered himself a poet; in one place of his memoirs he declares, "as I have a poetical disposition I sometimes

intentionally and sometimes involuntarily compose couplets and quatrains." In Hodivala’s rather harsh view they are in "characteristically self-sufficient ignorance of their utter worthlessness and banality." Many passages in the Tüzik prove his acquaintance with the works of such celebrated masters as Anwârî, Firdausî, Sanâ’î, Nîzâmi, Sa’dî, Jâmî and Hâfîz. He quotes many examples of flattering compositions made before him by such contemporary writers Tâlib Amûlî, whom he gave the title of Malikush-Shi’ara, Sharîf Muhammed, Sa’îdâ, Mullâ ‘Alî Ahmad etc.

Bâbar was nurtured on the rugged mountains of Farghanâ and Kâbul so he found the Indo-Gangetic plains uninteresting and monotonous. He remained a foreigner in India, a country which he could not love. In a celebrated and often quoted passage of his autobiography he listed all the pleasures and refinements of life familiar to him which were lacking in

---

25. Tûzik, I,228. For other examples of his ‘poetical disposition’: ibid, I,158-9, 203, 228, 303-4, 322, 338; II, 15, 31, 32, 37, 115. Also II, 85, 172, 176, 183, 212.


27. Tûzik: I,188, II, 95, 222 (recited by I’timâd-ud-daula in his death-bed) from Anwârî; I, 100, 159, from Amir Khusrau; II, 222 from Budâg; II, 36, 252, from Firdausî; II. 62, from ‘Umar Khayyâm (though Jahângîr failed to recognise it); I, 49, 314, 381 from Hâfiz; II, 29 from Mu ‘izzî; II, 205, from Sanâ’î; II, 273, from Nîzâmi; I, 340, II, 36 from Sa’dî; Râmî, I,356, from Rûmî; I, 21-2, II, 15-16, and 7, from Jâmî (also II,15,44); and II, 269-70, from Baihaqî; I,306; from Bû’Alî (Arvîcenna); from Fîgânî, I,150.

28. He also quotes from Tâlib Amûlî II,118; Sa’îdâ (Bi-Badal Khân), II, 29-30, 205, 328; Manohar, I, 17; Hâkim Ma’âhuza-zamân I,304; Mu’tamîd Khân, II, 118; etc.
Hindustan. He longed for Central Asia. How could he like a land devoid of good horses, good dogs, grapes, musk-melons or 'first-rate fruits, ice or cold water, good bread or cooked food in bazâars', a place where there are 'no Hot-baths, no Colleges, candles, torches or candlestick?' At one place of his memoirs he exclaims, 'the other day they brought me a musk-melon: as I cut it up I felt a deep home-sickness, a sense of exile from my native land, and I could not help weeping.'

Jahângîr, by contrast, was brought up amid the luxuries indigenous to Hindustan: he writes, 'Notwithstanding the sweetness of the Kâbul fruits [he names many fruits he has tasted and liked, including various kinds of grapes, cherries, plums, apricots and peaches] not one of them has to my taste the flavour of the mango!'

An interest in natural history was common to both monarchs. Bâbar had noted and studied with great interest the flora and fauna and the geography and topography of the new country. His description of Hindustan displays 'his undiminished interest in natural history, and his singular quickness of observation

30. Quoted in S. Lane-Poole, Bâbar, 195. Mrs. Beveridge (op. cit., 645-6) gives a different translation of this passage: 'Taking this opportunity a melon was brought to me; to cut and eat it affected me strangely; I was all tears!'
and accurate commemoration of statistical details. Jahāngīr followed in Bābar's footsteps in observing and meticulously recording the beauties of nature which he enjoyed so much. He felt delighted when he saw a good garden, an uncommon animal or bird, a rare tree, a beautiful flower or an unusual fruit and not only described them in detail, but also instructed his painters to include their accurate likeness in the Jahāngīr nāma.

Akbar, was, as H.G.Wells writes, "one of the greatest of Indian monarchs, and one of the few royal figures that approach the stature of great man." Jahāngīr lacked many of his father's excellencies, yet to know Jahāngīr properly one ought to know Akbar and how the impact of his great personality thoroughly transformed the entire character of the age. Akbar's greatness lies in the originality of his vision of life, in his wide comprehension and political insight and in his unceasing quest for knowledge. A single

32. Lane-Pool, op.cit., 194.
33. Tuzuk, I, 215-6. Hodivala gives a revised translation of this interesting passage: "Although His Majesty, the Emperor Bābur has, in his Memoirs, described in words (lit.written) the general appearance (or features) and shapes of several animals, he does not in any case appear to have given orders [to the painters] to draw pictures of any of them [from the life]."—S.H.Hodivala, Studies in Indo-Muslim History, II, Bombay, 1957, 316-7.
sloka of a contemporary observer, an orthodox Jaina scholar, aptly describes his qualities: "there is not a single art, not a single branch of knowledge, not a single act of boldness and strength which was not attempted by the young Emperor [Akbar]."

Nurtured in an atmosphere of intellectual inquiry and earnest religious speculation, Jahangir could easily form his own distinctive ideas and ideals. Akbar's aim sought for God, but without following the traditional paths prescribed by the existing religions. In order to find out the basic tenets of each creed and to seek the essence of all religions he invited scholars, devotees, preachers and teachers of all religions from all parts of India and the Islamic world, and even some European priests from Goa. The newly-built Ibâdatkhâna became the centre of all attention as the guardian of each faith tried to prove the superiority of his religion over others. Akbar was a patient listener, a silent learner and an enthusiastic speaker; the discussions of the Ibâdatkhâna gave him an opportunity to acquire a knowledge of many religions. Soon he realised the orthodoxy and narrow parochialism of every religion and felt somewhat disenchanted. He then propagated his own creed,


36. Akbar is reported to have said, "Although I am the master of so vast a kingdom,.... yet since true greatness consists in doing the will of God, my mind is not at ease in this diversity of sects and creeds...." Sayings of Akbar, Ain, III, (1948 ed.), 433.
the Din-i-Ilahi. Unfortunately the tenets of the Din-i-Ilahi were too obscurely conceived and it was difficult for the people to realise Akbar's ideals. Salim watched all these developments in religious thinking and studied the new creed carefully, but his pleasure-loving nature and his natural impatience made him incapable of understanding its true import. In consequence, his ideas became somewhat bizarre - an amalgamation of self-assertion and not very clearly directed mystical feelings. It is interesting to note the observations of the contemporary witness Thomas Roe; "Ghehangier Sha, his sonne, the present king, beeing the issue of this new fancy ... bread up without any religion at all, continewes so to this hower, and is an athiest. Sometyme hee will make profession of a Moore: but alway observe the hollidayes and doe all ceremonyes with the Gentilles too. Hee is content with all religions; only hee loves none that changeth. But, falling upon his fathers concept, hath dared to enter farther in, and to professe him selfe for the mayne of his religion to be a greater prophett than Mahomett; and hath formed to him selfe a new law, mingled of all, which many have accepted with such superstition that they will not eate till they have saluted him in the morning, for which purpose hee comes at the sunnes rising to a wyndow open to a great playne before his house,
The picture of Jahangir one gets from the contents of the Tuzuk corresponds with Roe's shrewd observations. Three questions could now be raised about Jahangir's religion: was he an atheist? did he really form a "new law, mingled of all"? and how great was his tolerance of other religions?

Throughout his career Jahangir showed a lively interest in religion, and it was not limited to a particular creed or a particular belief. Neither did he have a systematic hostility nor any consistent preference for any religion. His attitude towards Islam was rather lukewarm with occasional shows of piety. In the opening pages of the Tuzuk he writes "I directed the 'Ulama and the learned men of Islam to collect those of the distinctive apppellations of God which were easy to remember, in order that I might take them into my ward". During his tour of Gujarat in the 12th and 13th years of his reign (1617-18) he received the learned Shaikhs of Gujarat, presented books (Plate 74) and money to them and visited many renowned shrines and mausoleums. In one place he writes in the Tuzuk of his having taken an oath on the Qur'an

---

37. Roe, 276.
38. Tuzuk, I, 21. (In another place he refers to his request to the sons of Miyân Wajihuddin of Gujarat to send "some of the names of God which has been tested." ibid, I, 128-9.)
to fulfil the desire of Sayyid Muhammad, grandson of Shâh 'Âlam. At this the learned Shaikh desired to have the Qur'ân, a small and elegant volume in Yâqûtî calligraphy, considered by the emperor as a 'wonder of the age' on which the oath was taken. The request was granted and the impressed emperor put his autograph note on its flyleaf stating the details of the gift.  

There are frequent mentions of his arranging and attending religious assemblies, of his making gifts of money, and of various other things to the faqirs, shaikhs and learned men, and of visiting of mosques, shrines and mausoleums in places wherever he resided (Plates 71, 76). He donated money for mosques to be built or repaired, sacrificed sheep with his own hand, observed such festivals as Shab-i-Barât and 'Id. He even slaughtered a bullock in the newly conquered fort of Kangra. He had the fâtiha recited at the shrines of Shâh 'Âlam, Shaikh Wajhuddîn, Shaikh Ahmad

40. Tuzuk, II, 34: The Qur'ân is now preserved in the Salar Jung Museum, Hyderabad: C. Sivaramamurthy, Directory of Museums in India, Pl. 2, fig. 2.
42. Tuzuk, passim.
43. ibid, I, 58, 365, 424; II, 71-3, 109, 142, 153, etc.
44. ibid, I, 241-2; II, 223-227-8.
45. ibid, I, 189.
46. ibid, I, 45-6, 189, 298, 344, 385, 411; II, 22, 94, 167.
47. ibid, II, 223.
Khaṭṭu, and Shaikh Salīm Chishti, He always showed a special reverence to Khwāja Muʿīn-ud-dīn Chishti and Shaikh Salīm Chishti. He visited their shrines many times, donated a huge cauldron to the Khwāja's shrine and even pierced the lobes of his ears for wearing pearls in order to be an "ear-bored slave of the Khwāja". He was highly impressed by the depth of knowledge and religiousness of a Sindi dervish, Miyan Shaikh Muḥammad Mīr, who came from Lahore to meet him at his request. While returning from Kabul he visited a recluse, Maulâna Muḥammad Amin, and felt 'greatly consoled at heart'. He also records the visit of Shaikh Pīr to whom he gave money for completing the building of a mosque. He condemned

48. ibid, I,421, 425, 428; II,70.
49. ibid, I,253, 256, 297, 329 (where he states that he visited the shrine of Khwāja Muʿīn-ud-dīn Chishti nine times); II,70-1.
50. ibid, I,267. Many of the relatives and dependants of the Shaikh occupied important positions in Jahângîr's court.
51. ibid, II,119.
52. ibid, I,135.
53. ibid, I,241. H. Beveridge suggests (ibid,I,451) that Shaikh Pīr may be identified with the beggar, "a poore silly ould man, all ashed, ragged, and patched,..." (Roe,328). The identification is unlikely because Shaikh Pīr met Jahângîr at Agra long before the imperial party came to Ajmer in the middle of 1613.
the un-Islamic practices prevalent amongst a section of Kashmiri Muslims living near Rajauri, and punished Kaukab and his associates for indulging in activities contrary to Islam.55

But whenever any Shaikh or dervish or the leader of any faith transgressed this spiritual bounds and plunged into politics, thereby posed a threat to the maintenance of that equilibrium which Jahângir desired to maintain in his empire he became ruthless.56

No distinction was made between Muslims or followers of any other faith. Thus Shaikh Nizâm Thaneswarî, who is called a shayyâd (an imposter, a hypocrite) by Jahângir was banished to Mecca because of his support for Khusrau.57 Shaikh Ibrâhîm Bâbâ was imprisoned in the fort of Chunar for starting a religious movement in the neighbourhood of Lahore.58 Sayyid Nûrullâh al-Shûstâri, who served as the Qâzi of Lahore during the reign of

54. Tuzuk, II, 181.
55. ibid, I, 171.
56. S.A.A. Rizvi, Muslim Revivalist Movement in Northern India, 328-9.
57. ibid, 284; Tuzuk, I, 50.
58. Tuzuk, I, 77.
Akbar was flogged to death because he was accused of professing the Shia faith while bodily acting as a Sunni. Sayyid Ahmad Afghān of Bajwara was supposed to be a potent danger to the state and was imprisoned in Gwalior fort for more than three years. The same fate was also allotted for the celebrated scholar and staunch Sunni lawgiver Shaikh Ahmad Sirhindī, better known as Mujaddid. The imprisonment of Shaikh Ahmad for one year and his subsequent restoration to position is a subject of fierce controversy amongst scholars. Whatever may be the Mujaddid's intentions and achievements the fact remains that Jahāngīr was not prepared to accept any misinterpretation of his religious policy.

Jahāngīr's occasional disgust and condemnation of certain Hindu customs and his bitterness against the Śvetāmbara Jainas (Sewrās) and the Sikhs have been interpreted as acts of faith done for the cause

60. Rizvi, op.cit., 284-6.
62. Rizvi, op.cit. Chapters VI & VII for a detailed discussion.
63. Tuzuk, I, 254-5; II, 224-5.
64. Ibid., I, 417-8.
65. Ibid., I, 72-3.
of Islam, but the credibility of such conclusions becomes doubtful when the real circumstances in which these remarks were made are taken into account.

Born of a Hindu mother, married to a large number of Hindu princesses and depending on the talents of so many Hindu courtiers and generals, Jahangir's attitude towards Hinduism was bound to be tolerant and liberal. Sporadic references to observance of Hindu festivals like Dasaaharâ, Diwâlî, Samâkrânt, Sivarâtrî, Holi and Rakshâ-vandhan, celebrated in the palace, are found in the Tuzuk. The emperor visited Hindu temples in famous places of pilgrimage and showed profound respect to learned Hindu ascetics and scholars. In a way Jahângir's favourable disposition towards the Hindus and many of their customs, and festivals reflect the success of Akbar's policy of toleration and understanding, which

66. ibid, I, 158, 246-7, 252, 268, 361, 396; II, 38, 74, 100, 176, 212.
67. ibid, I, 254 (Pushkar); II, 103-4 (Brindaban), 218 (Haridwar), 224-5 (Kangra).
68. ibid, I, 355-6, 359; 49, 52, 104, 105-7; Roe, 343 (entry of 11 February, 1617). All refer to the famous Hindu saint Gosain Chidrup (not Jadrup). Jahângir received a Brahmin scholar named Rudar Bhattacharâj, who came from Varanasi (ibid, II, 203-4), and two Sanyasis, one of them is named Moti (ibid, II, 226-7, 23).
was earnestly continued by him.

This attitude helped Jahangir to amicably integrate with Hindustan, his affection for which was sincere and natural. He knew Hindi, and had a working knowledge of Hindi rhetoric and poetry. He appreciated the laudatory verses of a Hindi poet brought to the court by Raja Suraj Singh, some of which are translated into Persian and quoted in the *Tuzuk*. Though it is not easy to say whether he was conversant in music, there is no doubt that he understood well north Indian classical music. So, culturally, emotionally and even spiritually Jahangir's personality was a product of the Indian environment.

70. Names of a number of musicians are mentioned in *Tuzuk*: Lal kalawant (I, 150); Hafiz Nad Ali (I, 317; II, 69); Shaniqī, the mandolin player, was given the title Anand Khan (I, 331); Ustad Muhammad Naqī, the flute player (I, 370); and the great Tansen (I, 141; II, 71). Bakhtār Khan Kālwānt, a relative of Adil Shāh, came to the court from Bijapur (I, 271-2) [Plate 57]. ‘Ali Khan Karorī, the dāroghā of the Naqarakhāna obtained the title Naubat Khan (I, 111) [Plate 89]. Qawālī singers of Delhi are mentioned in I, 169, and the similarity of the Kashmiri music with North Indian music is noted in II, 148. The proficiency of Dāniyāl (I, 36), Tarbiyat Khan (II, 86), Ẓul Qarnain (II, 194), and ʿAbd al-ʿAdil Shāh (I, 271-2) [Plate 37], in Hindu classical music is noted by Jahangir. He himself composed ʿazals (I, 158, etc.). Presence of musicians in the court: Roe, 99; ETI, 103; *Tuzuk*, I, 48; II, 79, etc.
The derogatory remarks made in the Tuzuk about the Sewrâ Jainas\(^1\) are not corroborated by authentic Jaina works. In all probability, with the exception of occasional outbursts of antagonism, he maintained a friendly relation with the Jainas.\(^2\)

Jahângîr's drastic step to behead the leader of the incipient Sikh community, Gûrû Arjan Singh, on the ground of his complicity with the rebellious Khusrau permanently antagonised the warlike Sikhs. The remarks made in the Tuzuk show an acute lack of knowledge about their political strength\(^3\) and religious organisation. In the long run the later Mughal emperors had to pay heavily for their mutual animosity.

From his princely days Jahângîr maintained a friendly relationship with the Jesuit fathers. They enjoyed full prestige and a number of privileges in the

---


\(^2\) Bhanusingha Carîtas, op.cit., 20,52-58,59\(^{fn}\), 90-1; M.S. Commissariat, History of Gujarat,II,260-2.

\(^3\) Tuzuk, I,72-3.
Mughal court, which were not easily available in a court following a religion which was professedly hostile towards Christianity. The emperor discussed a wide range of subjects concerning Christ and Christianity with the fathers in the evening assemblies, in which the figures of the fathers in their dark cassocks formed an integral and familiar part.

They accompanied the emperor during expeditions and travels, and were consulted even in state matters. Thus the collection and study of the Christian miniatures and engravings by the emperor had the backing of a genuine urge for knowledge. But Jahângîr's interest in Christianity was never sufficiently serious to procure his conversation in spite of fond Jesuit expectations.

While narrating his father's qualities Jahângîr writes in the Tûzuk that "the professors of various faiths had room in the broad expanse of the incomparable sway"

75. JGM, 71f.
76. Father Xavier once wrote: "God would one day work in him a great miracle." - JGM, 69.
of his empire. "As in the wide expanse of the Divine compassion," writes Jahāngīr, "there is room for all classes and the followers of all creeds, so, on the principle that the Shadow must have the same properties as the Light, in his dominions, which on all sides were limited only by the salt sea, there was room for the professors of opposite religions, and for beliefs, good and bad, and the road to altercation was closed."\(^{77}\)

He further writes that Akbar "associated with the good of every race, and creed and persuasion, and was gracious to all in accordance with their condition and understanding",\(^ {78}\) which is also equally true about himself. His liberality, unless curtailed in specific instances for political considerations as has been pointed out above, is in every respect comparable with his father's. It would be wrong to exaggerate the motives of his occasional outbursts of antipathy, which was inherent in his nature.

But there are several other points which should be noted while discussing Jahāngīr's views on religion which to a large extent moulded his ideas and cultural

\(^{77}\text{ Tuzuk, I,37.}\)
\(^{78}\text{ ibid, I,38.}\)
and artistic activities. One of them is the high reverence paid to the sun, and another, the growing indications of theophany.

Akbar introduced in India many ancient Persian festivals associated with the worship of the sun. In Jahângîr's India Naûrûz was the greatest festival of the year. Elaborate preparations were made long before the celebrations started; it lasted for 17 or 18 days, when the nobles arranged elaborate festivities and presented choice gifts, jewels, to the emperor. To Jahângîr the sun had even greater import; he selected as his laqab Nûr-uddîn, the light of religion, the light which brightens the earth, brings benefit to mankind and new meaning to religion. As the complementary verse of a court poet indicated, from the light of his rising and the illumination of Jahângîr's justice the spheres had become "so bright that one might say: 'night had neither name nor sign.'"

At first sight Jahângîr's playing on the word "Nûr" may seem merely fanciful, but an examination of Jahângîr's words and activities shows a more deeply held belief than this. Akbar's devotion to the Sun was a

79. Tuzuk, I,49, et passim.
81. Ibid, I,141. For a detailed discussion on this subject see Professor Ettinhausen's brilliant paper: "The Emperor's Choice," Der Artibus Opuscula, XL, New York, 1961, 98-120.
part of his reverence for the Divine, an attempt to realize the greatness of its power and the vastness of its benefits. To Jahângîr the sun is the great light, the benefactor of the Universe, which he, as its human counterpart should mirror in his own way. He believed that he had a divine right to rule, since his birth was due to the intercession of dervishes. The laqab which he selected came into his mind by 'an inspiration from the hidden world' and had been foretold by savants; his accession coincided with the rising on the earth of the 'great light, the Sun.'

82. *ibid*, I,2-3.
84. *ibid*, I,47 (Nûr Gaj); 396,410,418 (Nûrbakht); II,79 (Nûr-i-Naurûz).
85. *ibid*, I,270 (Ghâshma-i-Nûr); II,151,238 (Nûr-afzâ), 197,199 (Nûr-Atshân), and 197,277 (Nûr-Manzîl).
87. *ibid*, I,319.
throne, and the eclipses of sun and moon, after which he donated money and various other gifts to the poor and to men of religion. His banner shows the motif of the resplendent sun; the sun is also present on his coins. His interest in astronomical and astrological reckoning, though connected with the reverence which he showed to the sun, also repeats an obsession of his grandfather Humâyûn. Astrologers held an important place in Jahângîr's court, just as in those of Humâyûn and Akbar. Jahângîr would not undertake any journey or start any campaign, enter or leave the capital or even go out in his favourite hunting expeditions unless his astrologers specified the exact moments of "fortunate conjunction of the stars." Astrologers of all systems, Hindu, Islamic and Greek, were present in the court. The most famous

88. ibid, I, 90, 168, 206, 236-7, 261, 284, 320, 373, etc.
89. ibid, I, 183, 281-2, et passim.
90. Tuzuk, passim; Roe, 171, 275, 253; ETI, 320 (Terry); W.H. Moreland & P. Geyl, ed. Pelsaert's Jahangir's India, 77.
91. Tuzuk, I, 328; II, 48, 235; Hodivala, Studies in Mughal Numimatics, 163 (where he gives the chart of Jahangir's horoscope and the names of the Musalman astrologer Mullâ Chand and "The Hindu master of the Art of Starry Science" Jotak Râî); idem, Studies in Indo-Muslim History, II, 305; Roe, 275.
of them, Jotak Rai is mentioned by name many times in the Tuzuk. He was weighed in gold and silver for his accurate foretelling of the fortune of the emperor's favourite grandson Shujā. Astrologers with their astrolabes and charts appear on the margin of the royal murqqa' and in miniatures of birth scene.

Jahāngīr firmly believed in his own divine inspiration and divine right to rule. At the time of Khusrau's rebellion he wrote:

He who is seized of Fortune cannot be deprived of it;
Throne and diadem are not things of purchase;
It is not right to wrest crown and dominion
From the head which God, the Crown-cherisher, has indicated.

92. Hodivala, ibid, 304-6, gives the correct form of the name. Rogers and Beveridge write Jotik Ray. The portrait of the Hindu astrologer in the birth scene, now in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts (Plate 67) may be of Jotak Rai.


94. Tuzuk, II, 203.

95. IMM, PL 18; Cat MFA, VI, Pl. III, V & Frontispiece; E. Wellesz, Akbar's Religious Thoughts Reflected in Mughul Painting, Pl. 23; etc.

96. Tuzuk, I, 51.
His beliefs that he was predestined to become emperor and that his position was irrevocable, bring in the mind an indication of theophany. He refers to Akbar as "that veritable gible and the visible deity", his son Parāwīz, in his turn, addressed him as "my visible God and .... gible." He would appear in the jharokā just before sunrise so that his courtiers and subjects might have their darshan and shout 'Rādishah sālamat'. Then everyone would perform the sijda and stand all along in front of him (unless the emperor wished to make a specific exception). He became an "emblem of the power of God and light-shedding ray from the Sun of the Absolute."

Jahāngīr tried to follow the path indicated by Akbar to find out the cream of every religion, but unfortunately he was very ill-equipped to do so. A single grand or sublime thought, or serious search for truth can

97. ibid, II,150.
98. ibid, I,181. Kaukab also addresses Jahāngīr as his gible (I,441).
99. ETI, 115 (Hawkins).
100. Tuzuk, I,395; I, 93.
hardly be found in the Tuzuk. There was hardly anyone amongst his confidants who could match the learning and intellectual calibre of Abu'1 Fazl or Faizi or Akbar's other close friends and important courtiers. So when we note some sporadic reference to such terms as Murid or ariyab-i-ikhlas, who were given the likenesses of the emperor (Shabih) for wearing round the neck as medals or on the turban as sarpinch and advised to follow the rules of Sulh-i-Kul in the Tuzuk,102 we are not able to find what was implied by this.

Did Jahangir continue preaching the tenets of his father's Din-i-Ilahi or was it that he "formed to himself a new law, mingled of all",103 as observed by Roe? Such shabih or portrait medals are specifically referred to by Roe and two other foreigners, William Hawkins104 and the French jeweller Augustin of Bordeaux105, as an indication of extra-special favour conferred

102. Tuzuk, I, 60-1. (The words Sulh-i-Kul is translated by Rogers and Beveridge as universal peace).
by the emperor himself upon a limited few. Hodivala has convincingly shown that the shabihns could be identical with the so called 'Portrait Muhrs' issued by Jahângîr for a limited period. On many miniatures painted in the Jahângîr studio the artist proudly adds the words murîd or ikhlâs before his name and the emperor also refers to his officers with these special terms.

Jahângîr's attitudes are so beset by contradictions that it is extremely difficult to trace any coherent system of thought. Christian visitors to his court, both the Jesuits and the English, write about his harsh words for Muhammad and yet one finds him counting his rosary performing his prayers (namaz) and observing the principal Islamic festivals and conventions. It is probable that by appeasing orthodox Muslims by meeting a few of their basic observances, the emperor could successfully put forward his own garbled ideas of theophany.

107. Tuzuk, I, 68-69. The signatures of Aqâ Rizâ include both appellations whereas Daulat uses only ikhlâs; infra,...
108. JGM, 71, based on du Jarric & Guerreiro; ETI, 147.
109. ETI, 115 (Hawkins); Tuzuk, I, 21, 248, 384.
110. Tuzuk, I, 45, 249, 275, 384; II, 52, etc.
111. Ibid, I, 45, 189, 298, 349, 385, 411; II, 94, etc. Also, ibid, I, 421, 425, 428; II, 70.
112. R. Ettinghausen, "The Emperor's Choice", 98-120.
"Honour the luminaries (the Sun, Moon, etc.)", he writes, "which are manifesters of God's light, according to the degrees of each, and recognize the powers and existence of Almighty God at all times and seasons. Be careful indeed that whether in private or in public you never for a moment forget Him." But before that one must be careful not to forget the Emperor, the exalted luminary of religions, "the World-gripper, World-giver, World-holder, World-king", Jahângîr!

From what we have seen so far about Jahângîr's attitude towards religion, it is clear that he was not an atheist as thought by Roe. He believed in God, and continued many outward practices to express it. But he did not have a serious interest in any particular religion, which made him generally well-disposed towards the learned and devoted followers and teachers of different religions. He respected their knowledge and integrity, and anyone in possession of these qualities could easily impress him. He lacked the zeal of his father, his mind was more concerned with unnecessary details. His concern about

113. Tuzuk, I, 61.
dreams or the science of number (abjad),\textsuperscript{115} his search for omens in Ḥāfīz,\textsuperscript{116} his firm belief in astrological readings and astronomical calculations make him appear superstitious but surely it would be wrong to say that 'superstition was his religion'.\textsuperscript{117} On the other hand, time and again we notice him questioning the established beliefs and current practices or making experiments and enquiries to ascertain their truth.\textsuperscript{118} It would also be wrong to exalt him by saying that he was "too enlightened to be satisfied with mere dogma or superstition."\textsuperscript{119}

Though lack of serious interest in religion or intellectual activities and lack of ability in running the administration or fielding an army provide the greatest

\textsuperscript{115} Dreams: Tuzuk, I,30-1,71-2,269. Also: Plate 108, which was painted after Jahângîr's dream of Shah Abbâs's visit to him: PSEI, Text facing Pl.12. Abjad: Tuzuk, I,253.

\textsuperscript{116} Tuzuk, I,214,381. The copy of Dīwān-i-Ḥāfīz from which Jahângîr took omens still survives in the Bankipur Public Library. On many of its folios, the emperor, like his grandfather Humâyûn, makes note of the circumstances and in many instances, also the date and time: M.A. Muqtadir, Catalogue of the Arabic and Persian Manuscripts in the Oriental Public Library at Bankipur, I, Calcutta, 1905. 231-52.

\textsuperscript{117} H. Blochman, "The Death of Jahangir, his character, and the Accession of Shah Jahan", Calcutta Review, I, Calcutta, 1867, 139-40.

\textsuperscript{118} Tuzuk, passim.

\textsuperscript{119} Beni Prasad, 406.
contrast of Jahāngīr's character with that of his father, he had many other interests. However trivial some of these might appear in the first instance they helped to create an atmosphere of cultural sophistication and refinement. He had a discriminating taste which made its mark especially on arts and crafts. In those days of prosperity and splendour artisans from many countries came to the Mughal court, and if they showed talent or could produce something novel they were employed by the emperor or his sons or some of his rich courtiers. If a craftsman or artist could produce something really unique the emperor rewarded him handsomely and bestowed honours upon him.

So, talented craftsmen who came from distant parts of the world got ready employment and a free hand to produce objects of the finest quality. Reading his account one wonders how many times Roe had to remind his principals to send presents of good quality because "here are nothing esteemed but of the best sorts." The emperor personally selected his artists, craftsmen and musicians, scrupulously examined their work, and supervised the production of choice articles. The Tuzuk is full of reference to beautiful ornaments and jewellery, fashionable dresses, intricate seals, wonderful sword-handles and jewelled Khāpwas, and

120. Roe, 77. Also: Letters Received, III, 337; IV, 243-4, 280.
above everything else, of superb paintings. Jahângîr did not hesitate to employ foreign artists, craftsmen or musicians, specially when they had such novel ideas as starting a waterworks or building a throne of unique shape. Artists and craftsmen, builders and architects, calligraphers and seal engravers held high positions in Jahângîr's court. The best carpets and trappings, the finest arras and gold-threaded makhmals, the most delicate jades and porcelains, superb glass and metalware, choice dresses and furniture were brought to the Mughal court from Persia, Iraq, Damascus,

121. Musicians: Thomas Armstrong (Roe, 98n, 99 & Letters Received, IV, 289); Robert the Cornet Player (Letters Received, I, 282-3); Robert Trully (ibid, I, 304); Lancelot Canning (ibid, I, 238, 304). Also, JGM, 289-90 for musicians and singers from Goa.
Coachman William Hemsel: Roe, 282, 284, 285n; Terry, 385; Letters Received, IV, 289-90.
Augustin of Bordeaux, who built the splendid jewelled throne and received the title Hûnârmand: Tuzuk, II, 80, 82. For full account: JPHS, IV, Calcutta, 1916, 1-14.
Also: ETI, 51-2; Letters Received, II, 98, 103-6, 141-2; E & D, VII, 45-6; J.B. Tavernier, Travels in India (Tr. V. Ball), I, 108.
Another jeweller, a Dutchman named Abraham de Duyts, is mentioned by Roe (Roe, 168: 'Abrams the Dutchman'). He was a diamond polisher and was employed by Khurram.
For Richard Steel and his 'projects': Roe, 390, 393, 405, 413, et passim.
Turkey, Transoxania, and Europe, as well as from all parts of India. They were brought by ambassadors as presents or by traders as merchandise. The traders were sure to get a good value and ready market. As a result, sophistication and refinement characterize the works of art produced in Jahângîr's India. Humâyûn had showed ready interest in everything that was novel. Akbar personally looked after the working of his numerous kârkânas and during his long reign the Mughal arts achieved their high distinction but to Jahângîr goes the credit of making each work of art a creation which reflected his own refined taste and luxurious values.

Jahângîr's love of novelties and collection of exotica were not restricted to the visual and decorative arts only, but extended to natural history, to rare and beautiful animals, plants and minerals. A zebra never seen before seen in Hindustan (Plate 101), a turkey cock (Plate 96) brought only a few years after it had been introduced to Europe from the New World, an African elephant, an albino falcon, a fruit of unusual size, a gem of unusual form, a flower of unusual colours, a bird of unusual appearance - all these would attract his fancy and he would not only show his curiosity but also describe
them in detail in the Tuzuk and instruct his painters to keep an accurate likeness of them. Thus in Jahangir period we find a large number of miniatures representing out-of-the-way subjects.

Thomas Roe writes about Jahangir that "he loves none that changeth", which is a totally wrong description of Jahangir's taste and inclinations. On the other hand, he was always dissatisfied with the conventional. He rarely accepted anything ipso facto, without personally examining it or thoroughly experimenting on it, and made numerous tests, which sometimes appear as childish. Thus the abdomen of a lion was dissected to ascertain whether its gall-bladder was covered by the liver; a scale-less fish was examined to find the reason of its prohibition amongst the Muslims; the carcasses of sheep were hung to measure the 'badness of air' of Ahmedabad and Mahmudabad, and so on. This tendency to challenge the validity of accepted traditions helped to create an atmosphere where conventional ideas were easily discarded and replaced by something novel or something more fascinating. This is especially noticeable in the arts and crafts: Keeping pace with the emperor's demand for objects of unknown brilliance and impeccable quality the artists and craftsmen of Jahangir's India strove hard to create new conventions
by freely borrowing the technique, decorative details and artistic themes from other countries.
The circumstances leading to the foundation of Mughal painting are not very clear in the present state of our knowledge. Bâbar was a learned and cultured man, whose appreciation of the act of painting was based on a fine and sophisticated taste and sound knowledge. But so far there is no evidence of his founding an atelier of artists. The credit of initiating a separate school of painting with talented masters as its head goes to Bâbar's luckless son Humâyûn. In the midst of the gloom of internecine struggles, and of rebellions fomented by nobles Humâyûn made a desperate but unsuccessful bid to cling to the throne of Hindustan that he inherited from his father. But he was driven away from Delhi by Sher Shâh in 1540, and after spending four fruitless years in wandering in the deserts of Rajasthan and Sind he had to leave India and take refuge with Shâh Tahmâsp in Iran.

Shâh Tahmâsp's treatment of Humâyûn was marked by "a curious compound of courtesy and insult, hostility and

hospitality, generosity and meanness", and Humayûn did not have a very easy time in Tahmâsp's Persia during the year or so that he spent. To the desperate Humayûn, the visits to the architectural splendours of Harat, Mashad, Qazwin, Persepolis, Ardabil, etc., and the mausoleums of celebrated saints and poets were more refreshing and more rewarding. Humayûn himself was a learned man as he was reared up in an atmosphere of sophisticated culture. The assembly of poets and writers, philosophers and lawgivers and painters and calligraphers in the Persian court awakened in his mind the desire for a similar entourage. Shâh Tahmâsp was also a learned man and an enthusiastic patron of art. Some of the finest Persian paintings and MSS were produced at his court. He himself took painting lessons from the celebrated Persian master Sultan Muhammad. But at the time of Humayûn's visit he suddenly lost his interest


4. The reception of Humayûn given by the Shâh took place in a specially prepared hall whose walls were painted with pictures. – AN, I, 437.
in painting and began to think indulgence in painting a wastage of time. This sudden change in the Shâh's attitude provided Humâyûn with the golden opportunity of recruiting the services of some of the finest painters of the Persian court.

From the evidence of Jauhar Aftâbchî and Bâyazid Bîyat it appears that even in the days preceding his Persian journey and before recruiting the Persian masters, Humâyûn not only had a library containing choice MSS but also painters in his employment. The former refers to the presence of a painter who was asked by Humâyûn to paint the likeness of a bird when the Mughal party was undertaking a perilous journey through the deserts of Rajasthan. The latter refers to a painter called Maulânâ Dûst who was present at Kabul when the Persian masters 'Abd-us-Šamad and Mîr Sayyid 'Alî arrived there. However, besides these indirect references we do not have any other corroborative evidence to supplement our knowledge.

5. V. Minorsky, tr., Calligraphers and Painters, 135.
7. M. Hidayat Hosain, ed., Tazkira-i-Humâyûn Wa Akbar of Bâyazid Bîyat, Calcutta, 1941, 65. I am grateful to Mr. Simon Digby for supplying me these valuable references, from his forthcoming paper on the evidence of paintings and painters in pre- and early Mughal periods.
The real beginning of the school of painting associated with the Mughals was made in Humâyûn's humble court at Kabul. While visiting Tabriz he met 'Abd-us-Šamad, a calligrapher and painter of considerable repute, and extended his invitation to join his court at once. He met the Shâh's chief painter Mîr Muṣawwir and his son Mîr Sayyid 'Ali, in the court of the Shâh and tried his best to induce both of them to join his services. The Mughal chronicles make specific mention of Mîr Sayyid 'Ali but are silent about Mîr Muṣawwir. According to Qâzi Ahmad's testimony (who was writing his treatise on calligraphers and painters in 1596/7) Mîr Muṣawwir joined Humâyûn's court at Kabul and accompanied the Mughal emperor along with Mîr Sayyid 'Ali to India, where he faced hard times and died.9

When Humâyûn returned to Kabul and started his own court both Mîr Sayyid 'Ali and 'Abd-us-Šamad were given good positions. Both of them were appointed as painting instructors of Humâyûn's young son Akbar. 'Abd-us-Šamad was also honourably appointed as the Âtâliq or protector guardian and supervisor of the young prince. He became a close friend of Humâyûn, who gave him the title Shirîn Qalam for his elegant calligraphic hand. From a note

the Khândân-i-Timûrayya Ms (f298a) in the Bankipur Oriental Library it appears that Humāyûn himself also took painting instruction from those two Persian artists.¹⁰

While living in Kabul and instructing the young prince both ʿAbd-us-Samad and Mîr Sayyid ʿAlî developed their skill and own distinctive styles. Catering for the need of the discriminating patron and freed from the age-old conventionalism of the Persian tradition the style of their work departed considerably from that current in Persia. This departure from the beaten track heralded the beginning of the new Mughal School.

Not much useful information can be gathered from contemporary writings about the activities of these painters and only a small number of paintings produced at Kabul can be definitely identified. Our knowledge of Mîr Sayyid ʿAlî is hopelessly limited because only four miniatures definitely coming from his brush are known to us. There is not a single miniature which could be indisputedly accepted as having been done in the Mughal court. His name is curiously absent from the long list of painters participating in numerous MSS produced in Akbar’s atelier.

¹⁰ Cat-Bankipur, VII,45; EWA, I,18.
Nevertheless, even a casual glance at the four miniatures painted by him would reveal the mastery of technique of this great artist. An accurate observation of nature and life, the depiction of minute details in an idyllic and naturalistic manner and an extraordinary skill in handling a distinctive palette are the most characteristic qualities of the Mir's style.

"Abd-us-Samad is mentioned by such contemporary

---

11. The four authentic works are:
1. Khâmsa-i-Nizâmi, BM Or 2265, f157: IPM, Pl.VI.

Works attributed to Mir Sayyid 'Ali:
1. "Princes of the House of Timûr", BM, 1913-2.8.1: LPT, Pl.III,IVA,IVB; IPM, IVb,XII,LXa & LXb; etc.
   This may be a joint work by Khwâja 'Abd-us-Samad and Mir Sayyid 'Ali.
3. A.C. Ardeshir Coll.: A.C. Ardeshir, Roop Lekha, I, No.2, Pl.3.
4. Survey, V, Pl.713A.
6. LMI, Pl.II, and elsewhere.

writers as Abu'l Fazl\textsuperscript{12} and Badaoni\textsuperscript{13}, and in the Tuzuk\textsuperscript{14} and Ma'asir-ul-Umara.\textsuperscript{15} He accompanied Humayun when the latter made his triumphant return in 1555 to Delhi and headed the painting studio either alone or jointly with Mir Sayyid'Ali. After Humayun's death Akbar retained the service of his former master and exalted him with the honorific title Khwaja and high position. In 1576/7 he was appointed as the head of the imperial mint at Fatehpur Sikri. Subsequently, after living as a leading courtier he was sent to Multan in 1583/4 as its diwan. As the son of the Wazir to the governor of Shiraz Khwaja 'Abd-ussamad enjoyed the position of a noble and prestige in the court. He was deeply religious and became a leading follower of the Din-i-Ilahi. The date of his death is not known. His son Muhammad Sharif was a painter of repute and contributed several miniatures in the Jaipur Razmnama.\textsuperscript{16} He was a close friend of prince Salm from their childhood.\textsuperscript{17}

\begin{itemize}
\item [12.] Aim, I,109,114,219,554-5.
\item [13.] MT, III, Passim.
\item [14.] Tuzuk, I,15.
\item [15.] MU, I,454-5.
\item [16.] Hendley, Pl.LVII,CI & CV.
\item [17.] Tuzuk, I,14-5; et passim; Ain, I,582-4: MT,429-32.
\end{itemize}

In the Khamsa-i-Nizami MS in the A.C. Ardeshir Collection there is an interesting note saying: "four times this picture was tried to be painted by Murid (pupil), but at last it was finished by Sharif." - Roop Lekha, I, No.2,29. A separate miniature in the British Museum (No.1948-10-9-006; ATP,145-6, No.649) showing Akbar, is signed by Sharif.
He defected to Salim in 1599/1600 when Akbar sent him to Allahabad and enjoyed Salim's friendship and patronage. He was made the highest officer as the Amir-ul-Umarâ after Salim became emperor.

There are at least five miniatures which bear Khwâja 'Abd us-Samad's signature or are authentically attributed to him. Two of them are dated and a third describes an episode mentioned in the chronicles. Some other miniatures, two in MSS and two mounted on muragqa' folios, bear his signature. But in each case the

18. The authentic works of Khwâja 'Abd us-Samad are:
1. Two youths in a landscape. Signed, "Made by Maulâna 'Abd us-Samad in half a day on Nawrûz, 958 Hijrâ'/1551.
2. Dervish running through a wood. Signed, "the slave shikasta-raqm 'Abd us-Samad Shîrin Qalam."
3. Akbar presenting a miniature to Humâyûn. Signed "the slave 'Abd us-Samad Shîrin Qalam."
5. Same subject. Signed.
All collected in the Gulshan album: PMP, passim; EWA, I, 16-20, Pl. 14A, 14B, 16, 15A.
7. Khâmsa-i-Nizâmi, BM Or.12208, f 82a; IPM, Pl.XXXVI.
8. Unpublished miniature. Freer Gallery of Art; Said to be a fine work: Cat-Heeramaneck, no. 198
A.C. Ardeshir, Roop-Lekha, I, No.2, Pl. 4.
Corrected by Khwâja 'Abd us-Samad:
Darâbnâma, BM, Or. 5615, f 103b, painted by Bihzâd;
V.A. Smith, History of Fine Arts in India & Ceylon, Oxford, 1911, Pl. CXIII.
Attribution doubtful:
1. Arrest of Shâh Abu'l Ma'ali, Bodleian Library: IPM, Pl. VIII.2.
2. Hunting Scene, Mrs. E.E. Meugens Coll.; Survey, V, Pl. 913A.
For his life and work:
R. Ettinghausen, EWA, I, 16-20.
attributions are not indisputed. As expected from a famous calligrapher a strong linear quality characterises the work of Khwâja 'Abd us-Šamad. In decorative details, in the drawing of trees, mountains and the landscape, and in the delineation of figures, 'Abd us-Šamad continues in a slightly modified form the established conventions of the Tabriz school. The principal differences lie in the realistic approach of the subject-matter, and in the portraiture along with the details of dresses and architecture. Khwâja 'Abd us-Šamad's portraiture of the young prince with elongated neck, slender body and graceful oval face is typical of his style.

Humâyûn died within six months of his regaining the Mughal throne, and the young Akbar was proclaimed emperor in 1556. The artistic activities in spite of the setback, continued under the new emperor. But excepting 'Abd us-Šamad's signed miniature of 965 Hijra/1557, discussed above there is no other dated material produced between the beginning of Akbar's reign and 1567/8, the date of the 'Ashigâ MS in the National Museum, Delhi. It is, indeed, possible that the royal atelier was preoccupied with the production of the most original and

19. Catalogue of Manuscripts from Indian Collections, New Delhi, 1964, 96-7, Colour Plate Facing p.77. The MS has two miniature. Mr. Simon Digby has suggested that it was prepared in connection with Akbar's marriage to Salima Sultan Begam, the widow of Bairam Khan.
important, as well as the most controversial Mughal MS, Dāstān-i-Amīr Hāmza, during this period and afterwards.

The Dāstān-i-Amīr Hāmza or Hāmza Nāma is an extraordinary MS in every way. Each folio measures a staggering 68x51 cm. in size and is made of fine linen mounted on paper, with a large painting on one side and the story describing the picture on the other. There are 360 such stories telling the exploits of Amīr Hāmza, and a monumental project of preparing twelve to fourteen hundred pictures, in twelve folio volumes illustrating the entire work, was undertaken by the royal atelier. According to Badā'īnī and Shāhnawāz Khān it took fifteen years and the toils of fifty "Bihzād like painters" to complete the task. They mention the name of Mīr Sayyid 'Ālī as the initial supervisor of the work, a post which was afterwards filled by Khwāja 'Abd us-Ṣamād.20

As only a fragment of the original 1200-1400 folios is preserved in museums and public and private collections throughout the world, and as none of the existing folios bears any signature, or any contemporary or later attribution to any artist, or any indication of

chronology, the *Hamza-nama* has become a subject of fierce controversy among scholars. The work is so much *sui generis*, the pictures show such an amalgamation of diverse stylistic elements, and the technique of representation is so novel that one is amazed and feels somewhat bewildered. Yet in view of our meagre knowledge of Mughal painting in its early phase it is not easy to attempt any categorical thesis about the chronological sequence or authorship of the paintings.

Akbar was very fond of the romantic fantasies in the mythical stories of *Hamza-nama* and he could recite them from memory like a story teller. The bound volumes of the MS were kept in the private apartments of the emperor, and he often would glance through its pages. ^21^ Abūl Fazl writes in one place that "His Majesty from the earliest youth has shown a great predilection for this art [painting] and gives it every encouragement, as he looks upon it as a means both of study and amusements." ^22^ Therefore Akbar possessed this sumptuous MS of the *Hamza-nama* illustrated under the supervision of his *muqaddam* old instructors Mîr Sayyid ’Alî and Khwâja ’Abd us-Samad. Shâhnawâz Khân mentions this in his *Ma'sir-ul-Umara*. ^23^

---

21. MU, I, 454; AN, II, 223.
23. MU, II, 454.
and the evidence of Abu’l Fazl and Badānik corroborates this. But a disputed passage of Mullā ’Alā-ud-dawla Qazvīnī specifically mentions the project as a brainchild of Humayūn and that Mir Sayyid ‘Ali Tabrīzī was appointed to supervise its completion with scrupulous care. Qazvīnī’s evidence appears to be doubtful, because in the relative lack of resources of Humayūn it is unlikely that such an enormous task would be undertaken in Kabul and there is no information about the appointment of any other painters during Humayūn’s lifetime. Possibly the project was contemplated by Humayūn wishing to make a present to Akbar who was so fond of the stories, but he could not, ultimately undertake the project, not to speak of its completion, because of his sudden death.

The character of the paintings of the Hāmzanāma is unmistakably Mughal: with their unusual size and

25. MT, op. cit.
27. Mr. B.W. Robinson exhibited two folios from a dispersed MS of auguries, Fal-nāma, from the collection of Chester Beatty Library, in the exhibition of Persian miniatures in the V & A Museum. Each folio measures 23 3/4" x 17 3/4" and the MS is attributed to 1550-60 date. The presence of an unusual work of this size in the same period when the Hāmza-nāma was produced, is worth nothing; B.W. Robinson, Persian Miniature Painting, 193. Also; M-V, I, Pl. LXIII, LXIV; E. Grube, Muslim Miniature Painting, 83, pl. 61.
the naturalistic representation of principal actors of the story in a realistic background of minutely drawn trees, flowers, animals and distinctive architectural details, they show a considerable departure from the Persian tradition. The powerful portraiture, the use of bright and luminous colours, the broad canvas and the thorough understanding with which all the diverse elements are integrated in a balanced composition, make the Hamza-nâma "miniatures" unique in the history of Islamic painting. It is very difficult to trace the individual authorship of the folios. As they contain a variety of elements ranging from pure Persian conventions to definitely Indian motifs, it seems that a large number of painters trained in both Persian and Indian traditions collaborated in executing the paintings.

It has been suggested by modern scholars that the project was completed before Akbar became deeply engrossed in the religious discussions in the 'Ibadatkhanâ when it was built in 1575 and no longer remained a good Muslim to appreciate the overzealous exploits of Amir Hamîza.28

28. PI, 786; AIR, 1404. J. G. Wilkinson, Islamic Painting,
This theory is totally unacceptable because Akbar's fascination for those stories was for their narrative mythological flavour and was never prompted by any religious zeal. But 'Abdu'l-Ṣamad's promotion as the Mint Master in 1576/7 may have followed his successful supervision of the whole project. The Anwar-i-Suhail of 1570/1 in the collection of the School of Oriental and African Studies, London, already begin to show signs of development from the mixed style of the Hamza folios.

From the beginning of the last quarter of the 16th century a rapid and vast change starts to take shape in the cultural scene. The discussions of the 'Ibadahkhana the presence of a large number of poets, writers, scholars and lawgivers from all over India and beyond her boundaries, the arrival of art-objects through embassies, religious missions and traders, and above all, the unsatiable curiosity of Akbar himself helped the rapid growth of Mughal painting.

The training of his early life made him a great patron of all forms of art. To him a work of art had much more importance than its outward appearance. In the words of Abu'l Fazl, a picture was a "source of wisdom, and an antidote against the poison of ignorance" for "a well-regulated mind." Abu'l Fazl quotes the actual words of
Akbar on painting:

"There are many that hate painting; but such men I dislike. It appears to me as if a painter had quite peculiar means of recognising God; for a painter in sketching anything that has life, and devising its limbs, one after the other, must come to feel that he cannot bestow individuality upon his work, and is thus forced to think of God, the Giver of life, and will thus increase his knowledge." 29

The unorthodox views of the emperor helped the painters to take calculated attempts to abandon the formality and rigid conventions of Persian idioms and to incorporate new ideas and elements, and to adopt new techniques. Thus, within a brief period the character of Mughal painting underwent a process of transformation. The miniatures of the Tūlīnāma MS in the Cleveland Museum of Art 30 probably belong to this phase, when the mixed style of the Hamzanāma suddenly began to give way to the local traditions. The strict supervision of the Persian masters was no longer necessary, the artists of the Mughal atelier were well on the way in their search for a meaningful ideal and an effective standard.

30. Sherman Lee & Pramod Chandra, "A newly discovered Tūlīnāma. . .", Burl. Mag., 1963, 547-54; AMI, 24-6, 162, Plates 3a-3d.
Akbar wanted to have a first-hand knowledge of all religions and to know the contents of the principal books of every religion. His love for India and respect for her rich traditions awakened in him an urge to understand the basic elements of Hindu literature and classical music. He also wanted his sons, and principal nobles and courtiers coming from Turkistan, Afghanistan, Persia etc, to have a fair idea about Indian life, culture and literature. So he recruited learned men and writers to translate such principal Hindu religious texts as Atharva-Veda, Ramayana, Mahabharata, Harivamsha, Yoga-Vasistha etc. into Persian. Works dealing with Yoga and Vedanta, the stories of Simhasana-Batis, Katha-Sarit-Sagara and Nala-Damayant, the mathematical works of Lilavati and historical works like Rajatarangini were also translated into Persian. Akbar paid particular attention to historical works, and especially to the history of his own race. Thus the Turki text of Akbarnama was translated in Persian, and works like Tarikh-i-alf, Humayunnama and Akbar's own court chronicles prepared by Abu'l Faizl, Akbar-nama and A'in-i-Akbari were compiled, and copies of Jamiat-Tawarih and Khanda-i-Timuryya were prepared.

While preparing MSS of these works, beautifully written by celebrated calligraphers and produced in a sumptuous manner, Akbar wanted them to be submitted with miniatures. The painting atelier was greatly enlarged and a large number of painters, colour-blenders, gold-sprinklers, binders, paper-manufacturers and their assistants were recruited to do this stupendous task. Along with the above-mentioned MSS a large number of Persian literary works like Baharistan, Gulistan and Bustan, the Divans of Hafiz, Anvari, Shâhi, Amir Khusrau Dihlavi, Jâmî etc., and such works as Anvar-i-Suhailî, Khamsai-Nizami, Shahnâma, Zafarnâma, Tutinâma, Dârîbnâma, Nafahat a... were produced in the atelier during this time. The enormous volume of work kept the Karkhana breathlessly busy. Of the large number of painters working in the atelier there were "more than a hundred painters", who had become, "famous masters of the art." Besides the two Persian ustads who started the Mughal School, fourteen other painters are listed as outstanding masters of art by Abu'l Fazl in the A'in-i-Akbari. They are: Daswant, Basawan, Kesav, Lal, Mukund, Mishkin, Farrukh the Qalmâq, Mâdhav, Jagan, Mahes, Khêm Karan, Sânwala, Harîbans and Râm.

33. Ibid, 114.
According to Abu'l Fazl "the number of those who approached perfection, or of those who are in the middling, is very large." 34

Akbar took a keen personal interest in the work of his artists. He examined their weekly output, assessed their merits by a comparative study and rewarded the painters accordingly. 35 All types of artists' materials and costly ingredients were made readily available to the painters, so the miniatures dazzled in rich gloss and warm colours. We are not in a position to say to what extent his own ideas were thrust on the works of his artists, though the products of the imperial atelier were probably influenced by the eclectic philosophy of Akbar. The court historian records how the emperor personally discovered the potential talent of Daswant and helped him to become "the first master of the age", whose works were not "behind those of Bihzâd and the painters of China." 36

Akbar was very much interested in portrait painting and himself sat for his likeness. He ordered "to have likeness taken of all the grandees of the realm." "An immense album was thus formed," writes Abu'l Fazl, and "those that have passed away have received a new life, and those who are still alive have immortality promised them." 37

34. ibid, 114.
35. ibid, 113.
36. ibid, 114; AN, III, 434.
37. Ain, I, 115.
Besides the prolific production of the imperial studio, a large number of miniatures and works of art arrived in Mughal court during this time. The rich collection of the imperial library was enlarged greatly and many new illustrated Persian MSS were included in it. Along with them, another source of supply opened up when the first Jesuit mission arrived at Fatehpur Sikri in 1580 from Goa at the invitation of the emperor. The presents for Akbar the fathers of the mission brought when they met him for the first time were a sumptuous set of Plantin’s Royal Polyglot Bible and the pictures of Christ and the Virgin. These were followed by a steady inflow of European painted books, engravings (possibly sometimes tinted), and art-objects brought by the fathers of the first and the succeeding missions coming to Mughal court. These European materials, not all of superb quality, amazed the Mughal painters in their difference of style, treatment of human figure and technique, and provided them with a whole new idiom to draw upon.

It was in these conditions the young prince Salim decided to start his own painting studio at the end of

38. ibid, 102-3: "...Painters, especially those of Europe, succeed in drawing figures expressive of the conceptions which the artist has of any of the mental states (Khilgi), so much so, that people may mistake a picture for reality..."
the 1580s. In this atmosphere of liberal royal patronage and eclectic cultural influence, the daring spirit of the young patron was sure to produce some bold new ideas.
A number of significant changes took place in Akbar's painting atelier when the Mughal capital was moved from Fatehpur Sikri to Lahore in 1585. Farrukh Beg along with a group of nobles and generals came from Kabul after the death of Akbar's half-brother Mirzâ Muḥammad Ḥakîm and joined Akbar's service. In the preceding year Daswant, one of the most celebrated Akbarî painters, became insane and committed suicide. Khwâja 'Abd us-Samad was promoted in 1585 to the diwânshīp of Multan from the post of the director of royal mints at Fatehpur, which he had held since 1576/7. The first Jesuit mission had left Fatehpur only a couple of years before this and perceptible impact of the prints, engravings and painted books brought by the fathers of that mission and presented to the emperor was slowly becoming apparent in Akbarî painting. Kesâvâdâs, an artist of the conventional indigenous style, painted the

1. AN, III, 714.
2. ibid, 651.
3. ibid, 779.
4. The mission came to Fatehpur Sikri in February, 1580. Though the rest of the mission left for Goa in 1582, its leader Father Aquaviva stayed till February, 1583.
superb coloured copy of a European engraving of St. Matthew in 1587/8. This is one of a large number of similar works prepared during this time and afterwards.

A few weeks after Salīm's marriage to his cousin Mān Bāt in 1585, he was given the high rank of 12,000 manaabdārī, a separate wardrobe, insignia, drums, and the tumāntāgh (the flag of highest dignity). He tasted his first cup of wine towards the end of the same year, an occurrence of no mean importance in his life. His own painting atelier was also founded at this time. The exact date of its establishment is not known, but it can be speculated from an indirect reference in the Tūzuk, which indicates that the studio was started when Salīm was still a prince and that Āqā Rīzâ Harâtî was appointed its director.

Āqâ Rīzâ is a puzzling name in the annals of Persian and Mughal painting and the appearance of more than one painter of considerable talent of the same name as near contemporaries has added to the confusion.

5. LPI, Pl.XIXb.
6. Infra, Chapter X.
9. ibid, II, 20.
However, Âqâ Rizâ, who used to style himself as murîd-i-Pâdishâh-Salîm is a Persian artist, trained in the best Harâtî tradition, and emigrated to India in the late 1580s. A tinted drawing, copying Dürer's St. John (Plate 13) drawn by his son Abu'l Hasan gives the precise indication of the date of Abu'l Hasan's birth. Since Abu'l Hasan is known to have been a Khânazâd, Âqâ Rizâ must have been already in Salîm's employment by the time of his son's birth in 1588/89. Âqâ Rizâ's name is not included in the list of important Akbarî artists compiled by Abu'l Fâzl in the Â'ìn-i-Akbarî, nor is he mentioned in the Akbarnâmâ. His name is not found amongst the scores of major and minor artists who painted hundreds of miniatures in Akbar's time. So, it seems that when Âqâ Rizâ arrived from Persia he entered directly into Salîm's Studio.

Very little definite information of the studio is known to us and very few securely dated works coming from it are found. So, it is not possible to have a clear idea about its size or the identity of artists besides

Âqâ Rizâ working in it. As the products of the Akbarî atelier are well-documented and easily identified, so any picture which shows a marked difference in attitude from the Akbarî style and is yet closely connected with it in technique and treatment, and which shows a youthful prince engaged in his favourite pastime of hunting, drinking or studying, either signed by Âqâ Rizâ or showing familiarity with his style, may be regarded as a characteristic product of the Salîm Studio.

Akbar visited Kabul and Kashmir for several times during the next decade. Another Jesuit mission arrived in the middle of 1590 but left the Mughal court within a few months of its arrival. In 1595 the third and by far the most important Jesuit mission arrived under the leadership of the learned Father Jerome Xavier and settled down for a prolonged stay. Meanwhile Salîm enlarged his harem and his first three sons and a number of daughters were born. Unfortunate clashes occurred between him and Abu'l Fazl and on a number of occasions between him and Akbar. A large group of courtiers gathered round the prince as his father grew old and his own fortunes rose. This increased his independence.
Meanwhile the Studio flourished and became actively involved in Salîm's search for rare and unusual paintings. Salîm made Āqâ Rîzâ busy in preparing miniatures in the Persian Safavid tradition, many of which appear as palapable copies of well-known Persian works (Plate 2). However, most of Salîm's attention was devoted to European pictures and engravings. Noting the prince's unusual interest, Father Jerome Xavier wrote in his letter of 20 August, 1595:

"I say the same in respect of the prince, for he was seriously angry with our Muhammadan guide for bringing him no image of the Mother of God and when bidding another to make extensive purchases, he particularly ordered him not to fail to bring with him a fine picture of Our Lord."\(^{12}\)

When the prince failed in his attempt to get hold of a copy of a picture or an engraving, he ordered his painters to make a replica of it,\(^{13}\) a task in which his painters were almost unsurpassable.\(^{14}\) A Portuguese painter brought by the fathers at Lahore was also appointed by him to make a

---

13. *ibid.*, 74.
14. Roe at a much later date supported this: *Roe*, 199-200, 224 "for indeed in that arte of limigne his paynters woorke miracles." Cf: Plates 49 & 50, 121, 126, 129, 113, 118.
copy of an excellent picture of the Blessed Virgin which the fathers were unwilling to part with. The fathers were constantly and unabashedly approached by him for more and more European pictures and art-objects. In his letter of December, 1597, Xavier wrote to his Superior:

"He was so anxious for things imported from Portugal and India and especially for the pictures of Our Saviour and the Blessed Virgin, the Queen of Angels (to whose care he says he commends himself) that he excites our wonder..."16

In the following year the father found him busy in directing the work of two painters who were "tracing out by the application of colours" some small pictures of Christian subject. 17

Signs of Salim's growing impatience became apparent in his activities over the next few years, and in 1599 burst in open rebellion. Taking advantage of Akbar's absence in the siege of Agra, Salim disregarded the imperial command and seizing a large sum of money belonging to a dying noble fled to Allahabad. There he entrenched himself in the strong fortress and styled himself Shâh. He settled down as a semi-independent ruler for some time.

16. JASB, op.cit., 75.
17. Ibid, 74.
During these years the little court of Salīm functioned in its own independent way. As Shāh Salīm he issued farmāna, granted jagîra, appointed governors, and even approached the fathers for sending a separate mission to Allahabad, probably to gain some recognition.18 His drinking bouts were intensified and hunting parties were often organised. By living a reckless and irresponsible life he became increasingly haughty and cruel, and engaged in unbecoming activities. In spite of all these, however, his passion for art did not become obscured. The Studio was much enlarged by recruiting more painters; many of them were trained, and some previously employed in the Akbarī atelier as minor artists. It undertook preparation of MSS, a task not attempted before. The exact number of MS prepared and illustrated at Allahabad is not known, but three works, all preserved in good condition and complete with dated colophons, still survive. These are a Diwān of Amīr Hasan Dihlavī, a unique copy of Râjkunwâr and an Anwâr-i-Suhaîtim,19 work on the last mentioned MS was undertaken in the Salīm Studio just before its break-up, and it was completed only at a later date. Besides the MSS, a number of interesting miniatures were painted in the

18. ibid, 89.
19. infra, Chapter IV.
Studio, mostly for compiling in the royal *murāqqaś*, the collection of European prints and engravings so enthusiastically built up by Salīm from the early days also grew in volume.

So the material which can be regarded as authentic products of the Salīm Studio is strictly limited in quantity. But, nevertheless, a detailed analytical study of these few pictures produced there is rewarding and necessary to determine the trends and tendencies initiated and promoted by Salīm, which ultimately paved the way for the refined and sophisticated Jahângiriş style. Basil Gray thinks that changes were already on the way and it would be rash to assume that Salīm personally brought about this "minor stylistic revolution." It is true that distinct stylistic changes are noticeable in such late Akbarī MSS as the *Nafahat-al-uns* and *Jog-Bâshisht*, but this may be the result of the influence exerted by the prince and his enthusiastic band of painters. Salīm's interest was more in the living world of nature than in speculation of the spirit and he was more interested in the persons moving around him, in the girls attracting his attention, and in the birds and beasts so carefully noted by him, than in dry discourses of theology or in lessons of past history. This

---

interest in living nature and in the human world is the keynote of the style of painting evolved during his time and followed both in the imperial atelier and in the Salīm Studio.

The practice of building up collections of miniatures of diverse sorts and calligraphic qītal's is not an innovation of Salīm, such muraqqa's were prepared in large number in Persia and Turkey long before Salīm's birth.21 At least two muraqqa's collected or compiled in Humāyūn's time have survived.22 Abu'l Fazl refers to the preparation of a sumptuous muraqqa of exquisite portraits of princes and nobles at Akbar's order.23 As the limited resources of Salīm's modest establishment did not permit the preparation of sumptuous MSS with numerous miniatures in the Akbarī model, and as Salīm's interest was mainly to collect pictures of various types, so the compilation of muraqqa's served his purpose well.


22. Two such muraqqa's of calligraphic specimens, one with a brilliant circular shamsa painted by Bihzād (B.W. Robinson, Persian Drawings, Pl.29), were exhibited in the Burlington House Exhibition (PMF, 124 & 131, Nos.109 & 131). One of them belonged to Akbar's mother Hamīda Bānū Begam, and other bears seals of Akbar's and autograph notes of Jahāngīr and Shāh Jahān.

He collected old Persian masterpieces, early Mughal works drawn by Khwāja ʿAbd us-Ṣamad, Farrukh Beg and also Mîr Sayyid ʿAlî and Daswant.24 His passion for European engravings and book illustrations is already noted. So when Âqâ Riżâ was employed, his first task was probably to arrange Salîm's collection of pictures in suitable muraqqa's.

Of the muraqqa's prepared in the Salîm Studio and continued during Jahângîr's reign and long after his death, only two,25 the Gulshan album and the so-called Berlin album, definitely come from Jahângîr's time, and the rest from succeeding periods. No muraqqa assembled exclusively in the Salîm Studio has survived, only the earlier of the two Jahângîr muraqqa's, the 'Muraqqa'-I-Gulshan:

24. Infra. Chapter VI
25. Some scholars think there was one grand muraqqa and the folios in Tehran and Tübingen as well as the stray folios found in numerous collections all belong to it (cf: S. Digby's note in IC, XXXVII, 293; AIP, 156). The size of the folios vary very little: in Tübingen and Boston it is 41.5 cm x 25.8 cm, whereas in Tehran and Paris it is 40x24.5 cm. The decorations in the hâshiyas, though differ in details, are of a similar type. The Gulshan album contains 88 (92 according to PMP, vide, following note) folios and has a 19th century Persian binding, and the Tübingen folios (25 folios) were collected by Heinrich Brugsch Pasha from Persia in 1860-1 (IBP, 8). Via lk in son aid Gray write on this problem in the following terms: 'The question must remain open whether all these pages originally formed part of a single book.' But for convenience of handling a number of handy volumes is much more desirable than one huge album. While referring to the albums the Jesuit fathers use the word registro in plural (J&J, 64-5) and a vague chronological sequence is also to be noted in the two remaining muraqqa's: the Tübingen album does not have anything dated earlier than 1608/9 and the Gulshan album has nothing beyond 1610/11.
contains some selected Persian masterpieces, original European engravings, early Mughal works and other materials spanning the years of the Salâm Studio, including the works of Âqâ Rizâ.26

26. The Muraqqa'-i-Gulshan was brought to Persia by Nâdir Shâh from Delhi as booty. Since then it has been preserved in the Persian royal collection. When the album was first exhibited in the International Exhibition of Persian Art, at Burlington House, London, in 1931, it created a major surprise. However, in the exhibition only the Persian examples collected by Jahângir were shown. In a subsequent article in the Burlington Magazine (April, 1935, 168-177), J.V.S. Wilkinson and Basil Gray gave an indication of its valuable content, and reproducing a number of superb Mughal miniatures and marginal drawings they wrote, "it would be an excellent thing if it could be published in extenso." (p.177). Since then the album has been exhibited in part or in full in various exhibitions (Leningrad, 1935; Paris, 1948; New York, 1949; Rome, 1956; The Hague, 1957; Prague, 1948; and in various places in 1962) and a few folios published in catalogues, articles and books, but this valuable document has never been published in extenso.

In the catalogue of the Burlington House Exhibition (PMP, Appendix C, 192) the number of folios in the Gulshan album is given as 92, though in a recent publication (Eltzinghausen, infra) the number is given as 88. At least one folio reproduced by Eltzingehausen (fig. 6) and described as coming from a Tehran Private Collection was published only a few years back by Hájek (infra, Pl. 32) where the source is clearly stated as the Imperial Library, Tehran. For the published folios:

PMP, passim. Pl. LXVII (double), LXXIV, LXXXVIIA & B, XCIV, CIII-B, CIVA & B, CVA & B.
B. Gray & A. Godard, Iran: Miniatures from the Imperial Library, Unesco, Paris, 1960, Pl.XVI-XXIV (all in colour and in original size).
The earliest dated example of Aqa Riza's work is found in a Gulshan Album folio (plate 3), where one of the seven figures spread all over the hashiya bears the inscription: Shâh Salîm Ghulâm bi-ikhlás Aqa Riza musawwir ... fi târikh Ramazân 1008/ March 1600 A.D.27 The figure shows a bearded man writing with a feather-pen on a scroll (Plate 3). Some Roman letters written on the scroll are still to be read above the Persian inscriptions. This as well as three other figures by

Survey, Pl. 893B, 911, 912B.
Mehdi Bahrami, Iranian Art: Treasures from the Imperial Collections and Museums of Iran, New York, 1949, 30-31, figs. 34-35.
Mostra d'Arte Iranica, Catalogo, Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, Milano, 1956.
Milo C. Beach, "The Gulshan Album and its European Sources", Bull. MFA, LXIII, No. 332 (Boston, 1967), 62-91, (28 figs.).
R. Eltzinghausen, "New Pictorial Evidence of Catholic Missionary Activity in Mughal India." Perennitas, Münster, 1963/, fig. 4-6.
IMM, Pl. 8-32.
27. Y. Godard, Athar-e-Iran, I, 13.
its side are obvious adaptations from European engravings of the Ascension of Christ\textsuperscript{28} or similar subjects. Father Xavier's information of two painters "tracing out by the application of colour some small pictures" of European origin under the guidance of Salîm\textsuperscript{29} is thus fully corroborated by these dated details.

It also confirms our proposition that murraqa's with elaborate hâshiyas were being prepared from the early days of the Salîm studio. The drawings of Aqâ Riza are done in strong lines with opaque colour tinges applied lightly within the frame of the outline, with some hint of modelling, (Plate 3). They differ considerably from the extensive shadowing and tonal variations adopted by Daulat, Bishandâs, Govardhan, Bâlchand etc. in the hâshiyas, some of which are dated 1608/1609,\textsuperscript{30} or from the decorations found rather unexpectedly in the margins of some folios of the Bâhâristân-i-Jâmî MS in the Bodleian Library, prepared in Akbar's studio in 1595/96.\textsuperscript{31} These decorations showing young prince on horseback, hawking, hunting or reading signed by Shivdâs, Bâlchand, Husain

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{28} \textit{ibid}, Fig. 1.
\item \textsuperscript{29} Maclagan, \textit{JASB}, 1896, 74.
\item \textsuperscript{30} infra, Ch. VII, Plates. 39-43.
\item \textsuperscript{31} MS Elliot 254, Bodleian Library, Oxford.
\end{itemize}
and Khim are uncommon in Akbar's time. One is tempted to think that like the decorative details on ff 596-60a of the second copy of the *Akbarnāma*, now in the British Museum, these marginal decorations were added in Jahāngīr's time. However, beyond the stylistic similarity and the appearance of Bālchand's name, which is also found in the "Berlin album", there is no other basis to strengthen this view, and the practice of drawing figures on the ḥāshiya of the Jahāngīrī murāqqa's may well have been inspired by this MS.

In the ḥāshiya which contains the dated details by Aqā Rizā, beside four European figures at the top there are two other details showing a young prince resting on an elaborate bed and a beautiful young lady sitting on

---

32. *Mughal Miniatures of the Earlier Periods*, Pl.10,11,12. Such details are found in folios 10,12b,17,21b,22,30,33,34,44,45b,60b and 61b as well as extensive designs in gold of floral and vegetal motifs, birds and landscapes, some of which are signed by Ghaffar and Ikhlās. Also in two folios of the Dyson Perrins Khāmsa-i-Nizâmî (B.M. Or.12208, folios 132a, 169b). Similarity of the details reproduced in *ibid*, Pl.10,11 is very close with the Jahāngīrī murāqqa's. In:

34. Or.12988. 163 ff, 39 miniatures. Folio 134 bears the signature of Kham Karan and dated 21 Sha'bān, 12 H. = 25 January, 1604.
35. IBP, Pl.38a (folio 13b).
a couch. She is shapely and attractive, wears a plumed headdress with a high rounded top and a Chaghatai-type dress and holds a spray of flower in her right hand. An aged man in Europeanised costume and hat is shown coming towards her with a round flower vase. It is likely that all other drawings of this hashiya are also painted by Aqâ Rizâ, and in the same year.

Signed works of Aqâ Rizâ are, as reported by Madame Godard, also to be found on three other folios of the Gulshan album (ff 29, 145, 152). None of them are dated, hence a strict chronological sequence of Aqâ Rizâ's style cannot be traced from them, because a number of later works painted by him are also found in the Gulshan album. Nevertheless, the hashiya decorations are of absorbing interest. One of them shows a young prince, perhaps one of the sons of Salîm, reading a book on which the name of the painter is cleverly incorporated in an otherwise undeciphered Persian inscription. He is seated on a mound, fully coloured in deep tones and wears a heavy costume and trousers, painted in green, orange and pink. The portraiture of the prince is not comparable to the studies made by such specialists as Bishandas and Daulat, but still it is quite satisfactory.

Other details of this ḥāshiya as well as another (f 68), show glimpses of the zanāna mahall. Princesses, their maids and companions (Plate 46), some playing on musical instruments, some preparing 'itr (a variety of which was in fact perfected in Jahângîr's household by Nûr Jehân's mother37), some carrying salvers of food or presents or vases of flowers or chaurs, are minutely presented in these decorations.38 These delightful female figures with their shapely bodies, slender limbs and graceful poise demonstrate a significant change in the attitude of the Mughals towards women. Women are portrayed in hundreds of Akbarî miniatures in scenes of birth, in court receptions, and in family scenes, as dancing lûlîs, musicians and attendants in the historical MSS, and as heroines in romantic tales, but with rare exceptions they remain impersonal and unrecognisable and devoid of character in their puppet like appearance. In the romantic eyes of young Salîm women were given more attention and the ladies of the royal household are portrayed for the first time in art. However, almost no

37. Tuzuk, 1, 270-1.
38. Y. Godard, op.cit., figs. 5, 6.
one of them can be precisely identified, as no authentic likeness of any Mughal princesses or empresses with their names written on them are preserved. Nevertheless, from their dignified and graceful countenance and their delicate beauty there is no doubt that these aristocratic and beautiful ladies seated on thrones or on couches, are indeed members of the royal household. As we shall see later, because of this change in outlook, artists were allowed to enter the zanâna to paint its members and also to train girls who painted delightful miniatures, some of which are preserved in the murâqqa's. At least in two instances the name of Aqâ Rizâ is mentioned as the instructor (Plates: 121, 129).

Of Madame Godard's other ascriptions, the vignette showing an old teacher giving lessons to his pupil, a young prince may have come from Aqâ Rizâ's brush, because the subject matter is a familiar Persian motif and its

Other female names occurring in the Minto Album are Shafi'a Bânû who painted the picture of Shâh Tahmâsp (V & A; Clarke, Pl.XVIII), and Nînî (Plate 113) and in the Gulshan album Raqiya Bânû. The former also copied one of Bihzâd's famous work in the Khâmsa-i-Nizâmî in the British Museum, which is preserved in the Nâsir-ud-din Album. (Y. Godard, Athar-e-Iran, 1937, 266, fig. 110).
40. Y. Godard, op.cit., 1936, fig. 8.
treatment is reminiscent of Āqā Rizâ's style. There is no such overwhelming stylistic or typological similarity for the other detail which shows a king looking like Akbar, seated on a throne under a tree while an attendant prepares sîkh-kabâb in the open and a young noble offers drinks.\textsuperscript{41} Another folio illustrated by S.C. Welch\textsuperscript{42} showing similar hunting scenes drawn in a style similar to the above-mentioned detail, may have been painted by the same artist. Mention should also be made of some other hâshiya details of the Gulshan album, reproduced by Hájek\textsuperscript{43} belonging to the same style. However, the folio reproduced by H. Goetz showing hunting scenes and attributed by him to Āqâ Rizâ\textsuperscript{44} is a late 17th century Persian work and has nothing to do with our artist.

Four full page miniatures in the Gulshan Album are signed by Āqâ Rizâ, two with the appellation muvîd-wa-ikhlâs-i-pâdishâh Salîm and the other two with the name of Jahângîr. The first two were apparently done in the Salîm Studio, while the appellation Jahângîr-Shâhî in the last two obviously put them in the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{41} ibid, fig. 7.
\item \textsuperscript{42} AMI, Pl. 27: Collection of the Nelson Gallery of Art, Kansas City.
\item \textsuperscript{43} IMM, Pl. 28
\item \textsuperscript{44} H. Goetz, East \& West, op.cit., fig. 15; collection of Musée Guimet, Paris.
\end{itemize}
post-1605 period.  

The first one is a fine picture of a young and handsome prince holding court in an elaborate architectural setting; (Plate 2). A large number of attendants and courtiers engaged in various activities are shown along with a portion of garden with the characteristic shanar and cypress trees and blooming creepers and part of the zanana-mahall. The colouring is said to be strong, the designs of architectural details, carpets etc. are minutely drawn and the complex composition very effectively handled. The faces of the principal participants, especially of the prince, are delicately modelled. The effect is of effortless sophistication. The miniature shows similarity to a Persian masterpiece of the Harâtî School, - a work of

45. Gray refers to an early work by Āqâ Rizâ in pure Safavid style, preserved in the Gulistan Library signed "the work of Rizât, the disciple of Pâdishâh Salîm." It is not clear from his description whether this miniature is a part of the Gulshan album. If Āqâ Rizât was not appointed by Salîm before 1588/89, how a miniature signed with Salîm's name be assigned to 1580 is not clear: PI, 99.

46. PMP, 149, No.236. Curiously, the signature "Rizât murid-i-pâdishâh Salîm" is written on the top of the miniature.
Üstâd Mirzâ 'Ali (f 77b) in the Khâmsa-i-Nizâmî of 946-949H/1539-1543, prepared for the library of Shâh Tahmâsp, now in the British Museum. There are some variations in architectural details or in the number of persons and their placings, obviously altered to cater for the taste of the Mughal prince. There is no doubt that Āqâ Rizâ was familiar with Mirzâ 'Ali's work or used a charba of it before painting the Gulshan miniature. The Gulshan picture is undated, but from the appearance of the young prince, who is no other than Āqâ Rizâ's patron Salim, it ought to be placed not later than 1592/93.

The other miniature in the same album inscribed with the name of Āqâ Rizâ, "murid-i-pâdishâh Salîm", shows a prince seated in an iwan. A superb miniature in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston shows a bearded young prince playing a mandolin under a weeping willow tree and is inscribed raqm-i-Âghâ /sic/ Rizâ Murîd bi-ikhlâs with the words Sultan Salîm written in gold above the signature. The portrait is very carefully drawn, with minute shading near the eyes and the nose, which give it a realistic look.

47. BM, Or.2265, folio 77b: Martin, II, Pl. 137.
49. Cat-MFA, VI, 30-31, Pl. XXIa.
Coomaraswamy identifies the subject with Salîm, probably considering Salîm's love for music and obsession with having his portraits made. But the identification is doubtful because the facial features are different from Salîm's and the prince is shown bearded, while Salîm is not known to have grown a beard.

The sketch-portrait of a young man seated on a chair reading, and inscribed râqimuhu Rizâr Shahîngîr-Shâhî, in the Museum für Völkerkunde, Berlin does not appear to be an authentic work of Âqa Rizâ. The inscription looks rather unformed and the lines of the sketch faltering. In all probability it is a slightly later version based on an authentic charba.

Chronologically the miniatures bearing Âqa Rizâ's signature in the Anwar-i-Suhaîlî MS (BM.Ad.18579) completed in 1610/11, follow these, because two of them are dated in the year 1604/5 and contain the appellation murîd-i-pâdishâh Salîm or bi-iklâs wa murîd. It seems that the MS was started in 1604 but because of the change in the political set-up the little studio of Salîm was wound up, and all works undertaken there were suspended,

50. Martin, II, Pl. 110, etc.
51. Infra, ...
so the preparation of this MS was interrupted, and was not taken up until at a later date. Of the 34 other miniatures in this MSS, three are signed by ʿAqā Rizā (or Muḥammad Rizā) and another, though not bearing his signature, no doubt comes from his brush. From the strict stylistic point of view five out of these six belong to the same style, whereas the sixth miniature (f 331a) looks more Persian in character (Plate 4). All of them must be held as contemporary to the two dated folios.

In general, the miniatures of the Anwār-i-Suhailī MS are of variable qualities. Amongst them the miniatures painted by ʿAqā Rizā stand apart from the rest mainly because of their unmistakable Persian appearance. The golden sky (f 20a, 360, 331a), the stylised (multi-coloured piled-up rocks (f 20a, 21a, 36a, 40b, 54b), the profusion of blooming shrubs (f 20a, 40b, 331a), trees with dried-up branches (f 36a, 40b, 54b), outsize birds (f 36a), and effeminate youths are typical of Rizā's more Persian-inspired style. Heads popping up from behind the hillock on buildings (f 20a, 36a, 54b), the use of deep and bright monochromes in dresses, and depiction of architectural details showing inscriptions and decorative designs (f 40b, 54b, 331a), are remnants of the Persian tradition in which

Âqâ Rizâ grew up. He continued to use these in his works and his pupils were also trained in the same way. The works of Abu'l Hasan (Plate 27) and Mirzâ Ghulâm (f 63a, 64b, 311b, 396a) (Plate 29) in the same MS show distinct influence of Âqâ Rizâ's style.

Of the six miniatures painted by Âqâ Rizâ, the Feast of the King of Yemen on f331a (Plate 4) is undoubtedly the best. Here he has chosen a much used Persian setting, an open terrace outside an arched portico in a garden. The young King of Yemen wears long bright orange jâma, green drawers and Safavid turban and sits on a rich floral carpet. Three musicians, one of them playing a panpipe, provide music. Drinks are served in profusion: the courtier on the right is already drunk. The minutely painted carpets of gorgeous floral design and the white back wall showing conventional landscape scenes and animals in blue and the intricate geometrical ornaments on the wall show Âqâ Rizâ's love for details, which is also apparent in the Gulshan Album miniature of the Court of Salîm (Plate 2). In no other miniature of this MS is so much attention given to bring out the effective orderliness and intricate nuances of a composition. The men are shown in three-quarter profile with narrow eyes and short chins, and the faces of
beardless youths have an effeminate look.

Strangely enough, the stamp of Āqā Rizā's distinctiveness is not evident in the Diwān-i-Amīr Ḥasan Dihlavī and Rājkunwār, the two important MSS produced at Allahabad. He is not specifically mentioned in the Tūzuk excepting in one place where the emperor casually refers to the name of Āqā Rizā and declares his preference to Āqā Rizā's son Abu'l Hasan who is considered a better painter than his father. Āqā Rizā was a good painter, fond of introducing realistic details and delicate modelling, but he lacked originality and that may be the reason of Jahāngīr's uncharitable remarks about him.

With his accession to the throne in 1605 Jahāngīr inherited the whole of Akbar's painting studio along with the royal painters and the importance of Āqā Rizā was consequently diminished.

Āqā Rizā was appointed to supervise the mausoleum of Shāh Begam, who committed suicide in 1604. The mausoleum, in the Khusraubāgh at Allahabad, was completed

---

54. M.A. Chaghatai, "Aqa Riza, 'Ali Riza, Riza-i-'Abbasi", IC, XII, 1938, 437. The inscription is:
at a later date and the name of Āqâ Rizâ Muqawwîr is mentioned in the inscription on the main gateway. But he did not completely leave the brush and continued to paint occasionally after Salîm became emperor. Though these works are to be regarded as products of the imperial studio, and not of the Salîm Studio, still it is proper to examine them in the present context as they will reveal an unbroken continuity of Āqâ Rizâ's individual style.

Two folios of the Gulshan Album are signed by Āqâ Rizâ with the appellation Jahângîr-Shahi, instead of Pâdishâh Salîm. One of them shows two maidens bathing in a pool within the palace garden while a prince watches from an upper-storey balcony window.55 The miniature reveals a favourite Persian subject treated in a wholly Persian way. The architecture, with its coloured decorations, and stylised arches, the garden with the cypress trees, the conventional thread-like silvery stream, the flowering shrubs, and the chanâr tree, the ladies with their Persian costume, slender body and small oval face, and the conventional hills in the background - everything makes it

55. H. Goetz, East & West, op.cit., Pl.XII; IMM, Pl.23 (colour). Goetz says the picture is not inscribed, but the inscription is visible in Hâjêk's reproduction, though not on the right as Hâjêk writes, but in the left hand corner.
look like a Persian work. Only the maidens who are taking their bath, especially the one on the right, shown stripped to the waist, are depicted in a realistic manner with some shadows in their faces and some hint of expression in their countenance. This may very well be an early work, but assembled in the royal *muraqqa* at a later date.

The other painting shows a young prince conversing with an old bearded mulla in a garden. Behind the hill in the background part of the palace gateway is visible. Above it the sky is painted in gold with blue and white Chinese-type clouds in the right hand corner. The garden is purely Persian in appearance, with a pair of cypress trees and blooming creeper-like plants, the conventional thread-like rivulet with stony banks, and the flowering shrubs. A young boy plays on a stringed musical instrument; on his right side stands the prince's horse, and to the left a heavily-built thickly bearded middle-aged attendant with a hunting dog. A young boy is climbing on the hill where a tree with stylised leaves and a few others with bare branches are visible. The prince wears a rich red *gabâ*

---

with turned up golden collar and an elaborate turban; a prize shâhîn falcon sits on his gloved right hand. The mullâ is a composed and reserved figure with a look of otherworldliness in his eyes. His fair complexion and snow-white beard are set off by his deep maroon coloured garment. The whole atmosphere is quiet, but the rich contrasting colour-tones and the profusion of diverse flowers give it a rare charm. It brings into the mind the wonderful miniature painted by Mużaffar 'Alî in the Garhaspâna prepared at Qazwin in 1573\(^57\), though there is no close similarity. It represents a much used Persian theme and looks earlier than the Court of Salîm or the pages of the Anwâr-i-Suhâlî\(^58\). The inscription in the top right hand corner of the miniature reads 'amal-i-murîd bi-ikhlâs Āqâ Rigâ Jahângîrshâhî, but the scribbling in the top left hand corner cannot be deciphered from the reproductions. The Hague Catalogue\(^59\) gives the date as 1030H/1620-21. This brings in a problem, because no

58. There are other comparative Persian examples of a similar style: cf. B.W. Robinson, Persian Drawings, Pls. 46 & 48 (in colour) showing a Hawking party in the mountain of c.1580 in Qazwin style by an anonymous painter.
other miniature of this album is dated beyond 1020H/1611-2, and there is no evidence to show that Āqā Rizâ lived that long. So, possibly this is a misreading of an unclearly written $y$ (2) as $w$ (3). The inscription is written in a coarse hand and does not appear to have been written by the painter or by the emperor; it may have been a later attribution to an earlier work of Āqā Rizâ.

There is another miniature in the Gulshan Album showing a youth wearing a cloak with blue, green and brown stripes, standing with a flask in his hands, which according to Gray, Wilkinson and Arnold is drawn in a style similar to Rizâ-i-'Abbâsî's. There is no identifying label, but as the presence of a copy of Rizâ-i-'Abbâsî's work seems unlikely in this royal album, assembled at an earlier date, Āqâ Rizâ may be assumed to be its author, the work being done in his earlier style. Some other examples of this style are found in this muraqqa': one illustrated by Beach shows a copy made by Râqiya Bâmû (fig. 12).

The only other miniature where an authentic attribution to Āqâ Rizâ appears is in the "Kevorkian Album", now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. It shows a youth who has fallen down from a tree while bird-nesting,

60. PMP, 174, No.336. Not illustrated.
his father kneeling by his side and crying in grief, while a mulla, Khwâja Jahân, looks on. In all its parts and details the miniature has the touch of Āqâ Rizâ’s hand. The face of the grieving father is charged with a deep emotion and the scene is moving. The attribution to Āqâ Rizâ is made by Shâh Jahân for whom the murâqqa' was prepared. 61

We have no information about the date and time when Āqâ Rizâ died. But if the very fine miniature depicting the scene at the gate of a city in the Berlin Album (Plate 5) comes from his brush, then he was still working in the 12th regnal year of Jahângîr, because the inscription on the city-gate reads: "this picture was completed in the library of Hazrat Zill-Ilâhî Nûr-ud-dîn Muhammad Jahângîr Pâdishâh Ghâzî in the year 12." 62 It is a sumptuous miniature covering most of the 40 x 23.5 cm folio, and shows the elaborate details of a crowded scene. The chanâr and pomegranate trees, the Persian costume of the male and female figures, the architecture, the rich colour scheme of bright red, green, yellow, mauve and

61. For a late copy of this miniature in the Victoria & Albert Museum, (IM 126-1921): Clarke, Pl. 4 (falsely attributed to Farrukh Beg).
62. IBP, 9-10.
orange, the golden sky and similar other features of this miniature make it appear as a first class work by Ḥaqā Rizā.

If the attribution is correct then it would be easier to adduce authenticity to the inscriptions in the Gulshan Album miniature of the young prince visiting a mulla, discussed above. Only it seems strange that Ḥaqā Rizā maintained his position and continued working in his characteristic Persianized style even in the heyday of the Jahāngīr School.

There is a large number of miniatures which are not signed but ascribed to Ḥaqā Rizā by various authors. In many cases the attributions are wrong and the pictures look very different from the authentic miniatures painted by Ḥaqā Rizā. In a few instances, however, they are closely related to Ḥaqā Rizā's style and it is difficult to reject the attribution. A superb miniature of the Diwān-i-Hāfiz (f 25) illustrated during Jahāngīr's time shows unmistakable affinity to Ḥaqâ Rizâ's style. The subject is the scene of a drinking party organised in the courtyard of a madrasa. The theological master Fāqīh and

63. I. Stchoukine, Gazette du Beaux Arts, VI, 1931, 160f., fig. 1. I am grateful to Mr. Simon Digby for helping me to decipher this extremely minute and difficult inscription. The term "al-ʿabd" should be noted, because Bihzād used to sign his name with this appellation.
two other teachers from the madrasa sit under an یونان with pitchers of wine beside them. Four other theological masters or students in a state of drunkenness or ecstasy are shown before them in the courtyard. The setting is Persian, with intricate architectural details and ornamentation, bluish decorations on the whitewashed backwall. The costumes of the teachers are also Persian. The quality of drawing is extraordinary and its colouring is fascinating. In every respect it is a superior example of a Persian émigré painter. Stchoukine assigned it to Aqa Riza, but rather hesitatingly. However, a minute inscription near the head of the teacher sitting on the extreme left, (which has not previously been noted, reads: سّعارة یلأبّد یعّامّم ملّهّمّر ریّزآ), unquestionably putting it in the list of Aqa Riza's work.

Three other unsigned miniatures, one in the Marteau collection of Museé Guimet, and another in the Náprstek Museum, Prague, probably both forming parts of the Gulshan Album, and a third in the Tehran Archeological Museum, may also have been painted by Aqa Riza. The first miniature, now in the Náprstek Museum, Prague, pasted on a murqqa' folio, shows a young prince wearing a rich gold-brocaded qabâ and a fur-lined headdress, who is seated on a tree with a curiously crooked trunk drawn in the Chinese manner.

64. IMM, Pl. 9 & 15.
He drinks from a cup held on a saucer by his left hand. A hunting dog looks on and six disproportionately large birds fly over his head. The picture has been attributed by Hájek to Āqā Rizā, which is not improbable, though Hájek's comment that the young man is almost a counterpart of the young gentleman with golden cup in the Fogg Museum of Art, Cambridge, Mass., is wholly untenable. Jahângîr writes in the Tûzuk that he did not taste wine before his seventeenth year and the youth of the Naprstek miniature looks younger than seventeen, so it does not portray Salîm but some one else. The Fogg Museum miniature, discussed by Eric Schroeder, seems to be a work of Farûkh Beg and not of Āqā Rizâ. The second miniature, also pasted on a Jahângîr album folio and, known for a long time, shows the same subject but in a different manner, is of the same style. The third example published by Hájek, shows an old teacher or calligrapher seated on a platform under a decorated canopy. A young page stands behind him, while a little boy, apparently the pupil of the teacher, while a little boy, apparently the pupil of the teacher,

65. ibid, 75.
66. Tuzuk, I, 307; Hodivala, Studies in Indo-Muslim History, II, Bombay 1957, 321 has shown that Salîm was in his 17th year, not 15 or 18.
68. infra, ...
69. IMM, Pl. facing p. 46.
70. IMM, Pl. 33.
waits nervously. Part of a hill is visible in the background and a blooming plant in the garden completes the composition. The subject is a favourite one in both Persian and Mughal art. The Tehran miniature has some similarity with the vignette in the Gulshan Album folio attributed by Madame Godard to Âqâ Rizâ, discussed above. Another miniature repeating the same subject, though not similar, reproduced by S.C. Welch and originally attributed by him to Âqâ Rizâ, does not appear to have been painted by Âqâ Rizâ.

Welch’s attribution of the miniature in a Bustûn Ms. of 1605/6 showing a thief bound to a column well be Âqâ Rizâ’s work; but the group of miniatures in an album in the collection of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, are surely not painted by Âqâ Rizâ. Coomaraswamy himself is hesitant about their authorship though he

71. Supra, Y. Godard, op. cit., Fig. 8. However, the style of the Tehran miniature shows some difference from the other two.

72. AMI, 30, Pl. 17. In AO, V, 1963, p. 223. Welch ascribed it to Âqâ Rizâ’s name and only gives the date c. 1585. K.J. Khandalavala in a recent review of Lalitkalâ, XI, 1962, 9-13 has ascribed a 19th century date to this miniature. The same subject painted on the wall of a building in a Bâbûnâma MS: S. Tyûlayev, Miniatures of Bâburnâmah, Moscow, 1960, Pl. 18.

73. AMI, Pl. 24; infra.

74. Cat. MFA, VI, 31-33, (MFA No. 15.24, 15.26, 15.29, 15.31, 15.32), Pl. XXIIb, XXIIa, XXIIIa, XXIVa.
attributes the picture of the young man playing a panpipe to Aqâ Rizâ.\textsuperscript{75} It resembles Aqâ Rizâ's works in some ways and a parallel example of a panpipe player occurs in one of the British Museum Anwâr-i-Suhâîlî miniatures.\textsuperscript{76} But Robinson's ascription of it to the Persian artist Muhammad Mu'min seem more probable.\textsuperscript{77} The picture of a young noble in the Indian Museum, Calcutta, attributed by Percy Brown to Aqâ Rizâ,\textsuperscript{78} is not a Mughal work, but a Persian painting of early 17th century,\textsuperscript{79} belonging to the Rizâ-i-'Abbâsî style.

Aqâ Rizâ exerted considerable influence in the evolution of the Jahângirî style. He was working at a time in the Salîm Studio when Mughal painting was evolving to a new synthesis after assimilating the diverse elements introduced by artists of very different traditions and when the Persian Şafavid idiom had almost been discarded. Aqâ Rizâ and the more elusive Farrukh Beg revived the Persianizing style in Mughal art. Aqâ Rizâ was not as distinctive or as talented as Farrukh Beg, but he must have been a good teacher and a good assimilator. In these

\textsuperscript{75} ibid. 31, Pl. XXIb.
\textsuperscript{76} J.V.S. Wilkinson, The Lights of Camopus, Pl. XXIX.
\textsuperscript{77} B.W. Robinson, Persian Drawings, New York, 1965, Pl. 49 (colour).
\textsuperscript{78} IPM, 65-66, Pl.IIIb.
\textsuperscript{79} Cf Martin, II, Pl.165b.
Robinson, op.cit., Pl.56: Seated youth by Aqâ Rizâ (Abbâsî), etc.
roles he helped to shape the separate identity of the Salîm Studio. The early works of his son Abu'l Hasan easily show the stamp of his training. Amongst other artists showing Aqâ Rizâ's influence mention may be made of Mirzâ Ghulâm. His most interesting pupil is Nâdirâ Bânû, daughter of Mir Taqî, who includes the name of her teacher in her signature (Plate 121, 129). The name Mir Taqî appears in two miniatures of the second MS of the Akbarnâma, and one Muhammad Taqî is mentioned in the Tûzuk as the diwân of buildings, but there is no way of knowing whether they are the same person. It is interesting to note that the earliest miniature of Abu'l Hasan (Plate 27), the earliest dated work of Aqâ Rizâ himself (Plate 3), and the work of Nâdirâ Bânû (Plates 121, 129) are all drawings copied from European engravings.

80. He painted the double page (f247b-248) showing Akbar breaking the fierce elephant Fath Mubarak in the Akbarnâma MS, now in the Chester Beatty Library. In f248 the name is simply signed as Taqî whereas in f247b he signs his name as Mir Taqî on the miniature itself: Cat-CB, II, Pl.34 (colour). S.C. Welch has published a tinted drawing from the Heeramaneek collection showing Dârâ and the herdsman, signed by Mir Taqî (AMI, Pl.6) and dates c1585. Welch (ibid., 163) equates Mir Taqî with 'Ali Qulî, apparently without any convincing reason. This drawing is stylistically very different from the Akbarnâma miniatures.

81. Tuzuk, I, 258.

82. Infra, ...
Of the two MSS definitely known to have been produced in the Salīm Studio at Allahabad the Diwān of Amīr Ḥasan Dihlavī is a full-size volume with fourteen delightful miniatures. With one exception (f.48), none of these miniatures are signed by the artist. Even on the only signed miniature the signature is difficult to decipher: it may be read as 'Alī Imām Qulī or, more probably, as 'amal-i-Salīm Qulī. Salīm Qulī contributed two pictures in the British Museum Anwār-i-Suhaṭīlī MS, and Raḥmān Qulī one. The name 'Alī Qulī is also found in two gorgeous and dated pictures in the Chester Beatty Library. The association with Salīm is supported by three other factors: the colophon mentioning the date and place of the execution of the MS; the colophon-portrait

83. The Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, No.W.650. 188f, 31.5 x 20.5 cm, Nastaʿlīq script on gold-sprinkled cream paper. All 14 miniatures have been cut out and remargined with tan paper. Lacquer binding in a delicate strapwork design (Reproduced: R. Ettinghausen, "Near Eastern Book Covers", AO, III, fig.23).
I am grateful to Dr. Dorothy Miner, Librarian and Keeper of MSS, Walters Art Gallery, for kindly supplying all information regarding this MS and a set of photographs of the miniatures.

84. J.V.S. Wilkinson, The Lights of Canopus, Pl.XXXI & XXXIV (for Salīm Qulī), and Pl. XXII (for Raḥmān Qulī).

85. Ind. MS. 11A f.23, Prince Bahrām Gūr hunting; inscribed naqle-'Alī Qulī and dated 1025 Hijra/1616: Cat-CE I,47; III Pl.87. f24 of the same album (Pl.88) is also signed by 'Alī Qulī.
with the picture of the calligrapher, and the appearance of the prince himself in two miniatures, both of which show him enjoying his pastimes in hunting and polo.

The miniature on f22b, reproduced by Ettinghausen in colour, shows the pathetic scene of the martyrdom of Al-Hallâj (Plate 11). It is a fine work where the tragic episode is illustrated with sympathy as well as understanding by a sensitive and powerful painter. There are as many as twenty-four persons in the picture, and yet the atmosphere is of a hushed silence. In it the chief concern of the painter is to render the agony and emotion in the facial expression of all the persons present. The most touching of all is the reserved and calm composure of Al-Hallâj who is shown just moments before his martyrdom. The expression of the moustached man in violet stooping low in the left hand corner and the bearded man wearing a pale blue jâma in the right, who have broken down in grief, are remarkably rendered by the unknown painter. The miniature has a well-balanced composition, which includes a portion of the red sandstone palace, the zigzag flow of the river, the distant city hidden by trees and the bluish hills and the high horizon with bluish clouds, all painted in an accurate

86. PSEI, Pl.8.
unitary perspective. The effect of bright patches of colour in the dresses of the attending persons is largely negativated by the pale green of the wide grounds covering nearly the whole area of the miniature and the general tonal effect becomes much soft and mellow.

Of the other thirteen miniatures many deal with subjects which were popular at this time both in the Salîm Studio and the Akbarî atelier. Such scenes as the court of Sulâîmân (f157a), dancing of the Şûrîs (f62a), the royal hunt (f109b) and Majnûn in the wilderness (f15a) are also repeated in this MS. But in each case the miniatures are painted in a fresh and pleasant style. They can be classified in two categories: the first includes works where prince Salîm (ff 41, 109b) or young members of his household (ff 113, 140) and similar persons are shown; the second category includes works of an allegorical nature where accurate portrait studies or realistic rendering of a contemporary scene are not strictly necessary (ff 15, 32b, 62, 84b, 127 & 157).

In the first category of miniatures a large number of courtiers and attendants are presented in contemporary costumes. In Martyrdom of Al-Ḥallâj these figures are of a slightly larger proportion than in other illustrations.
The main concern of the painters is to portray accurate emotional reactions and a definite stamp of character in each individual. Folio 41 (Plate 12) shows Salîm, accepting a cup of wine near the polo field where five other players are engaged in the game in progress. The presence of attendants, musicians, and the doorman, the bhisti, and sword-bearer make it rather crowded, but the composition is carefully constructed to focus attention on the prince. Though in this painting the sensitivity and dynamic spirit of the Martyrdom of Al-Hallâj are lacking, the interest shown in the human world in it is admirable.

The hunting scene on folio 109b is characteristic of the period, with the usual clichés in rendering the Persianised hills and the landscape. The whole field of the miniature is divided into coulisses. Salîm is mounted on a fast-moving horse and draws his bow to shoot a black buck near a lily pool. A similar amalgamation of conventionalisation and realistic portrait-like faces is evident in the battle scene (f184b), only the ominous thick black cumulus rain clouds distinguish it.

The other three miniatures of this category (folios 48, 113, 140) show a quieter atmosphere and a coherent unity in the different elements of the subject matter. In the picture showing men of various stations as well as a
beautiful maiden watching the new moon (Plate 13), the artist 'Alî Imām (?) Qulî (or Salîm Qulî), whose minute signature is written in the lower right hand corner, has successfully translated the feeling of expectation and excitement. The large number of people shown in the miniature are in conversation or point to the faint crescent moon just cleared out of thick bowel shaped veins of cloud, read from books and pray. The most dramatic part of the scene is shown in the lower half of the picture where an old man, stooping in age and weak in eyesight, fails to see the faint glow of the moon and a man gently holding his hand tries to turn his attention in the right direction.

A similar situation of excitement and expectation prevails over in the scene (f 140) where a prince with a spray of flower and attended by a waiter appears before his palace and is greeted by the courtiers, and learned men. The scene of a young prince's visit to the garden (f113), on the other hand, is much more quiet and reposeful (Plate 14). Here the prince is greeted by the owner of the garden who bows on the prince's feet, while a couple of gardeners continue their work. This miniature is very similar in spirit to one showing a prince wearing an Akbarî pointed jâma in a garden, now in the Bodleian Library.87 Our miniature

is much more refined and sophisticated with careful attention paid to details, and a superb finish. In fact, the refinement of the miniatures of this category can only be compared with the poetical masterpieces produced in Akbar's time during the 1592-1598 period; the difference of our miniatures lies only in the attention paid to render the human world with warm feeling and understanding.

In the second category the style is more formal and hard, very different from the suave naturalism of the first category. In folio 15 the familiar scene of Majnūn's father's visit to Majnūn in the wilderness is shown in a rather conventional manner (Plate 10). The hills look like a series of many coloured anthills, the thread-like rivulet, the animals, the gold background with tufts of grass arranged in a formal pattern and a narrow strip of blue and white cloud, all appear very unreal. A pair of chanâr trees are painted precisely according to the Persian norm. The scene of Solomon's Court (f157) may come from the brush of the same painter; the same hill-type, golden field, formalised trees with birds sitting on their branches, appear in it. The figure of Solomon is closely similar to Majnūn's father. Both these miniatures resemble the style and details of the miniatures painted by Mirzâ Ghulâm in the British Museum Anwâr-i-Suhaîlî MS, especially those on
folios 63a, 64b and 311b. Similar golden background, ant-hill mountains, Persian type chanâr tree with a flamboyant hollow opening at the bottom of the trunk, and lively animals are found in the Walters miniatures. Folio 84b of Amîr Hasan's Dîwân have some similarity with the other two folios just discussed, but considerable difference is noticeable in the use of shadow in the faces and in the treatment of trees and the sky. The shadowing of the face of the grief-stricken Farhâd looks rather naive. It may also be attributed to Mîrzâ Ghulâm because the young man attentively playing on a flute closely corresponds to the figure of a youth drinking in a landscape, signed by Ghulâm and inscribed with the name of Shâh Salîm.

The miniature showing an old man (f127a) lying ill is also painted by the same hand. Here the use of shadow in face, especially in those shown in profile, is more sensitive, though the face of the young nobleman shown in three-quarter profile is distinctive of Mîrzâ Ghulâm's style. Equally distinctive is the face of young man with a plump face and double chin, preparing medicine. The old woman who brought the false news of Shîrîn's death to Farhâd (f84b)

---

is again shown in the picture, where she offers a skein of wool for Joseph sold in a public sale. Similar distinctive shadowing is noticeable in all the faces shown in this picture, as well as in the scene of Sufi dance in a theological assembly inside a madrasa (f62). But the faces here are more expressive and the quality of modelling is much improved and more realistic than the earlier examples. The last mentioned picture is a remarkable exercise in depicting a subject with emotion and sensitiveness.

A noteworthy feature of this MS is the last miniature (f187a) painted around the colophon, showing the calligrapher at work (Plate 15). Calligraphers and painters are often portrayed in Persian painting. But the introduction of their likenesses under the colophon of a MS is not so far met with in Persian art. Only one Akbari MS, a Gulistān-i-Sa'dī written by Muḥammad Ḥusain al-Kashmīrī in 990H/1581 at Fatehpur Sikri, has a small miniature drawn under the colophon which shows the calligrapher and the young Manohar, son of Basāwan, who painted the miniature (Plate 18). The MS was reset and rebound at a later date. Sumptuous decorations of birds abound on its pages and a band of floral design in each folio was added at the

---

90. qV. Minorsky, op.cit., 35, Pl.4.
91. AIP, Pl.121.
at the time of rebinding. The MS is not illustrated with miniatures, so the sudden appearance of the interesting double portrait of the calligrapher and the painter looks rather puzzling. Gray thinks the double portrait is contemporary with the colophon, i.e. 1581, mainly on the basis of Manohar's appearance. Certainly Manohar does not look older than 15-18, which corresponds to his age in that year, because in his Gulshan Album portrait painted by Daulat (Plate 41) dated 1608/9, he appears to be in his mid-forties. But nowhere in the realm of Akbari painting does a similar example of self-portrait or a colophon-portrait exist, and it seems improbable that such an example would occur at such an early date. The style of Mughal painting in 1581 was not close to the style of this miniature. The intense personal feelings expressed in the face of the calligrapher and the young attendant, as well as the self-portrait of young Manohar absorbed in his work, all points to a Jahangiri association. 91a

The Walters miniature (Plate 15) shows the scribe Mir 'Abdullâh Kâtib, called Mushkin Qalam, working on a platform in the shade of a tree and attended by an apprentice busy preparing the sheets. The painter of the miniature is neither showed nor named. On a sheet of paper before the calligrapher his name, the city, Allahabad, and the date 91a. In PL, 82, Gray acknowledges this as a Jahângîrî addition.
Muharram 27, 1011 Hijra, are written. After a few years Jahangir ordered his painter Daulat to add a superb double-portrait of the painter himself and the calligrapher 'Abdur-Rahim 'Anbarin Qalam, under the colophon of the "Dyson Perins Khamsa-i-Nizamî" MS, prepared in 1595/6 in Akbar's atelier (Plate 16). Strangely enough, a very unexpected parallel is furnished by a Turkish MS prepared at Istanbul for the library of Sultan Mehmet III between 1600 and 1602, which shows the painter Hassan Pasha, the scribe, and one of their assistants, under the colophon (Plate 17). There were commercial and some diplomatic contact with Turkey in Akbar's and Jahangir's time and Turkish Sultans appear in Jahangiri miniatures. Even a sumptuous Turkish MS prepared in the Library of Sultan Mehmet III made its way to the Mughal Imperial Library at a later date.

92. I am indebted to Dr. G. Fehervári of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, for giving this valuable information and showing slides and photographs of this miniature. The MS is in the Topkapu Saray Library, Istanbul, and deals with the Turkish occupation of Dr. Fehervári's home town, Eger, and is to be published by him soon.

93. Ettinghausen, "The Emperor's Choice", 104-105, Fig. 1,2,3 & 7, for a detailed discussion on Turkish contact with Jahangir's India. Ife, Male 107.

94. An illustrated MS of the Shâhinshah-nama by Husain prepared for Sultan Mehmet III (1595-1603) at Istanbul is preserved in the Bankipur Public Library: Cat-Bankipur, III, 1-3; and V.C. Scott O'Connor, An Eastern Library, Glasgow, 1920, 19-20, 70. But the MS did not arrive in India before the reign of Shâh Jahân. It bears the seal of his daughter Jahân-ârâ.
but there is no other evidence, so that a theory of artistic interrelation between Turkey and Mughal India cannot be propounded.

The other MS produced in the Salīm Studio is a sumptuous copy of Rājkunwār, a prose romance popular all over north India. In painting the 51 full-page miniatures of the MS the painters of the Salīm Studio have considerably departed from the conventionalisations of the Akbari school, because now they are dealing with a study strong in local flavour and with enough scope to incorporate scene from the everyday life of Hindustan. Poet Nawf relates in his Sūz-u-Gudāz (British Museum, Or.2839), that Salīm's brother Dāniyāl (d.1604) told him: "The love story of Farhād and Shīrīn has grown old; if we read at all let it be what we have ourselves seen and heard." Salīm's reaction was not

I am grateful to Mr. Hayes and Mr. D. Zichy of the Chester Beatty Library for helping me in studying the MS in August 1966. I am also grateful to Mr. R. Skelton for supplying me a complete set of colour slides.

96. Cat. MFA, VI, 9.
much different from his brother's. However, in the Amir Hasan Dīwān we notice the continuation of the trend already set in the Akbarī atelier when works like Jog Bâshisht, Nafahat al-Uns and Bâbar-nâma were produced. A parallel trend with much simpler treatment of the human and animal world, more realistic emotional expression and more unconventional technique came in vogue mainly through the Khān-i-Khānān's studio. In such MSS as the dispersed copy of Razmānama of 1598, the Râmâyana produced for the Khân-i-Khānān and completed in 1007H = 1598/99101, and the


98. British Museum, Or. 1362: Written at Agra in 1603. Cat-BM, I, 350; Folio 142a is often reproduced: Pl. Plate on p.97 (colour). E. Wellesz, op.cit., Pl.35 (f 135b). Mrs. Wellesz wrongly states it as painted by Daswant and Basâwan. In fact, it is signed by Daulat: infra. Chapter VIII.

99. State Museum of Oriental Cultures, Moscow. The MS is undated and incomplete, but stylistically its 69 miniatures look later the British Museum, Or.3714 MS or the "Agra College" MS dated 1597/8. I am grateful to Miss Tomilina Oksana, for giving all facilities to examine the MS.

S.I. Tyulayev, Miniatures of Bâbur-nâma. (All miniatures reproduced, 20 in colour).


101. Now in the Freer Gallery of Art, No.07.271. PSEI, Pl. 4 7 5, and text facing the plates.
Zafarnama of 1009H = 1600/1601,¹⁰² and elsewhere, miniatures are drawn in this style. For its subject-matter the latter followed Persian proto-types, but in case of the former MSS., the painters, Hindus and Muslims alike, painted in largely Indianized style. This trend is apparent in the Râjkunwâr, though the style is refined, since it was produced in a royal studio and under the sophisticated eye of prince Salîm. Girls look more real and lively in their slender limbs, graceful faces, fuller busts, freer movements and unabashed expressions (ff 12, 15b, 20b, 77a, 106a, 122a etc.) (Plates 7, 9). Wearing all sorts of jewellery and ornaments, short chhûla, odhnâ and colourful ghâgrâ they gossip amongst themselves (ff 69b, 93b), sing and dance (f 122a), sit on a throne as princesses (ff 65b, 72a, 73a, 106a, 115a), yet as lovers they passionately wait for their beloveds (ff 20b, 29b), swoon in grief, (ff 22, 32b), and enthusiastically entertain them when they arrive (ff 12, 15b, 16b, 122a). The artists of the Salîm Studio even go further; in two instances (ff 59b, 77a) they show erotic scenes, which are, however, drawn to illustrate episodes of the story.

The female types represented in the Rājkunwār miniatures correspond to the type already evident in the 1598 Razmānāma. Here they are freer and more attractive. With the more enlightened outlook of Salīm women got a more prominent position in social and cultural life as well as in art.

The style and composition of the Rājkunwār miniatures do not radically differ from other late Akbari examples. The landscape is similarly filled with hills of conventional as well as naturalistic shapes. The tree types and animals are lyrical and lively and the composition of court-scenes and outdoor happenings are almost the same. The principal difference of the Rājkunwār painters lies in their interest in human figure. Nowhere the figure of patron Salīm unnecessarily occurs, yet the principal characters of the romances, the young hero who renounces the pleasures of the mundane world and becomes an ascetic, but returns to be happily reunited with princess in the end, look familiar. The princess with her lotus-petal eyes; an expression of deep emotional attachment and compassion on her face, and with a slender waist and heavy bust (Plate 7) easily attracts one’s attention.

103. Cf folio 95 (by Banwārī Khurd) of the part now in the British Museum, Or.12076. For another type of female figures shown in folios 16b, 22, 29b, 36b, 42b, 65b, 72, 73 and 115 of Rājkunwār, Cf. Razmānāma (Or.12076) folios 13b & 87.
In another group of miniatures the female figures are drawn in a different manner; they look more earthbound with stunted and plump bodies, squarish faces and short thick-set necks (Plate 9). In order to make them more expressive and to translate their animated movements the painter varies the facial outline of some figures in a strange manner. A similar trend is noticeable in Bishandâs's signed miniature of the Sultan of Baghdad and the Chinese girl (Plate 28) in the Anwâr-i-Suhaîlî MS, painted at a slightly later period. To the same painter at least two other miniatures of the Râjkunwâr MSS depicting similar themes and showing a number of comparable female figures (folios 15b & 122a) may be ascribed.

There is yet another female type represented in this MS; these look more delicate with their slender and gracefully poised elongated figures (folios 16b, 20b, 29b, 32b, 36b & 115a). They are thin and fragile, wear colourful dresses, and move quietly. In one instance (f 32b) the fainted figure of a girl looks exactly similar to the figure of the unfaithful wife in an Anwâr-i-Suhaîlî miniature (f 280b) signed by Nânhâ.  

104. J.V.S. Wilkinson, op.cit., Pl. XXV.
On the whole, the different types of female figures of the Râjkunwâr come from the common stock, also represented not only by the 1598 Razmâma already referred to (Plate 147)\(^{105}\), but by the Vijñântipatra painted by Ustâd Sâlivâhana in 1610 (Plate 145)\(^{106}\), by the Mâdhavânala-Kâmakandâlâ series of c. 1620-1625 (Plate 146)\(^{107}\) and by a whole series of miniatures painted during the same time\(^{108}\) outside the imperial studios.

In other examples of the Râjkunwâr, the painters take delight in depicting natural scenery (folios 8, 23b, 25, 26, 27, 28, 28b, 46, 46b, 48, 49, 54, 60, 88, 111, 121). With the exception of some Persianised hills, the landscape with trees, rivers, animals and human figures is naturalistically depicted. An exceptionally lively scene is painted on f25 (Plate 8), where the king meets his ascetic son under a tree. The landscape with a red sandstone fort in the background, the zigzag course of the rivulet and distant hills, closely resemble the landscape of the

---

105. Supra, \(^{\_}\_}\_||, also; Pramod Chandra, "Ustad Salivahana and the development of Polular Mughal Art", Lalitkala, VIII, 1960, fig. 21.
106. ibid, Colour pl. A.
107. ibid, fig. 43d and, Cat-Khajanchi, Colour pl. B; Cf Plate 147.
108. Pramod Chandra, op.cit., fig. 22, 25, 26, 31, 43, 44.
Martyrdom of Al-Ḥallâj miniature in the Walters Dīwān of Amir Ḥasan Dihlavl (Plate 11). Only the mood is quieter here and not charged with the emotion of the tragic episode in the scene of Al-Ḥallâj's martyrdom.

The composition of court scenes and palace scenes is, however, much more formal (folio 3, 4, 16b, 39, 65b, 71, 72, 73, 81b, 110). Similar formalisation is also noticed in the conventional treatment of hills and arrangement of details in the series of miniatures depicting the demon in his cave-abode (folios 50b, 55, 56b, 57b). Only in three examples (folios 44, 66, 115), probably all coming from the brush of the same painter, the settings are more lively and informal and the arrangement of figures more unconventional and suggestive than the earlier group. The colour-scheme of the latter group is also remarkably soft and mellow.

The only familiar theme associated with Salīm is represented on folio 4 where a game of polo is shown in progress (Plate 6). The scene is not very different from the Amir Ḥasan Dihlavl Dīwān example 109, only in the present miniature Salīm is not represented and the composition is more uncrowded and balanced. The colour scheme is very distinctive here; and equally noticeable are the deep green trees outside the compound of the palace.

109. folio 41. Plate 12.
The appearance of erotic scenes is rather unusual because in the large number of miniatures painted in the Akbarī atelier with the sole exception of a scene of bestial nature in the Dārābnrāma MS\textsuperscript{110}, such scenes are conspicuously absent, though erotic subjects are not unknown in Persian art. Their appearance signifies Salīm's unconventional attitude. In a way these are the beginnings of a whole range of miniatures showing an unashamed attitude in depicting embracing couples produced throughout the later Mughal period.

The trend of manuscript-illustration was continued for some time and some miniatures of the Anwār-i-Suhallī were painted, but with the reconciliation of Salīm with Akbar the Salīm Studio outlived its purpose. In the prosperity and enormity of the imperial atelier the individual identity of the Salīm Studio was lost for ever.

The miniatures of the three MSS which were produced in the Salīm Studio do not reveal much indebtedness to European or Persian ideals. In this respect, the muragga' pages provide a contrast. During the following years these diverse trends only continue until a final synthesis of the Jahāngīrī style is reached.

CHAPTER 4
The Continuity of Tradition

Akbar did not take any strong measures to curb Salīm’s activities when the prince systematically disregarded his directives and fled to Allahabad. When Salīm’s life became increasingly reckless and behaviour became unbecoming of a Mughal Prince, Akbar felt disgusted. After exhausting all attempts to persuade him to take the right course he decided to march to Allahabad on the head of a strong army in the autumn of 1604. Salīm, in spite of his utterly irresponsible acts, was fully conscious of the weakness of his position and of the probable outcome of any direct confrontation with his father, the most capable and seasoned strategist of the age. He was waiting for a suitable opportunity for reconciliation, which was unexpectedly found after the sudden death of Mariyam Mākānī Hamīdā Bānū Begam. Akbar was deeply grieved by his mother’s death. When Salīm, who was always favoured and protected by her, expressed his intention to come to pay his respect for the departed soul, he readily agreed.
Salîm therefore came to Agra with his eldest son Parwîz and made his submission to Akbar.1 After an honourable public reception on 9 November, 1604 and some heavy private chiding by Akbar the period of estrangement of the self-styled Shâh Salîm amicably ended.

Within a short time Salîm regained his position of crown prince. A decree was issued by Akbar commanding the Dîwâns to manage state affairs after consulting Salîm and to fix the seal of the prince on the grants of mansabe.2 John Mildenhall reports about Salîm’s independent assessment of the Portuguese made before his father in an open assembly which was goodheartedly accepted by all.3

But the relationship between Akbar and Salîm deteriorated again and came to the fore on the occasion of a fight between Salîm’s elephant Giranbar and Khusrau’s elephant Apurva. Akbar felt disheartened and the difference between father and son increased again. Within a few days Akbar became seriously ill with acute diarrhoea and died on 16 October, 1605. A flurry of intrigues went on during the short time when Akbar was lying ill between the Khân-i-Azam ‘Azîz Kômâ and Râjâ Mân Singh, who tried to

1. The decision to submit seems to have been Salîm’s own, and made against the wishes of his counsellors: Tuzuk, I, 65.
2. AN, III, 1257. For a grant issued in the name of Abu’l Muţaffar Sultân Shâh Salîm, dated 14 Shahrîyâr of the 50 Ilâhî/August 1605, see: M.D. Desai (tr.) Bhanuchandra Caritra, 82-3.
place the young and popular Khusrau on the throne. The plot was foiled because other nobles did not want to override the Timurid convention of primogeniture. Salim ascended the throne on 24 October, 1605, assuming the title Nur-ud-din Muhammad Jahangir Padishah Ghazi.

Jahangir tried his best to attain the popularity and the reputation for justice and benevolence which his father had enjoyed. He adopted various welfare and administrative measures which are fully recorded in Tuzuk. The Tuzuk, however, does not take any notice of artists or art-activities carried on during the opening years of the new reign. It only refers to the appointment of the aged and learned retainer Maktub Khan (Plate 104), as the superintendent of the royal library and picture gallery. To indicate his interest in books, Jahangir autographed on many of the important books and MSS of the library.


5. Tuzuk, I, 12.

6. Y.K. Bukhari & S. Digby. IC, XXXVII, No.4, 283-94. Jahangir's autograph note on the fly-leaves of many other MSS are known. Amongst them are:- Akbarnama and Futuhat-Makkiiya in the Victoria & Albert Museum; Bustan in the collection of Phillip Hofer; Khamsa-i-Nizami in the collection of A.C. Ardeshir; Gulistan in the Bibliotheque Nationale (Sup. Pers, 1958); Tuhfat-al-Ahrar, Diwan-i-Shahi, Musibatnama and Lavaih of Jami in the Chester Beatty Library (Per. Nos.215, 257, 121 & 260 respectively); Khamsa-i-Nizami and Akbarnama in the British Museum (Or 6810 & 12988); Tasawwuf by Ansari in the Rampur Collection and the famous Diwan-i-Hafiz, the Yusuf wa Zulaikha presented by Khan-i-Khanan and Diwan-i-Kamran in the Bankipur Public Library; Yaqtif Qur'an presented to Sayyid Muhammad at Gujarat in the 13th r.y., in the Salar Jung Museum; and two other MSS in the Azad Library, Aligarh Muslim University.
The painting atelier was certainly reorganised by Jahângîr when his own favourite painters and old employees were given good positions and the services of the eminent members of the Akbarî atelier were also retained. The tradition of MS painting, which was the sole concern of the Akbarî atelier, continued for some time, though preparation of elegant MSS embellished with dazzling miniatures was not particularly encouraged by the new emperor. The reason for the continuance of the tradition of MS painting in spite of his lukewarm interest is the sudden change that took place in the political scene after Khusrau's rebellion. In Akbar's time the production of MSS hardly suffered from the absence of the emperor from the capital, because Akbar wanted some selected books to be translated and copies of them prepared with suitable miniatures, but the style of these miniatures was not supervised by him, on limited by his taste. He encouraged the production of good miniatures, richly rewarded the painters preparing them, but nevertheless, miniatures of indifferent qualities were also produced in a large number because of the great volume of work. Jahângîr was too vain and too squeamish about paintings and tried his best to supervise the work of his painters. This is the main reason why
the volume of pictures produced during his time is much less
than the immense production of the Akbarî studio, and their
overall quality so good and uniform.

During Akbarî's lifetime Khusrau was a strong contender
for the throne, but when Jahângîr ultimately became emperor
his treatment towards his son was not very harsh, he was
kept under vigilance and his movements were restricted. One
day in the pretext of visiting his grandfather's tomb at
Sikandra, Khusrau fled from the fort with a handful of young
retainers and started his ill-planned rebellion. Jahângîr
was scared at the thought of the possibility of collusion
between Khusrau and Râjâ Mân Singh and a widespread revolt
against his authority, which were proved unfounded. Jahângîr
himself followed the prince's trail and within a few weeks
the imperial commanders arrested the prince with all his
accomplices. The life of the prince was spared and he was
kept in chains (Plate 65). Most of his supporters were,
however, savagely punished. The short-lived rebellion was
thus crushed and the ambition of the luckless prince

8. The adjective is Jahângîr's own. The portrait of
Khusrau watching a cockfight is inscribed in
Jahângîr's autograph; "Shabih-i-Khusrau
Kambakht": Plate 61.
ruthlessly destroyed. With three brief periods of freedom Khusrau spent the rest of his life in captivity. 9

When the excitement subsided Jahângîr made a long and quiet stay at Lahore. By the end of 1606 he had reverted to his usual routine of work and enjoyment. The painting atelier and the library were transferred from Agra to Lahore. The evening assemblies were regularly held and various topics on religion were discussed at length. 10 He gratefully accepted a copy of the Gospels translated into Persian by Father Xavier. 11 On the advice of the emperor the father began to revise the Persian translation of the Lives of the Apostle, "Dâstân-i-Ahwâl-i-Hawâriyân", which was originally done at Akbar’s time. The book was prepared 'interleaved with many pictures of their sufferings', and was presented to Jahângîr when he came back to Lahore after his Kabul visit. 12 The very fact of having the book illustrated presupposes the presence of capable painters in Lahore. The copy of Dâstân-i-Ahwâl-i-Hawâriyân MS under discussion has not been found so far, but if the style of the surviving miniatures in other MSS of Christian subjects,

---

10. JGM, 74-5.
12. ibid, 43-4. The fathers noticed in 1608 elaborate paintings on the walls of the palace at Agra whose designs were copied from this book: ibid, 64.
like the Dâstân-i-Mâsih, is taken into consideration, it would be found that these MSS were illustrated by artists of lesser merit not coming from the imperial studio. The old set-up of the studio was no longer continued: those who could not match the new emperor's exacting demand for quality and finesse had ultimately to quit, and only the talented ones were kept in service.

A few selected members of the studio along with a part of the royal library, were included in the entourage when the emperor decided to visit Kabul. The visit was not a long one but it helped to rejuvenate his spirit with the cultural bond with Kabul and Persia that had so long united his forefathers. The royal party returned from Kabul in the autumn of 1607 and after a brief halt at Lahore came back to Agra in early 1608. For the next few years Jahânîrh did not undertake any ambitious military campaign; life remained restricted to his usual routine of work and enjoyment.

During these years Jahânîrh devoted considerable time and energy for the development of arts, especially for painting. Preparation of MSS, elegantly written by noted

13. JGM, plate facing 203; Felix zu Lowenstein, Christliche Bilder in Altindischer Malerei, Münster, 1958. Pl. 38, 39, 49; Sotheby's Sale Catalogue......
calligraphers, embellished with pictures painted by established masters, and handsomely bound was the principal preoccupation of the Akbarî atelier. Jahângîr’s concern was more with things of immediate perception, with the din and bustle of the living world, with the persons around him, the sights seen and the sounds heard by him. He was fond of Persian classics and proud of his lineage, but his interest was not profound enough to encourage production of new works of history or biography or translation of Hindu or Greek books in Persian. Music and poetry reading were his favourite pastimes; learned writers and lawgivers flocked around him, but his susceptibility to fulsome flattery and the absence of a genuine quest for knowledge failed to encourage the production of any outstanding literary work.

However, this did not hamper the growth of the library in any way. Repeatedly he consulted the royal MSS, read from them, and even wrote marginal notes on their pages.¹⁵ Perhaps while going through enormous library built up by his father, he decided to give further attention

to some of the treasured volumes. Not only did he testify to their value\textsuperscript{16} or the handwriting of his father or grandfather (Plate 150)\textsuperscript{17} or the authenticity of the miniatures,\textsuperscript{18} but also selected a few from the huge collection for further attention and 'treatment'.

He also allowed the completion of those MSS which were under production during the change in succession. Thus there are three distinct categories of MSS: the first includes those works which were left unfinished but allowed to be completed; the second includes some valuable and important MSS taken up for further embellishment with miniatures, colophon portraits or hashiya decoration; and the third category includes the few new MSS prepared during his reign.

\textsuperscript{16} See: Yusuf wa Zulaikhā in the same collection: ibid, II, 76-80 (No.196), Tuzuk, I, 168. Also, PMP, 130, No.131 (an album of calligraphic qita'as), and the following note.

\textsuperscript{17} Cf: Zafarnāma in the John Hopkins University Collection: T.W. Arnold, Bihzād and His Paintings in the Zafarnāmah, MS, 1-6. Plates facing pp. 1 and 22.

At last three important MSS known to us were under production in 1605, when Akbar died and Jahângir ascended the Mughal throne. These are: an Akbarnâma, divided between the British Museum and the Chester Beatty Library; an 'Ivâr-i-Dânish, divided between the Chester Beatty Library and the Cowasji Jehangir Collection, and a Bûstân of Sa'dî, in the Rothschild Collection. The Akbarnâma lacks a colophon, but, rather unexpectedly, one of its folios is dated 1012 Hijra, the 'Ivâr-i-Dânish also lacks a dated colophon, but according to Karl Khandalavala's report the MS originally had a colophon dated 1015 Hijra, and the Bûstân is dated 1014 Hijra.


20. Chester Beatty Library, Ind. MS. No.4. 130ff, 96 min.: Cat-CB. I, 12-21; II, Pl. 38-47 (some in colour) & Cowasji Jehangir Collection, 52ff, 52 min.: Cat-Cowasji, 17, No.7 & col. pl. C. Here the MS is described as Anwar-i-Suhafî.


22. The inscription written in a quick careless hand reads: "1/6 712 sha'ban 21 mân Ilânâf sannâh 47 'amal-i-Khem Karan." The date is equivalent of 25 January, 1604.

From the stylistic point of view the miniatures of all three MSS belong to the later Akbar tradition, only some miniatures of the Bûstân bear distinct stamps of the sophistication associated with Jahângîr.

No illustrated Akbarnâma MS complete with dated colophon prepared in Akbar's or Jahângîr's reign has so far been found. Sir Chester Beatty acquired in 1923 the second and third volumes of a copy whose 61 miniatures show a style which is later than the Victoria and Albert Museum version. Recently the British Museum has acquired the first volume of this work, which was only partially known through the publication of a few folios by F.R. Martin. The fly-leaf of this volume contains a long autograph note by Jahângîr and another by Shâh Jahân which help to

24. The large fragment in the Victoria & Albert Museum with 116 miniatures, produced in a sumptuous scale, is generally believed to be a part of the royal copy. E. Wellesz, "An Akbarnâma Manuscript," Burl.Mag. LXXX, London, 1942, 135-41, 12 fig. Some folios from it are preserved in the Pozzi Collection, Freer Gallery of Art, Indian Office Library, Heeramanek Collection etc. Sukumar Ray mentions the existence of another illustrated version preserved in the Kabul Museum in his monograph Humayun in Persia and publishes a miniature from it (facing P.42). But he does not give any other information about the MS.


27. I am grateful to Mr. G.M. Meredith-Owens and Mr. R. Skelton for helping me to decipher the difficult inscriptions and to make a detailed study of the miniatures.
identify it beyond any doubt as an important royal production undertaken during the last couple of years of Akbar's reign.

The one hundred miniatures still bound with the volumes and the folios detached at an early date from the work and preserved in different collections throughout the world belong to a style which is more or less uniform, and characteristic of the first decade of the seventeenth century. But there are several considerations, which would after a close examination reveal that the work, though commenced in

---

28. Folios from either of the above-mentioned sets (or other versions) are found in:

i. Gulistan Library, Tehran: fragment of a MS with 12 miniatures - PL. 95.


iii. India Office Library, London, Johnson VIII, f4: W.G. Archer, ibid, Pl. 22 (colour); also Johnson VIII, f6 & VIII f3.


ix. S.C. Welch Collection: ibid, fig. 7.

x. Heeramanee Collection: Cat.Heeramanee, Pl.20

xi. Chester Beatty Library, MS 61, No.9-12, & MS 62, No.1: unpublished.


XIII. Edward Biney III Collection.
late 1603, soon after Abu'l Fazl made the final additions and was murdered, was completed only in Jahangir's reign. Jahangir's autograph note is not dated in the year of his accession; on the other hand, it is dated 1618. The circumstances in which the MS was kept out of the imperial library for such a long time are not known. Some of the miniatures appear less colourful and pale, suggesting as if they were left unfinished, or at least the final coating of colours and the calendering remain to be done in them. In a few examples the artists are unknown and unfamiliar. The hashiyas/opening folios of the first volume are decorated with elaborate geometrical design and animal

29. T.W. Arnold also had the same view: "It is possible that some, if not all, of the miniatures are a little later than 1605." Chronicles of Akbar the Great, 26.

30. Folios 61a, 125b, 129a, 134b, 137b, 139a of the BM volume and folios 1a, 7a, 10b, 11a, 18a, 19a, 23b, 25a, 27b & 268b of the CB volumes.

Cf: Cat-CB, III, Pl. 6, 7, 9-14, 37.

31. e.g. Kanak Singh (or Ganga Sen?) Karim Dād, Hirānand, Mīr Taqī. A painter called Manak Singh Chela worked in the "Dyson Perrins Khamsa-i-Nizāmi" (folio 281a) and in Bankipur Timūrnāma. Mīr Taqī is the father of Nādir Bānī, the female painter who did the colouring of two European engravings in the Gulshan Album (Plates 121, 129), done in the Salīm Studio. The name of Karim Dād (f 137b BM) also is not met with in other Akbari MSS. On Hirānand who was Jahangir's jeweller, is mentioned by Hawkins: ETI, 11.
motifs in gold interspread with figures of poets and young men in gouache, which resemble the later folios of the "royal muraqqa's" painted at about the time when Jahāngīr wrote his note. 'Abdur-Rahīm Khān-i-Khānān came to meet Jahāngīr in late 1618 when the latter was returning to Agra after the long tour of Ajmer, Mandu and Gujarat. It may be assumed that the MS, which was probably removed from the imperial Kārkhāna and by chance reached the noted bibliophile Khān-i-Khānān's library, was presented to the emperor by the Khān-i-Khānān.

The 'Iyār-i-Dānish MS is also fragmentary in its present form. Two substantial parts of this lavishly illustrated copy are preserved. According to the testimony of the dealer who sold these two fragments, the remaining portion, whose whereabouts are unknown, had a dated colophon. Though this dubious evidence is not accepted by scholars, many of the one hundred and fifty old miniatures of this MS are signed, where their names are preserved, by well-known painters working in the last few years of Akbar's reign. The delicate colour scheme, the straightforward mode of story telling and the idyllic description of nature found in these miniatures are not very different from the Jahāngīrī norm.

32. infra, Chapter VI.
33. The Khān-i-Khānān met Jahāngīr's party near the Ghati-Chanda pass: Tuzuk, II, 57.
34. B. Gray in AIP, 144-5, No.646; R. Pinder-Wilson, "Three Illustrated MSS of the Mughal Period," AQ, II, 415 fn5.
The Akbarnāma miniatures also reflect a similar feeling for expression, but for the requirement of the subject-matter, their depiction is necessarily restricted to political events, fightings and personalities. Folios 168b & 169a of the Chester Beatty part painted by Daulat and folio 158a of the British Museum part painted by Govardhan are especially noticeable. Their warm colouring achieved by using a strong palette and the close attention paid to the individuals easily connect them with their later works done in Jahāngīr’s studio.

The Būtān MS in the Rothschild Collection, on the other hand, contains miniatures of different styles and various qualities. The colophon on folio 198 gives the calligrapher’s name as ‘Abd ur-Rahīm al-Harāwī and the date of completion as 1014 Hijra/1605-6. According to Stchoukine most of its 26 miniatures are painted in a style closely related to the late Akbārī idiom. However, there are a few which reveals a distinct Jahāngīrī flavour and in some hardly surprising European elements (ff 58, 92, 101 & 176), as well as predominant Persian elements (ff 2 & 75) are noticed.

---

35. Cat-CB, II, Pl. 28 & 27.
37. Infra, Chapter VIII.
38. Supra, note 21.
Folio 147 is said to be influenced by the Deccanese style. Unfortunately none of these folios are reproduced by Stchoukine. Judging from the few examples published by him, the miniature illustrating the story of Dārā and the Herdsman seems to be one of the finest in the MS (Plate 19). Though this superb composition of horses do not repeat the composition of the famous Bihzâd miniature in the Bûstân MS now in the Cairo Museum, there is no doubt that the painter had sufficient knowledge of the Bihzâd miniature. Another remarkable work is painted by Daulat (f 92), which shows the Ṣūfî crossing the water on his Prayer-carpet (Plate 20). This is the only example in the MS where the painter’s name is preserved.

Three other miniatures, reproduced by Stchoukine (ff 11, 67 & 89), compare favourably with the Anwâr-i-Suhâlî miniatures painted by Āqâ Rizâ and Mîrzâ Ghulâm. Large disproportionate heads on stunted torsos, serrated hills, trees with barren branches are familiar in Āqâ Rizâ’s work in the Anwâr-i-Suhâlî MS. Stchoukine attributes the miniature on F101 with its overwhelming European elements to Kesâv Dâb.

39. PMP, Pl. LXIX (colour).
40. Cf. PSEI, Pl.7, where Bihzâd’s composition has been repeated.
41. Stchoukine, op.cit., Pl.XXIV.1, XXVI.4 & XXVI.5.
42. J.V.S. Wilkinson, The Lights of Conopus, Pl. IV & VIII.
Chronologically the Bûstân MS, now in an anonymous private collection in the U.S., described by S.C. Welch, belongs to the same phase. From the meagre information given by Welch it appears that the MS was written at Agra during the first year of Jahângîr’s reign, 1605-6. The number of miniatures or the names of artists working in it are not given precisely by Welch. He publishes one miniature from it which is very much in the Persian style. Perhaps the overwhelming Persian elements in this superb miniature (Plate 24) led him to attribute it to Âqâ Rizâ. The figure of the thief bound to the column is drawn with sympathy; an expression of hopelessness is apparent from the pathetic look of his eyes. The twisted figures of the guards complete with their shields and weapons trying to snatch a nap after a tiring and hard day in whatever posture they found convenient are arranged in such a way as to direct the eye to the figure of the thief standing upright near the blazing flames of the torch in the centre of the composition.

The number of MSS in the imperial library which were left unillustrated, was not very small. Some of them were collected by Jahângîr’s predecessors, some were

43. AMI, 70, Pl. 24.
44. Supra, PP.
produced in Akbar's Kârkhâna, and the rest was added to the collection by Jahângîr himself. Instead of having new MSS prepared at a great cost, Jahângîr probably decided to fill up the blank spaces reserved for miniatures in some of the existing volumes. Thus the treasured Shâhnâmâ, formerly in Bâbar's possession and bearing an autograph of Humâyûn, now in the collection of the Royal Asiatic Society, London, the Gulistân prepared at Bukhara in 1567, now in the British Museum, the Bûstân prepared at the same time, now in the Philip Hofer Collection, and similar other works brought down from the stacks for the 'new treatment.' The "Dyson-Perrins Khâmsâ-i-Nizâmî", distributed between the British Museum and the Walters Art Gallery, a Diwân-i-Hâfiz, divided between the British Museum and the Chester Beatty.

47. AMI, 70-71, 165-6, Pl.23.
Library, a Babarnâma in the British Museum, the "Atkinson Lailâ-Majnûn" in the Bodleian Library, and a tiny Diwân-i-Hâfiz MS in the British Museum may also be included in this group. All of them show definite indications of the emperor's decision either in the form of autograph notes or in the identity of the painters who are known to be working only in the imperial ateliers. A number of MSS prepared earlier in Persia contain miniatures which are stylistically related to the Jahângîrî school. As none of them have any royal seal or autograph note and the painter's name do not survive in any of them, it is difficult to say whether these were produced in the imperial atelier or in the establishments of the nobles. Among them are a volume of Hâtîrî's Khusrau wa Shirîn in the Bodleian


50. BM, Or.26200: Cat-BM, I, 244.


Library, a Hadīqat ul-Hadīqat of Sanā'ī in the Chester Beatty Library, a slender volume of Nizāmī's *Lailā Majnūn* in the India Office Library, a MS of Jāmī's *Panj Ganj* in the Chester Beatty Library and a large book of Ghazals compiled from various authors in the Bodleian Library.

Though the production of illustrated MSS was severely curtailed in the imperial atelier, the tradition was by no means discontinued. In the establishments of the Khān-i-Khānān and some other nobles such richly illustrated works as *Razmānama*, *Shāhnāma*, *Khāmsa* of


55. India Office Library, MS. 384, Written by Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Mullâ ʿAlî in 965 Hijra/1557-8; 50ff, 5 miniatures: Cat-IOL, I, 605, No. 1000; R. Pinder-Wilson, "Three Illustrated Manuscripts of the Mughal Period", AO, II, 413-5.

56. Chester Beatty Library, Ind. MS. 20, 177ff, written by Sultān ʿAlî, dated 926 Hijra/1519-20; 3 minute miniatures in each folio. Unpublished.

57. Bodleian Library, MS. OMs Ad. 175, 317ff, 11 miniatures, written by Mir ʿAlî al-Kātib, dated 927 Hijra/1521. Contains Ghazals of Ḥāfiz, Maghrībi and Kâsim Anwār: Cat-Bodleian, I, No. 816, 859, 863. The miniatures probably belonged to a Shāhnāma produced during the Jahāngīr period.

58. *Razmānama* of 1025 Hijra/1616, produced for the Khān-i-Khānān and written by ʿAbdollā, now dispersed; about 50 folios in various collections: S. C. Welch, op. cit., AO, V, 228-30, for bibliographical reference.

59. British Museum, MS Add 5600, 585ff, 90 miniatures, nearly all signed by Banwarī, Bulā, Bhagwatī, Kamāl, Qāsim and Shimāl. A fly-leaf inscription in later hand states that the MS was presented by Jahāngīr to Ḥāvardī Chela in the 8th Jūlūs. Another inscription partially cut and faded give the name Mustaqīm Khān and the year 20th Jūlūs (1625) of Jahāngīr's reign.
Amîr Khusrau\textsuperscript{60}, Silsila-al-Zahab\textsuperscript{61}, Jâmî's Haft-Aurang\textsuperscript{62}, and Nizâmi's Khâmse\textsuperscript{63}, etc., were illustrated or their new copies prepared. A large number of Hindu and Jaina works and Râgamâlâ sets were also prepared in the courts of vassal kings and powerful Hindu courtiers, which reveal a close relation of artistic ideals and techniques with the Jahângîrî style. Jahângîr's policy of reducing the activities of the imperial studio and confining the number of personnel employed there to the selected and highly skilled ones, may have boosted the growth of such productions in regional schools.\textsuperscript{64}

\begin{enumerate}
  \item Preussische Staatstibliothek, Berlin, MS Orient. Folio 1278. In a note dated 1617 Khân-i-Khânân writes that the MS was purchased in Gujarat as a masterpiece jointly executed by the calligrapher Sultân 'Ali and the most renowned Bihzâd. But in the present volume the miniatures are signed by Hashim, Qâsim, Nâdir etc. : T.W. Arnold \\& A. Grohman, The Islamic Book, Pl.84-87 and text.
  \item Chester Beatty Library, Ind. MS. 8; 123ff, 3 miniatures; Colophon dated 1022 Hijra/1613. Prepared for Nawâb Mîrtazâ Qulî Bukhârî and written by Muhammed Qâsim: Cat-CB, I, 38-9, III, Pl.73.
  \item Indian Institute, Oxford, MS. Per 8. 250ff, 62 miniatures of sub-imperial quality, all unsigned; Cat-Bodleian, III, 36, No.2617. The colophon is dated 974 Hijra/1566.
  \item Chester Beatty Library, Ind. MS. 14; 326ff, one miniature written for Nawab Bahâdur Khan / Bahâdur Khan Uzbeg Abu'l Nabi in 1022-23 Hijra/1613-14: Cat-CB, I, 76-7; III, Pl.96.
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{64} Infra: Chapter: xl, Epilogue
For the alacrity of Daulat the MSS in which new illustrative materials were added may be fitted into a fairly accurate chronological sequence. On Jahāngīr's instruction Daulat painted a number of portraits of his colleagues (Plates 40-43) and copied a portrait of Jāmī from an original by Bihzād on the hashiyas of the royal muraqqa'. At the same time he was asked by Jahāngīr to add a fine double portrait of himself and the calligrapher of the MS 'Abd ur-Raḥīm 'Anbarīn Qalam (Plate 16), below the final colophon of the superb Khamsa-i-Nizāmī produced at Agra at the end of 1595. In the much damaged inscription around the wall and on the volume lying before them, Daulat mentions the emperor's command. The inscription is dated both in the Hijra reckoning and in the julūs era; though the final digit of the Hijra date is damaged beyond recognition, it can be easily corroborated by the mention of the 4th regnal year.

65. Y. Godard, Athar-e-Iran, I, fig. 21.

(julûs). This Khâmsa-i-Nizâmî MS is one of the best produced and preserved Mughal MSS and there is nothing to show that besides the colophon portrait any other of its 42 miniatures were added in Jahângîr's time, though certain characteristics which are more expected in a Jahângîrî production than in Akbarî one are found: the incorporation of a delightful hunting scene by Khwâja 'Abd us-Samad which was certainly painted earlier67, the appearance of European paintings in the background of a miniature by Miśkina68, the introduction of an organ with European pictures painted on it in the composition "Plato playing his fantastic music" by Madīnu, and the distinctive and unusual palette of Farrukh Chela's work,70 which is comparable in some measures with folios 15a, of the Amîr Hasan Dihlavî's Dîwân (Plate 10).

Another notable MS which easily drew Jahângîr's attention is a fabulous Gulistân, now in the British Museum. It was prepared at Bukhara in 975 Hijra/1567, by the celebrated calligrapher Mîr Husain al-Husainî. Six of a

67. IPM, Pl. XXXVI (f82a).
69. Martin, II, Pl.181 (f298a).
70. IPM, Pl. XXXVIII (f123a); Cf: the miniature 'Khwâja Khizr bathing the grey horse' on f281a, drawn by Kanak Singh Chela: Warner, op.cit., Pl. CXXV.
total of thirteen miniatures in it are painted in a style not far from that of contemporary Bukhara. But curiously enough, two of them contain the name and full appellation of Akbar. Their artist, Shahim Muẓahhib, who signs his name on four of them, is unknown in India, though his miniatures show familiarity with Indian costumes, especially of the typical Akbari pointed jāma. The rest of the miniatures are superb works painted in a very different style. They cover the whole of the folio and show a wide landscape gradually receding towards the distant horizon (folios 50a, 70a, 103a). Through streams flowing in angular course, mountains of gradually diminishing heights and diagonal architectural projections, the painters exhibit a wonderful mastery of the science of perspective. The mellow and subtle colour-scheme with a wide range of mixed tones help to create a graceful and quiet atmosphere. The principal persons of each miniature are drawn with scrupulous care to ensure a correct expression of mood and the precise psychological situation. On the whole, these

---

71. Martin, II. Pl. 146, 147 (ff 30a, & 25b). A MS of Hātif's Ṭimūrnāma (BM Add 22.703), produced at Bukhara at about the same date, has several battle scenes which seem to be prototype of the crowded meles popular in Akbari painting; B.W. Robinson, Persian Miniature Painting, London, 1967, 108, No. 164. The pictures of the Ṭimūrnāma may actually have been painted in the Mughal atelier.
miniatures successfully combine the richness of the
Bodleian Bāhāristān with the emotionalism of the Walters
Dīwān (Plate 11).

The miniature describing the plight of Sa'dī and
young marksman, who being untried in battle dropped his
weapon in terror (Plate 25), is probably the finest of the
group added later. The portraiture of Sa'dī, being
disrobed by the intruders, and of the young man from
Balkh, who is on his knees and whose gold-handled dagger,
belt and turban etc. are being removed by the robbers, are
painted with a sense of realism unmatched elsewhere in the
MS. The city-scape, the zigzag river with boats floating
on it, the woods, etc., painted vividly in the background,
loosely resemble a similar landscape in the background of
a hunting scene signed by Manohar Dās, now in Leningard
(Plate 90). The remarkable depiction of dramatic action
counterpoised by the quietness of nature, the distinctive
colour-scheme and the use of shadow for subtle modelling
are reminiscent of the work of a master, who can be
anyone else but Manohar. The scene of lion hunt cannot
be equated with any incident described in the Tuzuk, but
from the way Manohar signs his name, it appears to have
been painted very early in Jahāngir's reign.

72. Pl, Pl. on p. 88 (colour).
73. Cf. J.V.S. Wilkinson & B. Gray, Burl.Mag., 1935,
Pl. IIIa & b; Cat-CB, I, 45-6.
All seven miniatures of this group are ascribed to Jahângîr's reign-period by Stchoukine and Gray. From a defaced and washed out inscription on the fly-leaf of the volume the year 1017 Hijra /1607-8, and 3rd âlûs could be read. So it is almost certain that this Gulistân was also selected by Jahângîr in 1608, along with the Khâmâsâ-i-Nizâmî, discussed above, for filling up the blank folios with miniature.

The Bûstân MS in the Philip Højer Collection, appears to be a companion volume of the Gulistân as it was also prepared at Bukhara and written by the same calligrapher. It was prepared for the library of Sultân 'Abdul 'Azîz of Bukhara who ruled from 1540-1550. The MS was acquired or inherited by Jahângîr, and Welch informs us that three miniatures were added to it by Jahângîr's order. Two of them are said to be very close to the Bukhara style while the third (Plate 30), shows qualities associated with the style of Jahângîr's atelier.

74. LPI, caption of Pl. XX.
75. PI, 81 & 99.
76. AMI, 70, 165-6. Another MS a Maṭla' ul-Anwâr written by Mîr 'Alî in 947 Hijra and prepared for Sultân 'Abdul 'Azîz of Bukhara and illustrated with 4 miniatures is preserved in the Bankipur Public Library: Scott O'Connor, An Eastern Library, 64-5.
It is no wonder that two of the miniatures closely follow the Bukhara style, because contact between Bukhara and Mughal India was very close indeed. Apart from this set of Sa'di's twin classics, a large number of MSS, illustrated or unillustrated, were in the Mughal Library: the sumptuous volumes coming from the pen of the celebrated calligrapher Mir 'Alî were especially treasured. It is not known whether some of them were specially commissioned for the Mughal library, with places for illustration left vacant. The style of Bukhara art was familiar to Mughal artists and many of its familiar examples were borrowed by them and introduced into Mughal art. Such passages are by no means rare in the works of Âqâ Rizâ and Farrukh Beg.77 The Harātī idiom, so often encountered in Mughal works, is in many cases imitated from the Bukhara versions.

This miniature aptly illustrates the confrontation. The architectural details of the Indian temple of Somnath, rather amazingly, correspond with a similar form of architecture painted by Mirak in a miniature of the Khâmsa-i-Nizâmî (Plate 31), prepared in 931H/1523-4 for the Safavid Royal Library.78 The MS never came to India and the Mughal artists

77. Supra, Chapter III and infra p. 80 Chapter VIII.
had little chance to look at it. But rather unexpectedly the source of the Mughal painters' familiarity with the theme is provided by another miniature in a MS (now in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris) which was in the Mughal Library. This is a *Lisân al-tâîr* by Mîr 'Alî Shîr Nawâ'î and was prepared at Bukhara in 1553.\(^7^9\) (Plate 34). Another MS, prepared in the same centre, in 954H/1547 for 'Abd al-'Azîz Bahâdur, a Bâhâristân of Jântî,\(^8^0\) has a miniature with an exactly similar composition.

It shows a large number of human figures, priests, worshippers, devotees and learned men, some reading from scriptures, some offering blessings, some counting the *quietly* rosary, and some*worshipping*. They appear to have been observed from close quarters for a long time and were painted from life. Only the figure of Sa'dî obviously an adaptation from some authentic Persian model, stands out in isolation. Welch attributes the miniature to Bishândâs, and there is no ground to dispute his attribution.

The *Shâhnâma* of Royal Asiatic Society, London,\(^8^1\) is another fine MS, which was in the Imperial Mughal Library.

---

It was prepared at Harat in about the fourth decade of the 15th century and it preserves some of the finest paintings of that period. The MS was collected by Bābar in as early as 906 Hijra/1500-1, and bears the seal of every Mughal emperor till Aurangzeb and a long autograph note by Shâh Jahan. One of its twenty four miniatures stands isolated from the rest and shows definite signs of retouching or repainting in the early 17th century style. (f531a). The subdued colour scheme, the improved technique of indicating depth and the landscape in the distant background connect it with the Akbarnâma miniatures, discussed above.

The "Atkinson Lailâ Majnûn" lacks a colophon, but there is an Akbari seal of 971 Hijra/1563 on f28. Nine miniatures were added later in the MS by the painters who are known to have worked only during the closing years of Akbar's reign and later. Eight of them are signed by Āsî, Bâhan, Bhagwân, Banwâlî Khurd, Dhanûn (2), Dharamdâs and Luhanga Chela, whereas the attribution under the painting on f47 is rubbed beyond recognition. Miniatures prepared

82. ibid, Pl. I.
83. ibid, Pl. XXIV (colour).
84. Supra, note 51. From the Nastaliq script the MS is assumed to be a 15th century work. The miniatures are reproduced by A.F.L. Beeston, op.cit., and in Mughal Miniatures of the Earlier Period, Oxford, 1953, Pl. 1-7.
by all of them except Bāhan are to be found, among others, in 'Iyār-i-Dānish and Akbarnāma just discussed, and Bāhan's work is found in the 1598 Razmānāma. Almost all the miniatures of the MS are of good artistic quality and comparable to the style and quality of the miniatures in the above-mentioned works. As in them the general flavour is Akbarī, but the Jahāngīrī preoccupation for the expression of mood and emotion, is noticeable in the paintings of Bāhan (f82), Dharamdās (f105) and Dhanūn (f55). The figures of Salīm and Majnūn sitting under a tree in the wilderness amongst mask-faced animals in f82 are striking. Though not indicated in the attribution under the miniature, the faces were probably retouched by a major portraitist like Manohar or Dharamdās. The delightful study of Lailā with her large retinue in a lush green palm grove in f55 indicates careful attention paid in respect of facial expression. Distinct Western inspiration in the rendering of two female servants waiting outside the wall is noticeable. This is a feature found in the works of Dharamdās, a major participant in most MSS associated with Jahāngīr's reign.

86. Mughal Miniatures of the Earlier Period, Pl.6.
87. ibid., pl. 7.
88. ibid., pl. 5.
But in this instance Dharamdâs creates a simple unencumbered but highly moving atmosphere in the touching scene of Majnûn's pathetic death on his lover Lailâ's tomb. It appears that Dharamdâs draws here from the experiments made by Manohar. The work of Banwâlî Khurd (f53) and Magwan (f41), on the other hand, shows the indifference of a characteristic which is responsible for much inferior painting even in first-rate Akbari MSS. Taken as a whole, the Lailâ Majnûn belongs to the phase when the special requirements of Jahângîr's taste and refinement were just beginning to have their effects.

The Hadîqat ul- Haqiqat of Sanâ'î has only three miniatures and all of them are of very fine quality. The miniature on f28a "at the holy man's place" is a particularly charming example, whereas the situation of the story of the old woman, his sick daughter and the errant cow whose head was stuck within the rim of a pitcher on f36b recalls the fine work of Dharamdâs in the British museum Anwr-i-Suhailî MS (f295b). The MS is tentatively dated C.1610 in the descriptive label of the Chester Beatty Library; stylistically the three miniatures are of the early Jahângîrî style with a heavy overtone of later

90. ibid, pl.3.
91. ibid, pl.2.
93. J.V.S. Wilkinson, The Lights of Canopus, Pl. XXVI.
Akbari elements.

The copy of Hâtifi's Khusraw wa Širîn in the Bodleian Library is a "confused and incomplete" small and elegantly written MS. It is important and interesting as all but one of its 19 miniatures are left unfinished after primary sketching, with partial colouring started in a few examples. The only finished one (on f14v) is unfortunately done by an unskilful late artist.

The sketches of this MS given a good idea of the technique of painting such manuscript illustrations. The outline is drawn in very thin but strong and sweeping black lines. From the partially coloured examples on folios 12b, 32a, 37b and 73b, it is apparent that the next stage in preparing the miniatures was to colour the landscape in the foreground. The more important task of drawing the human figures were taken up next, and only after this was done at the end, the details of faces were painted.

The last MS in this category, the Grenville Diwan-i-Hâfiz, is equally interesting as its illustrations are intermediate in style between the works of the first three years of the reign and those of the following period.

---

94. Cat-Bodleian, III, 39, No. 2632.
when manuscript illustration itself was going out of fashion. All but one of its nineteen miniatures are unsigned and unattributed. The signed miniature is on f167a, and shows a young prince reading, while two youths drink wine and another plays a musical instrument. The almost illegible signature of the artist written on the book may probably be of Ustād Madū. The MS is undoubtedly a royal copy as an autograph note of Shāh Jahān, covered up at a later date, reveals.

Hafiz was Jahāngir’s favourite poet. Jahāngir always carried a copy of Hafiz’s Dīwan and also was in the habit of taking auguries from it. So it is no wonder that quite a few MSS of Hafiz were prepared or embellished during Jahāngir’s reign. The splended copy, written by Khwaja ‘Abdus-Samad Shirin Qalam in Akbar’s reign was selected by Jahangir for adorning with miniatures. This copy bears a seal of Nur Jahan, which probably indicates

96. Tuzuk, I, 214, 381. For the royal copy bearing extensive marginal notes by Jahāngir and the previous owner, Humāyūn, but no miniature: V.C. Scott O’Connor, An Eastern Library, 25-27; Cat-Bankipur, I, 231-52; III, pl.1; another autographed copy is in the Salar Jung Museum, Hyderabad: Y.K. Bukhara, op.cit.

97. Supra, Note 49.

98. Cat-CB, I, 78-80. The seals of Akbar (dated 1582) and the carbon written by ‘Abd-us-Samad are not relied upon by the learned authors of the Catalogue.
that it was presented to the empress by Jahāngīr. Another
MS written by the famous calligrapher Sultan Muḥammad Nur
in C.1525 was embellished with beautiful birds in full
colours in the panels above each section, exactly in the
same manner as that of the former, and with golden ornamental
designs on the margin of each folio. The book of Ghazals
in the Bodleian Library written by the celebrated Mir 'Alī
Hamāvī in 927H = 1521 also contains the full Dīwān of Ḥāfīz.
The dainty miniatures of the pocket size Grenville
MS are of delightful colours and minute workmanship.
Unfortunately some insensitively orthodox Muslim owner
obliterated the faces of all human and animal figures by
painting a gaudily coloured flower on each of them. Many
of the miniatures have been badly damaged by amateruish
attempts to remove these floral overpaintings in recent times.
In spite of all the obliteration and damage enough remains
to appreciate the fine workmanship of the miniatures. The
composition is in most cases simple with a minimum of details
showing a rigid restraint from drawing ornamental designs,
minute urban views or landscapes though such details are

The Library of A. Chester Beatty. A Catalogue of
the Persian Manuscripts and Miniatures. Dublin,
1927(?), I, 86-7; II, PI. 37-39. Also Pl, 82.
100. Supra, Note, 57.
indicated in a sketchy manner in some examples. In spite of the thoughtless obliterations the faces, where they are visible, are expressive of mirth or joy or despair or other emotions.

The choice of subject for illustration shows preference for youthful pastimes, drinking parties, musical soirées, poetry reading (folios 32b, 66b, 135a, 167a, 192a, 244b), and such scenes as a game of polo, a wine seller, the meeting of Lailâ riding on a camel with Majnûn in the wilderness, Noah's Ark, the Court of Solomon and audience scenes (folios 232a, 228b, 216b, 112b, 14a, 115a & 200b respectively). The picture of Noah's Ark shows a European couple clad in period costumes, and folio 104b illustrates a scene of public hanging comparable with the description of the "Martyrdom of Al-Hallâj" in the Diwân of Amîr Hasan (Plate 22).

The last important group of MSS completed during the early part of Jahângîr's reign comprises a handful of works, a few of which are dated, and others approximately assignable to a chronological sequence on grounds of style and subject-matter. Of these, the Anwâr-i-Suhaîlî containing Aqâ Rizâ's signed and dated works was completed in 1610/11. The miniatures of Aqâ Rizâ were painted in 1604, so the MS was under production in Allahabad when Jahângîr left his
semi-independent court there. The miniatures of the British Museum - Chester Beatty Diwan-i-Hafiz and nine surviving miniatures from a lost MS of Gulistan, in two American collections also belong to this period.

Stylistically the nine miniatures of the Diwan-i-Hafiz are related to those of the Rajkunwar and the Diwan of Amir Hasan Dihlavi. The size of Hafiz's Diwan is only 142 x 90 mm. Its elegant Nastaliq in dazzling black is written by Khwaja 'Abd us-Samad Shirin Qalam in 990H=1582. The folios were remounted at a later date, so it is not known whether there were any decorations on their margins, but the blank spaces at the head of each verse are decorated with a pair of tiny birds in a variety of colours and forms.

Of the miniatures, three on folios 194b (Plate 21), 218b (Plate 22) and 249b (Plate 23), show the likeness of Jahangir; the last one illustrates a court scene showing Jahangir with the princes and the leading nobles and it could perhaps be assigned to the year 1608. Ivan Stchoukine made a detailed study of these three miniatures but he took only passing notice of the rest. His

101. Chapter III.
102. Supra, notes 49 & 98.
tentative identification of the first miniature (f25) with 'Imād ud-dīn Faqīh's party is correct. What he apparently overlooked is the fragmentary inscription giving the name Muḥammad Rīzâ. This delightful miniature has already been noticed in Chapter III. 104

The second painting, showing a handsome young man entering a feast, 105 is also a first rate work. All the participants of the fēst, especially the shy young man and the aged mullâ, appear to be real persons and not just the members of a faceless crowd. The evening sky, the solitary tree, the flying bird, the architecture of the building, even the China wine-cups, are accurately observed and naturalistically depicted. The minute brush work, the use of deep tones, and the striking portrait studies, especially of the dark bearded man in the right and the mullâ welcoming the young noble, are characteristic of Daulat's style. The successful use of green, in a wide tonal range breathes the air of youth and wonderfully express the pleasant mood of an evening of drinking and poetry.

But the real masterpiece is to be found on f66b, showing the dance of two dervishes. 106 There is no formal

104. Supra. ....
105. Stchoukine, op.cit., fig 6; PI. Pl. on p.100 (colour).
106. PI, Pl.101 (in colour), Stchoukine, op.cit. fig.7.
setting, no background, except patches of pale green, and three Western style winged cherubs peeping in wonder through shell-shaped bluish clouds at the top. The two old dervishes are engaged in the frenzied ecstasy of their mystical religious dance to the rhythm of the four singers and their instruments. The fervour and mysticism of the theme are rendered in the expression of the faces of the dancing dervishes. Jahangir was very fond of Sūfī dances and frequently mentions his attending such performances in the Tūzuk. For instance on 1 Šafar 1019H/1610 he witnessed a religious assembly when ʿamāʿ and ʿawād dances were performed by Shaikhs Ḥusain Sirhindī and Muṣṭafā at his request. He notes in the Tūzuk, "hilarity and frenzy were not wanting" on this occasion. 107 This miniature well portrays the hilarity and frenzy of that evening.

The gathering of sages by a water reservoir, painted on f88a is a scene of an animated discussion between a learned mulla and two nobles along with three others. 108 Here the atmosphere is serene, filled with calmness. The colour-scheme is subdued and the absence of red or yellow or any bright tones lends an air of serious detachment.

108. Stchoukine, op.cit., fig. 8.
The expression of the participants of the debate is that of wholehearted absorption, oblivious of all outside differences.

On the other hand, the wineseller in the open air on f138b\textsuperscript{109} is of a very different mood. The large storage jars containing wine, the matter-of-fact looking wineseller, the young workers distilling wine, the mulla taking cover at the side of the earthen jars and the prince, looking very much like a member of Jahāngīr's household, paying money - everything here is expressed in a languorous and intoxicating mood. The colour-scheme is neither very gay nor very subdued but the draughtsmanship is powerful. In the interesting miniature on f194 emperor Jahāngīr is shown engaged in a game of polo with two of his sons, Parwiz and Khurjām, along with another noble, probably I'tiqâd Khân, son of I'timâd-ud-daulā (Plate 21). Jahāngīr's fondness for polo is expressed in two other miniatures painted in the Salīm Studio (Plates 6,41). Here the artist has succeeded in capturing the fast movement of the game which requires speed, alertness and accuracy, by juxtaposing the fast-running horses and the hard-hitting swing of the emperor's polo stick shown dangling in the air. His white horse, the only one

\textsuperscript{109} ibid, fig. 9.
shown in full, his violent bodily movements and his thoughtful placing in the centre of the composition, easily capture the focus of attention. Stchoukine attributes this fine miniature to Manohar.

The picture showing Jahângîr setting out on a hunt (Plate 22), on the other hand, is an example of effortless simplicity. The unusual feature of the miniature is the introduction of a winged angel who is fixing up the stirrup of the emperor's bluish horse. This detail, though illustrates the words of the poet, is directly borrowed from some European engravings. The angel is of fair complexion and his head is full of blonde curls. It also exemplify for the first time the idea of theophany which was further developed at a later date and expressed in miniatures (Plates 1, 107, 109, 110). The rest of the picture, the attendants and page-boys, the dog-keeper with a pair of impatient hounds, the faintly visible distant city-scape on the other side of the typically constructed hills, everything is painted in minute details. The picture cannot be firmly ascribed but may possibly be by Abu'l Hasan.

110. ibid, 161.
111. Supra, Chapters I, IX.
The last miniature in the British Museum part of the MS shows a very interesting court scene presided over by the emperor (Plate 23). This tiny miniature shows as many as 18 princes and nobles besides the emperor, all painted with extraordinary accuracy. It can be regarded as the forerunner of a large number of similar court-scenes, depicting the emperor in his public and private assemblies. In the numerous illustrations of court-scenes in historical MSS done during Akbar's time only a handful of courtiers could be identified and that also in examples where the important faces were specially drawn by some renowned portraitists.

Stchoukine made a detailed study of this miniature and identified most of the nobles present in it. On the basis of his findings he identified the scene as to have happened in 1607, when Jahangir visited Khurram's house in the Urta garden in Kabul on the occasion of the latter's 16th lunar birthday. But Stchoukine overlooked two facts: the existence of a good miniature, probably a part of the *Jahangirnama*, in the British Museum (No. 1948-10-9-69) illustrating the same episode (Plate 67).

the presence of Rāja Mān Singh. But the problem of identifying the exact episode described in the picture is by no means solved when we read in the Tuzuk about Jahāngīr's presentation of a ruby and two single pearls of the value of Rs.40,000 to Prince Khurram on 17 Jumāḍāl-akhir. Clearly the painting does not illustrate this event because Mān Singh and Mahābat Khān were away by that time, and the painting represents presentation of pearls to Jahāngīr, not from Jahāngīr. So the only likely proposition is that, it illustrates an event of the year 1608 when all the important courtiers shown were present in the court.

The last painting of the Dīwān-i-Hāfiz which is to be found in the portion now in the Chester Beatty Library, is also a fine work. This again, shows a young prince. From the clever use of deep colours - green, mauve, black, violet, purple and blue, and their deft handling to express depth and volume, and the characteristic expression of

114. Rāja Mān Singh did not come to Kabul with Jahāngīr in 1607. He met the emperor only in early 1608, before, the Naurāz festival (Tuzuk, I, 137-8), when the imperial party was waiting outside Agra. He was sent to the Deccan a few months afterwards (ibid, I, 148).

115. ibid, I, 156.

116. Mān Singh was sent to the Deccan in the end of 1608: ibid, I, 147.
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personality and emotion this also seems to be painted by Daulat.

The Anwâr-i-Suhailî in the British Museum has not only a dated colophon but also signature and dates written on two of its 36 miniatures. As many as 32 miniatures of it are either signed or the name of the artist is written on the lower margin. One of the remaining four, two can be attributed to renowned artists. It contains some rare examples of Aqâ Rizâ's book illustration; an early work of Abu'l Hasan; some fascinating compositions by Mîrzâ Ghulâm and Anant; and pictures by such renowned painters of the period as Dharamdâs, Bishandâs, Nânhû and Madhu. The names of Manohar, Mansûr, Govardhan and Daulat, who attained prestige and position during Jahângîr's time are conspicuous by their absence. The MS was in full progress in the Salîm Studio in 1604, when Aqâ Rizâ signed two of his works (folios 36a, 54b), but its publication probably was abandoned at the sudden turn of events leading to Salîm's reconciliation with Akbar and the subsequent developments, for it to be brought out again in 1610/11 for completion.

As the MS took a long time to be completed, the miniatures vary from indifferent to good quality. Two of its best miniatures are Aqâ Rizâ's 'the Feast of the King of Yemen' (Plate 4), discussed in Chapter III, along with his other works, and his son Abu'l Hasan's 'King Dabshâlam's visit to the sage Bidpâf' (Plate 27). The latter work can be considered as an early masterpiece by the talented painter. It shows obvious Persian features like the serrated hills, drawn in bright contrasting tones of chocolate, green, pink, blue and yellow, its boulders placed like fleeting clouds, and the deep blue sky. The juxtaposition of milky white turbans and the white cloak worn by the old sage against the coffee-coloured cave enhances the dramatic effect. The facial features of the sage closely resemble the portrait of an old dervish in the Rothschild Collection, also painted by Abu'l Hasan. The wonderful portrait studies of the young prince and the weathered sage show full promise of this young painter.

The painter who contributes most, after Aqâ Rizâ, is Anant. As many as five miniatures of uniformly good quality (folios 6a, 130b, 169b, Plate 139, 197a & 267a)

119. Supra, pp.
120. IPM, Pl.XVII.a.
come from Anant’s brush. These are characteristic of the transitional phase between the basically simple and straightforward style of the Salim Studio and the sophistication of the later Akbari style. The drawing of architectural details (folios 6a, 130b, 197a & 267a) shows Anant’s technique of indicating accurate perspective. He avoids bright tones and takes delight in using mauve, purple and violet. His tendency is always to create an atmosphere of hushed action through the use of a subtle tonal range of colours. But, though his characters are neatly drawn and their facial expression carefully modulated, the overall impression is that of a static woodenness, lacking the dramatic element so evident in the works of Nanha (folio 280b), Dharamdas’ (folios 218b & 295a) or Mirza Ghulam (folios 630, 64b, 311b & 396a: Plate 29). Only the miniature illustrating the story of the camel rider, the snake and the buffalo (Plate 139) is free from this fault.

Mirza Ghulam is no doubt a powerful artist. His works have an increased proportion of Persian elements uncommon in these years except in the work of Aqa Riza and Farukh Beg. At the same time he has a highly individual
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124. Ibid, Pls. VIII, IX, XXVII & XXXVI.
125. Supra, Chapter III.
approach. The use of purple for hills and architecture and gold for the sky, the stock Persian motif of cypress and almond blossom and the geometrical \textit{tile} patterns—all are characteristic of Mîrzâ Ghulâm's work. The agony of the man at whose sneeze the women died and his expression of grief and surprise and painted in a superb manner on folio 64b. The animal world pictured on folio 311b appears real, unlike Ustâd Husain's wooden studies on folios 146a and 201b. The last miniature of the MS (folio 396a) is Mîrzâ Ghulâm's masterpiece (Plate 29). He has chosen here a gayer colour-scheme,—strong patches of brown, mauve, violet, purple, interspersed with touches of yellow, vermilion, moss-green, with a patch of ultramarine on the top of the footstool. The use of lighter colours in the dress of the young prince and his minister is perhaps to emphasise their positions of importance in the composition. The atmosphere is of a gay abandon with a serious and subtle liveliness created through the verdant green of the trees and the neatly drawn flowers. The stooping figure of the youth in the left appears to have been adopted from some Western print.

The miniature depicting the tragic end of the fox who through his own folly was crushed to death between
two fighting goats (f63a)\textsuperscript{126} can certainly be associated with Mīrzā Ghulām. The fine miniature depicting the principal characters of the story, the ox Kalilah and the fox Dimnah (folio 87b)\textsuperscript{127} is painted in a very different colour-scheme, and the liveliness and expressiveness of the animals depicted in it are remarkable. It may also have come from the brush of the same painter.

The miniatures on folios 280b and 320a are individual works of outstanding quality. Folio 280b\textsuperscript{128} is attributed to Nānḥā, a leading member of the Akbari studio. He outlived Akbar and remained a painter of importance in Jahāngīr’s reign. He was commissioned by Jahāngīr to copy the famous picture of a camel fight by the celebrated Persian master Bihzād (Plates 60,61) in 1017H/1608-9. It is very probable that the tragic story of the Unfaithfull Wife painted on f280b was also painted by Nānḥā in about the same time. It is a remarkable work, painted with precision and ease. By adopting mellow colour-scheme and eliminating unnecessary details he has transferred a tragic scene into one of suave drama. Except for the bright orange of the unfaithful wife’s silwār, a touch of red in the

\textsuperscript{126} ibid, Pl. VIII.  
\textsuperscript{127} ibid, Pl.XI.  
\textsuperscript{128} ibid, Pl. XXV.
saddle of the prince's horse, and the dark green of the two isolated trees cleverly introduced to balance the composition, he has avoided bright colours and masterfully created an atmosphere of sombreness. The animals, especially the horse, galloping away in bright, are well painted. The blue tinged sky, the burnt sirena hills and the touches of green of the ground, the swift flowing stream and the hazy city-scape in the background - all help to create a naturistic impression.

The scene of the Sultân of Baghdad and the Chinese princess, painted on f329a, is a work of a different character by Bishandâs (Plate 28). It gives intimate view of a zanâna, with a host of beautiful damsels where the youthful King of Baghdad is the only male member. The King of Baghdad unpretentiously depicted is no different from any Mughal prince, and the Princess of China is none other than a Mughal princess. The intimate setting, the details of physiognomy, the transluscent muslim cholis and jâmas of the girls, the dancing lûlîs, female musicians, all are well known to us from the scenes of Râjkunwâr (Plate 9). The depiction of a dark aged attendent woman, the 'chaurî'-bearer'wearing a piece of scarf in the left and the shapely beauty standing behind the Chinese Princess bear an

129. Supra, Chapter III.
extraordinary resemblance to the ladies assembled near the well in a picture of the Rajkunwar already discussed.

Folios 77b, 111b, 244b, 350b and 363a could be classified in one category, where the composition is simple, the colouring unremarkable and intricate details or minute brush works and shading are generally avoided. Folio 77b drawn by Durga is a simple work, comparable to the drawings of the Babarnama MS produced in the first years of the 17th century. But his work in folio 111b is reminiscent of the products of the Salim Studio; the expression of the contemplative Qazī at the sight of the dishonest partners fighting with each other, and that of the man wearing pale blue jāma are comparable to those of the grief stricken watchers in the Martyrdom of Al-Hallaj (Plate 11). Though here the composition is simple.

Hariya's work on folio 135a is somewhat different from the scene illustrated by Durga. It depicts the moving story of a darvish who was delivered from calamity by a Shaikh. The sense of drama and emotion is expressed, though not very subtly. The human figures are anatomically

130. J.V.S. Wilkinson, op.cit. Pl. X.
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disproportionate and the bright patches of red and violet distract attention and fail to convey the atmosphere of the scene. Similar indiscriminate use of mauve and yellow in the miniature illustrating the cat's treachery in folio 209b\(^{134}\) distracts attention without achieving the desired effect. The works of Hariyā have a naive naturalism, often met with in sub-imperial products.

The dramatic effect of the story of the foolish ape who was about to stab his master while trying to kill with a sharp knife the ants moving over his body is subtly conveyed by Rāhmān Qulī in his only work in the MS (folio 244b)\(^{135}\). In a very simple manner, by using lighter colour tones and without drawing outline he has created the soporific atmosphere of night; the candle in the right hand corner appears to be superfluous. The startled expression of the master who is yet to realise the meaning of the crazy behaviour of his faithful pet is well shown.

Two miniatures signed by Dharamdās (folios 218b and 295a)\(^{136}\) convey an almost similar effect but in a different way. Both are sophisticated productions, where the compositions are cleverly planned and a wider range of

\(^{134}\) ibid. Pl. XX.
\(^{135}\) ibid. Pl. XXII.
\(^{136}\) ibid, Pls. XXI & XXVI.
colour and tonality is employed. Folio 218b is the only example in this MS where two artists have participated in one miniature. Padārat, was perhaps responsible for the colouring because its colour-scheme is considerably different from the other one. The second picture, illustrating the story of the old woman, her sick daughter and the cow whose head was stuck inside a vessel, is a very fine work. The theme appears to have had a wide popularity at that time: in the Hadīqat ul Haqīqat of Sanâ'ī (folio 36) and in the 'Iyār-i-Dānish MSS (No. 68)¹³⁷, both in the Chester Beatty Library, we notice illustrations of it. The figures of the sick girl, weak and motionless, in pale colours against a deep blue pillow, and that of the cow jumping in wild hopelessness, are juxtaposed, with the startled figure of the wicked mother to maintain the balance of the composition.

Mohan's solitary work (f264a), illustrating the story of the devotee and his wife, is a fine miniature (Plate 26). Though Mohan's name is associated with the Khān-i-Khānān studio¹³⁸ and Akbarī MSS, this one is more in the style of the early Jahāngīr period. Of special interest are the superb portraiture of the devotee and the half-seen figure of the girl peeping from behind the

¹³⁷. Cat-CB, I, 19, No. 68, by Thirpal.
¹³⁸. PSEI, text facing Pl. 4.
half-opened door, a familiar Persian motif in the bottom. The wife of the devotee with her slender limbs belongs to the prevailing female type of this period.

Salîm Qulî's work in folio 363a139 appears rather uncommon. It differs from all others in its dusky colour-scheme, in which different tones of brown, buff, purple, mauve and violet predominate over other colours. The effect is magnificent. The king of Hindustan sits rather uncomfortably but majestically on the golden throne, with an elaborate jewelled tiara on his head. Wilkinson saw in him some likeness to Jahângîr, which is rather far-fetched.140 But the courtiers in their light-coloured jâmas and the attendants in their dark heavy dressed no doubt resemble Jahângîrî characters. The picture of the animals are drawn with great sympathy and the rendering of the elephant in white is meaningful because a white elephant is the symbol of râj-chakravartî.141 Salîm Qulî paints in a more traditional than experimental style.

But the converse is true about the next miniature (folio 368b), the name of the artist of which is unfortunately lost.142 This is an imaginary subject and

139. J.V.S. Wilkinson, op.cit., Pl. XXXIV.
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hence the painter has introduced many details which are not traditional. The figure of the winged peri carrying a book in her hands, is almost certainly an adaptation from some European source. Even her hair is blonde. The other winged jinn to the right and the arrangement of the heavy drapery around the throne have also some foreign traits. In all other respects it is a perfect Jahangiri work, closely resembling a similar painting in the Amir Hasan Divan (f157) tentatively attributed to Mirzâ Ghulâm.\textsuperscript{143}

The birds of this picture are well drawn and appear more lively than Ustâd Ḥusain's birds on folio 201b.\textsuperscript{144}

The other folio signed by Salîm Qulî (f338b)\textsuperscript{145}, one of the three subjects selected from the Tenth Book, is a charming work, but differs greatly from his other miniature on f.363a. It is difficult to believe that both the miniatures are by the same hand. Folio 338b is a simple work which shows the hunter galloping away his deep brown horse after taking away the leopard skin by beheading the other hunter after a fierce fight. Amidst the sad sight of the dead hunter, the lynched leopard, the watchful lynx and the gaily attired hunter merely galloping away provide a sharp contrast. In the picture on folio 339a which bears

\textsuperscript{142. ibid, Pl. XXXV.}
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the name of 'Abd us Salīm[146] the entire atmosphere is reversed to the tragic inevitability of the story - the recently victorious hunter and the galloping horse, still in the gay colour-scheme of bright orange, blue, green and deep brown, but now lying shattered in the monotony of mossy green of the hilly terrain. The technique of minute hatching, otherwise unknown in this MSS, is quite effective in rendering mass and volume.

The last work still to be examined is one of the most notable miniatures in this MSS: the Washerman and the Crane (folio 350b) drawn by Madū[147]. This, also is a simple work without sophistication, but on a close scrutiny, it reveals a masterly sense of perspective and use of colour, adopted in the simplest possible manner. The tonal range is limited; green, faint touches of pink, pale blue, darkish flesh tints of the washerman, a dash of red on the neck of the crane and some traces of mauve. The pathetic end of the greedy crane, and the eager and elated washerman are wonderfully expressed through a minimum of effort. The lucky pegeon flies away and only the washed garments hang listlessly on the line.

146. ibid, Pl. XXXII.
147. ibid, Pl. XXXIII.
The predominant note of the Anwâr-i-Suhaïlî is simplicity. Like the fables, the paintings are drawn in a simple manner, their compositions are less complex, the colours less varied and lineworks limited to the minimum. The mode of story-telling adopted in them is direct and straightforward with a minimum of decorative or subsidiary details. Exceptions to this generalisation are the folios drawn by Nânhâ, Dharamdâs, Aqâ Rizâ and Abu'l Hasan.

On the whole the 36 miniatures of the Anwârî-i-Suhaîlî furnish a valuable evidence of the gradual development of the Jahângîrî style from the Salîm Studio to the early years of his reign when the trends and tendencies of the later Akbarî style were giving way to the discriminating taste of the new emperor. The folios painted by Abu'l Hasan, Mîrzâ Ghulâm, Aqâ Rizâ and Salîm Qulî show definite Jahângîrî trends. The miniatures by Dharamdas, Nânhâ, Hariyâ, Rahmân Qulî, on the other hand, provide the continuity of the late Akbarî style. The result of this mixture is not particularly happy, and in view of the existence of indifferent and careless works with a few good miniatures, the Anwârî-i-Suhaîlî, may be regarded an important but not quite first-class work.
The nine detached miniatures of the lost *Gulistān* MS fully exhibit the refined sophistication of the developed Jahangīrī style. The keynote of the miniatures is not what is told in them but how they are told. As Ettinghausen has shown the nine extant examples, seven of which are in the Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, and two in an anonymous private collection in the U.S.A., form only a part of what was a sumptuous MS with numerous miniatures. The miniatures were detached from the MS and were mounted on *muraqqa* leaves, three in one instance and two each in three others.

Like other miniatures drawn in this period, these paintings portray dramatic events with a special interest on the psychological situation, depicted through subtle and accurate expressions of the principal characters. To make his characters important and their attitude more meaningful and symbolic within the situation, the artist has composed them in a horizontal format, eliminating the problems of painting landscapes, architectural details,
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150. S.C. Welch, "Early Mughal Miniature Paintings from two Private Collections shown in the Fogg Art Museum," AO, III, 142-3, Fig.18; AMI, Pl.25A,B. E.J. Grube, 'The World of Islam', Pl.100 (colour).
trees or sky in a proper perspective. The horizontal format was by no means an innovation, because all earlier pro-Mughal and even some early Mughal MS illustrations were done in that way, but amongst the numerous developed Akbari examples it was rarely adopted. The revived tradition was continued and a Shāhnāma, prepared most probably in the Khân-i-Khânān's atelier during the middle of Jahângîr's reign\(^{151}\) and two sumptuous MSS of Bustān\(^{152}\) and Gulistān\(^{153}\) prepared in the first two years of Shâh Jahân's reign show similar horizontal illustrations (in 1039 and 1038H = 1629 and 1628/9 respectively).

Of the seven miniatures in the Baltimore Collection two remain unpublished. The published ones along with the folio in the private collection\(^{154}\), show considerable development in technique and differences in style, though the essential qualities remain the same with the illustrations of MSS discussed above. The faces are brimming with living expression, of serious involvement, of concern, of aloofness

\(^{151}\) Supra.
\(^{152}\) British Museum, Add 27.262. R. Pinder-Wilson, "Three Illustrated Manuscripts of the Mughal Period," AO, II, 425-428, Figs. 6-12.
\(^{154}\) S.C. Welch, op.cit.; PSEI, Pl. 10.
or disgust; some faces appear to be replicas of some of the well-known courtiers. The colouring and tonality are remarkable: in some compositions (Plate 44 upper), the colour-scheme is soft and mellow, in some it is tuned to the sombreness of the atmosphere with a choice of deep and darker tones (Plate 44 lower), while in others it is gay (Plate 44 middle). The faces of the principal characters are delicately modelled, and the eyes are directed to the specific person or object at which they are supposed to look. The pale drawn-in face of the dying King in the Baltimore folio (Plate 44 middle), the expression of the beaten imposter Hajji and the sceptical courtier confering with King in another miniature\(^{155}\), the dervish showing the ecstatic dance (Plate 44 upper) or the good and bad natured ministers\(^{156}\) - all are very successfully drawn. The faces of the confering shaikhs in another miniature (Plate 44 lower) are drawn differently and the colours employed are generally in dark, green, violet, blue, turquoise blue, aubergine purple, deep chocolate brown, and dark red. The effect is not only charming but successful in rendering the real mood of the scene. This particular miniature appears

---

155. Grube, op.cit., Pl. 100 (colour).
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to be from Daulat's brush, while the upper one in the same folio from Govardhan's. Welch ascribes the top one of the folio published by him to Manohar, but this as well as the top one illustrated by Gray, which is obviously by the same hand, do not seem to show the characteristics of Mahohar's style - Gray reads the signature 'Dust(?)', in one of the miniature. This may be Daulat, because the lower panel of the folio published by him is in Daulat's characteristic style.

The penchant of the painters for the minutest details as evidenced from the designs of textiles, the book-bindings, and pen-cases, the painted tiles and elaborate carpet designs, is noticeable as is the extent of European influence. The frightened prisoner in the miniature of "the criminal condemned to death", resembles, as Welch remarks, "a St. Sebastian from whom the painter has conveniently removed the arrows."  

157. AO, III, 142.  
158. AIP, op. cit.  
159. Ibid, 155, No.695.  
160. AO, III, 142.
PART TWO
THE NEW SYNTHESIS
CHAPTER 5

Power and Glory

The talented painters of Jahângîr could not remain content with the preparation of a handful of new MSS or the addition of one or two miniatures or colophon-portraits here and there in existing MSS. As soon as the emperor settled down in Agra after the Naurûz of 1608, the royal painters embarked upon the production of ambitious works reflecting their real ability. Mughal art is a court art which depended on the wishes and ideas of the court; in the time of Jahângîr the dependence was carried upto the extreme as the paintings were required to be modelled on the ideals arbitrarily set by the emperor. When the painter could work according to the emperor's set principles he was likely to get the fullest attention, otherwise he was destined to incur the wrath of the patron.

The paintings produced in the royal studio during Jahângîr's lifetime are essentially products of the emperor's specific demands. When the emperor could not devote enough time or spend sufficient attention to them the number of miniatures sharply decreased, and when he was more relaxed and in good spirit, the painters received
the right impetus and the quality of the paintings gradually improved. So far a proper appreciation of Jahângîrî paintings and an analysis of their style and contents, the power and glory achieved in various fields of life during this time which ultimately determined the mood of the patron emperor, must be taken into account. We have already tried to estimate the character of Jahângîr and to specify how it was shaped, and in what ways it resembled or differed from his predecessors, who were all considerable patrons of the arts.

Jahângîr's long stay in Lahore after the crushing of Khusrau's rebellion already revived in his mind the elements which patronised and guided the production of works of art and paintings from his princely days. The decision to visit Kabul, instead of coming back to Agra, though necessitated by obvious considerations, was also typical of Jahângîr's temperament.

The journey to Kabul was "traversed with great enjoyment and pleasure", sometimes looking at the beautiful oleanders (karabrî) or the flaming orange of the palâs blossoms, sometimes visiting the forts, old monuments or buildings, and sometimes in drinking parties, or in sports and fishing. Following his father's practice, Jahângîr

included a number of painters and calligraphers in the royal party in order to record the principal events as well as the uncommon sights encountered during the journey. When the party halted at Bikrami and the emperor was shown "a piebald animal like the flying mouse", never seen by him before, he was impressed and at once ordered the painters "to draw the likeness of it."  

The brief sojourn at Kabul was spent in a whirlwind manner with frequent outings, sports meetings, garden parties and drinking bouts. The royal party visited many beauty spots around Kabul and all its magnificent gardens and also went to Babar’s mausoleum along with the members of Nie zanâna. Fetters were removed from Khusrau’s legs so that he might walk on the rich carpet-like turf of the Shahr-ârâ garden.  

In fact, Jahângîr enjoyed every moment of his stay as though he had regained his lost youth! In that atmosphere of exuberance and hilarity the painters received the right incentive. Jahângîr also mentions ordering them to take the likeness of a strange mountain-goat known as mârkhur (Plate 98), an animal which he had never seen before or imagined. He describes a few

2. Tuzuk, I, 104.5.
3. ibid, I, 111.
4. ibid, I, 111, 113. Supra. Chapter VII.
other strange and curious animals and a variety of fruits of unusual shape and size in the Tûzuk. It is only probable that the emperor wanted to have pictures of many of them prepared by his painters.

Jahângîr's stay in Kabul was not long, and he commenced his return journey in the early autumn of 1607, which was made at a quicker pace. But that did not prevent him from visiting interesting places or watching spectacles. After a brief stay in Lahore, the imperial party arrived near Agra just before the Naurûz of the 3rd julûs.

Once Jahângîr settled down in Agra the Mughal capital regained its place of pre-eminence. Henceforth a new awareness of strength prevailed in Jahângîr's political designs, and an eagerness for further moral and material achievements shaped his peacetime ideals. Râjâ Mân Singh and 'Abdur-Raḥim Khân were recalled from their respective strongholds and were given commands in the Deccan along with Khân-i-Āzam 'Azîz Kâkâ. Jahângîr's plans for enlarging the empire further to the south, however, did not materialise, and the appointment of his son Sulṭân Parwîz, with reinforcements under Khân-i-Āzam and Mahâbat Khân,

---

5. ibid, passim.
6. Cf. ibid, I, 117; IPM, Pl.XIX.
all proved to be of little avail. Similarly, the exploits against Râṇâ Amar Singh of Mewar proved futile.

In the beginning the affairs of the Deccan and Rajasthan had little effect on the smooth and peaceful life of the emperor in the capital. As usual, his mind remained preoccupied with 'honest intentions'. Even before he arrived at Agra, he despatched his surgeon and courtier Muqarrab Khân along with Father Pinheiro to Goa. But the venture was more to collect rarities and jewels than to establish a diplomatic contact with the Portuguese. In fact, when Muqarrab Khân after postponing the mission for several times, finally reached Goa in 1611 and came back to Agra in April 1612, the emperor was overwhelmed at the sight of the turkey cock (Plate 96), pheasant and novelties of that sort, and did not bother about political matters at all. As an unhappy after-effect of this, there was a complete breakdown in the relation of the Mughals with the Portuguese, during the following years, for which, of course, the high-handedness of the Portuguese pirate ships, was equally responsible.

The relationship with the Bijapuri ruler Ibrâhîm 'Adil Shâh was cordial. The learned Mîr Jamâl-ud-dîn Hüsain

7. JGM, 77-8.
8. Tuzuk, I, 215f.
Injū was despatched to Bijapur and the dialogue started by Akbar was successfully continued. This helped to maintain a two-way traffic between the culturally rich State of Bijapur and the Mughals.

In 1611 Shāh 'Abbas sent a belated letter of mourning at Akbar's death through his envoy Yâdgâr 'Alî Sultan. Active diplomatic relationship with Persia was maintained by Jahângîr and gifts and objects of every description arrived at the Mughal capital in large number: Jahângîr also sent an embassy led by his trusted lieutenant Khân-i-’Alam in 1613. An envoy from the Sharîf of Mecca came to Agra to be received by Jahângîr with honour and rich presents.

The atmosphere of stability and prosperity made Agra the focal point of trade and of the attention of foreign travellers. The first indication of a systematic English attempt to gain trade concession in Mughal ports and cities was signalled by the arrival of the self-styled English ambassador William Hawkins. He was followed by other Englishmen, including Robert Coverte, William Finch, Johan Jourdain, Thomas Coryat, Paul Canning, Nicholas

9. ibid, I, 176, 178, 182.
10. ibid, I, 193.
11. ibid, I, 248.
12. ibid, I, 133.
Withington, Thomas Kerridge, etc., and ultimately by first authorised ambassador from the Court of St. James, Sir Thomas Roe. Though the English failed to gain the expected trade concession from the Mughals, an active contact was established for the first time between the non-missionary Europeans and the Mughals. 

The Jesuit fathers were already held in esteem for their learning and controversial discussions with the orthodox Muslim scholars in the Mughal court. Books and pictures on Christian subjects were presented by them to Jahângîr. Their prestige reached a climax when Jahângîr ordered baptism of his three nephews, the sons of Dânîyâl. But hostile action of the Portuguese naval force had a devastating effect on the confidence and trust so diligently built up by the Jesuits, and their influence diminished considerably within a short time.

The Jaina continued to enjoy the patronage of the Mughal court. Farmâns were issued by Jahângîr prohibiting animal slaughter on certain festive days, and granting rent-free lands. But soon the young Jaina scholar resident in the court fell into Jahângîr's disfavour, and the

---

14. J & J, 49f, 58f, etc.
15. JGM, 72-3; ETI, 148; Not mentioned in the Tuzuk.
Jainas felt his disapproval for some years.

Some noticeable changes are observed during this time in Jahangir's attitude towards Islam. He began to show "special respect to the Law" and ordered the Mîr-i-'Adl and Qâzî, "who are the pivot of affairs of the divine law" not to kiss the ground in sîjda before him. A few months before this he had sacrificed three sheep with his own hand in the festival of 'îd-i-gurbân.

The days of the emperor were spent in enjoyment and happiness with frequent drink parties, longer hunting expeditions and hilarious private assemblies in the evenings. The quantity of his drink went up, double-distilled šarāq and opium were now required to give him the right "kick". In the end of 1610 he had a providential escape from death when the brave Rajput Anûp Rây saved his life from a ferocious lion, and obtained liberal royal favours and the title Anîrâ'i Singh-Dalan (the Lion-slayer).

Considerable changes occurred in Jahangir's family life. He married the grand-daughter of Râjâ Mân Singh in 1608, and the daughter of Râmchând Bundela in early 1610.

---

18. Tuzuk, I, 203.
22. Ibid, I, 144-5.
But his last marriage in May 1611 with Mehr-un-nisa, the intelligent, accomplished and beautiful widowed daughter of I'timād-ud-daula, left a marked effect on not only his own life but also on his time. Within a short time, the family of the new queen, who became the Shâh Begam after Salima Sultan Begam's death in the beginning of 1613, steadily came into prominence and power. I'timād-ud-daula became the Madar-ud-Mahal, and rose high on the ladder of power and position, his elder son received the title and high position of Āṣaf Khân after Ja'far Beg's death in 1612. The swift rise of the house of the new queen, along with her own ability and the steady decline in the emperor's health and capacity, considerably altered the course of Mughal history. Many novel and uncommon objects were collected by Jahāṅgīr and repeated references to painters are made in the Tūzuk in course of recording detailed description of them. Mūnis Khân presented a rare and valuable jade wine-jar with a riqâ' inscription of

24. Beniprasad, 162.
27. Tuzuk, I, 260.
Mirzâ Ulugh Beg's time. Muqarrab Khan presented various European craft-objects and interesting pictures of European workmanship. Mahâbat Khan offered European jewelled boxes and Khan Dauram presented Chinese procelain, sable pustins and other rare objects. The Khân-i-Khâmân's offering in one year consisted of a rare volume of Yûsuf-wa Zulaikhâ in the handwriting of the celebrated Mir 'Alî, and in a beautiful gilt binding, which was valued at 1000 muhrs by the emperor. Yâdgâr Khwâja of Samargand brought a rare muraqqa' from Balkh. Muhammad Husain Chelebî was sent to Istanbul by way of Iraq to procure jewels and rarities.

29. *Tuzuk*, I, 146. Three jade wine cups originally prepared for Ulugh Beg and inscribed with his name, which were collected by Jahângîr, are preserved in Bharat Kala Bhavan, British Museum and Calouste Gulbenkian Collection, Lisbon. These are inscribed in the 6th, 5th and 8th jûlûs of Jahângîr's reign, so the whereabouts described here is not known: R.H. Pinder-Wilson & W. Watson, *BMQ*, XXIII, 19-22, pl. XI; R.H. Pinder-Wilson, *BMQ*, XXVI, 50, fn 4; R. Skelton, "Jades Moghols", *L'Œil*, 92, (Paris, 1962), 4, 89.

With these came a deonāk monkey from Ceylon, a turkey-cock (Plate 96) and another variety of monkey from Goa, an Abyssinian elephant, a Sumatran parrot, some European and Iranian hunting dogs, a Shāhīn falcons, white cheetahs and a zebra (Plate 101), and similar other rare birds and animals from various places. Wrestlers, fencers, jugglers, poets, musicians and persons employed in many other professions flocked in the Mughal capital and were patronised. Mullā Mir 'Alī Muhrkan and the chelas of the imperial kārkhāna produced wonderful seals, the blacksmiths like Ustād Dāūd prepared swords of unbeatable quality and the goldsmiths and inlayers like Puran, Kalyān and Hūnarmand prepared ornaments, jewellery and thrones of novel designs. For the first time a painter, Farrukh Beg, and a calligrapher Muhammad Ḥusain Kashmīrī are mentioned in the Tūzuk by name.

36. ibid, I, 143.
37. ibid, I, 215-6.
38. ibid, I, 323.
39. ibid, I, 272.
40. ibid, I, 283; II, 107-8. cf Plate 109.
41. ibid, I, 139.
42. ibid, II, 201. See infra.
43. ibid, I, 335; I, 253; I, 422; I, 141, et passim. For musicians: Chapter I, Note 70.
44. ibid, I, 200-1.
45. ibid, II, 204; II, 98-99; II, 80,82.
46. ibid, I, 159; I, 159, 169-70, 228; Ain, I, 35.
The splendid mausoleum over Akbar’s tomb at Sikandra was completed and Khwâja Jahân Dûst Muḥammad laid the foundation of a new fort at Lahore. The same man built a delightful mahâll inside Agra fort within only three months, which won the emperor’s unstinted praise. Large sums were spent in building mansions, pleasure-houses and mosques all over the empire.

In the midst of such hectic activities in fields of various peacetime occupations, the shadow of the failures of his son Parvwâz and the most capable generals in Rajasthan and in the Deccan cast a gloom upon the emperor’s mind. In the middle of 1612 he became ill with the disease khûn-pâra and longed for a change of air. For some time he was contemplating to pay a visit to the mausoleum of Khwâja Mu’in-ud-dîn Chishtî. As his presence at Ajmer was expected to make his generals more responsible and overawe his enemies, and therefore, his decision to move southwards from Agra can be regarded as a long-overdue political move.

The artists, as usual now, followed the emperor’s trail. Only Bishandâs was sent with Khân-i-’Alam’s embassy
to the court of Shâh 'Abbâs because Jahângîr wished to have a faithful record of the Shâh and the Persian Court. As we shall see later, the mission, as far as Bishandâs is concerned, was most successful (Plates 85, 86, 88).

The royal party arrived Ajmer in November 1613 and settled down for a long stay till November 1616, after which Jahângîr moved to Mandu and Khwâram went further south to lead a more concerted campaign in the Deccan. From Mandu Jahângîr went on a sight-seeing tour of Gujarat and visited the ancient part of Cambay, and Ahmadabad, and also engaged in elephant hunting at Dohad. After once postponing the journey on account of the outbreak of bubonic plague in Agra, the royal party finally returned there in the beginning of 1619. By the end of the same year he left for Kashmir and arrived there after the Naurûz of his 15th julûs. The journey to Kashmir and his stay of seven months in the Vale was most enjoyable. By the end of 1620 he returned to Lahore and Shâh Jahân left for the Deccan to tackle with the renewed trouble there. Father and son were never to meet again. Jahangir finally returned to Agra at the beginning of 1621. His health was failing and the political affairs were changing fast.

52. ibid., II, 116.
53. Infra, Chapter VIII.
Though Jahāngīr's journey to Ajmer and Mandu was prompted by specific military necessities, he did not himself participate in any battle, but wholly depended on his son Khurram and his generals. In fact, the history of this period is the history of the steady rise of the power and prestige of Prince Khurram. Within a few months after his appointment as the leader of imperial forces against Rānâ Amar Singh, the Rānâ offered his submission to the prince, and sent a large tribute including a rare ruby. When Khurram triumphantly returned to the court at Ajmer with Karan, the son and successor of the Rānâ, Jahāngīr's long cherished dream of winning a victory unachieved even by his father, was fulfilled. The success of Khurram put him in an enviable position of power and prestige. In his twenty-fourth birthday, observed after a few months, he was given the first cup of wine by the emperor himself and was loaded with gifts and favours.

Khurram's next task was to lead the imperial army in the Deccan. Parwīz was recalled from Burhanpur and was ignominiously posted to the governorship at Allahabad. Khurram received the title Shâh Sultan and left for the

54. Ibid., I, 308.
Deccan in November, 1616. The gains achieved by Khurram in the Deccan were not as substantial as those in Rajasthan, but nevertheless he was able to put the rife-torn Mughal army in order and show certain gains. The delighted emperor bestowed the unprecedented rank of 30,000 zâts with 20,000 sawârs and the title Shâh Jahân on his proud son. Thus within a short span of time the able military leadership of his young son shed lustre on Jahângîr's reign.

Meanwhile Jahângîr was spending his time pre-occupied with his usual pastimes - drinking, hunting and holding private assemblies in the evenings. More and more traders, diplomats and persons conversant with the arts, literature and theology were coming to the court. With the submission of Mewar the whole of the Rajput domain was on friendly terms with the Mughals. Karan made a long stay in the court and became friendly with Shâh Jahân and the emperor who loaded him with rich gifts and favours. More envoys came from the Iranian court and also from the court of Ibrâhîm 'Adil Shâh of Bijapur. Though there were visitors and traders coming to the Mughal court from England, it was only in

55. *Ibid.*, I, 337-9; Roe, 281-2.
January 1616 that a duly accredited envoy from the court of St. James's, Sir Thomas Roe arrived. Roe's trade mission did not fully succeed and he returned empty-handed. But he was an adventurous and learned man and from his interesting and vivid journal and letters much of first-hand information about Mughal court life is known. As he did not understand the language spoken in the Mughal court, and did not travel much within the country, his accounts of political events and of the factions of the Mughal court is to be treated with caution. Nevertheless Roe's journal and letters are full of important sidelights on Mughal history and a good deal of information concerning the arts is to be found in them.

Some minor territorial gains were achieved in the frontier regions of Orissa, Saurashtra, Kishtwar and Kangra, which helped to boost the pride of the emperor, but not much else. On the other hand, clouds were gathering on Qandhar, and the political equilibrium in the Deccan was shattered as soon as the imperial party withdrew in the north.

58. Roe, 84-87. The first audience was held on 10 January, 1616 at Ajmer. Roe's name is not found anywhere in the emperor's memoirs.
Jahângîr began to show signs of piety and became increasingly religious. In one place of the Tûzuk he declares that a principal purpose of his coming to Ajmer is to visit the shrine of Khwâja Mu'in-ud-dîn Chishti. He visited it nine times, donated a pair of huge cauldrons for the preparation of food, held religious assemblies and built a golden railing around the tomb of Mu'in-ud-dîn. He also became the "earmarked" slave of the Khwâja by having lobe of his ears perforated. The Jainas obtained further farmâns prohibiting animal-slaughter and allowing freedom of worship to all Jaina monks. According to Jaina sources the emperor even wanted to resolve the factional dispute between their two principal sects. A rapprochement with the Portuguese was established and the wave of hostility against the Jesuit fathers ended. The old and somewhat exhausted Father Xavier finally left.

59. Tûzuk, I, 249. He visited the Khwâja shrine nine times: *ibid*, 341., five of them are described in the Tûzuk: *ibid*, I, 253-4, 256, 267, 297, 329. For pictures representing three of these visits, see infra. Chapter VII and Plates 71, 76.

60. *ibid*, I, 267.
61. BC, 82-4, 88-9.
63. JGM, 84f; Rev. Father Felix, "Mughal Farmans, Parwanahs and Sanads issued in favour of the Jesuit Missionaries," JPHS, 1916, Pl. III, fig. 5a, 5b.
the Mughal court from Ajmer in 1614. Father Joseph de Castro joined the mission at Agra, while Father Corsi stayed with the imperial party when it moved from place to place. In accordance with his practice of sightseeing the emperor went to see all mosques and mausoleums and paid their due respect during his tour of Gujarat. The shaikhs and Sayyids of the province were accorded a warm welcome and given money, religious books and other signs of favour (Plates 74, 75). They accompanied the emperor to various places and joined in religious discussions with him.

This increase of religious feeling, instead of inducing humility in Jahangir, led the emperor and his courtiers and painters to lay stress on the divine aspects of the imperial person. A set of miniatures was painted where the emperor is invariably shown resplendent like the sun and the moon, looming over the heads of powerful monarchs from distant regions of the earth and showing favours to saints, dervishes and shaikhs. The angels rejoice at him, the cherubs smile, and the symbol of universal kingship hangs over head (Plate 107, 108, 109 110). 66

64. JGM, 98 fn 105, 234.
66. Supra, Chapters I & X.
The changed political atmosphere associated with the steady rise of Khurram, led to some interesting new developments in court-politics. Parwiz became a political non-entity and the luckless Khusrat an unwanted burden. One of the first acts of Nur Jahan, after she was married to the emperor, was to make alliance with the rising star, Khurram by arranging his marriage with her niece, the daughter of Araf Khan, Mumtaz Mahall. The old political set-up was broken down after the death of such stalwarts as Araf Khan Jafar Beg, Raja Man Singh, Raja Rambas Kachchwa, Shujaat Khan, Mirza Ghazif, Amir-ul-Umar Sharif Khan, and curbing the powers of the Khan-i-Khanan and the Khan-i-A'zam. This was the beginning of a fierce rivalry between a handful of nobles and a steady decline of the power of the emperor which was systematically usurped by the empress and by Shah Jahan.

However, Jahangir devoted his full attention for the promotion of the arts and the effects of the backstage political drama were not apparent before the end of the second decade of the 17th century.

The intimacy with the house of Mewar and with Ibrahim Adil Shah brought a new stimulus to Mughal culture. Though not specifically mentioned in the Tuzuk the new bond
of friendship with the Râh of Mewar certainly helped to form an easy two-way traffic between Mewar and Agra. The Râgamâla set prepared at Chawand in 1604 (Plate 142) already shows signs of intimate knowledge of the achievement of the Akbari painters, and unceasingly strong Mughal influences in the art of Mewar become apparent in the later years of Jahângîr's reign.67

The Tuzuk refers to the arrival of gifted artisans, musicians, wrestlers, fencers, poets etc. from the Deccan, and specially from Bijapur, along with gifts of every description.68 The prolonged stay of the learned Mir Jamât-ud-dîn Husain Injû, who was given the title 'Azud ud-daula and appointed tutor of Shah Shujâ',69 at Bijapur, and the frequent exchange of envoys with Ibrahim 'Adil Shâh, must have led to a close link between cultural fashions current at the Mughal and the Bijapuri courts. Such fine miniatures as the "Boston Poet" (Plate 39), the portrait of Ibrahim 'Adil Shâh in the British Museum,70 and the splendid folio of royal muragga bearing Farrukh Beg's name, in the Nâprstek Museum (Plate 37) could never have

67. infra, Chapter XI, Epilogue.
68. Tuzuk, I, 110, 178, 271-2, 298-9, 335, 387-8, 400-1; II, 36-7, 288, 290.
69. ibid, 320; II, 82.
70. PL, colour pls. on p.126; also on p. 125, 127.
been produced had not there been a close cultural relationship between Bijapur and Agra.\textsuperscript{71} Signs of this became even more apparent in other fields of creative art like textile, furniture, decorative arts, ornament design etc.\textsuperscript{72}

The presence of Thomas Roe opened up yet another unknown source of inspiration to the Mughal artists.\textsuperscript{73} Jahangir's amazement at the sight of an English miniature of a lady\textsuperscript{74} and his pleasure in accepting gifts of non-religious subjects and portraits of noblemen and ladies,\textsuperscript{75} provide us with a fair idea of his taste. The period when Roe's presents of miniatures were made to Jahangir in Ajmer and Mandu coincides with the phase in Jahangir painting when some of the finest portraits of his reign were painted (Plates 51, 54, 56, 57, 83, 84, 105) mainly by

---

\textsuperscript{71} infra, Chapter VIII.
\textsuperscript{72} J. Irwin, "Golconda Cotton Paintings of the Early Seventeenth Century," Lalitkala, V (Delhi, 1952), 11-48; R. Skelton, "Documents for the study of Painting at Bijapur in the Late Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Centuries", AA, V, 97-125; D. Barrett, Painting of the Deccan, London, 1958.

\textsuperscript{73} infra, Chapter X.
\textsuperscript{74} Roe, 188-90, 199-200; Terry, 135.
\textsuperscript{75} Roe, 221-4, 125-6, 132, 322-4, 357.
Manohar and Abu'l Hasan. Roe's description of the exhibition of European pictures and the lengthy account of preparation of faultless replicas of one of them amply prove how enthusiastically these pictures were collected and studied by the Mughals.

Jahangir's interest in European art was not confined to miniatures only. Roe mentions the name of two English painters of doubtful merit who were warmly received by the emperor. Mention should be made here of the talented French jeweller Austin of Bordeaux, whose delicate craftsmanship in gold was highly appreciated by the emperor.

Like Jahangir himself in his princely days, Shah Jahan also seems to have maintained his own atelier. Though there is no mention of a painting studio established by Shah Jahan, there are frequent mentions of his goldsmith's shop, his blacksmith's works, his garakyar or department of

76. ibid., 125-6, 337.
77. ibid., 188-90, 199-200.
78. ibid., 187-8, 447, 468n.
80. Tuzuk, II, 80, 82-3.
82. Tuzuk, II, 96.
83. ibid., II, 79. The word has been wrongly transcribed and translated by Rogers & Beveridge. It is a Turkish word meaning 'providers of what is necessary.' Used in the A'in-i-Akbar (A'in, I, 93 fn6) slightly differently, possibly in the sense of employers of the department of royal furnishings. Also, Tuzuk, II, 47: where Shah Jahan's workmen prepared a boat in the Kashmiri fashion.
royal furnishings, etc., in the Tuzuk. Judging from the neatly written autograph notes giving many interesting information on the flyleaves of valuable MSS in the royal library (Plate 150) and his identifying notes carefully written on the mounts (unlike his father's practice of writing on the miniature itself) of pictures collected in muragga's built up by him, it is possible that his impeccable taste in these arts may also have been apparent in paintings. The works produced in the heyday of his power may have continued to develop the same artistic qualities as those works produced under his patronage before his ascent of the throne.

The paintings prepared during the middle of Jahangir's reign against this background may be divided into several distinct groups. The trends of the Salim Studio were not exhausted in the continuation of the tradition of MS illustrations, individual portraits were more in demand than books and MSS. The sumptuous muragga that was being built up in the Salim Studio by Aqa Rizâ and his associates was completed and a new one was taken up. When the old collection of Persian and early Mughal masterpieces and European engravings was exhausted new

84. Clarke, passim: Sotheby's Sale Catalogue, 12 December, 1929, etc.
84a. vide: Sotheby's Sale Catalogue, 15 June, 1959, Lot 118, for a muragga containing miniatures with calligraphic specimens from Khurram's pen, dated 1020H/1611.
miniatures and portraits were mounted on the folios.
Portraits of the emperor were sent to the neighbouring kings and selected nobles\(^{85}\). When Roe brought an ordinary picture of the emperor from the bazaar and the emperor saw it, he felt unhappy that Roe did not approach him directly and offered him one, with his autograph written on it. The original miniature has never been found but an unknown English engraver prepared a woodcut painted by Samuel Purchas with the account of Roe's Chaplain Edward Terry (Plate 136).\(^{86}\) The inscription runs: "Sannah 1(0)26, dar shahr-i-Mândû. Râqimutma Manohar. Dar sînn-i-panjâh sâlagî bûndam", which means that the portrait was painted in the emperor's fiftieth year in 1026 Hijra/1617 in the city of Mandu by Manohar. Similar portraits of the emperor, the princes, nobles and courtiers of all professions were prepared in large numbers for not only the royal murqqa's but also for the collection of the princes and some leading nobles.

Jahângîr presented copies of the Jahângîrnâma to his sons, Shâh Jâhân, Parwîz and to I'timâd-ud-daula and  Ağaf Khân,\(^{87}\) all of whom probably had their own libraries and picture

---

85. Tuzuk, II, 36-7, 90; Roe & Leveug . Read. Passim.
86. Purchas His Pilgrimes, London, 1625, II, 1474.
Roe, Introduction pp. LXXVIII-LXXIX.
87. Tuzuk, II, 26-27, 37, 69.
collections. The names of such important bibliophiles as the Khān-i-Khānān and Shaikh Farīd Bukhārī and such nobles as Muhābat Khān, 'Azud-ud-daula and Muṣṭafā Khān are to be added to the list. 88

The miniatures of the Jahangīrīnāma form another category because of the descriptive details of actual happenings incorporated in them. As Jahāngīr specifically mentions in the Tuzuk of the preparations of one grand volume of the first twelve years' account, it is reasonable to assume that all illustrations describing events which happened during the first twelve years were painted before the beginning of 1619. 89

Besides the above-mentioned types many paintings were prepared outside the imperial studio and in the vassal states. Though they dealt with different subject-matter and followed a different tradition, these paintings cannot altogether be excluded from the study of Mughal painting. However, with the exception of a few dated examples, very little is known about their exact provenance, date and authorship. 90

88. infra, Chapter XI, Epilogue.
89. Tuzuk, II, 26-7. infra, Chapter VII.
90. infra, Chapter XI.
And lastly there are detailed and specific descriptions of wall-paintings painted on royal chambers, audience halls, zanāna mahālls and garden-houses etc., preserved in the journals of foreign travellers as well as in the Tūzuk.91
CHAPTER 6

The Muraqqa's

Jahangir's principal interest lay in building up a formidable collection of paintings, starting from rare Persian miniatures to European engravings, and including early Mughal works and portraits of his ancestors and contemporaries. These were mounted on well-produced muraqqa's, and kept ready at hand so that the emperor may select some of them as subjects of wall-paintings, take up some engravings to initiate theological discussions with the Jesuit fathers or, as the story given in the Ma'āṣir-ul-Umarā reveals, start noting comments on them.¹

As we have tried to show earlier, the first task of Aqâ Riza after his employment was to arrange this collection in muraqqa's, to fill up the lacunae with suitable miniatures prepared by him and to embellish the hashiyas with elaborate golden designs and coloured details. The earliest example of his work is preserved in the Muraqqa'-i-Gulshan where a hashiya detail is dated 1599/1600 (Plate 3).²

¹. MU, I, 99.
². Supra, Chapter 3. For a detailed note on the Gulshan Album: Note 26. of the same chapter.
Besides the Muraqa'-'i-Gulshan a large number of detached folios of similar size and similar hashiya designs containing outstanding miniatures or calligraphic qit' as as the centerpiece, are found all over the world. A total of 25 such folios were bound in Persia in early 19th century and were collected by Heinrich Brugsch Pasha in 1861. It was subsequently deposited in the German State Library and substantial portions of it were published by Kühnel and Goetz. Other stray folios are found in the Musée Guimet, Paris, coming from the bequest of G. Marteau, Otto Sohn-Rethel Collection, Náprstek Museum, Prague, William Rockhilk Nelson Gallery, Kansas City, Freer Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., a private collection, Tehran.

4. IBP, Pl. facing pp. 46 & 48; LMI, 35-6; Marteau & Vever, II, Pl. CLXVII-CLXVIII.
6. LMI, 70f, Pl. 8-20 & 21-32.
8. R.Ettinghausen, "New Pictorial Evidence of Catholic Missionary Activity in Mughal India (early XVIIth century)", Perennitas; Festschrift für P. Thomas Michele OSB, Münster, 1963, 391-95, Fig. 7-8.
9. ibid, Fig. 4-6.

10. Art of Greater India, 60, Pl. 100; Heeramanek Catalogue, 1967, Pl. 198 a, b, c; Apollo, February, 1967, Pl. IX.
11. Cat-MFA, VI, 50, Pl. XXXIXb.
13. AIP, 156, No. 704.
15. Catalogue des objets et peintures persones de la Collection P. Stchoukine, Moscow, 1907, Pl. XXX.
17. No. 7174 CS No. 55; 7175 No. 56; 7176 No. 57; 7177 No. 58. Unpublished.
20. E. Kühnel, La Miniature en Orient, Paris, n.d. (1923), Pl. 115; from the Leonce Rosenberg Collection (Marteau & Vever, No. 238-40, Pl. CLXIX); F.R. Martin & F. Sarre, Meisterwerken der Muhammadanicher Kunst in München, Munich, 1912, Pl. 3.
Cat-Cowasji, No. 14, 15.
The average size of these folios is 41 x 25 cm. The large size is adopted to accommodate more than one miniature or calligraphic qit'as in a presentable manner. Sometimes one large painting, drawn on paper or linen, occupy the whole folio, but in most instances two or four, or even more than four, miniatures of unequal size are pasted on the central panel. Clever attempts are made by painting trees, creepers on landscape to give the apparently unrelated portrait-studies a concerted appearance. Otherwise no systematic chronological, or stylistic sequence is followed in their arrangement. The folios are fairly thick, made up of layers of bluish, pinkish or buff-coloured papers and are highly glazed.

The hashiya is uniformly wide on the top and at the bottom and on the side further from the spine. Delicate designs of creepers and trees, hillocks and streams, mythological and real birds and beasts, curious clouds and strange geometrical patterns in gold are painted on it. In some cases animals with cartouches of small birds in

21. At least two large paintings drawn on prepared linen are mounted in these muraqqa's: The picture of a pair of magpies in the Berlin Album (f 17b, IBP, Colours Pl. 10) and the picture of an unidentified foreign ruler (A. Sakisian, "La Miniature a l'Exposition d'art persan de Burlington House", Syria, XII [Paris, 1931] fig. 2, tentatively identified as Sultan Mehmet II of Turkey).
brilliant colours abound amongst these golden ornamental and landscape designs.

The arrangement is almost the same in the folios where calligraphic qit'as replace the miniatures in the centre. Fine calligraphic specimens are always treasured in the Islamic world and given even greater value than miniatures. A number of muraqqa’s containing specimens of writing from the pens of celebrated Persian calligraphers were collected in the imperial Mughal Library. Jahângîr had some of them mounted in his muraqqa’s. The spaces between the lines and between the qit'as are carefully embellished with elaborate golden designs and various floral motifs and small birds. The principal difference of the folios containing calligraphic qit’as from the folios containing miniatures lay in the ḥashiyas. In order to offset the monotony of the angular and curvilinear letters of the calligraphic panels Jahângîr ordered his painters to draw small vignettes within which human figures were painted. At first, under Āqâ Rizâ, these were drawn in sketchy outlines in transluscent water-colour, but later on, these

22. PMP, 124, 130, Nos. 109 & 131. One of them contain a shamsa showing old age and youth painted by Bihzâd and autograph notes by Jahângîr and Shâh Jahân. The second one was in the collection of Akbar’s mother Hamîdâ Bânû. The first album is in the Freer Gallery of Art (No. 44.48): B.W. Robinson Persian Drawings, Pl. 29.
were replaced by gouache drawings resembling small miniatures. Gradually vignettes and cartouches were eliminated and the figures were placed directly within the golden designs.

The marginal figures provide us with a new element so far unrepresented in court art. The principal subject-matter remains the members of the royal household; the emperor, hunting, flying hawks or seated on a throne, attending parties, drinking wine, or resting under a tree; his predecessors (Plate 48); his young sons engaged in their studies before an aged teacher, hunting, drinking, listening to music or even making love (Plates 45, 47, 59). Royal princesses are depicted on the hashiyas of a number of folios (Plate 46, 47), while on others are depicted members of various trades and professions, such as, calligraphers and poets, astrologers and astronomers, binders, paper-makers and gold sprinklers, distillers and wine blenders, hunters, falconers, fishermen, weavers, shepherds, carpenters, jewellers, retainers, infantrymen, horsemen, elephant riders, fencers and jugglers. Dervishes, mullahs, learned teachers and reclused also remain favourite subjects. On one folio the various functions of the Khanzanchi's department are illustrated. The members of the harem are frequently represented and in one instance
the celebration of 'holi' festival is depicted on the ḥāshiya. The ḥāshiya are full of a large number of small details showing various types of figures taken from European engravings. Wilkinson and Gray have compared this practice of illustrating ordinary occupations of craftsmen and labourers with the Luttrell Psalter.²³ Akbar and Jahāngīr both took interest in the development of the arts and crafts. The kārkhanās were situated near the royal quarters, Akbar occasionally went there and even participated in their works. Jahāngīr was no less interested in the production of novel and uncommon works of art and jewellers and blacksmiths, like painters, calligraphers, architects, poets and astrologers, are frequently mentioned in the Tūzuk.

Possibly another source for these representations may be sought in playing cards. According to Abu'l Fażl Akbar took interest in playing cards and the system of the game was revised by him. New sets of cards with figures of the king and the court, the queen and her retainers, the army, the wazir and his subordinates, the officers of the

treasury, and so on were prepared. Both the Gulshan Album and the Berlin Album illustrate figures resembling some of these subjects, although they are not done in any systematic or orderly manner.

A reason for the production of these figures on the hashiyas to the murqqa's may be found in Jahângîr's active interest in Persian and European paintings. Many interesting details of these pictures fascinated him, but as such related details could not always be incorporated in the portrait-studies or in the Jahângîrnama illustrations, so he may have decided to get these fascinating details copied on the hashiyas. Similarly, many talented craftsmen and scholars whose abilities were appreciated and valued by the emperor but fuller attention to them in the form of separate portrait-studies could not be given in the strict social hierarchy for their humble status, may have been selected for depiction on the hashiyas. The details copied from European prints and drawings supplied new materials which were incorporated in the mainstream of Jahângîr's

painting. Thus these hashiyas provide the Jahangiri painters with a unique opportunity to experiment.

Signatures of many of the principal Jahangiri painters, such as, Aqa Riza, Bishandas, Balchand, Daulat and Govardhan, are found on these hashiyas. The names of three of Jahangir's best painters, Abu'l Hasan, Manohar and Mansur have not been found, but a large number of unsigned folios are painted in their styles, and their non-participation is inconceivable. The name of Basawan on one folio of Gulshan album (f44b)25 is puzzling.

The Gulshan album contains folios dated between 1008 Hijra/1599-1600 (Plate 3) and 1020 Hijra/1611-12.26 Nanhâ's copy of Bihzâd's study of camel-fight is dated 1017 Hijra/1608-9 (Plate 50), and this was taken as the terminal date of the album by Wilkinson and Gray.27 The dating was further strengthened by the fact that no material dated before 1017 Hijra/1608-9 has been found in the Berlin Album.28 But since then two important folios of the Gulshan Album have been published, one showing Ibrahim 'Adil Shah (Plate 37) dated 1019 Hijra/1610-11, and the other showing

---
28. IBP, 10.
the meeting of a young prince and an aged mulla painted by Aqa Riza and dated 1020 Hijra/1611-12, have been published. So it appears that Jahangir devoted considerable attention to his collection of pictures soon after returning from Kabul in 1608. While the album already under production from 1008 Hijra was being completed, the compilation of another album started at the same time. Nanha was ordered to copy famous Bihzad (Plates 49, 50) and Daulat to draw the portraits of his fellow artists (Plates 40-43) in the same year. At the same time Daulat painted the double-portrait under the colophon of the Khamsa-i-Nizami MS (Plate 16). Probably this is also the time when Daulat added the golden hills in the beautiful Haratf-style hunting scene attributed to Mahamud Muzahibu by Mehdi Bahrami, made additions to another miniature of the same album, copied the portrait of 'Abd ur-Rahman Jami from a Bihzad original and painted the miniature in the Rothschild Bustan (Plate 20). The latest additions to the Gulshan Album were made in the following couple of years when Farrukh Beg's remarkable portrait of Ibranem 'Adil Shah

30. M. Bahrami, Iranian Art, New York, 1949, No. 69/4; PMP, Pl. C III B.
(Plate 37) and Aqa Rizâ's delightful study of the prince's interview with the mullah were included.

Meanwhile we may conjecture, work had already started on the other album which continued during the emperor's journey to Ajmer, Mandu and Ahmedabad. It was not completed before Jahângir came back to Agra in early 1619.\(^2\)

The picture mounted on these murâqqa'-folios can be divided into several distinct categories. The masterworks of Bihzâd, Mahmood Muzahhîb and other unidentified Persian masters may be included in the first category. While the early Mughal works coming from Khwâja 'Abd us-Samad, Kesâvadâs, Farrukh Beg and possibly from Mîr Sayyid 'Ali and Basâwan come under another category. The large number of European materials, monochrome engravings and book-illustrations, and their polychrome Mughal versions and copies are included in a third category and will be discussed in detail in Chapter XI. The whole range of contemporary materials, portraits, genre-scenes and figures of yogis and dervishes, and so on, illustrate some of the

\[^{31}\] Y. Godard, Athar-e-Iran, 1936, 26, Fig. 21.
\[^{32}\] Tuzuk, II, 65.
many facets of Jahângîr's life and time, and in many instances precise chronological data can be had from them. So it is prudent to include these works with the miniatures of the Jahângîrnâma, to be examined in a detailed manner in the following chapter.

The Gulshan Album is rich in Persian miniatures of fine quality, many of which are well-known throughout the world. 33 The great Persian master Bihzâd attained considerable fame during his lifetime, and by the time of the Mughals his fame became proverbial. 34 Babar's judicious remarks on Bihzâd were certainly made from his familiarity with Bihzâd's works; 35 MSS containing Bihzâd's drawings collected by him have survived. 36 Humâyûn is likely to be far more familiar with the works of Bihzâd and important Persian MSS containing his works started

34. See, R. Pinder-Wilson, "Bihzâd", EWA, II, for a detailed account and a full bibliography.
35. See Chapters I & IV.
36. Zafarnâmâ MS of 1467, now in the John Hopkins University Library (T.W. Arnold, Bihzâd and the Painting in the Zafarnamah MS, London, 1930), was in Babar's collection.
finding their ways to the Mughal Library from his time. To Jahāngīr Bihzād was a haloed name, so it is no wonder that Bihzād's miniatures would be enthusiastically collected by him.  

Jahāngīr's enthusiasm was not limited by only collecting MSS illustrated by Bihzād, or detached miniatures signed by him, he encouraged his own painters to copy them and incorporate details from these compositions. At least two works of this kind are preserved in the Gulshan Album, and one in an album compiled at a later date. The most notable of these three is Nānha's copy of the well-known scene of camel-fight said to be painted by Bihzād in his 70th year (Plates 49, 50). The copy is no doubt a close

37. Tuzuk, II, 20, 116; Besides the Zafarnāma the following MSS containing Bihzād's works were in Jahāngīr's library: Khâmsa-i-Nizâmi, Dated 900H/1494: BM Or.6810. Muragga of calligraphic qit'as. Freer Gallery of Art No.48.44.

38. PMP, 130-1, No.132-3, Pl. LXXXVII A, B. The motif of camel fight is a much-used one and has been copied from the early times to a much later date. See: R. Ettinghausen, "Four Istambul Albums", AO, I, 102, fig. 63; Rai Krishnadasa, "Mughal Miniatures", New Delhi, 1955, Pl. 5, where it has been attributed to Hunhar. Karl Khandalavala attributes it to Nānha and so does Moti Chandram, Indian Art, Bombay, 1954, Pl. XXVII. W.G. Archer's opinion of its being a Shāh Shafī' period Persian work is probably not too off the mark: Burl.Mag., December, 1956, 456.
one and justifies Jahângîr's pride for the ability of his painters to prepare copies of any picture made to Roe at a later date. The emperor was satisfied with Nânhâ's work and put an autograph note in a cartouche on the miniature itself.

The second instance of copying Bihzâd's work is revealed by a note written by Daulat near the figure of an old poet. He identifies the poet as Jâmi and records that it was copied from an original by Bihzâd.

The third example is found in the Nasir-ud-dîn album and is signed by a woman painter named Sahîfa Bânû. It is a copy of Bihzâd's work found in the Khâmsa-i-Nizâmî, prepared in 1494, now in the British Museum.

A few other Persian miniatures are also found in this album. Two of them, signed by Maḥmud Muzahhîb, were repainted by Jahângîrî artists. In one case the painter

40. The inscription reads: "Allah-u-Akbar. This work of Ustâd Bihzâd was seen and copied by Nânhâ the painter according to my order. Written by Jahângîr son of Akbar Pâdishâh Ghâzî. Year 1017(Hijra)".
41. Y. Godard, Athar-e-Iran, 1936, 26, Fig.21. The Bihzad original is lost.
42. Y. Godard, Athar-e-Iran, 1937, 266, f68, fig. 110.
44. PMP, 102, Nos.95,96, Pl.CIIIB (No.96). A. Godard & B. Gray, Iran, Paris, 1956, Pl. XIX, XVIII.
happens to be Daulat. Of the other Persian examples, one is attributed to Qâsim 'Alî. 45

Like the Gulshan Album the Berlin Album also contains a number of Persian miniatures. Though these are not as interesting as the Persian masterpieces in the Gulshan Album, they deserve attention, which has strangely been denied them. One of them (f 19 b) bearing an attribution of the Jahângîrî period to Bihzâd, but rejected by Kühnel & Goetz for reasons best known to themselves, is a superb work. It shows the meeting of a Persian lady, identified by an inscription as the mother of Sultan Muhammad of Khwârizm, with Shaikh Majd-ud-dîn Baghdî, also identified by another inscription. 46 The miniature was repaired and enlarged, but it still retains marks of the master's brush, especially in the distinctive and restrained colour-scheme and in the well-knit composition. There is no reason to mistrust the Jahângîrî attribution to Bihzâd. Kühnel and Goetz write elsewhere in their study that this picture is most closely related to those of the Bihzâd School. 47

45. PMP, 100, No. 87, Pl. LXXIIIA. Other notable examples: PMP, No. 163, 226, 224. Not illustrated.
46. IBP, 6, 51, not illustrated. Probably an illustration to the Majâlis ul 'Ushshâq associated with Sultan Husain Bayqârâ.
47. Ibid, 30.
The second painting, a large miniature on f 12a, showing a sea-battle is perhaps the best example of Persian art in the whole of the Berlin Album. Its distinctive colour-scheme consisting of different tones of blue and green along with the occasional use of yellow, red, faded gold, violet, buff, grey and black, its highly effective composition and the dramatic fury of the fierce battle on the turbulent sea are reminiscent of the work of Bihzâd. It is neither signed by Bihzâd nor attributed to him by any inscription. Kühnel and Goetz think that the work was directly inspired by him, but not coming from his brush. They assign it to a putative school of Babar; in a later study Goetz writes that this miniature of sea-battle reminds him of 'somewhat later historical pictures describing battles in or near the gulf of Cambay'.

In the same vein Goetz thinks the splendid miniature showing Humâyûn's meeting with Mirzâ Hindal in a rocky landscape to be 'an archaic but not an early work'. He even thinks the highly conventionalised Persianesque landscape consisting of curious serrated cliffs in multi-colour sometimes vaguely shaped like elephants and other animals

48. IBP, 31, Pl. 3 (colour).
49. Ibid, 51.
50. H. Goetz, East & West, 1957, 162.
as 'a most graphic and correct description of the "Ridge" to the West and Southwest of Delhi'! It is of course totally unlike the Ridge at Delhi. It is a picnic scene and shows a large number of persons including the royal ladies. Humāyūn and Mīrzā Hindal are identified in an inscription written on the miniature. Hindal is shown as presenting a picture of a young man to Humāyūn while a young prince, presumably Akbar, stands near Humāyūn. The figures are drawn in a highly stylised manner, wearing curious high headdresses and sophisticated Persian costumes. No horizon is shown and trees and plants with multicoloured leaves and mountain cliffs of curious shapes divide the composition into various compartments. It is a fine work showing no resemblance to any early Mughal painting, and if it was indeed done by any contemporary painter the choice would fall on Mīr Sayyid 'Alî, though there is not much of the Mīr's wonderful portrait-studies and his harmonious and poetic description of nature in it.

On the other hand the Persian miniature mounted on folio 11a showing the entertainment of a Persian emperor, identified by Kühnel and Goetz as Shâh Ismâ'îl, in a

51. ibid, 162.
landscape does not show the slightest touch of Bihzâd's genius. To these learned scholars, however, this miniature has a strong resemblance to the work of the "Persian Raphael", though they admit that it hardly seems to belong to the same 'spiritual type' of the miniatures referred to above. The miniature is much retouched and does not appear to an outstanding example of Persian art.

Another miniature, identified by an inscription as illustrating the Sikandarnâma, which shows a Persian king holding court in a landscape (f 9b) is a Persian painting of good quality. Iskandar is meeting a lady by night. The full-toned blue and green indicate the darkness of the night, with the figures illuminated by candles and torches, these lend a certain distinctiveness to the miniature. The sides of the miniature were much enlarged and repainted in Jahângîr's court to bring the whole to a convenient size for the murâqqa'. The portrait of the old poet with while beard is striking. The landscape in the far right background with blue, green, yellow and pink trees, buildings and river is very characteristic of the style of Farrukh Beg.

52. ibid, 4, 18, 51-2, Pl. 33.
53. IBP, 4, 25, 50, 52. Not illustrated.
54. Cf Farrukh Beg's works reproduced by R. Skelton, AO, II, figs. 12, 15.
A majority of the large number of Mughal miniatures found in the Gulshan Album were painted in the early days of Mughal painting, but the same is not true about the Berlin Album and other stray folios. When Salîm was forming his collection the founders of the Mughal School of painting Mîr Sayyid 'Alî and Khwâja 'Abd-us-Šamad were most probably already dead. The greatest of the Indian painters of the first part of Akbar's reign, Daswant, was also dead. We have no idea of Basâwan's last days, but in all probability he died or ceased to paint just before the turn of the century. Farrukh Beg was the reigning master of the day, along with Âqâ Rizâ directing the Salîm Studio.

The miniatures painted by Âqâ Rizâ have already been noted and those by Farrukh Beg will be discussed in full details in Chapter VIII. No inscribed miniature of Daswant Basâwan or Mîr Sayyid 'Alî has been found in any of the albums or on the stray folios. However, some pictures of Salîm's collection may be attributed to them.

Passing references have been made to the pictures painted by Khwâja 'Abd-us-Šamad found in the Gulshan Album, in Chapter II, 55 The Heeramanec Gallery possesses another hunting scene painted in a style similar to that of the Khwâja. 56

---

55. Chapter II, Note 18.
56. Cat-Heeramanec, No. 198b.
The same is applicable to the folio, again of a scene of hunt by a young prince, published by A.C. Ardeshir from his own collection.  

A folio in the Gulshan Album showing the scene of Mughal general's camp in the evening after a hard day's work, is attributed by Hâjek to Basawan. It is a good study where factual details of a camp scene in the evening are naturalistically rendered. The style is not far from Basâwan's works in the Victoria and Albert Museum Akbarnâma and in the Jâmi'-ut Twârîkh, now in the Gulistan Palace Library, Tehran. It may have come from Basâwan's brush. A picture in the Berlin Album, showing the scene of a ghastly murder, resembles Daswânt's style. It is a large painting and depicts the episode in a continuous narrative as in the Hamzanâma. The strikingly realistic rendering of the expression of agony on the murdered man's face and that of animal fury and ruthlessness on the face of the murderer are comparable to the scene of Bhîma, dressed as a woman, killing Kîchaka in the Razm nâma MS now at Jaipur.

57. A.C. Ardeshir, Roop-Lekha, I, No.2, Pl. 4. The work is inscribed and the inscription is written sideways in a manner comparable to the signed examples of the Khwâja in the Gulshan Album.
58. IMM, Pl. 24, 25, 26.
59. IBP, Pl. 2 (colour). f 16b.
colour-scheme with bright patches of red, yellow, saffron, purple, blue and green and the strange architectural details also resemble some other miniatures of this MS. Wilkinson and Gray report the work of Basawan on the hashiyas of one folio of the Gulshan Album. The folio remains illustrated and no further details are given either by them or by anyone who examined the album in the subsequent exhibitions where it was shown. If at all the hashiya illustrations of this folio were painted by Basawan then these would appear to be the result of the young prince's persuasion of the aged master to contribute something for his newly started venture.

The name of Kesavadas is always associated with copies of European engravings, because a number of signed pictures copied from European originals are found not only in the Jahangiri muraqqa's but also in other muraqqa's. His signature is suddenly found in an isolated conspicuous picture in the Berlin Album. It shows an old mendicant, stooped in old age, and leaning on a stick, wearing a dhoti, scarf and turban, all in white, presenting a paper-scroll. In a Nagri inscription the name of the artist along with the exact date of its execution in the Saka era are written on the paper scroll.

61. ibid. Pl. LXVI, LXXXI, XCIll.
63. infra, Chapter X.B.
64. IBP, Pl. 39. The inscription is dated 1646 Samvat = 1590. Albrecht Weber's translation is given in IBP, 9.
The group of miniatures painted during or after 1608 and illustrating the passages of the Tūzuk are discussed in the following chapter, because in spite of their presence in these muraqqās they belong to the group of Jahāngīrनामा illustrations.
Like his illustrious great-grandfather Babar, Jahangir preserved occasional notices of contemporary events and personalities, and sometimes even a day to day description of his movements in the form of an autobiographical narrative. This memoir was written down by him upto his 17th regnal year, after which it was continued by his learned courtier Mutamad Khan for a further couple of years, and is commonly known as the Tuzuk-i-Jahangirî.

The accounts of the Tuzuk begin from the day of Jahangir's accession, but the actual writing may have started from a slightly later date. The first direct reference to the Jahangirnama, which is the real name of the work, occurs in the course of Jahangir's description of a turkeycock and a monkey brought by Muqarrab Khan from Goa:

Among those were some animals that were very strange and wonderful, such as I had never seen, and upto this time no one had known their names. Although King Babar has described in his Memoirs the appearance and shapes of several animals, he had never ordered the painters to make pictures of them. As these animals appeared to me to
be very strange, I both described them and ordered that painters should draw them in the Jahangirnama, so that the amazement that arose from hearing of them might be increased.

The next reference to the Jahangirnama is made at a much later date, in October 1616, when he records an exact copy of a friendly letter written to him by Shâh 'Abbâs, and sent through Muḥammad Riżā Beg. References to it are more frequent in later days, and more explicit in an entry of the 13th Julûs when copies of the accounts of the first twelve years were prepared and presented to the first favourite Shâh Jahân and then to I'timâd-ud-daula, Āṣaf Khan and Parwiz. It appears from the contents of the Tûzuk that the emperor directed the wakîle of his kutubkhâna to prepare one master copy for the library illustrated in a sumptuous manner and a number of copies for distributing amongst his "special servants" and sending to the "various cities, so that administrators (arbâb-i-daulat) and the auspicious might adopt them as their code."  

1. Tuzuk, I, 215; Syud Ahmad's text, 105. For Hodivala's more accurate translation: Supra, Chapter, I, Note 33.
2. ibid, I, 337.
3. ibid, I, 353; II, 20, 26, 37, 69.
4. ibid, II, 26-7.
5. ibid, II, 33.
6. ibid, II, 69-70.
7. ibid, II, 26-7.
The first copy, which was presented to Shâh Jahân, was prepared on 8th Shahriyar of the 13th julûs/20 August 1618. Two months before this the celebrated painter Abu'î Hasan painted the striking frontispiece which profoundly impressed the emperor. So, finishing touches were surely being given and suitable illustrations were being added to the memoirs of the first volume of the work at that time. Though not specifically indicated by Jahângîr, from the short time in which the copies for I'timâd-ud-daula, Asaf Khan and Parwîz were prepared, it would appear that these copies contained only the written text and no illustrations.

The royal copy of the Jahângîrâma for which Abu'î Hasan painted the frontispiece which earned such high praise from the emperor and the title Nâdir-uz-Zamân, has not been found. Only a few miniatures, produced on a grand scale (12\(\frac{3}{4}\)'' x 9''), but no text, survive in the Raza Library, Rampur, appear to belong to it; and a number of miniatures illustrating some episodes of the Jahângîrâma.

8. *ibid*, II, 20-1. The entry was made in the last days of the Ilâhi month of Tir.
9. Copies presented to I'timâd-ud-daula and Asaf Khan were prepared in the beginning of the month of Mihrâ. The copy meant for Parwîz was sent through Nasrullah in the month of Bahman of the same year.
and probably forming parts of it, are found in various collections throughout the world. An incomplete copy of *Jahângîr-nâma* running up to the 7th julus, acquired by the National Museum, New Delhi, is believed, from the handwriting, to be a royal autograph. From internal evidence it appears that the emperor himself kept his diary, because in one place he writes:

> On this date an event occurred such that, although I was greatly desirous of writing it down, my hand and heart have failed me. Whenever I took my pen my state became bewildered, and I helplessly ordered I'timâd-ud-daulah to write it.11

He again writes in his 17th regnal year:

> As in consequence of the weakness that came over me two years ago and still continues, heart and brain do not accord. I cannot make notes of events and occurrences. Now that Mir' tamâd Khân has come from the Deccan, and he had the good fortune to kiss the threshold, as he is a servant who knows my temperament and understands my words, and was also formerly entrusted with this duty, I gave an order that from the date which I have written he shall hereafter write them with his own hand, and attach them to my Memoranda. Whatever may occur hereafter he should note after the manner of a diary, and submit them for my verification, and then they should be copied into a book.12

---


11. Tuzuk, I, 326. (Urdíbíhisht, 11th Julús).

12. Ibid., II, 246. Cf Hawkins's evidence: "...he hath writers who by turns set downe everything in writing which he doth, so that there is nothing passeth in his lifetime which is not noted,": ETT, 116. Note, Plates 62, 64, 65, 66, 75.
But there is some uncertainty whether the manner in which the earlier portion was written was the same as has been indicated here.

Storey in his Bio-Bibliographical Survey recognises three versions of the memoirs in the available MSS\textsuperscript{13}. The first consists of what is generally accepted as the "authentic" version, written down by the emperor up to the 17 julûs and continued to the beginning of the 19th julûs by Mu'tamad Khan. The text of this version was edited and lithographed by Syud Ahmud in 1864 from a single defective MS\textsuperscript{14}. A. Rogers's not too accurate English translation of it was edited and completed by H. Beveridge and was published in 1909 and 1914\textsuperscript{15}. Only one contemporary MS containing the account of the first 12 years and bearing the royal seals of Jahângîr and Shâh Jahân is known to exist.\textsuperscript{16}

\begin{enumerate}
\item Syud Ahmud, Toozuk-i-Jehangeere (with Muḥammad Hâdi’s continuation), Alligarh, 1863-4.
\item A. Rogers, tr., and H. Beveridge, ed, The Tûzuk-i-Jahângîr or Memoirs of Jahângîr (without Hâdi’s continuation), London, 1st Vol, 1909, 2nd Vol, 1914. W.H. Lowe translated only one fasciculus in 1889. W. Erskine translated the account of the first nine years which was never published. The best translation of the Tûzuk is in Hindi and made by Brajaratna Das (Jahangir ka Atmacharit, Varanasi).
\item Storey, op. cit., 557: From an article in Urdu in Oriental College Magazine, II, No.4 [Lahore, 1926], 51-2.
\end{enumerate}
The second version is found in a MS originally in the library of Jahângîr's contemporary Muḥammad Quṭb Shâh of Golkânda; this abruptly ends in the 3rd julûs and was written at Hyderabad on the 5th julûs. The third version called by Storey the "garbled memoirs", is apparently an amplification and extension of this early version. Noting

17. ibid, 556. The MS is now deposited in the Bankipur Public Library. Cat-Bankipur, VII, 557; Scott O'Connor, op.cit, 57. The presence of this copy in the royal library at Golkânda, when Jahângîr's work was in such an unfinished state, is curious. The explanation probably lies in the fact that Sultan Muḥammad Quṭb Shâh was outstanding among the Muslim rulers of India as a bibliophile and book collector. Possibly as soon as he heard of Jahângîr's composition he may have indicated his desire for a copy, or his name may have occurred to Jahângîr as a most obvious person to whom to send the first fruits of literary composition. A great number of fine manuscripts with the seal and often the autograph of Sultan Muḥammad Quṭb Shâh are extant today. For MSS of his predecessor's Dakhnî verse Diwân with Sultan Muḥammad's autograph see Kulliyât-i-Sultan Muḥammad Quṭb Shâh, Hyderabad, 1940, Plate facing p.333. See also Manuscripts from Indian Collections, New Delhi, 1964 pp. 92, 93-4. Another witness to the interest of Sultan Muḥammad Quṭb Shâh in the literary productions of the Mughal court is a MS of Fayzî's celebrated Mathnâvî, Nal wa Daman, bearing a note by Sultan Muḥammad Quṭb Shâh recording its presentation to them by Rızâ Quṭb in 1023/1614. (See the Writer's Handlist: Accession No. 50). Also Oriental College Magazine, Feb. 1928. I am grateful to Mr. S. Digby for supplying these bibliographical references.
the exaggerated statistics and the alterations in passages reflecting on Shâh Jahân, Rieu suggests that the third version was written in the early part of Shâh Jahân's reign. Most of the MSS of this version contains at the end a Pandnâma, or collection of moral precepts, ascribed to Jahângîr with a prologue by I'timâd-ud-daula. The garbled version was translated by Major David Price in 1829.

We have already noticed Jahângîr's practice of including painters in the royal entourage and having pictures of curious birds and animals or notable incidents drawn by them. Though painters accompanied the royal party on its leisurely journeys to Kabul and drew pictures, we cannot be certain whether these pictures were incorporated in the Jahângîrnâma. The whole range of miniatures illustrating specific events described in the Tûzuk, persons visiting the court or objects attracting the emperor's fancy, noted and sometimes narrated elaborately in the Tûzuk, may be divided into two distinct groups: in one group, the miniatures are drawn in a larger scale, and lavishly produced with particular attention given to the

20. Supra, Chapter V.
details of the incident, to the persons actually present and to the surroundings of the place (Plates 62-68, 71-72, 74, 76, 78-80); while in the other group the painters just illustrate the object which attracted the emperor's fancy or portray the person who arrived in the court at a certain time and place, the details of which are sometimes written on the picture itself by the emperor (Plates 54, 55, 57, 77, 81-85, 93, 101-106, 108, 136).

The first group of pictures was probably prepared when Jahângîr decided to have the accounts of the first twelve years compiled in one volume.21 Some miniatures of the second group may have been included in it, though the majority was preserved in murāqqa’s. This would explain the presence of the portraits of the Khân-i-Khânân who met the emperor in late 1618 (Plate 105),22 of Râo Bhâro who came to the court in the same year (Plate 50)23 of Jassâ Jâm who succumbed to Mughal rule towards the end of the 12th julûs and travelled with Jahângîr’s party till the beginning of the 13th julûs,24 of Bakhtar Khân Kalâwant who arrived at Ajmer in the beginning of 1615 (Plate 57),25 and of others specifically referred to in the entries of

22. Ibid, II, 57.
Tûzuk, in the Berlin muraqqa'. The miniatures which were not included in the Berlin muraqqa' may have been kept aside for other muraqqa's or for their future use as illustrations to the second volume of the Jahângîrnamâ comprising the accounts of the subsequent years, which was never completed. However we have no evidence that the Jahângîrnamâ included smaller pictures of other than the full page format consistently favoured in the production of royal manuscripts of court-chronicles, from the illustrated Akbarnâma to the Pâdishân-nâma of Shâh Jahân's reign now at Windsor Castle.

As the accounts of the Jahângîrnamâ begin with the description of Jahângîr's coronation to the throne, the emperor probably wanted a double page illustration to describe the details of festivities and portray accurately the large number of nobles present on the occasion. He entrusted the task to Abu'l Hasan, who completed it in the beginning of the 13th julus, and presented it when the royal party was leaving Gujarat for Agra. This was only a few weeks before the first copy of the first volume of the Jahângîrnamâ was prepared.\(^{26}\) The emperor was pleased when

\(^{26}\) ibid., II, 20-1: entry of 20th Tîr 13th julus. The first copy which was presented to Shâh Jahân, was prepared on 8th Shahrîyâr of the same year (August 1618).
he saw it, and recalled that he had paid close and careful attention to Abu'l Hasan since his birth in the imperial household; and that he had conferred on him the title Nādir-uz-Zamān. This key passage in the Tuzuk has already been referred to many times. The double page frontispiece (Plates 62-3) is preserved in a muragga' of Persian and Mughal miniatures and calligraphic qu'as in a Leningrad Collection.27

The left half of the double-page composition (Plate 62) shows the rejoicings of the people on the coronation day. The gate of the palace has been opened not only for the nobles, higher officers, and foreign envoys and priests, but also for the ordinary subjects scrambling for coins stamped with the name of the new emperor. Musicians and dancers, horsemen and elephant riders, poets and reciters, wrestlers and fencers, hunters and falconers, Jesuits priests and Iranian ambassadors have all assembled in the palace courtyard. On the architrave of the gateway Abu'l Hasan gives the date of coronation 1014H/1605, but as we have already noted, the picture was painted at a much

later date in 1618. This double-page picture may be regarded as one of the finest examples of Abu'l Hasan's work, and deserves the unstinted appreciation that the emperor made. The artist's sense of balance and harmony is apparent in the composition consisting of such a large number of people, each of whom can be easily identified, below the huge arched gateway whose red sandstone structure and white marble dome stand majestically against the blue sky.

The right half (Plate 63) of the composition shows the emperor seated on the throne under a canopy and attended by a large number of nobles and important officers, all standing within the special enclosure. Here the figures are of a slightly larger proportion and arranged in orderly rows with their heads shown in full or three-quarter profile. In many instances the names of the nobles are given by the painter. The portraits of the principal nobles like Khân-i-Khânàn, Khân-i-A'zam, I'timâd-ud-daula, Râjâ Râmdâs Kachchwaha, Âsâf Khân Ja'far Beg, Mahâbat Khân, Râjâ Bîr Singh Deo, Âmîrâ'î, Mîrzâ Ghâzî, Rustam Mîrzâ, Muqarrab Khân, etc., are not difficult to identify even without reading the inscriptions, because their portraits are drawn not from life but probably from the Album of portraits collected in the imperial library. Similar likeness, copied from the same source or the same charba, are repeated time and again in other court groups.
especially when they depict events which happened long before and were painted when many of those nobles were dead or living in far-away provincial capitals. But the portraiture of the emperor, and the princes and nobles in pictures describing contemporary events (65, 71, 72, 74, 76, 78, 79) are less stereotyped and taken from life.

The right half of this double-page composition is not signed, but as the name of Abu'l Hasan is prominently displayed in the other half, it seems that the same painter is responsible for this superb group picture. Special attention has been given by the painter to the colour scheme of the whole composition and to the intricate designs of carpet, textile, and the decorative cloths covering the circular tents put up for members of the seraglio. Two pictures on European subjects on back wall, painted in many colours, give an idea of the use of these pictures and of their subjects. The Jesuit father painted in the left half of the composition, seated wearing a dark brown cossock and holding a book seems to be Father Jerome Xavier, who was present in the Mughal court on that occasion.

One notable point in the double-page composition is the absence of the sons of the emperor, except Khurram. Is it because the eldest son Khurram became rebellious and was virtually imprisoned, and the second son Parwiz was not in
favour at the time of its painting? Similar reasons have been propounded for the substitution of the figure of a young prince for a nobleman in a scene of private party (Plates 69, 70). The acceptance of this theory depends solely on the identity of Khusraù. As seen from the likeness of Khusraù in the portrait authenticated by Jahângîr's autograph note (Plate 61), and a large genealogical picture in the Rothschild Collection (Plate 53), the young man offering wine to Jahângîr in the British Museum picture (Plate 70) does not appear to be Khusraù. The Rothschild picture itself is an example of a similar change in the emperor's attitude: it is very probable that originally the lower half of this genealogical picture showed Jahângîr's third and most favoured son, Shâh Jahân with his sons, but because of his rebellion declared in 1622 the angry emperor probably ordered to cover up that portion with another detail showing his predecessors, originally painted by Dhanrâj.

The British Museum version of the private party also shows Parwîz carrying a salver full of cherries and Khurram

with the chaurī. Jahāngīr was fond of cherries and frequently ate them during the days of his sojourn at Kabul. On one occasion he records:

At the stage of Dāka they brought from Kabul (cherries) which my [father] revered] and had entitled Shāh-ālū. As I was much inclined to eat them, inasmuch as I had not (hitherto?) obtained them, I ate them with great zest as a relish to wine. 31

In the Leningrad version (Plate 69) the setting and description of the scene remain exactly the same, only Parviz does not carry the salver of cherries and instead of the unidentified youth, a formidable looking noble offers wine to the emperor. Both versions are signed by Manohar and the colour-scheme of both pictures is similar. Only in the Leningrad copy there are fewer decorative designs and jewels on the body of the emperor.

Three miniatures, depicting scenes of royal births and found in Boston (Plate 67) 32 and Leningrad, 33 probably come from the royal copy of the Jahāngīrnama. All three are uninscribed and no part of the text is visible in any of them. The size of these pictures do not agree with the extra-large illustrations, undisputedly belonging to the royal copy (22.5 x 38 cm approx).

The portraiture of the persons presented in these pictures reveals Jahângîr's predilection for accurate likenesses and a realistic rendering of mood and emotion. The exact episodes illustrated in these pictures cannot be definitely identified because only brief mention of the births of his sons Khusrau, Parwiz (born in Kabul), Khurram (born in Lahore), Jahândâr and Shahriyâr are made by the emperor and no other details are given in the Jahângîrnâma. Moti Chandra's identification of the scene as that of the birth of prince Khurram is not unlikely and Welch's attribution of the picture to Bishandas also looks very probable. The women crowding the zanaâ-mahall resemble the female figure in Bishandas's other works (Plates 9, 28 and 30).

A considerable part of the Jahângîrnâma is devoted to the description of the rebellion of Khusrau, how it was crushed and how he was captured. Amîr-ul-umarâ Sharif brought the captured prince to the garden of Mîrzâ Kâmran near Lahore, for the trial. The trial is thus described

---

34. Tuzuk, I, 15.  
35. Ibid., I, 18-9.  
36. Ibid., I, 19-20.  
37. AMI, 166, No.26. S.C. Welch writes: "We are grateful to Dr Moti Chandra for the suggestion that this scene, perhaps from a Jahângîrnâma, may represent the birth of Prince Kerim [sic]."
by Jahângîr:

On Thursday, Muharram 3rd, 1015, in Mîrzâ Kamran's garden, they brought Khusraû before me with his hands tied and chains on his legs... They made Husain Beg stand on his right hand and 'Abd-ur-Raḥîm on his left. Khusraû stood weeping and trembling between them....I....handed over Khusraû in chains, and ordered these two villains to be put in the skins of an ox and an ass.38

The episode is illustrated in a brilliant picture, now preserved in the Raza Library, Rampur (Plate 64). It was published by Percy Brown,39 but unfortunately he wrongly identified the scene as Kaukab's disgrace, an incident of little importance which took place in the Manâmakar garden near Agra in 1609. The whole scene of Khusraû's trial is so graphically depicted in this picture that Brown's identification seems completed unwarranted.

The depiction of Mîrzâ Kamran's garden with tall, realistically rendered mango-trees and a reservoir with a fountain create a soothing atmosphere of suave naturalism and verve rarely found in MS illustrations. The emperor is shown as visibly annoyed at the conduct of his son, while the whole assembly of nobles waits in hushed silence to hear the emperor's verdict. The disgraced prince is shown standing, 'weeping and trembling', as has been described

38. Tuzuk, I, 68.
39. IPM, 137, Pl. XLIX.
in the Tuzuk. The expression of distress following his failure is sensitively painted by the artist, whose signature has been defaced, but may be read as Manohar.

In the following summer the imperial party moved from Lahore to make a short visit to Kabul. The emperor's description of the journey and of his enjoyable stay in the delightful City of Kabul is sufficiently detailed. On two occasions the emperor records the description of two animals the like of which he has never seen before. On both occasions he instructed his painters to record their likenesses. One of them is a "piebald animal, like the flying (i.e. jumping) mouse," while the other is a markhor, of which he writes:

The same Afghans killed and brought a markhor (Erskine translates this 'a serpent-eating goat'), the like of which I had never seen or imagined. I ordered my artists to paint him. He weighed four Hindustani maunds, the length of his horns was 1\frac{1}{2} gaz.40

A superb likeness of a mountain-goat with long voluted horns majestically standing in a landscape is preserved in the "Minto Album", now in the Victoria & Albert Museum, answers to the description (Plate 98) and may represent the same

40. Tuzuk, I, 112-3. The markhor is a large mountain goat having splendid horns with one or more convolutions and upto 60" long, found in Kashmir, in the Western Himalayas, Hindukush and Pamir.
animal described by Jahângîr. The name of the painter as written on the mount is 'Inâyat. If the identification is correct then this picture will have to be regarded as one of the earliest of Jahângîrî paintings, specifically mentioned in the Tuzuk. The background of the picture is painted in blue-green with pinkish patches of cloud in the twilight sky. The small bush in the right hand corner probably indicates the enormous size of the animal. The same painter contributed three miniatures in the Akbarnâma, distributed between the British Museum and the Chester Beatty Library.

The emperor took a special fancy of the delightful gardens of Kabul and held sports meetings and threw parties in many of them. In the famous Shahr-ârâ garden he held several entertainment parties with his intimate courtiers, and some with the ladies of the harem. On one night he watched the famous Afghan "goomb" dance of which he writes:

At nights I ordered the learned and the students of Kabul to hold the cooking entertainment, bughra, and the throwing of bughra, together with arghushtak dances.

41. Clarke, Pl.13 and text; AIP, 153-4, No.686. Clarke's identification with another mîrkhâr described in Tuzuk, I, 83-4 is less likely, because in the passage quoted above Jahângîr specifically mentions his order of having a picture of the animal made by the painters.

42. BM, MS 12988, f25a; Chester Beatty Library, Ind. MS 3, f230 (signed as 'Inâyat Khânâyâd) and f26a (Pl.37 of the Cat-CB, II).

43. Tuzuk, I, 107.
This night-party scene is illustrated in a picture painted by Abu’l Hasan, formerly in the A.C. Ardeshir Collection (Plate 68). The party is limited to the intimate few of which the portraits of Khurram, Râjâ Bhâo Singh, I’timâd-ud-daula, I’tibâr Khân, and Muqarrab Khân can easily be identified. Jahângîr is shown wearing a sleeveless nadîrî, a dress of his own invention and several strings of pearls. Five old bearded bughra’iyan are shown performing the dance before the emperor. The leaves of the trees of the Shahr-ârâ garden dazzle in the light of the candles and the flames of the fire on which a large round cooking pot is placed.

Another important event described in the Tuzuk, which was chosen for illustration, is the weighing of prince Khurram (Plate 66). The celebration of the anniversary is thus described:

On Friday, the 6th Rabî’ul-âkhir, I came to the quarters of Khurram, which had been made in the Urta Garden. In truth, the building is a delightful and well-proportioned one....In this year, which was the commencement of my son Khurram’s 16th lunar year...., I gave an order that they should weigh him according to the prescribed rule, against gold, silver, and other metals, which should be divided

44. A.C. Ardeshir, "Mughal Miniature Painting. The School of Jehangir", Roop Lekha, II, No.3, 34-5, Fig. 2.
45. Tuzuk, I, 384.
among faqirs and the needy. The whole of that day was passed in enjoyment and pleasure in the house of Bābā Khurram, and many of his presents were approved.46

There can hardly be any doubt about the correct identification of the scene, because the last sentence of the passage quoted above is preserved at the top of the picture and the young prince appears to be not older than 16, which age he reached in 1607. Gray revised47 his earlier opinion about its identification,48 but the pearl ear-studs worn by the emperor and the prince seems to have puzzled him. It is probable that when the picture was painted in 1618, at the time of the production of the royal copy of the first volume of the Jahangirmāsam, the painter made a mistake in showing the pearl ear-studs which Jahangīr started wearing only in 1614.49 The names written on the courtiers need not pose

46. ibid, I, 115.
47. AIP, 157-8, No.710. Gray writes, "This can hardly be the occasion mentioned in the Tuzuk-i-Jahangiri (sic) to mark Prince Khurram's 16th (lunar) year (cf Rogers translation, I, p.115) since Pir Khān only received the title of Khān Jahan later this year (A.D. 1607)." But he accepts Stchoukine's suggestion and ascribes C.1620 to it in another place (AIP,98).
48. PI, 105-5, colour plate on p.103. Here he writes: "Khurram, appears in the picture to be not more than sixteen, an age which he reached in 1607; but the emperor wears pearl earrings, a fashion which he apparently started only in 1614, when he records that he had his ears pierced. It is hardly therefore possible that the drawing may not be contemporary with the event depicted. It can hardly be later than 1615 however on stylistic grounds."
any problem because these are written later by an unformed hand. The identification of the Khan-i-Khanân is certainly inaccurate because the likeness of the bearded old man is different from that of the Khan-i-Khanân (Plate 105), and the latter did not accompany the emperor to Kabul. He may be identified with Qâzî 'Arîf, son of Mullâ Sâdiq Halwâî, who was appointed a few weeks earlier than Mir-i-'Adl and the Qâzî of Kabul by Jahângîr. 50

The picture is a fine example of Jahângîr's taste for accurate representation and realistic portraiture. The Chinese porcelain and glasses arranged in the niches, the novel design of the earpet, the factual depiction of the gifts of textile and jewellery arranged in trays, and the part of the Urta garden as shown beyond the new building on the right, all reveal the sharp eye of the painter for minute details. The picture is rightly attributed by Gray to Mahohar. 51

To the same painter is attributed by Percy Brown another wonderful picture illustrating the unusual scene of a fight between a spider and a snake 52, of which the emperor writes:

50. ibid, I, 104.
52. IPM, Pl. XIX.
As we were going along I saw near 'Ali Masjid and Gharib Khana a large spider of the size of a crab that had seized by the throat a snake of one and a half gaz in length and half strangled it. I delayed a minute to look on at this, and after a moment it died (the snake)\textit{sic}.^53

This much damaged picture is preserved in the Raza Library, Rampur, and shows the emperor riding on a horse watching the big crab like spider fighting with a black snake. The landscape is hilly as the royal party was then passing through the Khyber pass on its way to Lahore. A stream flowing through the valley shown in the background and the battlements of the fort of Kahmard in the foreground accurately indicate the place of the occurrence of this strange spectacle.

No picture of the part of the royal copy of \textit{Jahangirnama} dealing with the account of the next few years has been found, but a few miniatures describing several incidents that happened during these years are known. Possibly the painters were spending most of their time over this period in preparing the royal muragga's and adding new miniatures in old MSS. The most notable MS of this kind which incorporates miniatures describing events taking place

---

53. \textit{Tuzuk}, I. 117. The fort of Káhmard is described in the following page of the \textit{Tuzuk}. 
after the emperor came back to Lahore in early 1608 is the British Museum - Chester Beatty Dilān-i-Hâfiz, already discussed in detail,54 where we have tried to show that the court scene illustrated on f249a of the British Museum part (Plate 23) probably depicts some presentation scene taking place in the year 1608 when Râjâ Mân Singh was attending the court. The scene of religious dance painted on f66b55 may represent the samâ' and wajd dance of Shaikh Husain Sirhindî and Shaikh Mustaṣâqâ as described in the Tûzuk.56

The well-known picture of private audience within a garden in a hilly country, now in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London (Plate 73) is one of the finest of all Jahâṅgîrî group pictures.57 The likeness of the emperor, one of his sons, and sixteen leading nobles occupying the key positions in the administration are vigorous and animated. By virtue of minute observation and accurate depiction the individual likenesses have a stamp of authenticity and, in fact, we have adopted these portraits as our key. The name of the painter is not preserved but

54. Supra, Chapter IV.
55. PI, colour plate on p.101.
scholars like Gray and Stchoukine have attributed it to the most successful portraitist of the time, Manohar.  

It has not been possible to identify the interesting audience scene with any passage of the emperor's memoirs. Ivan Stchoukine made a detailed study of it and with the help of minute inscriptions written on their garments identified all the courtiers shown in it. The prince shown as handing over a cup of wine to the emperor, seated on a takht with the volume of Diwan-i-Hafiz in his left hand (which was his constant companion), is identified as Parwiz. Parwiz met the emperor late in 1606 near Lahore, after Khusrau's rebellion had been crushed. He was in favour with his father for some years, and in 1609 he was sent to the Deccan and did not again meet Jahangir before 1619, when he came from Allahabad and was received in a grand assembly. The most likely year the assembly depicted

58. AIP, 155 No.694; LPI, Pl. XXVIII.
59. I. Stchoukine, op.cit. Only in the case of the aged noble in brown standing near the left hand side of Jahangir there is no inscription. At first Stchoukine identified him as Raja Bhao Singh, but later correctly identified him with Raja Man Singh: Gazette des Beaux Arts, VI, 166-7.
60. supra, Chapters I & IV.
61. Tuzuk, I, 73, 74.
62. ibid, I, 156, (October).
63. ibid, II, 93 (June).
in the picture could have taken place is 1608, when both Râjâ Mân Singh and the Khân-i-Khânân were present in the court. However, the presence of Muqarrab Khan and Mîrzâ Ghâzi pose a problem because the former left for Cambay by the end of 1607 and the latter took leave from the emperor to join his assignment as the governor of Qandhar in January 1608. On the other hand, Râjâ Mân Singh arrived only a few days before the Naurûz festival in March 1608 and the Khân-i-Khânân did not come to Agra before August of that year. The only probable explanation of this discrepancy is that the picture was painted at a later date when the whereabouts of some of the nobles were not carefully checked by the artist. As the importance of Râjâ Mân Singh and the Khân-i-Khânân is likely to be more than others, the painting probably depicts some event that happened during 1608, when both of them were present in the court. It is difficult to ascribe a definite date for the time of its painting. From the absence of pearl ear-studs Ivan Stchoukine attributed it to the period between 1610-14, but probably it was painted much later. It is smaller in size (27 x 20 cm without border) than the Jahângîrnama miniatures and there is no reason to think that it was

64. JGM, 77-8; ETI, 88fn.
65. Tuzuk, I, 133.
66. ibid, I, 137-8; left in August: ibid, I, 148.
67. ibid, I, 147; left in November; ibid, I, 153.
painted during the time when the *Jahangîrnama* was being prepared. Again it is certainly later than 1614 because I'tiqâd Khân received the title Âsaf Khân only in 1614, and the names inscribed on the portraits appear to be contemporary with the picture. In all probability, the picture was prepared for a *muraqqa* at a time when many of the nobles represented in it were either dead (Râjâ Mân Singh, Jâfar Beg, Râjâ Râmdâs Kachhwaha, Mîrzâ Ghâzi were dead by 1614) or away from the court.

If we accept that the portrait of Parwîz in this group picture shows his likeness in 1608-9, then we may ascribe the same date to the additions made in the famous and intriguing picture "the Princes of the House of Tîmûr", because the likeness of Parwîz in this is strikingly similar (Plate 58). As we have noted before, this was the time when the emperor was taking interest in the collection of the library and picture gallery, selecting old MSS for further embellishing, and old miniatures for mounting on the royal *muraqqa*’s. 68 "The Princes of the House of Tîmûr"

68. *Supra*, Chapter IV.
is an important document of Mughal art. The gigantic composition is painted on fine linen in colours, whose mellow effects is still retained in spite of neglect and irreparable damage done to it. It was probably painted during the early years of Akbar’s reign by one or both of the émigré masters, Mîr Sayyid ‘Alî and Khwâja ‘Abd us-Samad. The likenesses of Humâyûn, Akbar, Jahângîr and Shâh Jahân seated within the central canopy were added later at different times. The portraits of Akbar and Humayun were probably added first, in the 1580s as Akbar looks middle-aged. Judging from their appearances the portraits of Jahângîr holding a choice falcon and his two sons Parwâz and Khurram seem likely to have been added during 1608-9. Shâh Jahân’s bearded portrait was included under the central canopy at a much later date; and to avoid duplication his earlier portrait, to the right of Humâyûn’s head, was purposely defaced.

A similar example of retouching at a later date is furnished by another well-known miniature, captioned on its lower border as Jahângîr contemplating the portrait of Akbar (Plate 51). The picture shows Jahângîr richly attired in costly clothes and valuable jewels and with a halo behind his profile, holding a jharoka - picture of his father, Akbar. Akbar looks old and fragile; he is dressed in pure white and holds a globe in his left hand. Two other inscriptions, one written under Jahângîr's arms, and other written at a later date on the lower mount make it possible to date this remarkable study. The first inscription reveals that the picture was originally painted by another artist (whose name is lost) when Jahângîr was in his thirtieth year and was retouched by Nâdir-uz-Zamân. That the retouchings were done after 1605 is sufficiently indicated by the inscription on the globe; and in all probability it was done in the year 1614, when Jahângîr saw Akbar in dream urging the release of 'Azîz Khân Khân-i-'Azam.

70. Musée Guimet, No.3676B.; LMI, 26-29, Pl.6.
71. "Shahibh-i hazrat 'Arsh Ashiyani 'amal-i-Nadir-uz-Zaman." Jahângîr explains in the opening pages of the Tuzuk (I,5) that the term 'Arsh ashyani is employed to refer to his father.
73. Tuzuk, I,269. Stchoukine assigns a similar date on the basis of Jahângîr pearl earring (LMI,27). Gray's date is "about 1615 AD" (AIP,157, No.706). S.C. Welch does not accept this dating and ascribes Circa 1599-1605 (AMT,167,Pl.29).
The portrait of Râjâ Sûraj Singh Râthôr (Plate 55) mounted on a folio of the part of royal muraqqa' now in Tübingen was painted by Bishandâs when the Râjâ came to the court in April, 1608, with a Rajput "Charan-poet", whose flattering verses very much pleased the emperor. Jahângîr, in his characteristic way, wrote on the miniature, "the work of Bishandâs, portrait of Râjâ Sûraj Singh, the maternal uncle of Khurram, who made a stay in the year 1017(Hijra)."

A few more portraits of this type may also have been painted by the leading portraitists, Manohar, Abu'l Hasan and Nânhâ, around this time, but to ascribe a definite date to Mughal portrait studies when they are not accompanied by a dated inscription is extremely hazardous. Almost equally problematic is another painting, produced in the larger format and found in the Raza Library, Ramâpur, showing a processional scene. Two gigantic elephants lead a procession of groups of musicians, dancers and footmen carrying standards and other items of regalia. The scene may be identified as one of the celebration of a royal marriage. Several marriages contracted by Parwîz and Khurram are mentioned in the Tuzuk  

74. Tuzuk, I, 140-1.  
75. IPM, Pl. XXXI (colour), also XLI fig.2 & LXII for two enlarged details. Brown dates it 1605.  
and this picture appears to describe the celebration of Khurram's marriage with I'tiqād Khān's (Åsaf Khan) daughter Arjumand Bānâ, later designated as Mumtâz Mahâll, held in April, 1912. The picture is signed by Manohar, but it shows certain features, especially in shadowing the faces of the girls in the lower right corner and the arrangement of the footmen and standard-bearers, which indicate a later date and show stylistic characteristics associated with painters like Govardhan. The group of dancing figures in the distant background, are, as pointed out by Wilkinson and Gray, directly derived from Flemish originals of the school of Breughel and the whole composition betrays an overwhelming European favour not noticeable in any of Manohar's later works.

---

77. ibid. I, 224-5.  
Jahāngīr's plan of having pictures of birds and beasts made for the Jahāngīrnama simultaneously with its writing has already been referred to. The wonderful study of the turkey-cock brought by Muqarrab Khān from Goa was prepared just after it was shown to the emperor in April 1612. Muqarrab Khān's choice was highly appreciated by the emperor who was attracted by the bird and incorporates a long description of it in the Jahāngīrnama. Mansūr's fascinating study not only fully illustrates the emperor's description, but also wonderfully expresses the majesty of the bird's movement. It is difficult to refrain from quoting Jahāngīr's description:

When it is in heat and displays itself, it spreads out its feathers like the peacock and dances about. Its beak and legs are like those of a cock. Its head and neck and the part under the throat are every minute of a different colour. When it is in heat it is quite red— one might say it had adorned itself with red coral — and after a while it becomes white in the same places, and looks like cotton. It sometimes looks of a turquoise colour. Like a chameleon it constantly changes colour. Two pieces of flesh it has on its head look like the comb of a cock. A strange thing is this, that when it is in heat the aforesaid piece of flesh hangs down to the length of a span from the top of its head like an elephant's trunk, and again when he raises it up it appears on its head like the horn of a rhinoceros, to the extent of two finger-breadths. Round its eyes it is always of a turquoise colour and does not change. Its feathers appear to be of various colours, differing from the colour of the peacock's feathers.

79. Supra, note 1.
Though it is virtually impossible to reproduce the full colour range of Mansûr's work, a fair idea of it can be had from the fine colour reproduction published by the Victoria and Albert Museum, where the original study bearing Mansûr's signature is preserved (Plate 96).  

Another version of the same bird is preserved in the Indian Museum, Calcutta. 82 Like the Victoria and Albert Museum example it also is mounted on a murâqqa' folio with wide-şâshiya of golden floral design and bears the royal seal of Jahângîr, but unlike the former it is not signed by Mansûr and there are certain very small but considerable difference in the minute designs of the feathers. The size of the Indian Museum picture is slightly larger and the floral shrubs in the foreground are replaced by grassy plants. But the drawing is so similar to the signed example that it would not be improbable to ascribe it to the same painter, who may have painted copy for Khurram at a slightly later date.

Jahângîr describes a monkey of a strange variety, also brought by Muqarrab Khan along with the turkey-cock in the same vein, but unfortunately no picture of it has survived. The wild pheasant called tazarû born in Jahângîr's


household and described in the same place\textsuperscript{83}, may be identified with the study of a pheasant standing in a hilly landscape, and signed by Ustād Mansūr (Plate 91) in the same album in the Victoria and Albert Museum.\textsuperscript{84} This picture may also be of the bird called \textit{jān-bahan} which was presented to the emperor in 1621 by Bāso'ī, the Zamindar of Talwāra\textsuperscript{85}, because the variety represented in the picture is of the Himalyan cheer pheasant family.\textsuperscript{86} Two other versions of this study are known to us, one in the Baron Maurice de Rothschild Collection\textsuperscript{87} and the other a reversed copy, obviously copied from a \textit{charba} in the wrong way, formerly in the hands of Bernard Quartich.\textsuperscript{88} None of these versions is signed by Mansūr, and the background differs in each case.

\textsuperscript{83} Tuzuk, I, 216-7.
\textsuperscript{84} Victoria and Albert Museum, No.IM 136-1921. Wantage Bequest. Signed: "'amal-i-Ustād Mansūr. The bird is painted in full colours in grey, brown bistre and white, while the background is painted in faint washes.
\textsuperscript{85} Tuzuk, II, 220.
\textsuperscript{86} Clarke, No.24, Pl. 16; AIP, 159, No.715.
\textsuperscript{87} IPM, Pl. MIV.
\textsuperscript{88} Martin, II, Pl. 220.
The royal party arrived Ajmer on 8 November, 1613 and the first act of the emperor was to visit the mausoleum of Khwâja Mu'âin-ud-dîn Chishti. During his stay of three years the emperor paid nine visits to the Khwâja shrine, including occasions when he presented a pair of huge cauldrons and held a large assembly, became an ear-bored disciple of the Khwâja by piercing his ears, or attended the "Urs" festival and watched religious dances. Three fine pictures preserve valuable documentary evidence of these visits.

The first one, in the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay, records the emperor's visit to the shrine to attend the "Urs" festival. The visit cannot be equated with the one made in the beginning of 1614 when the giant cauldron specially cast in the imperial workshops at Agra was donated by the emperor and enough food was cooked in it to satisfy five thousand poor and needy devotees, because both Khurram and Karan are shown in the picture and all are wearing shining pearl ear-rings. No other visit to Khwâja's shrine is mentioned in the memoirs when a similar assembly of needy and poor people were fed from the cauldron, so the incident

89. Tuzuk, I, 341.
90. Ibid, I, 256.
92. Ibid, I, 297.
93. Prince of Wales Museum of Western India, Bombay, No. 29.6257: Indian Art, Bombay, 1954, Pl. XXIII (colour).
94. Tuzuk, I, 256.
illustrated in the picture may be of some other visit which is not recorded. The picture is unsigned and definite marks of repainting are visible in it. It has been dated in the Catalogue c. 1613, which is not probable because Khurram and Karan did not come to Ajmer before March 1615.

The second picture, now preserved in the Victoria Memorial Hall, Calcutta (Plate 71)\(^{95}\), illustrates the emperor’s visit to the Khwâja shrine in August, 1615. The event is thus described in the \textit{Jahangîrnamâ}:

> On the night of Sunday, as it was the anniversary of the great Khwâja (Mu'inud-din), I went to his revered mausoleum, and remained there till midnight. The attendants and Sûfîs exhibited ecstatic states, and I gave the fakirs and attendants money with my own hand; altogether there were expended 6,000 rupees in cash, 100 Saub-Kurîa (a robe down to the ankles), 70 rosaries of pearls, coral and amber, etc.\(^{96}\)

The picture shows the emperor seated in European fashion on a throne and distributing money and gifts to an old bearded dervish, while others perform ecstatic dance to the accompaniment of music. The principal courtiers including \textit{I'timâd-ud-daula}, \textit{Aâsaf Khân}, Muqarrab Khân, \textit{Mâhâbat Khân}, \textit{Râjâ Bhâo Singh}, Khwâja Abu’l Hasan, \textit{Râjâ Sûraj Singh}, Khwâja Jahan, watch the spectacle. Prince Khurram, fresh from his success in Mewar, the vanquished Rajput Karan, and

\(^{95}\) \textit{JGM}, Pl. facing p. 84.
\(^{96}\) \textit{Tuzuk}, I, 297.
a Jesuit priest, very probably the old Florentine Father Corsi, are also to be seen. As it was a night assembly, the painter has showed the illuminated façade of the shrine with its domes and cupolas faintly visible in the background. This fine picture may have come from Abu'l Hasan's brush.

The other example showing the emperor's visit to the Khwâja shrine along with Khurram (Plate 76), now preserved in the Raja Library, Rampur, probably illustrates the event when a golden railing with lattice work was presented to the shrine. The visit is only briefly indicated in the Jahangîrnamâ with no description of the celebration. But the occasion cannot be any other than this because no other visit to the Khwâja shrine is described in the memoirs between Prince Karan's departure in April, 1616 and Khurram's departure for the Deccan in the November of the same year.

The miniature is unsigned and several problems arise while attributing it to any known painter. The meticulous rendering of the fort and palace in the distant background is similar to the style of Bishandâs, who painted the fascinating work, the House of Shaikh Phûl, in the Bharat Kala Bhawan (Plate 106). It can also be compared with the

97. IPM, Pl. XX.
98. Tuzuk, I, 329.
99. Ibid, I, 324.
100. Ibid, I, 337.
the fine domestic scene in the *Nafahat-al-Uns* MS attributed here to Daulat. In 1616 Bishandâs was away in Iran and he did not come back before the end of 1619; on the other hand, there is no concrete evidence to show Daulat’s presence in Ajmer during this time. Though the aged Shaikh with long white beard is painted in a superb independent study by Manohar, the likenesses of both Jahângir and Shâh Jahân are too weak, and cannot be ascribed to that wonderful and experienced portraitist.

Three other miniatures preserved in different collections, show both Khurram and Karam, and faithfully illustrate events described in the *Jahângîrînâma*. Khurram received a tumultuous welcome when he returned victorious from his Mewar campaign in 1615. Karan accompanied Khurram and stayed for some months in the Mughal court. During this short period Jahângîr in his attempt to woo the warlike Rajput showed him much favours and showered heaps of presents on Karan. The well-known miniature of lion hunt in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (Plate 72) is one example when the emperor wanted to impress the Rajput prince by exhibiting

101. British Museum, Or 1362, f142a: PI, colour plate on p.97;
Supra,
102. Lala Radhamohan Lal Collection, Jaipur. Mounted on a *muraqqa* folio similar to those of the Minto Album and bears a seal of Jahângîr on the floral *hâshiya*. Signed: Manohar Banda: Kanwar Sain, "A Note on Five Rare Old Paintings of the Moghul School," *JPHS*, IX, Pt II (Calcutta, 1925), 161-171, Pl. I. Mr. Sain identifies the Mullâ with Jahângîr in the pose of a saint!! The Mullâ is no other than Shâh Shabir Ahmad of Ajmer. Cf Plate 107.
his skill in hunting.  

The identification of the second picture (Plate 65) is made easy by the preservation of a part of the text at its top, which gives the correct description of the scene:

On the 13th [Tir] took place the meeting of the festival of the Ab-pashan (rose-water scattering), and the servants of the Court amused themselves with sprinkling rose-water over each other.  

The picture is signed by Govardhan and is preserved in the Raza Library, Rampur. Brown's identification of the scene with celebration of the previous year is however wrong, because Khurram and Karan who are shown in the picture, were not present at that time. The life size representations of two Portuguese soldiers on the back wall provide a remarkable feature, which indicates that pictures on European subject were painted on the walls of palaces and royal abodes, whenever it might have been. The designs of the golden throne on which the emperor sits and of the pillow on which he rests his body are also novel.

104. Tuzuk, I, 295.
105. IPM, Frontispiece (colour).
107. Infra, Chapter XII. Cf Nur Jahân's reception scene discussed below. Clarke, Pl. 7; R. Ettinghausen, Peremtæae, Figs. 2-3.
The third known group picture prepared at Ajmer during this time is an allegorical work painted by Abu'l Hasan (Plate 75). This is an important work requiring further enquiry, which will be made at a subsequent stage.¹⁰⁸

A number of portraits of officers and important visitors, and known events painted before Jahāngīr left for Mandu, are preserved in different collections. Probably these were not meant to be used as illustrations to the Jahāngīrnama, because they are smaller in size, and they only preserve the bare likenesses of the persons concerned. Probably they were meant for the murāqqa's in which they are found.

One of these portrait-studies records the visit of Khurram's maternal uncle Rājā Sūraj Singh Rāthōr, (Plate 55) noted above. A few other portraits are found in the "Berlin Album" which were painted during this time. The young and handsome 'Abd-al-Wahhāb, son of Akbar's learned physician Ḥākim 'Alī, mounted on folio 4b¹⁰⁹ may record his arrival from Burhānpur in 1609 with a group of Karnatic jugglers.¹¹⁰ The jugglers impressed the emperor

¹⁰⁸. infra, Chapter X.
¹⁰⁹. IBP, Pl 5 (colour). For a portrait of Ḥākim 'Alī, inscribed by Jahāngīr and painted by Manohar:
Y. Godard, Athar-e-Iran, 1937, fig. 106.
¹¹⁰. Tuzuk, I, 143.
by showing various tricks and games. A group of female acrobats and jugglers are in fact illustrated on the hashiya of a folio of the "Gulshan Album."\textsuperscript{111} Painters were ready at hand on that day as the emperor mentions ordering them to take a likeness of a strange and ugly tailless monkey called deonāk, brought by a dervish from Ceylon,\textsuperscript{112} so it is probable that the acrobats were painted at the same time.

The portraits of Bakhtār Khān Kalāwānt, prince Karam and the wrestler called Fil Šafīd, found in the Berlin Album are also to be included in this category. The portrait of Bakhtār Khān clearly corresponds with his visiting to the Mughal court in 1615,\textsuperscript{113} because the autograph note of Jahāngīr written on the picture itself (Plate 57) reads, "Year 1024, portrait of Bakhtār Khān Kalāwānt who is the son-in-law of 'Adil Khān. He made his obeisance on arriving in Ajmer." The text of the Tāzuk describe the visit in the following way:

\textsuperscript{111} H. Goetz, East & West, 1957, No.2, Pl. VIII; Perzische Miniaturen..., The Hague, 1957, No.49, Pl. 5.
\textsuperscript{112} Tuzuk, I, 143.
\textsuperscript{113} ibid, I, 271-2. The portrait is mounted on f4b. IBP, 9 & 21, Pl. 8 (colour).
In the same days Bakhtar Khān Kalawant, who was closely connected with 'Ādil Khān, inasmuch as he ('Ādil) married his own brother's daughter to him, and made him his preceptor in singing and dūrpat guftān, appeared in the habit of a dervish. Summoning him and enquiring into his circumstances I endeavoured to honour him...  

A wonderful portrait of Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh himself was painted by Farrukh Beg and was prominently displayed in the royal muraqqa' (Plate 37). As has been indicated elsewhere, the origin of Farrukh Beg's superb study seems to be a Deccani work presented by the Bijapuri ruler through his own envoys or through Mīr Jamāl-ud-dīn Husain Injū who returned from Bijapur in early 1610. A fine portrait of Jahāngīr dressed in a long flowing Deccanese costume and holding a bow and arrow may be regarded as a further example of the result of this mutual reciprocation. In this picture the emperor wearing the pearl ear-studs, and the caption at the top styles him as Salīm, not as Jahāngīr. It is difficult to say whether it is a Deccanese copy of a Mughal original or a Mughal work showing the emperor wearing a Deccanese costume. This can hardly be the portrait which was...  

114. Tuzuk, I, 271.  
115. Infra, Chapter VIII.  
118. Jahāngīr took a fancy in wearing dresses of different types when he was presented with such dressed: Cf: Roe, 427, et passim.
sent to Ibrāhīm 'Adil Shāh with the emperor's autograph note in 1618.\textsuperscript{119}

The portrait of prince Karan mounted in the Berlin Album\textsuperscript{12} was probably painted during his stay at the Court between March 1615 and April 1616.\textsuperscript{121} The painting is unsigned. Another portrait of Karan, where he is shown slightly older, is preserved in the Nāṣīr-ud-dīn Album.\textsuperscript{122} This portrait is painted by Abu'l Ḥasan. The picture of the wrestler called "Fil Safīd", the White Elephant (Plate 83) may also be assigned to this period. Jahāngīr does not refer to any wrestler of this name in the Tāzuk,\textsuperscript{123} but writes of an expert wrestler of Mugal lineage named Shīr 'Alī, who was born and brought up in Bijapur and was sent to the court by Ibrāhīm 'Adil Shāh in 1616.\textsuperscript{124} He defeated the best court wrestlers by his skill and was retained by Jahāngīr in his service. But the title given to him was "the athlete of the Capital", not Fil Safīd, so it seems that our portrait probably depicts the Chief court

\textsuperscript{119} Tuzuk, II, 36-7.
\textsuperscript{120} f22b: IBP, Pl. 35.
\textsuperscript{121} Tuzuk, I, 277. He left for home (I,293), returned to the court again in March 1616 (I,317). He left Ajmer in the following month for his marriage (I,324).
\textsuperscript{122} Y. Godard, Athar-e-Iran, 1937, Fig. 81. There is another portrait of Karan in the Museum of Ethnology, Berlin (No.I.C.24345,f7a): IBP,22. Unpublished.
\textsuperscript{123} Tuzuk, I, 329. The translation of the line "be-dargāhī ḍashtū shīr Fil marhammat shod", may also be, "rewards was given on the house of the wrestler named Fil."
\textsuperscript{124} Tuzuk, I, 335.
wrestler, painted by Manohar. From the Rothenstein
Collection now it has come to the Victoria and Albert
Museum.125 The swordsmen painted on the hâshiya of f20a
of the Berlin Album may be identified with the swordsmen
who were invited by Jahângîr to come to Ajmer from Bijapur.126

A set of portraits of the member of the royal family
was also painted by the royal artists. Two of them are to
be found in the Berlin Album and two others in later albums.
The first of them shows Jahângîr standing facing right
(Plate 56) where a portrait of his father curiously dressed
in a kilt-like garment and a thin chaddar covering his bare
upper body is painted.127 As Jahângîr does not wear the
pearl ear-ring, the picture may rightly be assigned to a
pre-1614 date, but not much earlier, because his appearance
favourably compares with the Jahângîrââma illustrations
discussed above.128

The other portrait found in the Berlin Album is that
of prince Khursâau, Jahângîr's ill-fated eldest son.129 The

125. No. I.S.217-1951. L. Binyon, "Indian Painting at
Wembley: The Retrospective Exhibition; Râpam,
No.21, (Calcutta, 1925), Pl. I.
126. Tuzuk, I, 335. IBP, Pl.18 (detail in colour), 22.
127. f18b: IBP, Pl.36b.
128. Cf Plates 71, 73, 76 etc.
129. f23a. Kühnel & Goetz make no mention of this picture
in IBP. The portrait is to be found with three
others, of the Khân-i-Khânân, Jassâ Jâm and Râo
Bhâro, all inscribed and dated. Plates 54, 103.
For the picture of Jassâ Jâm: IBP, Pl.37 (lower).
portrait was not so far identified, but from a casual reference made by Roe it can now be identified with certainty. The prince, dressed in white and sporting a thick
gown beard, seated on an ordinary mat or bedspread with designed borders and resting on a red takīyā. His likeness is strikingly similar to Jahāngīr, but he cannot be Jahāngīr because Jahāngīr never grew beard and his portraits are far too well-known. In his account of 3rd February 1617, Roe records his meeting with "Sultan Corsoronne, the king's eldest restrained sonne". Roe writes: "His [Khusrau's] person is good and countenance cheerfull; his beard growne to his girdle."\textsuperscript{130} From the genealogical picture in the Rothschild Collection (Plate 53) the similarity of Khusrau's facial features with those of his father is apparent. So, here we have a rare portrait-study of Khusrau. Only a month before Roe's meeting with Khusrau he recorded rumours about Khusrau's entente with Āṣaf Khan in his diary.\textsuperscript{131}

The other portraits are of Shâh Jahan and Shahriyār. The picture of Shâh Jahan was painted by Abu'l Hasan (Plate 60) and Shâh Jahan himself writes on the lower

\textsuperscript{130} Tuzuk, I, 342.
\textsuperscript{131} Ibid, I, 325.
mount that this good portrait of him in his 25th year was painted by Nādir-uz-Zamān. Shāh Jahān was born on 5 January, 1592, and his 25th birthday was celebrated with pomp and ceremony in 1616, when he was weighed and given the first cup of wine by his father. The title Shāh Sultan was given later that year when he left for the Deccan, but the title Shāh Jahān was given only in the following October. So, it appears that Abu’l Hasan Nādir-uz-Zamān added the halo, the words "Shāh Jahān" and "the auspicious portrait of the qibla and the lord of mankind" and his own signature with the usual appellation, only after Shāh Jahān became emperor, probably when the muraqqa' was being prepared.

The portrait of Shahriyar mounted in the Nāṣir-ud-din Album, is unsigned and undated, but it shows similar floral background and stylistic quality, as seen in Shāh Jahān's portrait.

On his way to Mandu the royal party made a halt at Ujjain in February 1617, because the emperor was eager to meet the celebrated Hindu Sanyāsī and Vedantic scholar Gosvāmi Chidrup. The Emperor was highly impressed and

132. ibid, I, 306f.
133. ibid, I, 338.
134. ibid, I, 395.
136. Y. Godard, op.cit., fig. 101.
137. Tuzuk, I, 355-7: Roe, 343, entry of 11 February 1617.
met him again on two occasions when the imperial party was returning to Agra in December 1618\(^{138}\), and again in the following October, at Mathura\(^{139}\). It is not possible to say which of these interviews is illustrated in the fine unsigned picture in the Musée Guimet (Plate 79)\(^{140}\), but surely it illustrates one of the three meetings held at the humble cave-like dwelling place of the Sanyāśi on the bank of Kāliyādāhā, near Ujjain, parts of which are visible in it.

Khurram's short stay in the Deccan was profitable because for the time being it created considerable political stability. However, the emperor became overwhelmed, and exaggerated his son's modest achievement to a great extent. When the victorious prince made his triumphant return in October 1617 to the court, then sitting at Mandu, the emperor accorded him a warm welcome:

> After he had performed the dues of salutation and kissing the ground, I called him up into the jharokha, and with exceeding kindness and uncontrolled delight rose from my place and held him in the embrace of affection.\(^{141}\)

---

The famous elephant Sarnāg and a box of jewels sent by 'Adil Shāh were presented to the emperor and the prince received the high rank of 20,000 रुपये and 10,000 शाहजहां and the lofty title Shāh Jahān. Three pictures, an unfinished and much damaged sketch in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston and two disputed miniatures of identical subject in the Victoria and Albert Museum and the Freer Gallery of Art, vividly illustrate the events. The first one, an inscribed brush drawing, shows the emperor embracing his son. The face of the prince is a replica of the face in the portrait painted at the age of 25 in the Victoria and Albert Museum (Plate 60). The likenesses of the nobles as well as the portrait of the great elephant renamed after a few days as Nūr-bakht are sensitively rendered. Coomaraswamy makes a very objective analysis of the picture and two other versions of the same theme. The India Office Library version signed by

142. ibid, I, 395.
143. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, No.17.2696: Cat-MFA, VI, Pl. XXXIII.
146. Tuzuk, I, 395-6.
147. Cat-MFA, VI, 43-4.
148. India Office Library, London, Johnson Album IV: J.V.S. Wilkinson, Mughal Painting, London, 1948, Pl.7 (colour); IPM, Pl.LVIII; AIP, 161-2, No.732. A finished miniature painted by Murār is found in Windsor Castle Shāh Jahān-nāma, which is based on this drawing.
Râjâ Manohar Singh, an unfamiliar name, seems to be a late copy, where the description of the present subject has been unsuccessfully altered by a weak artist.

The other picture shows the prince attending the entertainment party given by the empress Nûr Jâhnân, held a week after the prince's arrival. The list of Nûr Jâhnân's gift included a fabulous array of costly jewels, ornaments and dresses. Two versions of this picture are known, one in the Wantage Bequest, Victoria & Albert Museum, and the other in Freer Gallery of Art. Both of them have been discarded as late copies, but there is little ground to reject the Freer version as an 18th century copy of a 17th century original. It appears to be an authentic and stylistically a first class work giving an intimate view of the zanâna. The rich carpets of novel designs, the picture of Christ and Virgin along with of birds, beasts and trees on the outer wall of the pavilion, the portraiture of the emperor and Shâh Jâhnân, and garden setting, with every detail, have been carefully rendered. There is no reason to discard it as it shows a zanâna scene.

149. Tuzuk, I, 396-7.
150. Notes 144, 145 Supra.
151. Moti Chandra, Technique of Mughal Painting, Lucknow, 1945; Ettinghausen, op. cit., 391 fn31.
For the enlightened empress[^152] who could shoot a lion with a single shot, cure her husband's maladies when the recognised physicians had given up hopes of cure, send an envoy to Turan[^153], design dresses and ornaments, form new rules and take up the reins of the empire virtually in her own hand at the time of the emperor's physical crisis, it was not impossible to break old conventions and create new ones. Thus in this picture we get an authentic glimpse of the Mughal zanâna, and a likeness of Nur Jahan. The portrait of a beautiful lady standing with a flower in her hand, found in the Nasir-ud-din Album, can be identified with the help of this picture as Nur Jahan's[^154]. Incidentally the jade wine cup which she offers to her husband is of a shape similar to an example in the British Museum, inscribed with the name of Shâh Jahân and dated 1647[^155].

Once Shâh Jahân established some kind of suzerainty over the Sultanates of the Deccan, the purpose of Jahangir's journey to the south was served. As the emperor wanted to see the salt sea and make a sight-seeing trip, and also to hunt elephant in the "elephant-Khedas" at Dohad, the royal

[^152]: Beniprasad, Chapter VIII.
[^153]: Tuzuk, II, 205.
[^154]: Y. Godard, op.cit., 254, f56, fig. 102.
party moved westwards from Mandu. A large number of pictures, mostly portraits of officers and vassal chiefs visiting Jahangir’s travelling court, is preserved. Quite a few of them are autographed by the emperor and some of them are mounted in the Berlin Album. The portraits of Rao Bhâroî, the chieftain of Kachh and 'Abdur-Rahîm Khân-i-Khânân (Plate 105) are also dated.

In March 1618 the emperor presented the shaikhs and learned men of Gujarat, who were accompanying the royal party, in compliance with the royal wish, various gifts including books on religious subjects:

To each of them I gave a book from my special library, such as the Tafsîr-i-Kashshâf, the Tafsîr-i-Husainî, and the Rauza-i-ul-ahbâb. I wrote on the back of the books the day of my arrival in Gujarat and the day of presentation of the books. 156

A Freer Gallery miniature157 accurately portrays the event (Plate 74). The emperor is seated under a large canopy within an enclosure of sâyâbâns erected in the manner described in the A‘în-i-Akbarî158 and shown as presenting books to Shaikh Haider, Sayyid Muḥammad and the sons of Shaikh Wajîhuddîn. The old noble standing with a book near

156. Tuzuk, I, 439-40.
158. Ain, I, 47, 55-7
the emperor seems to be Shaikh Ahmad, the Sadr, who was in charge of religious administration.\footnote{159} The picture is not signed, but may be assigned to either of the three masters accompanying the emperor, Manohar, Abu’l Hasan and Govardhan. It is difficult to agree with Ettinghausen's identification\footnote{160} of the Persian envoys, who were present in the Mughal Court\footnote{161}, with imaginary portraits of foreign kings.

The portraits of Jassâ Jâm\footnote{162}, Râo Bhâro (Plate 54)\footnote{163} the Khân-i-Khânân (Plate 101)\footnote{164} and 'Abdulla Khan\footnote{165}, collected in the Berlin Album, the portraits of the Dying Man, correctly identified as the dying noble 'Inâyat Khân,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Tuzuk}, I, 419, 426, 440.
\item Ettinghausen, "The Emperor's Choice", 113.
\item Roe, passim.
\item Berlin Album f23a Painted by Nâdir-uz-Zamân \textit{IBP}, 10, 21-2, Pl. 37.
\item ibid, f23a; painted by Govardhan; \textit{IBP}, 10, 21, Pl.36. The portrait is inscribed in Jahangir's hand: "Portrait of Râo Bâhram, Prince of the land of Kachh, painted by Govardhan in the 13th year, that is 1027 (1617/8). He came to the town of Ahmadabad to pay his respect to Hazrât Nûr-ud-dîn Jâhânâr, son of Akbar Bâdshâh. The aforesaid Bâhram is the most important of the princes of the provinces of Gujarat and never yet appeared before any of the rulers of the land." Also: \textit{Tuzuk}, II, 19.
\item Berlin Album, f23a. Painted by Manohar: \textit{IBP}, 19-20, Pl.36.
\item ibid, f4b; \textit{IBP}, 18-19, Pl.6.
\end{itemize}
in the Bodleian Library (Plate 81)\(^{166}\) and the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (Plate 82)\(^{167}\) were painted when they came to the court. The pictures of Jahângîr receiving a pair of pearls from the Khân-i-Khânân, painted by Hashim,\(^{168}\) of the emperor seated on a throne in the European fashion under a canopy with old I'timâd-ud-daula standing before him, painted by Manohar,\(^{169}\) and the superb double portrait of Râo Bhâro and Jassâ Jâm, painted by Bishandâs,\(^{170}\), all found in muraqqâs compiled by Shâh Jahân, seem to be based on contemporary charbas and prepared at a slightly later date, because Bishandâs came back from Iran in late 1619.\(^{171}\)

The portrait of the dying noble 'Inayât Khân is truly regarded as one of the supreme achievements of Mughal painting.

---

169. ibid, Lot 108. See also: M. Dimand, "An Exhibition of Islamic and Indian Paintings", Bull-Met., XIV, 2953 Pl. 96. The picture is signed by Manohar banda Jahângîr-Shâft.
171. Tuzük, II, 115, 120.
and a great drawing of all times. The preliminary drawing representing the Khan in the last stage of emaciation only a day before his death (Plate 82) can easily be regarded as an example of the remarkable artistic ability of the great master whose name is unfortunately lost. The emperor was overawed at the wretched condition of his favourite noble when he was brought before him in a palanquin and writes:

He appeared so low and weak that I was astonished. "He was skin drawn over bones". Or rather his bones, too had dissolved. Though painters have striven much in drawing an emaciated face, yet I have never seen anything like this, nor even approaching to it. Good God, can a son of man come to such a shape and fashion? ... As it was a very extraordinary case I directed painters to take his portrait.....Next day he travelled the road of non-existence.

The coloured version (Plate 81) takes away much of the strength and vigour of the sensitive and extremely powerful lines of Boston drawing, but, nevertheless, the expression of death-agony can hardly be surpassed.

172. A.K. Coomaraswamy in Cat-MFA, VI, 42; R. Ettinghausen in Ira Moskowitz, ed., Great Drawings of All Times, VI, New York, 1962, Pl. 877 (colour); E. Schroeder in Art and Thought, op. cit., 73-86; L. Binyon, Spirit of Man in Asian Art, London, 1935, etc. etc.
173. Tuzuk, II, 44.
Jahangir's intention to watch elephant-trapping in the mountainous regions near Dohad originated from his active interest in elephants. The Tūzuk is full of long descriptions of elephants either in his possession or presented to him from time to time. The royal diarist not only minutely describes them and their behaviours but gives their names, dimensions, value and in some instances even their history. A number of fine pictures of majestic elephants definitely coming from Jahangir's time still survive, and some of them may easily be compared with the great elephants associated with the life of his brave father whose fondness to the noble animal is almost proverbial. 174 Probably the earliest of these Jahangiri elephant portraits is the picture of a white elephant, in the collection of the Bharat Kala Bhavan. 175 Jahangir refers to a number of albino birds and beasts in the Tūzuk, 176 but he does not mention any white elephant, and a white elephant is such a great rarity that he is not likely to forget mentioning it. Stylistically the majestic white elephant in Benaras belong to the early 17th century,

174. AN, passim; Tuzuk, II, 18, 41-2, Cf IPM Pl. XXXIX; LPI, Pl. XVI, XVII, XVIII.
176. Tuzuk, I, 139-40.
and as Moti Chandra has shown, it probably depicts an imaginary portrait of the unique white elephant in the possession of the King of Arakan. The great and dignified animals standing under a canopy while his keepers prepare his food, in the Indian Museum, Calcutta (Plate 103) is named Gaj-Ratan, in a contemporary inscription \(^\text{177}\). The more interesting points of this picture are that it is painted on linen and shows part of an Akbari-type landscape at the top. Landscape of a comparable nature is also to be seen in a large picture showing two magpies, mounted on a folio of the Berlin Album, which is again painted on linen. \(^\text{178}\)

Two more large pictures of elephants of excellent quality painted on linen are found in the Lady Harringham Bequest, Bedford College, London \(^\text{179}\) and the National Museum of India. \(^\text{180}\)

---

177. Indian Museum, Calcutta, No.R.647. Unpublished. This elephant may be identified as the one presented by Ratan, son of Bhojahara, in March 1608: \textit{Tuzuk}, I, 140. It was subsequently presented to Khan Jahân in 1621: \textit{ibid}, II, 209. Another elephant of a similar name, Ratan Gaj, was presented to prince Parwiz in 1623: \textit{ibid}, II, 260.

178. \textit{Jahangir Album}, now in the University Library, Tübingen, f17b, \textit{IBP}, Pl.10. There is a picture of a rooster and chicken in the British Museum (No.1953-2-14-02; \textit{AIP}, 155, No.697) and picture of short-tailed partridge in the H. Vever Collection, Paris (\textit{LPI}, Pl. XXVIb), which are painted on linen.

179. B. Gray, "A New Mughal Painting on stuff," \textit{ArsIslamica}, IV, [Ann Arbor, 1937], 459-61, 2 figs.

180. \textit{AMI}, 168, No.36.
The Bedford College picture shows an enormous elephant marching at the head of six other elephants and a calf. The subject-matter has been identified by Gray as the triumphant return of a young prince, probably Salim, from a military exploit and dated 1585-90. Whatever may be the subject-matter, the majesty of the giant elephant is remarkably rendered in the picture. The National Museum picture (Plate 102) portrays the famous 'Alam Guman, the chief elephant of Rana Amar Singh, which was captured by Khurram and sent to Jahangir at the time of the Nauruz of 1614. It was very much approved by the emperor, who himself probably wrote the details on the picture. Unfortunately the name of the artist is damaged and cannot be read. Portraits of two other elephants are to be found in the royal murqqa's, one in the Gulshan part and the other in the Berlin part. In each case the animals are

182. Tuzuk, I, 259, 260. Another elephant of the same name was presented to Rana Man Singh in 1610; ibid. I, 170.
183. The inscription is believed to be written by Jahangir (S. Digby IC, XXXVII, No.4, 293), but the handwriting is rather neat, and not very similar to his other autographs.
185. f24b. IBP, Pl. 34.
sensitively portrayed by artists whose names are not preserved. Considering the time when many of the portraits found in the Berlin Album were painted, the elephant is shown as being harnessed seems to be the giant named by Jahângîr as Pâvan and described by him as "the pick of my catch". 186

The memoirs were regularly kept for a few more years but it becomes increasingly difficult to trace miniatures accurately illustrating the written text. The emperor was taking more interest in animal pictures and a great many of them were prepared in the following years. He looked at the flowers and fruits, birds and beasts, rivers and mountains more carefully than before, and was not feeling flattered by eulogies and costly presents given by the nobles. Painters were of course included in the royal entourage and Mansûr was specifically singled out by the emperor for painting hundreds of pictures of the numerous varieties of rare and beautiful flowers found in the Vale of Kashmîr. His painting style will be studied in appropriate details in a later chapter. 187.

186. Tuzuk, II, 18. Of a very large number of fine elephant portraits found throughout the world the following ones appear to have been painted in Jahângîr's time:

a. Indian Museum, R.8b., IPM, Pl.LVI; AIP, 162, No.734. Painted by Bichitf in 1620/1. The name of the elephant is given as Iqbal.


c. Sitaram Sahu Collection, Benaras; N.C. Mehta, Studies in Indian Painting, Pl.47 (colour).

187. infra, Chapter VIII.
Brief notice of five pictures depicting some happenings occurring during this time should be made here. One of them is a very large composition showing 67 courtiers, nobles and other selected persons, and is in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (Plate 80). It is an important document because the portraits of many of these nobles are identified by contemporary inscriptions. But the exact occasion when such a large number of courtiers and both Parwiz and Shâh Jahân assembled remain undecided. The picture is well-known for more than half a century and reproduced for numerous times. Stchoukine made a detailed study of this picture and identified the scene as the public reception of Parwiz given on 9th June 1619. But the passage in the Tuzuk describing Parwiz's arrival hardly pre-supposes such a lofty assembly and, as Stchoukine has rightly shown, many of the nobles shown in the picture were either dead or away from the court at that time. The inscription regrettably enough cut off by some unwary binder, only the words "'amal-i-Kamtarîn-i-Khânazâdân" can be read now. Curiously enough, the words have always

191. Tuzuk, II, 93.
been taken by scholars to denote the presence of more than one painter, whereas the appellation has been repeatedly used by Daulat and Abu'l Hasan before their names. It seems from what is left of the inscription that Abu'l Hasan was the painter of this remarkable assembly.

The picture of Jamângir's pilgrimage to his father's mausoleum (Plate 78) seems to illustrate the visit the emperor made in early 1619 after coming back from his tour. The picture is of excellent quality with a subdued colour-scheme, accurate portrait-studies of the principal nobles and a wonderful sense of optical perspective. The arrangement of the standard-bearers and footmen is comparable with Manohar's work in the Rampur Library. The figure of the prisoner brought before the emperor closely resembles the figure of a prisoner in a Gulistân illustration, now in the S.C. Welch Collection.

192. Gray writes: "The remains of a signature indicate that the painters were two (or more) Khânahzade (Palace-born) artists. The part may be attributed to Abu'l Hasan Nâdir al-Zamân." AIP, 161, No. 729. Stchoukine suggests Abu'l Hasan Nâdir al-Zamân & Daulat; op.cit. 229; Coomaraswamy thinks Abu'l Hasan and Manohar: Cat-MFA, VI, 44; supported by S.C. Welch, AMI, 167.
193. infra, Chapter VIII.
194. J.V.S. Wilkinson, Mughal Painting, Pl. 5 (colour); AIP, 161, No. 730.
196. IPM, Pl. XXXI (colour).
above. Both figures have been adopted from some European St. Sebastian figure with the arrows removed from his body. The later work has been attributed to Manohar, and this picture may also be attributed to him.

The picture of Jahângîr's celebrating the "holi" festival in the company of Nûr Jâhân and the member of the zanâne in the Chester Beatty Library may depict the celebrations of the 'feast of Basant-bârî' as described in the Tûzuk. It was the day when a valuable pearl and a ruby lost by Nûr Jâhân during hunting were found, the news of the defeat of Sûraj Mâl arrived and coincided with the day of the emperor's lunar weighing. The other two pictures, one showing the emperor and infant prince Shuja painted by Hashim, to be found in the Nâsir-ud-dîn Album and the other showing Shâh Jâhân riding in a hilly country with his son Dârà, in the Victoria and Albert Museum (Plate 84) were painted in Kashmir when the imperial party was travelling there. The latter one is a superior work

197. Supra, Chapter IV; AMI, Pl.25 (upper); S.C. Welch, AO, III, 142; E. Grube, The World of Islam, Pl. 100 (colour).
198. Chester Beatty Library, Dublin, Album 7, f4: Cat-CB, I, 28; III, Pl.56.
199. Tûzuk, II, 74.
200. Y. Godard, Athar-e-Iran, 1937, fig. 70.
showing good likeness of Shâh Jahân and his handsome young son Dârâ Shukoh, painted by Manohar and the pink coloured hills appear to be the mountain range beyond the Dâl Lake. W.G. Archer thinks that originally the picture showed Jahângîr and Shâh Jahân, which was at a later date repainted in the present fashion. The basis of Archer's theory is the minute signature of Morâr who retouched the faces. Morâr or Murâr (not Murâd as thought by Archer and Gray) is a Shân Jahânî painter who started working in the end of Jahângîr's reign when he painted a number of miniatures including the portrait of Maktûb Khân (Plate 104) in the Victoria Memorial Hall, Calcutta. He is responsible for the large group picture in the Windsor Castle Pâdishâhnâma showing Shâh Jahân's leave taking. But Archer's theory is not warranted by fact and minor retouching of faces was a standard practice in Mughal art (Cf: Plate 51).

204. AIP, 162, No.732; Y. Godard, op.cit., fig. 103, 104.
CHAPTER 8

The Leading Painters of Jahângîr

No Abu'l Fazîl has kept any record of the leading painters working in Jahângîr's time or give any information about their activities. Only the emperor himself makes a few passing references to his painters giving their names and fields of specialisation in the Tûzuk, which help us in a very modest way to start with. Jahângîr's practice of having pictures of specific events or persons or things made by his leading painters working alone helped them to develop their own styles, and it is not impossible to trace the individual styles of a few painters, especially of Farrukh Beg, Daulat, Manohar, Mansûr, Bishandâs and Abu'l Hasan. The names of Nanha, Bichitr and Govardhan also come to the mind but pictures indicative of their individual styles are by no means sufficient for a critical assessment.

Of the six leading painters the names of Daulat and Manohar are not mentioned by Jahângîr in the Tûzuk. The omission of Manohar's name is surprising because a majority of the remarkable portrait studies and court groups come from his brush, and the exquisite quality of these portraits and their sheer quantity easily prove the emperor's reliance
on his abilities. The omission of Daulat's name is also puzzling because the artist emphatically mentions on more than one occasion the emperor's command for drawing portraits of the leading painters, including his own. Farrukh Beg is mentioned in the Tuzuk only once, in a routine list of the recipients of his favour. The adjective used by him, "muṣawwir ke aj bībadlān 'aṣr ast"¹, "the painter who is unrivalled in the age"², is however revealing. The name of Ḥaq Rizā, whose works have already been examined in details in Chapter III, is referred to by the emperor in a somewhat perfunctory way.³ The remarks made by him on Abu'l Hasan, Mansūr and Bishandās are, on the other hand, more specific.⁴ The importance of two of them, Abu'l Hasan and Bishandās, along with of Manohar, Govardhan and Daulat is however acknowledged in the emperor's decision to have them portrayed on the ḥāshiya of the royal muraqqa' (Plates 40-43). Two other portraits of painters at work are preserved in the Berlin Album,⁵ and in at least three

[1] Syud Ahmud's text, p. 76.
[5] f21a: IBP, Pl.59a, b. The identity of these painters remain uncertain. One of them is old and wears pince-nez and is shown as drawing the picture of Madonna. He has been identified by Maclagan as Keśāvadās (JGM, 251) but without any convincing reason. The other painter is shown as painting a landscape scene, and may be identified as Mansūr, who was very much active in the time of the compilation of the muraqqa'.
occasions painters are shown as presenting their works to Jahângîr. 6 Karl Khandalvala mentions a self-portrait of Farrukh Beg in the collection of A.C. Ardeshir. 7 The leading painters of Jahângîr's time probably enjoyed a better status in the Mughal hierarchy: the reported remarks of the sharp-tongued 'Azîz Khân Kôkâ to Muḥammad Sharîf were made because Sharîf's elevation to the post of Amîr-ul-umârâ aroused fierce jealousy in the court. 8 From the evidence of Roe it seems that the painters enjoyed a considerable position. 9

6. India Office Library, Johnson Album XXVII f 10; H. Goetz, Bilderatlas..., Pl. 135; AIP, 158, No.712. Cabinet des Estampes, Paris, No.OD 49 f 40: LPI, Pl. XXIV b. There is another picture pasted on f 21a of the Berlin Album which shows an old man stooping down to present a portrait, apparently his own. This is neither described nor reproduced in IBP.


8. Quoted in Beniprasad, 122 fn 12, and Cat-CB, I, p. XXV. The remark made by 'Azîz Kôkâ is: "I say Nawàb, you do not seem to be my friend. Now your father 'Abd us-Samad the mulla, was much attached to me. He was the man that painted the very walls of the room we sit in."

Farrukh Beg

Farrukh Beg was already working for twenty years when Jahāngīr ascended the throne in 1605. He contributed in such major Akbari MSS as the Victoria & Albert Museum Akbarnama, the Bankipur Timūrnāma, the Ardeshir Khamsa-i-Nizāmi, the Rampur Diwan-i-Hafiz (Plate 38) and also, as we shall presently see, in a dispersed copy of the Bābarnāma. Notwithstanding his position as an important Akbari painter, Farrukh Beg may equally be regarded as a leading Jahangiri painter because his works are found not only in the muraqqa’s but also in loose miniatures, some of which are autographed by the emperor (Plates 34, 35, 36), and his name is mentioned by Jahangīr in the Tuzuk as a painter of unequalled fame.

10. Supra, Chapter III.
11. ff 96, 117. R. Skelton, "The Mughal Artist Farrukh Beg." AQ, II, Fig. 1, 5; Another miniature from this MS signed by Farrukh Beg is in the collection of Edwin Binney III: Persian and Indian Miniatures from the Collection of Edwin Binney III; Catalogue of an Exhibition..., Portland, 1962, No.57.
13. A.C. Ardeshir, Moghul Miniature Painting, Roop-Lekha, I, No.2 [Delhi, 1940], 32, 37, Pl. 7; R. Skelton, op.cit., Fig. 3.
15. Tuzuk, I, 159.
Farrukh Beg painted in a highly individualistic style which is strikingly different from those of other leading painters of the time. It agreed quite well with Jahângîr's taste as he preferred talented painters who could develop their own styles. Farrukh Beg came to the Mughal court in 1585 from the court of Akbar's half-brother Mîrzâ Muhammad Ḥâkim at Kabul. As his name occurs amongst the nobles leaving for Qandahar in 1590 so it is possible that he started painting in Akbar's studio at a date later than this. Jahângîr refers to Farrukh Beg in late 1018H/1609, and one of his works is mounted on a royal muraggâ folio dated 1019H/1610-11 (Plate 37). An identical note written on several miniatures (Plates 34, 35, 36) states that these were painted by him at the age of 70. No other biographical information about Farrukh Beg is known to us.

16. AN, III, 714.
17. ibid, III, 887. In the Ḍīn-i-Akbarî Abu'l Fazl writes his name as Farrukh the Qalmaq: Ain, I, 114.
19. infra, for full translation of this important inscription.
Attracted by Farrukh Beg's fascinating style

Robert Skelton made a painstaking study of all available paintings signed by or associated with this master-artist. Unfortunately the literary evidence cited by Skelton is not too dependable and this has made the theory of Farrukh's career propounded by him as unsound. Notwithstanding this drawback Skelton's study of Farrukh Beg's artistic style and its antecedents and precedents, is one of the best done so far on any Mughal painter.

We have virtually no knowledge of Farrukh's early life and we are not aware of any early work which can definitely be attributed to his pre-Lahore days. The miniatures of the small Khamsa of Amir Khusrau in King's College Library, Cambridge, though bear his name in attribution made at a much later date, are more related to the style of the well-known Harâtî painter Muhammadi, than

23. Pote Collection, No.153; B.W. Robinson, Persian Miniature Painting, 1967, 110-1, No.170; R. Skelton, op.cit., 395-6, Fig. 4.
24. B.W. Robinson, Persian Drawings, 1965, Pl. 45 (colour); Cat-MFA, VI, Pl. XXIIa, XXIIb, XXIIIa, XXIVa. Robinson attributes the Man playing the panpipes to Muhammad Mu'min: op.cit., Pl. 49 (colour); Cat-MFA, VI, Pl.XXlb. The main reason for rejecting Skelton's reliance on the inscription, which is also supported by Robinson, is that the title Nâdir-ul-‘aerî has never been used by Farrukh Beg, and there is no record of its conferment on him by Akbar or Jahângîr. Secondly, the use of shadow, which is so characteristic even in Farrukh's earliest known works, is completely absent here.
of Farrukh Beg's miniatures in the Akbarî MSS. We have already noticed the practice of adopting designs and compositions of well-known Persian miniatures by Mughal artists for their own use, so the apparent similarity of the composition of Farrukh Beg's Akbar's entry into Surat in the Akbarnâma MS with the scene of the reception of Zulaikhâ's procession in the Haft-Aurang MS of 1555-65 in the Freer Gallery of Art need not pose any problem.

Farrukh Beg may or may not have lived and worked in Ibrâhîm Mîrzâ's court at Khurasan, the evidence of such compositional similarities in support of this do not hold good.

None of the royal MSS in which Farrukh Beg contributed, the Bankipur Khânâbâd-i-Timûriya, the Ardeîshir Khâmsa-i-Nizâmî, the Rampur Diwan-i-Hâfiz, as well as the Victoria & Albert Akbarnâma, are firmly dated, but they are generally thought to have been produced during the last five years of the 16th century. Of these the Ardeîshir Khâmsa is an early MS which is stated to have been brought by Humâyûn and embellished with 35 miniatures at a later date of which Farrukh Beg contributes four or five. The beautiful royal copy of

26. R. Skelton, op.cit., fig. 5.
27. ibid, fig. 6.
30. A.C. Ardeîshir, op.cit.
Divān-i-Hārīz now in the Raza Library, Rampur may be of a slightly later date than what S.C. Welch assigns to it, because it does not contain any miniature by Basāwān, whose latest works occur in the Khamsa of Amīr Khusrau MS dated 1597/8, now dispersed in various American collections.31

Apart from this modest output in only five major Akbarī MSS, no work of Farrukh Beg is found in any of the later Akbarī production. This is rather difficult to explain. However there is no secure evidence to show that Farrukh Beg travelled southwards to Bijapur.32 The close similarity of Farrukh’s individualistic style with a group of miniatures, some unsigned and some attributed to Muḥammad ‘Alī, and the exquisite portrait-studies of the Šāhrukh rulers of Bijapur,23 easily allures one to search for some kind of association between Farrukh Beg and the great patron of all arts Ibrāhīm Šāh II. It has been suggested that Farrukh Beg was included in the Mughal embassy sent to Bijapur under

31. Distributed between the Walter Art Gallery (W.624), the Metropolitan Museum of Art, & Cincinnati Art Museum. The folio attributed to Basāwān and published by Hājek, IMK, Pl.6 (colour) from the collection of the Archaeological Museum, Tehran, also belong to MS: S.C. Welch, Lalitkala, X, 7-17; AMI, 163, No.7, 8.
32. R. Skelton, op. cit., 401f.
33. ibid, fig. 9, 17; also fig. 14, 16; PSEI, Pl. 9; LPI, Pl. XLIII; Pl, Pl. 126, 127 (colour).
Mir Jamal-ud-din Husain Inju in 1601, but we have no evidence to prove it. He could not have been included in the first mission of the Mir sent in Jahangir's time because the solitary occurrence of Farrukh's name in the Tuzuk is found just before the entry recording the Mir's return from Bijapur in early 1610.

Farrukh possessed the qualities which could easily attract the attention of the connoisseur emperor: a precise style of great technical competence and an individual aesthetic sensibility revealing itself in a high and peculiar range of colour. From the miniatures found in the Gulshan Album signed by him and the few examples found in different collections bearing his signature one notices several features some of which occur almost invariably in each of Farrukh Beg's pictures: the liberal use of shadow in modelling the facial features, the stylised gait of the body if the person illustrated is an old man, the stylised neatly folded ends of the garment, the exuberance of decorative details, flowers and plants of fantastic shape and strange colour, landscapes with trees with luminous edges and a very

34. R. Skelton, *op cit.*, 399 f. For this embassy:
35. Tuzuk, I, 159: entry of 9th December, 1609;
judicious use of mixed colour tones. These stylistic features lend a rare charm and a distinctiveness to the work of Farrukh Beg which easily catch the eye of even the most discriminating critic. So it may not be improbable to assume that his services were requisitioned by Jahangir even before his father's death. The main reason for such assumption is the presence of a number of his works in the Jahangiri muraqqa' (Plates 32, 37), the existence of a group of miniatures with an inscription, probably in Jahangir's autograph (Plate 34, 35, 36), and the glorification of the cults of the youthful prince and of the learned mulla, two of Salim's passions, made in almost all the available works (exception: Plates 35 and 37) of Farrukh Beg.

While carefully examining the well-known miniature, Abu'l Adyan sitting alone on a mat on a fire while a crowd of people watch in the Nafahat-al-uns MS, the name of Farrukh Beg was found mentioned in an inscription written on it as the teacher of Daulat, the famous painter who mainly worked in Jahangir's time. This helps us to strengthen

37. British Museum, MS No. Or.1362. f 135b: E. Wellesz, Akbar's Religious Thoughts as Reflected in Mughal Painting, London, 1952, PI. 35. The MS is dated 1012H/1603-4. Cat-BM, I, 350. The inscription written on the architrave of the gateway reads: Allah-u-Akbar mashq-i-Kamtarin Shagird-i-Farrukh Daulat Chela. The name Daulat is written elsewhere as well. I am grateful to Mr. Simon Digby for helping me to read this minute and damaged inscription. The miniature seems to have suffered damage in recent times, and Mrs. Wellesz's plate preserves the undamaged inscription. See, infra for Daulat.
the view that Farrukh Beg headed the Akbari atelier after Basawan, but at the same time it would be more difficult to explain the absence of Farrukh's works in the early 17th century Akbari MSS.

Two pictures of a similar size and probably belonging to the same historical work dealing with the Timurid dynasty or of the Babarnama pasted on the folios of the royal muragga' are known to us. Marteau & Vever published another folio from the collection of H. Vever which also seems to belong to the same MS. The last one is signed by Farrukh Beg, and of the ones mentioned first, the folio in the Otto Sohn-Rethel Collection is correctly attributed by Kühnel to Farrukh Beg, whereas the picture found in the Gulshan Album may also be attributed to Farrukh, because it bears the unmistakable stamp of his style and the characteristic elements associated with him.

Godard and Gray have published a fine miniature of a young noble standing carrying a white falcon, from the Gulshan Album which is signed by Farrukh beg (Plate 32).

38. One in the Otto Sohn-Rethel Collection, Dusseldorf: E. Kühnel, "Die indischen Miniaturen der Sammlung Otto Sohn-Rethel", Pantheon, VIII [Munich, 1931], 387, Abb. 4; R. Skelton, op.cit., Fig. 12. The other is in the Gulshan Album: J.V.S. Wilkinson & B. Gray, Burl.Mag., 1935, 175, Pl. III C.
39. Marteau & Vever, II, Pl. 109; IPM, Pl. XIV; R. Skelton, op.cit., Fig. 2.
40. A. Godard & B. Gray, Iran, Paris, 1956, Pl. XX.
This is one of his "several miniatures" found in the same album, amongst which there is a portrait of an aged dervish on which is written that it was painted when Farrukh was 70. Similar writing is found on at least three other pictures depicting a young page boy in the Chester Beatty Library (Plate 36), an aged mulla in the Victoria and Albert Museum (Plate 34), and a moustachioed gentleman reading, in the Alwar Durbar Library (Plate 35). The motif of the aged mulla also appears in full colours in a miniature of fine quality now in the Bankipur Library (Plate 33) and in the form of a drawing in the Victoria and Albert Museum. The cult of youth is repeated in a signed miniature to be found in the Nasir-ud-din Album showing a young noble holding a parrot and in an unsigned study of a young noble with a golden cup in the Fogg Museum of Art. The most important miniature coming from Farrukh Beg's brush

41. ibid, 22-3.
42. ibid, 22; Y. Godard, Athar-e-Iran, 1937, 214.
43. No. IM 10-1925.
44. First published: S.K. Banerji, Humayun Badshah, II, Lucknow, 1941, Frontispiece.
45. Pramod Chandra, ed. The Art Heritage of India, Bombay, 1964. Pl. 51C.
47. Y. Godard, Athar-e-Iran, 1937, 240, Planche 46, Fig. 95. A copy of this picture is in the Cowasji Jehangir Collection: Cat-Cowasji, Pl. M. (colour).
for our study is found in the Naprstek Museum, Prague (Plate 37), which is dated 1017H/1610-11. A few other miniatures attributed to him in various times and discussed in the following pages are also to be taken into account.

The likeness of the young prince with an albino falcon in the Gulshan Album (Plate 32) appears strikingly similar to the young prince riding on a white horse just behind Akbar in the Victoria & Albert Akbarnāma illustrating Akbar's entry into Surat. The graceful chanar branch extended at the top of the picture, the conventionalised trees on the hill with luminous edges, and the soft and distinctive colour scheme of the picture associate it with the works of Farrukh Beg in the Akbarnāma and the Rampur Dīwan-i-Hāfiz (Plate 38). Only the face of the Gulshan prince is more naturalistically modelled, which probably indicates that a fuller attention was given to its rendering. Then the date of its execution cannot be far removed from the Akbarnāma. The part of Akbarnāma in the collection of the Victoria & Albert Museum lacks a dated colophon and various suggestions have been made for its dating. The MS is

49. IMM, 70-3; Pl. 10-14, (colour).
50. R. Skelton, op.cit., fig. 5.
51. ibid, fig. 1.
52. ibid, 393, and fn 4, 5; AIP 150-1, No.670; etc.
almost universally acknowledged to be a royal copy in which the ablest royal painters participated. Considering the episodes illustrated in this part which were just written down by Abu'l Faüz from 1585 to 1590 and the occupation of the royal artists in producing the series of poetical MSS and works like the Jamīʻut-Tawārīkh in 1595 to 1600, an early dating of the Akbarnāma, within 1590-95, seems more likely. No conclusive evidence for the dating of the folios of the unidentified MS painted by Farrukh Beg which were collected in the Jahangirī muraqa's or the Gulshan Prince can be made from this revised dating, and it may be hazardous to think that these were produced in the Salīm Studio just after it was started, because no other evidence of Farrukh Beg's presence in the Salīm Studio is found. Though a few folios of the Diwān of Amir Hasan Dihlavi produced in the Salīm Studio show shadowing of faces in the manner of Farrukh Beg, no miniature actually signed by him has been found in this MS or in the Rājkunwār.53

Stylistically the pictures painted by Farrukh Beg found elsewhere other than the Jahangir Albums belong to the same phase of his career. The portraits of aged mullās

53. Supra, Chapter III.
in Bankipur Library (Plate 33) and Victoria & Albert Museum (Plate 34), and of handsome youths in the Chester Beatty Collection (Plate 36) and Nasir-ud-din Album are finished works with full colours, whereas the portraits of another aged mulla in the Victoria & Albert Museum and the Gentleman Reading Book in the Alwar Durbar Library (Plate 35) are line-drawings. Skelton attributes C.1615 for the three pictures found in the Minto Album. He assigns C.1605-8 for the Nasir-ud-din Album Prince with a Parrot taking it as one of the last miniatures painted by Farrukh at Bijapur. Since the theory of Farrukh's stay at Bijapur cannot be proved with any certainty, this miniature should also be included in the above group. The whole group may now be dated with some certainty in view of some additional data provided by other miniatures. The Naprstek picture of Ibrâhîm 'Adil Shâh playing on a string instrument in a musical assembly (Plate 37) has the following inscription written by the well-known calligrapher Muḥammad Ḥusain Kashmîrî:

Likeness of Ibrâhîm 'Adil Khân, Tarâfdâr of Bijâpur, who in the science of music of the Deccan considers himself the chief of the practitioners of that art. The work of Farrukh Beg in the 5th year of the

54. R. Skelton, op.cit., fig. 11.
55. ibid, fig. 10.
56. ibid, 397.
57. ibid, 407.
auspicious reign corresponding to the year 1019 Hijra. Written by the least slave Muhammad Husain Zarrīn Qalam Jahāngīr-shāhī.58

From the phrasing of the inscription it appears to have been copied by the calligrapher from a comment made by Jahāngīr. It reveals that Farrukh Beg and Muḥammad Ḥusain were engaged in the preparation of the royal muraqqa's in 1019 Hijra/1610-11. The portrait of Shāh Tahmāsp in the Kevorkian Album, now in the Freer Gallery of Art, bears an inscription giving Farrukh's name and the date 1020 Hijra/1611-12. It appears to be a copy of a Jahāngīr original painted by Farrukh Beg at the given date59. Lastly the presence of a miniature in the Gulshan Album inscribed to the effect that it was executed by Farrukh Beg at the age of 70 in Jahāngīr's autograph gives us an additional point to believe that Farrukh Beg had

58. S. Digby, IC, XXXVII, 294, where he criticises the grossly erroneous translation made in Hajek's book: IMM, 70. I am grateful to Mr. Digby for kindly translating this inscription for me. In spite of my best efforts and preparations I was not able to examine the original during my stay in Prague in the summer of 1965. From colour transparencies of this valuable picture one can see how hopelessly distorted are the reproductions in Hajek's book. See: Plate 18 for Muhammad Husain Kashmirī's portrait. For reference to his work etc: Ain, I, 109; Tuzuk, I, 91, 159.


60. Y. Godard, Athar-e-Iran, 1937, 214; A. Godard & B. Gray, Iran, 22-3.
already attained 70 when the Gulshan Album was completed in about 1020 Hijra/1611-12.  

So far we have only discussed chronology, but the accomplished works of Farrukh Beg call for more attention. The fine illustrations to the five Akbari MSS mentioned above easily strike the eye in their ingenuous colour-scheme and prefect compositional unity. The earliest miniature in our reckoning which can be connected with Jahangir is the portrait of young prince holding a *tūghan* falcon in the Gulshan Album (Plate 32). The prince is richly attired in a *pustīn* of large floral designs over his red full-length *jāmā*, also of large floral designs of a different sort, a narrow *patka* of geometrical patterns in black, red and gold, and a golden-yellow turban with black plume. He stands alone on the bank of a river or pool of water faintly indicated at the lower part of the picture. In the background a mauve and greyish violet hill looms against the sky painted in pure gold. A few flowering shrubs are painted on it, while two large flowering plants of the hollyhock type are painted on both sides of the prince. Deep bluish green trees with luminous edges, a gracefully carved branch of a *chanar* tree on which a number of chirping birds are seated and a rich

61. Supra, Chapter VI.  
velvet-like turf of deep green in the foreground, complete
the composition. The young prince stands in a nonchalant
mood with his eyes directed outside the picture to the right.
He wears a moustache and thick-set tufts of hair are visible
over his long and slender neck. His face is small and drawn
with infinite care by subtle shadowing. He holds a tuyghan
falcon of majestic shape which, curiously enough, sits on
his ungloved left hand, while a small white wine-cup is
held in his blue-gloved right hand. The prince remains
unidentified; he does not resemble Salīm. The young prince
on a white horse following Akbar in the picture of the
latter's entry into Surat in the Victoria and Albert Museum
Akbarnāma, whose figure the Gulshan portrait closely
resembles, cannot also be Salīm because the prince could not
have accompanied his father in the siege of Surat in 1572,
as he was born only in 1569. The young prince seems to
glorify the cult of the adorable youth which was popular in
Persian literature and also in the time of the youthful
Shāh Tāhmāsp and again in 'Urfī's writings on Salīm. 63

63. R. Skelton, op. cit., 398, fn 29; A large number of portraits of youthful
prince are found on the hashiyas of the Jahāngīr Albums and
as centerpieces in it: Cf.: IBP Pl.9, plate facing p.46, et passim
For other examples in the British Museum, India Office Library
Demotte Collection, Pozzi Collection etc: AM, Tafel 76, Abb.
208; Marteau & Vever, II, Pl.236; E. Blochet, Musulman
Painting, London, 1929, Pl.CXCI. The India Office Library
portrait of a young prince is unpublished (Johnson VII, f12).
Mr. S. Digby has prepared a long note on the "Cult of
the youthful prince" and I am grateful to him and to Mr.
Skelton for detailed discussions on this point.
The portrait of the page boy in the Chester Beatty Library (Plate 36) and the youth in the Nasir-ud-din Album express a similar spirit.

A number of unsigned pictures showing such "adorable youths" are found in various collections, which have puzzled the art-historians. The tinted drawing of a young noble in the Fogg Museum of Art\(^64\) and a fully coloured miniature of a young Safavid prince in the Pozzi collection\(^65\) clearly resemble the Gulshan portrait of the young prince with the albino falcon (Plate 32). Schroeder correctly recognises the Fogg Museum drawing as a Mughal work and attributes it to Ḍârā Jâhângîrshâhî. The Pozzi miniature is well-known through Blochet's publication and Skelton notes it in his study of Farrukh Beg, and assigns it to the Deccan.\(^66\) The close similarity of pose and attitude of all three of them, in spite of their representing a different person in each case, cannot be fortuitous and Farrukh Beg appears to be the painter in each case. The Pozzi miniature was painted first, the Gulshan miniature was probably painted afterwards for Salīm with suitable alterations, and the Fogg Museum drawing was

\(^{64}\) E. Schroeder, _op. cit._, 109-13 Pl. XIX.

\(^{65}\) E. Blochet, _Les Peintures Orientales de la Collection Pozzi_, Paris, 1930, Pl. XI, XI\(^{bis}\) (colour).

\(^{66}\) R. Skelton, _op. cit._, 411.
prepared still later. The latter example cannot be attributed to Āqā Rīzā, because the subtle shadowing of the face and the type of the youthful prince are more typical of Farrukh Beg's style. The curious motif of exaggerated dāman shown in the Fogg drawing\(^67\) is noticeable in a number of late Akbarī MSS as well as in the Rothschild Būstān\(^68\), Moscow Bābarnāma\(^69\) and in the enigmatic portrait of the yogīṇī in the Chester Beatty Collection.\(^70\)

The type of the aged mulla is also a favourite theme repeated over and over in Jahāngīr's time. Jahāngīr's respect for mulās and dervishes and admiration for learned people was genuine, as even a cursory glimpse of the Tūzuk will reveal. In the pictures of mulās and dervishes signed by or associated with Farrukh Beg, their identifications are rarely disclosed, and they appear more or less like representing a set type. Portraits of aged mulās or learned teacher signed by Farrukh Beg are found in the Minto Album, now in the Victoria & Albert Museum (Plate 34)\(^71\), the A.C. Ardeshir Collection\(^72\), and the Bankipur Library (Plate

---

68. I. Stchoukine, "Un Bustan de Sa’di illustre par des artistes moghols", RDA, XI, Fig. 2.
69. S. Tyulayev, Miniatures of the Babur Namah, Moscow, 1960, Pl. 32 (colour).
Pictures showing an assembly of learned men or dervishes are found in the Rampur Diwan-i-Hafiz (Plate 38) and in a Leningrad Collection (Plate 33). A number of miniatures showing such scenes as the presentation of a book by an author painted in a style closely resembling Farrukh Beg's, but probably not painted by him, are also found.

The Aged Mullâ in the Minto Album (Plate 34), like the Chester Beatty Page Boy (Plate 36) and the Alwar Reading Gentleman (Plate 35), has the inscription referred to above, written on it. The writing is in a "spidery hand", as Skelton describes it, and according to him, much different from Jahângîr's or Shâh Jahân's handwriting; he thinks it as the autograph of the aged painter himself. The signature written on the lower part of the Nasir-ud-din Album Young Noble with a Parrot is also believed by him as the painter's own writing, which is not unlikely.

The picture of the old dervish in the Bankipur Library (Plate 33) shows an old man standing on the bank of a river or water-pool supporting a long stick and holding his rosary in his left hand. The landscape is similar to Farrukh

---

73. Pramod Chandra, ed, The Art Heritage of India, Bombay, 1964, Pl. 51C.
74. The Hermitage, Leningrad; Skelton, op. cit., fig. 15.
75. See, infra:
76. R. Skelton, op. cit., 397.
77. ibid, 398.
Beg's other finished works, with the characteristic Persian style hillocks and flowering plants. The mulla wears a white turban, a heavy flowing dark-coloured dress, and a long scarf of simple design hangs over his shoulders. Curiously enough, the portrait of the mulla has a close similarity with the figure of an old man sitting near the prince in the delightful miniature in the Rampur *Diwan-i-Hafiz*, which shows the scene of an evening of music, drinking and poetry-reading in a garden pavilion (Plate 38). The young prince who presides over the party may show an idealistic representation of Prince Salim. The same princely figure is portrayed in a miniature in the Gulshan Album, where he is shown as receiving a book presented by an author. Unfortunately the miniature could not be examined in original and the quality of reproduction made by Goetz and Hajek is so bad that it is difficult to make any definite assertion. From whatever could be seen the picture appears to have originated from the circle of Farrukh Beg or Aqa Riza.

The attention given to religious persons is evidenced in the Leningrad picture large composition showing four dervishes in an imaginary landscape scene. The portraiture

78. IMM, Pl. XXII.
79. H. Goetz, *East & West*, 1957, Pl. III.
80. R. Skelton, *op.cit.*, fig. 15.
of the saintly persons with their subtly modelled faces, long
fluffy beards and expressive eyes, and the crisp neatly folded
dges of their draperies are typical of Farrukh Beg. The
profusion of flowering plants and shrubs full of flowers of
different and sometime unrealistic shapes and colours, the
Deccani type forts in the distant background and stylised
trees with luminous serrated edge occur in other works of
Farrukh Beg.

The 'Aged Mulla' (Plate 34) in the Minto Album is a
stooping figure standing on a curved bank under a tree. A
curious plant with leaves of yellow, saffron, red and white
intermixed with the characteristic green spreads over most
of the upper half of the picture. He wears a long and heavy
robe, and a thin long yellow scarf is spread over it, whose
neatly folded ends swing in the air. The 'Page Boy' in the
Chester Beatty Library (Plate 36) is more colourful and rich
in appearance. He wears a costly pushfn diapered with
stylised Chinese clouds. The pallav of his long scarf and
patkâ have the same bold geometrical patterns as are found in
the Ibrâhîm 'Aydil Shâh portrait. The plant before which the
page boy stands bears delightful blossoms as do the slender
creeper like branches: all have flowers of five white petals
with a touch of red at the lower end of each, and a yellow
centre, visible in the manuscript-illustrations referred to
above as well as in the portrait of Ibrâhîm 'Adil Shâh and in the Saint in a landscape.

In many respects the atmosphere and details of the "Boston Poet" (Plate 39), especially the flowers and the narcissus plants, the curved bank of the rivulet or pool faintly indicated to the lower left corner of the picture, and the dress of the poet, resemble the works of Farrukh Beg, yet one cannot be sure of the attribution. The princes depicted in pictures now in the Rothschild Collection, the Freer Gallery of Art, and in the Leningrad Album show much similarity in details, but the refined subtlety of the facial expression of the 'Boston Poet' has nothing to do with the conventionalised faces of the princes. Indeed the expression of thoughtfulness and the mood of profound feeling and poetic imagination apparent in the portrait of the 'Boston Poet' should be regarded as one of the finest achievements of refined naturalism. It may very well be a Deccani work, because for a painter who could draw such fine portrait studies of Ibrâhîm 'Adil Shâh in the British Museum and of an unidentified noble in the India Office Library, it could not be an impossible task.

81. R. Skelton, op.cit., 399-400; AIP, 98, 154, No.688; Cat-MFA, VI, 35, No.LVI; Pl. 145-5.
82. R. Skelton, op.cit., fig. 9.
83. PSEI, Pl. 9 (colour)
84. Leningrad Album, Pl. 81.
The Alwar miniature (Plate 35) is a line drawing with touches of colour. Only the face is sensitively modelled in the characteristic touch of Farrukh Beg. The moustachioed gentleman wears a long flowing jāma touching the ground, and a plain shawl is worn around the upper part of his body in a way as if he is protecting the book he is reading from sun or rain or other people's gaze. The same 'spidery' inscription is written near the left side. Another inscription, obviously late and unreliable, reads: "Sabīh Shāh Tahmâsp, Shāh-zādgi," Picture of Shāh Tahmâsp as prince.

It is interesting to note that virtually the same figure occurs on the hāshiya of a folio of the Gulshan Album86. In this case the gentleman is riding on a galloping horse and holds a greenish falcon on his gloved right hand, but the same morose and downward look of the eyes, similar modelling and facial features closely connect both the figures. The appearance of this typical Farrukh Beg work on the hāshiya of the Gulshan Album leads us to believe that Farrukh Beg was working in the Jahângîrî atelier from the very beginning.

86. IMM, Pl. XXX.
The second portrait of a mulla in the Minto Album is a tinted drawing drawn completely in Farrukh Beg's style. The attribution, probably made by Shâh Jahân, lends authenticity to it. But no value can be attached to attributions made on or below a number of apparently late miniatures. Only in two instances the attributions cannot be so outrightly rejected. One of them is a copy of what seems to be a genuine Farrukh Beg dated 1020 Hijra, found in the Kevorkian Album, now in the Freer Gallery of Art. It gives the indication that Farrukh Beg was working till that date. The second one, a portrait of a young prince apparently in the late-Jahângîrî/early-Shâh Jahânî style, contains an inscription, which in all probability comes from the pen of Jahângîr. Unfortunately the last two digits of the date appended to this autograph note are damaged beyond repair and the facial features of the prince do not betray the slightest indication of Farrukh Beg's style. As the golden clouds near the inscription clearly reveal, the picture was extensively repainted at a time later than the inscription. In that case, if we accept the autograph note

87. R. Skelton, op.cit., fig. 10.
88. From the list given by Skelton (ibid, 407-411) the following ones do not appear to be Farrukh Beg's work: Nos. 5, 11, 12, 13, 14, 24, 25-31, 34, 36-9.
89. Y. Godard, Athar-e-Iran, 1937, fig. 78; R. Skelton, op.cit., fig. 19.
90. ibid, 403-4.
is from Jahângîr's pen then the easy explanation of the problem will be that an original Farrukh Beg drawing with a royal autograph was repainted at a slightly later date.

Daulat

Many painters were working in the painting atelier of Agra when Jahângîr became the emperor, but only a few could impress him and came up to rigid standard set by him. Daulat was one of them. His name occurs in several MSS prepared towards the end of 16th and early 17th centuries; the Agra College Bâbarnâma, the Nafahat-al-uns, in the British Museum, the 'Iyâr-i-Bânish and Akbarnâma fragments in the Chester Beatty Library and in the Rothschild Bustân. His self-portrait is found in a double-portrait painted under the colophon of the Dyson Perrins Khâme-i-Nizâmî (Plate 16), as well as in the ḥâshiya of a Gulshan Album folio (Plate 43).

92. Reproduced by E. Wellesz, Akbar's Religious Thoughts..., Pl. 35.
93. Cat-CB, I, 14, No. 2, 3; not reproduced.
94. ibid, I, 7 (f52), 10 (ff 168b & 169); not reproduced.
95. supra, Chapter IV.
His full name is given as Daulat Muḥammad in the Rothschild Bustān (Plate 20) and in one ḥāshiya drawing. He also writes the appellation khānazād in some of his works, yet nowhere does he give his father's name. From his appearance in the self-portraits in the Khamsa-i-Nizāmī colophon picture (Plate 16) and in the ḥāshiya detail (Plate 43) he looks to be in his early thirties; so though he was born in the royal household and presumably grew up there, it seems that he did not take up painting as a profession at an earlier age.

In the MS-illustrations Daulat's work shows much distinctiveness. The use of strong colours in deep tones, subtle modelling and intense interest in expressing exact mood and vigorous character make his pictures look so different from the works of his colleagues. In an inscription written on the architrave of the gateway in a picture of the Nafahat al-uns MS, Daulat gives the name of Farrukh as his teacher. This would explain his delight in drawing portrait-studies, his wonderful sense of composition and his predilection with colours. So he possessed the particular talents which would attract Jahāngīr's attention.

96. Y. Godard, Athar-e-Iran, 1936, Fig. 18.
97. ibid; in the Bustān miniature reproduced in Plate 20 and in the Bābarnāma MS.
98. supra, note 37
His signed miniature in the Rothschild Bûstân (Plate 20) of 1605 shows certain departures from his earlier work in the Na'farhat-al-uns and the Akbarnâma MSS; the composition is neat and relatively uncrowded, the colouring much milder, and the portrait-studies more accurate and penetrating. It is very probably because of the exquisite portrait-studies that Daulat was selected by the emperor to paint the series of pictures of himself and his four well-known colleagues on the hashiya of a folio of the royal muraqqa' (Plates 40-43), and to add the exquisite double-portrait under the colophon of the Dyson Perrins Khâmsa-i-Nizâmî (Plate 16). He was also entrusted with the task of retouching some Persian miniatures which were mounted in the royal muraqqa' at the same time. On at least one occasion Daulat records the fact that he added the golden hills in a mid-16th century Bukhara copy of a 15th century Harâtî hunting scene, attributed by Mahdi Bahrami to Mahmud Muzâhîhib. He was asked to draw a portrait of the celebrated Persian mystic poet 'Abdur Rahman Jâmî, which as he mentions in the accompanying inscription, was copied from a study by Ustâd Bihzâd.

100. Y. Godard, *op. cit.* 29, fig. 21.
In the double-portrait under the colophon of the Dyson-Perrins Khamsa-i-Nizami Daulat mentions that his portrait was added at the express command of the Pâdishân in the fourth julûs. The idea of incorporating the portrait of the calligrapher under the colophon seems to be a typical Jahangirî practice, though portraits of calligraphers are by no means rare in Persian art. For the first time we notice the incorporation of such colophon portrait in the MS of the Diwan of Amir Hasan Dihlavi prepared at Allahabad in 1604 (Plate 15). Here only the portrait of the calligrapher was painted, along with a young assistant. The portrait of the painter was not included neither had his name been mentioned. In the Khamsa-i-Nizami MS the colophon portrait includes representation of the painter as well. Daulat's portraits of his colleagues, Manohar, Govardhan, Bishandás, Abu'l Hasan, and his self portrait on the hashiya of the royal album must have greatly satisfied the emperor when he commanded the inclusion of the painter's portrait along with that of the calligrapher.

Abu'l Fazl mentions the names of important Akbarî painters and calligraphers; it seems unlikely that likenesses were preserved in the royal muragqa', because their social and economic position, especially that of the painters, was not so high in Akbar's time. It was Jahângîr who took a

101. supra, Chapter III.
personal interest in the styles and techniques of individual painters and encouraged them to specialise in the fields in which they excelled. He singled out the talented ones and encouraged them to work according to their forte. Thus instead of a huge atelier, a manageable establishment employing a very select number of painters doing exclusive and specialised jobs was organised. Consequently, the members of this special department, directly supervised by the emperor himself, gained in prestige and position. This may be the reason why portraits of some of the principal Jahangiri painters are found on the hashtiyas and in separate miniatures in the royal muraqqa'.

Of these portrait studies the third figure from the top in a clockwise direction is that of Abu'l Hasan (Plate 40), the young son of Aqa Riza. He was about 21 years old in 1608 when the portrait was drawn by Daulat. Though his name does not figure in any known work done in this period with the exception of the miniature in the British Museum Anwâr-i-Suhâfiî MS (Plate 27), Abu'l Hasan was probably already an active member of the studio. He is shown in this study as engaged in drawing with close attention a miniature by his left hand.¹⁰²

¹⁰² Cf Plate 118 and see infra, Chapter IX.
The next figure is that of Mahohar, son of Basawan (Plate 41), a portly person in his forties, engaged in drawing a miniature portrait. Bishandas, who is described in the inscription as the nephew of Nanha (Plate 42) comes next. He is shown with a folio of the muraqqa' on which he is working. The bearded and dark-complexioned Daulat and the young and handsome Govardhan sit face to face at the bottom of the folio (Plate 43). Govardhan is the son of Bhawanidas, a famous Akbari master. He worked in a number of important late Akbari MSS, including the Chester Beatty-British Museum Akbarnama which include the well-known miniature Abu'l Fazl's Presentation of the Second Volume of the Akbarnama to Akbar. Govardhan is shown as turning his face and speaking with Bishandas sitting behind. The posture is no doubt prompted by the need to express liveliness and dynamism in which Daulat has achieved considerable success.

In his self-portrait Daulat is shown as holding a sheet in his left hand on which is written: Allahu Akbar. Be-hukm-i-Shah Jahangir naqqash-i-in taswar nemud. Bande Daulat shahin-i-khud tahrir qa'iluh wa ragimuhu faqir al-

103. 'Berlin Album', f25b: IBP, 9, 50, Pl. 39. The drawing shows a poet or teacher and his young pupil and is dated 1018H/1609-10.
104. Cat-CB, I, folios 49b, 176b, 177, 201; II, Frontispiece (colour), Pl. 16, 31; and BM, MS 12988, Fol. 158, unpublished.
105. ibid, II, Frontispiece (colour).
haqqir Daulat. The inscription is identical to the one written in the colophon portrait of the Dyson Perrins Khâmsa-i-Nizâmi. In the muraqqa' folio on his lap, on which he is apparently working, a minute portrait of Jahângîr is faintly visible.

Another folio of the same album shows a series of seven figures, of whom six are young princes. Four of these drawings accompany the signature of the painter Daulat Muhammad, of which one is dated in the month of Zulqa'da, 1018/beginning of 1610. The princes are not identified, but two of them may portray Jahângîr's youngest sons Shahriyar and Jahândar, who were in their 6th year in 1610.

Daulat's work is found on many other folios of the royal muraqqa'. Wilkinson and Gray reproduce part of a folio showing the preparation of a thick sheet of paper for the muraqqa' and report a whole series of hashiya details on two folios (77v & 78r) illustrating the different stages of paper-making and calligraphy. Similar details of paper-making and calligraphy are also depicted on the

106. supra, Chapter IV.
107. Y. Godard, op.cit., 24, fig. 15. (whole folio), 16-19 (details).
109. ibid, 173.
hashiya of f18 of the Berlin Album\textsuperscript{110}, though there is little stylistic similarity with the Gulshan examples.

Madame Godard reports the presence of the picture of a handsome prince signed by Daulat in another folio\textsuperscript{111}, and assigns the fine portrait of young Parwiz\textsuperscript{112} to him.

Daulat is also responsible for an excellent study of Jahângîr showed shooting a pair of deer by his long gun on a forked stand on the ground\textsuperscript{113}. She also attributes to Daulat a haloed portrait of Jahângîr seated on a golden throne and dressed in immaculate white costume and wearing rich jewels and ornaments, drawn on another folio\textsuperscript{114}. Goetz's ascription to Daulat of a set of five figures of young princes in the company of bearded teachers or writers on the hashiya of a folio of the same album is probably correct\textsuperscript{115}. Then suddenly we do not hear of Daulat or find any work signed by him. His style was successfully adopted by Govardhan, to whom the excellent folio of the Heeramanek Collection may be assigned\textsuperscript{116}.

A fine miniature in the S.C. Welch Collection of a dervish and a musician is one of the very surviving isolated

\textsuperscript{110} IBP, Pl. 20.
\textsuperscript{111} Y. Godard, op.cit., fig. 20.
\textsuperscript{112} ibid, fig. 25.
\textsuperscript{113} ibid, fig. 22, 23.
\textsuperscript{114} ibid, fig. 24.
\textsuperscript{115} ibid, H. Goetz, East & West, 1957, Pl. XIII; figs.V,VI.
\textsuperscript{116} Cat-Heeramanek, No.198, Pl. 198 & colour detail.
miniatures signed by Daulat. The principal subject of this miniature, 'the somewhat foppish holy man who has burnt and slashed his arms as acts of love', remains unidentified. A pair of cranes and a little doe, with a 'sweetly innocent' look stand fearlessly before the dervish, while a musician plays on a curious-looking ektâra. An amusing smile fills his countenance.

A painter named Daulat Kallân signs on a portrait and a few hâshiyas of the Wantage Album in the Victoria and Albert Museum, but no doubt he is late artist. As it was Bishandâs, not Daulat who was sent with Khan 'Alam's embassy to Persia, and described by the emperor as unrivalled in the art of portrait painting, Daulat probably ceased to paint by the time Bishandâs was chosen in 1613.

118. There is a copy of this picture in the Musée Guimet - No. 367D; LPI, 44, No. 61.
120. Moti Chandra, The Technique of Mughal Painting, Lucknow, 1949, 80-1.
Manohar

Manohar was the most prolific of all Jahângîrî painters. Many of the Jahângîrîmâ illustrations, portrait-studies of the emperor and his leading courtiers and pictures of royal assemblies were painted by him. But who is Manohar and how much of his biographical details are known to us? The answer will be that almost nothing is known except that he was the son of one of the greatest of Akbarî painters, Basâwan. This information is appended to the signature on the sheet of paper held by a young painter under the colophon of a Gulistân MS in the Collection of the Royal Asiatic Society, London (Plate 18)\textsuperscript{121}.

Manohar's name is found written in three different ways: Manohar, Manohar Dâs and Manohar Bandeh (Banda). The name Manohar Dâs is found on two folios of the Gulshan Album showing scenes from the story of Lailâ and Majnûn\textsuperscript{122} and in a picture illustrating the same story in the Chester Beatty Library\textsuperscript{123}. All three are tinted drawings adapted from European engravings which are connected with a series of similar drawings signed by his father Basâwan\textsuperscript{124}. Our

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{121} *supra*, Chapter IV.
\item \textsuperscript{122} Gulshan Album, ff30b, 38b: J.V.S. Wilkinson & B. Gray, \textit{Burl. Mag.}, 1935, 174, Pl. IIIIB, IIIIA.
\item \textsuperscript{123} Cat-CH, I, 45-6. Not illustrated.
\item \textsuperscript{124} Musée Guimet, Paris, No.3, 619: LMM, 15-6, No.9; AIP, 150, No.669, Pl.128. The same folio has three other drawings, one signed by Manohar and two attributed to Basâwan. The last two do not seem to be authentic. Cf: AIP, 164, No.746, Pl. 137, attributed to Basâwan by S.C. Welch: \textit{Lalit Kala}, X, 13fn1.
\end{enumerate}
knowledge of Basáwan's life is also hopelessly limited. W. Staude and S.C. Welch devote considerable attention to the study of this great Mughal master and the style of his painting, but no definite information of his life or ancestry could be given by them. From a signed folio of the Cleveland Tutinâma it is apparent that Basáwan worked in the Akbarî Studio from its early days. He achieved considerable fame as he probably took charge of the atelier after Daswant's death in 1585. The list of his qualities as a painter as given by Abu'l Fazl is formidable:

In back grounding, drawing of features, distribution of colours, portrait painting, and several other branches, he is most excellent, so much so that many critics prefer him to Daswanth.

Manohar is not mentioned in Abu'l Fazl's admittedly short list of the principal Akbarî painters; presumably he was

126. Premod Chandra thanks that Basáwan's name places him in the Ahir caste of Uttar Pradesh: S.C. Welch, op.cit. 8.
127. Aîn, I, 114. S.C. Welch, op.cit., 8, quotes this variant translation made by R. Skelton. Skelton's translation is an improvement on Blochmann. But the most likely version is: "Basáwan became the unique one of the age in outline-composition (tarrâhî) the portraiture of faces, the blending of colours (rang-âmezi), the painting of real likenesses (mânind-nigarî) and other operations of this art. Many connoisseur (didavarân-i-shinâsâ) prefer him to Daswanth." I am grateful to Mr. Simon Digby for translating this passage for me.
then only a rising young artist. Manohar's works are not found in the Jaipur Razmnama, the earliest Akbari MS where the names of the painters are systematically given. In the British Museum Dārāmāna, which is generally accepted as an early MS, pictures signed by Manohar suddenly become common in the historical and political MSS painted in 1595 and afterwards. His contribution in the Victoria and Albert Museum Akbarnama is limited to the colouring of only one folio drawn by Mukund, which may be regarded as one of his earliest major works.

129. The A'in-i-Akbari was completed in 1597. The section on painting is included in A'in 34, hence it may have been written considerably earlier.

3. Anvâr-i-Suhâifî, Bharat Kala Bhavan, Benaras: Manuscripts from Indian Collections, New Delhi, 1964, 102.
10. Akbarnâma, Chester Beatty Library, Dublin, Ind. MS. 3, ff 32b, 57a, 212a, 212b: Cat-CB, III, Pl. 15, 18.
11. Akbarnâma, British Museum, Or. 12988, ff 32a, 129a.
Manohar could not have made his debut in the colophon portrait of the 1581 Gulistan (Plate 18), because the date is too early for such portrait-studies to be introduced and for Manohar to draw in that mature style\textsuperscript{131}. It seems to be a clever attempt on the part of this fine portraitist to paint his self portrait as he was a young man in 1581.

Manohar easily became a leading painter in Jahangir's atelier as he was a capable artist with a mastery over the science of perspective and proficiency in drawing accurate and lively portrait studies. In addition, the balance and harmony expressed in a mellow and subdued colour scheme infusing a distinctiveness in his works must have pleased the connoisseur emperor Jahangir. Though Manohar's name has never been mentioned in the Tuzuk, his position as a leading painter is attested by the presence of his portrait on the hashiya of the Gulshan album (Plate 41), painted by Daulat in 1608-9\textsuperscript{132}. In it Manohar appears to be a man in his mid-forties, with a successful career lasting for a good many years more ahead of him. That he accompanied Jahangir in the latter's journey to

\textsuperscript{131} Gray revised his early opinion expressed in AIP, 94, 143 No. 642, and acknowledges in PI, 82, that this is a Jahangir period addition. See supra, Chapter III.

\textsuperscript{132} supra,
Ajmer, Mandu, and Ahmedabad in 1613-1618 is proved by the portrait of Jahangir (Plate 136) presented to Sir Thomas Roe and of the picture of the Khan-i-Khanan (Plate 105), on which the emperor wrote his autograph note giving the date and the place of their painting. 133

In most of the pictures painted during this period his name is written as Manohar. Only on a number of portraits and animal studies which are compiled in later muraqqa’s his name is sometimes written as Manohar Bandeh. He seems to have stopped working during the last years of Jahangir’s reign or at the beginning of Shah Jahan’s reign, soon after the fine study of Dara Shukoh’s white horse called Dilpasand was painted. 134 The name Raja Manohar Singh written on a drawing, depicting the meeting of Jahangir and Shah Jahan, in the India Office Library 135, is as mentioned before a fictitious attribution.

Manohar must have been sufficiently at home with European engravings. He studied them and carefully copied

133. supra, Chapter VII.
134. India Office Library, Johnson, III, f 1: HFA, 1911 ed., Pl. CXXV.
135. India Office Library, Johnson, IV: IPM, Pl. LVIII.
136. supra, Chapter VII.
them as exercise in modelling and perspective. Gradually with the development of his personal style, his paintings began to show well controlled modelling and accurate perspective. In miniatures painted by him in such MSS as the Dyson Perrins Khamsa-i-Nizâmi, the Rampur Diwan-i-Hâfiz, the British Museum Babarnâma, the dispressed Khamsa of Amîr Khusrau, and the British Museum-Chester Beatty Akbarnâma, the composition is almost invariably well-planned and the figures lively. Manohar's style of portraiture is much influenced by his father's almost unequalled mastery in this branch of painting. He avoids using shadows and drawing "type characters", which are so characteristic of Farrukh Beg and âqâ Rizâ, and concentrates his attention not only in having a precise likeness but also giving it life and character.

He must have played an important rôle in the first few years of Jahângîr's reign while the tradition of manuscript painting continued. The fine miniature showing

137. Besides the pastiche works in the Gulshan Album and the Chester Beatty Library, there are drawings in the Musée Guimet (LMM, 17 No. 13) and in the Leningrad Album ff 53, 88 (Leningrad Album, Pl. 21, 20) which are either copies of Western engravings or based on them. S.C. Welch attributes a tinted drawing showing a portrait scene, obviously copies from one of more European engravings to Manohar: AO, III, 226, fig. 11.
the Disgrace of Sa'dî and the untried Young Marksman, (Plate 25) which was added to the British Museum Gulistân MS of 1567\(^{138}\), has been attributed to Manohar mainly for the wonderful portraiture of the persons and the delightful river and wood landscape drawn in a precisely accurate perspective. The hunting scene in the Leningrad Album (Plate 90) shows a virtual replica of this miniature. The scene cannot be certainly identified but as Jahângîr appears rather youthful and as he is not shown with his retinue of nobles and attendants, it seems to have been painted during his princely days. Manohar signs his name as Manohar Bas and thus it is connected with the group of three Lailâ-Majnûn illustrations where the figure of Lailâ is copied from European engravings. Similar additions or incorporations of European elements are also noticed in two Jahângîrnamâ miniatures, A State Procession\(^{139}\) and Jahângîr's visit to Akbar's Tomb (Plate 78), and in a miniature of some lost MS of Gulistân\(^{140}\) all attributed to Manohar. In each of the last two, a figure of a prisoner is introduced which is adopted from a European St. Sebastian "from whom the painter has compassionately and conveniently removed the arrows"\(^{141}\).

\(^{138}\) supra. Chapter IV.  
\(^{139}\) \textit{IPM}, Pl. XXXI.  
\(^{140}\) S.C. Welch, \textit{AO}, III, Fig. 18.  
\(^{141}\) \textit{ibid}, 142.
A miniature signed 'Manohar Bandeh' and detached from a small unidentified MS is preserved in the Indian Museum, Calcutta. It shows a group of masons building a wall, while in the foreground an old man bows his head before a dark-complexioned mulla. The miniature is drawn in subdued colours and its association with Jahangir is further strengthened by an inscription written on the arch of the mosque giving the name Shâh Jahângîr.

With the passage of time Manohar specialised in portrait and animal studies. The young prince standing in a pavilion holding a book, in the Gulsham Album (Plate 59), may be regarded as an early work of Manohar. An inscription in Shâh Jahan's autograph written on it identifies the subject as a likeness of young Khurram. If the fine portrait of Dâniyâl, identified by Jahangir by an inscription written on it, is regarded as a contemporary likeness of the Prince then it is apparent that Manohar was painting portraits from the end of Akbar's reign.

143. Y. Godard, Athar-e-Iran, 1936, 31-2.
Manohar's contribution in the Jahāngīrī muraqqa's is not very substantial. There are at least four portraits which are either signed by Manohar or attributed to him by Jahāngīr. The portrait of Jahāngīr (Plate 56) found on f 18b of the Berlin Album may have been painted by him because traces of his mastery in modelling are apparent in the vigorous expression of the emperor's face. Two other portraits of unidentified nobles found on the same folio are also painted by Manohar, though Kühnel and Goetz read it as Manoshahr. The portrait of the Khān-i-Khānān on f 23a (Plate 105) bears a note signed by Jahāngīr which states that it was painted by Manohar in the 13th julūs.

A large number of Manohar's works are found in the later muraqqa's which were probably collected by Shāh Jahān from his princely days and bound in albums later during his reign. In the Minto Album, now in the Victoria and Albert Museum, the signed portrait of Shāh Jahān and his eldest son Dārā Shukoh (Plate 84) riding in a hilly landscape, probably in Kashmir, and the picture of Jahāngīr's private assembly

145. IBP, 55-6, Pl. 37.
146. supra, Chapter VII.
(Plate 73) are preserved. The latter is not signed by Manohar, but attributed by scholars to him. The faces of Shâh Jahân and Dara Shukoh in the former example are retouched by a Shâh Jahâni painter called Murâr, so it is possible that Manohar did not complete the picture, and that it was completed by Murâr at a much later date.

At least four authentic works are found in the Wantage Album in the same Museum. Two of them portray Mîrzâ Ghâzî Beg and Murtaza Khan, a third shows Jahângîr's reception of Quṭb-ud-dîn Khân Koka, while the fourth portrays a tame big black buck led by its keeper (Plate 99). The inscription is inscribed Shâh Jahângîr at the top and signed Manohar Bandeh. The identity of the animal remains uncertain, but it may represent the emperor's favourite antelope called Mansarâj or Râj on whose grave a minâr was built. Another example of Manohar's venture in the field of animals-portraiture is found in the collection of Geoffrey C.N. Sturt, Painswick, which shows a small falcon on a perch. Besides the portrait of Dâniyal referred to above, the Kevorkian Album contains a fine portrait of Mahâhat Khân and another picture of good

---

147. supra, Chapter VII.
148. Clarke, Pl. 4; AIP, 154, No.690.
149. ibid, Pl. 11.
150. Clarke, Pl. 7; AIP, 153, No.685.
151. Clarke, Pl. 8 wrongly labelled 'Jahangir leading a black buck'; AIP, 156, No.703, dates C.1610.
152. Tuzuk, I, 90-1.
153. AIP, 159, No.720.
154. Sotheby's Sale Catalogue, 12 December 1929, Lot 134.
quality showing the emperor seated on a throne with I’timād-ud-daula standing before him. The Nasir-ud-din Album contains many portrait-studies, but the album was compiled at a much later date; the attributions are not always reliable. However, the quality of portraiture in the pictures of the Khān-i-Khānān, Āṣaf Khān and Ḥakīm ‘Alī seems adequate. The attribution of the picture of the meeting of young prince and an aged dervish need not be doubted because all the faces in the picture are wonderfully drawn. Reference has been made to the pictures of the royal wrestler called Fil Safīd (Plate 83) and of the Shaikh Hmaīm Aḥmīd, unidentified Mulla in a private collection in an earlier chapter.

156. Y. Godard, Athar-e-Iran, 1937, figs. 100, 80, 106 respectively.  
157. ibid, 238, fig. 93.  
Bishandas and his visit to Persia

Bishandas is mentioned in the Tuzuk in the 14th julus soon after Khan-i-'Alam was received by the emperor in the garden of Kalanaur. The entry reads:

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 unequalled in his age for taking likenesses, to take the 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.  

On the same day Bishan Das was honoured by the emperor by the gift of an elephant. Khan-i-'Alam's mission was sent to Persia just a month before the emperor left Agra on his way to Ajmer in September 1613. The idea to include a painter of repute in the party is novel and characteristic of Jahangir. Before the hostility, long impending between Iran and Mughal India, finally broke out in the middle 1621, relations between Shah Abbás of Iran and

161. In the light of this decision of Jahangir, R. Skelton's attempt to connect Farrukh Beg with the Bijapur Court and the style of its painting does not appear to be very improbable. But the court chronicles are completely silent on this point. We confront a similar enigma when we notice the presence of several portrait studies of members of the Rana of Mewar's family, painted by Nanha. Did Nanha accompany prince Karan when the latter returned to Mewar in 1616 to draw a series of portraits of Jahangir's vanquished enemies, now exalted as friends? Cf: Cat-MFA, VI, 18, Pl. LII; Sotheby's Sale Catalogue 12 December 1929, Lot 133 (Bhim Kunwar).
and Jahāngīr were cordial.162 Ambassadors with big retinues, rich presents and flattering letters from the Shāh came to the Mughal Court and made long stays163. Two fine miniatures in the Freer Gallery of Art (Plates 108, 109) bear witness to this friendly relation. According to inscriptions written on one of them, the miniature was painted hurriedly before the Naurūz to represent a dream of Jahāngīr of visit by Shāh 'Abbās in a well of light (Plate 108). It also gives us the information that the painter Abu'l Hasan inquired about the likeness of the Shāh from many people who had seen him. On the basis of these enquiries and using his imagination and skill, he achieved a portrait which most agreed was like the Persian emperor. So it is quite clear that the picture was painted before Bishandās returned from Persia with the portraits of the Shāh drawn by him. It also gives us an indication of the emperor's wish to have a good collection of portraits of important personalities164.

162. Beniprasad, Chapter XVI; Tuzuk, I, 193-6, 237-8, 248-9, 282-3, 284, 298-9, 310, 336-7, 334, 398; II, 94, 107, 115-7, 178, 186-7, 198, 201, 211.
163. Cf, Roe, 262-3: "This is but the first act of his [the Persian ambassador Muhammad Rizâ Beg who came in October 1616] presenting. The play will not bee finished in ten dayes."
164. PSEI, Pl. 6 text.
On the painting-board held by a thinly-built middle-aged moustachioed man of sharp features (Plate 42) the painter Daulat writes a note identifying the man as Bishandâs, a nephew of Nânhâ, a well-known Akbarî master. The portrait, painted on the hashiya of a Gulshan Album folio, is associated with other leading painters, Manohar, the young Abu'l Hasan, Govardhan and Daulat himself, and thus recognises the pre-eminence of Bishandâs as an important member of the Jahângîrî atelier. His works are found in at least three Akbarî MSS, the Bharat Kala Bhavan Anwâr-i-Suhâfî, the Victoria and Albert Museum Babarnâmâ fragment and in the Chester Beatty Library Jog Basisht. The first one is dated 1596/7 and the last one 1602; so it seems that Bishandâs was active in the Akbarî atelier for at least five years.

His works are not found in the British Museum-Chester Beatty Akbarnâmâ. The Nafahat-al-uns miniature, showing a vision of future married bliss for Abu Bakr Duqqî as foreseen by Abu'l Husain Karâfî, attributed by Coomaraswamy to

165. Y. Godard, Athar-e-Iran, 1936, 23; 18-23.
166. Manuscripts from Indian Collections, New Delhi, 1964, 102.
168. Chester Beatty Library, Ind. MS. No.4, f 249, signature cut-off: Cat-CB, I, 21-5, not illustrated.
169. supra, Chapter IV.
170. British Museum, Or 1362, f 142a; Pl. Pl. on p.97 (colour).
Bishandâs\^171 seems more likely to be a work of Daulat\^172. If our attribution of a group of miniatures in the \(\text{Rāj Kunwār} \) MS (Plate 9)\^173 to Bishandâs, which has an undoubted similarity with his only miniature in the British Museum \(\text{Anwār-i-Suhālī} \) MS (Plate 28) is correct, Bishandâs must have left Agra before 1603 in order to join Prince Salīm's Studio at Allahabad.

S.C. Welch's attribution of a miniature of Sa'dī's visit to the Temple Somnath\^1 in a \(\text{Būstān} \) MS (Plate 30) to Bishandâs appears to be irrefutable\^174. Bishandâs' signature is found again on the \hāshīya of the Gulshan Album, a detail from which showing a calligrapher at work, has been published by Wilkinson and Gray\^175. Welch also attributes to Bishandâs the birth scene, which might have formed an illustration to the \(\text{Jahāngīr nāma} \) (Plate 67)\^176. The signed picture of the House of Shaikh Phūl (Plate 106), in the Bharat Kala Bhavan may also be assigned to the same period when the Scene of a Royal Birth was painted\^177.

---

172. supra.
173. supra, Chapter III.
174. supra, Chapter IV.
176. AMI, 21.
177. S.C. Welch assigns C.1610 for the birth scene which is not improbable from the stylistic point of view. The \(\text{Jahāngīr nāma} \) illustrations were not, however, painted before C.1615: supra, Chapter VII.
Bishandâs was selected to accompany Khân-i-‘Alam, but not many of Bishandâs’s portrait studies are known to us. The only exception is the portrait of Râjâ Sûraj Singh Râthôr of Jodhpur (Plate 55) painted in 1608 when the Râjâ came to the court. Most of the known portraits of Bishandâs were either brought by him from Persia or painted after his return.

The best known amongst the group of pictures painted in Shâh ‘Abbâs’s court is the scene of the reception of Khân-i-‘Alam by the Shâh, now in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (Plate 86). The meeting apparently took place out of doors, probably when the Shâh was out hunting. According to Jahângîr’s report the Shâh’s attitude towards Khân-i-‘Alam was cordial. The Shâh even permitted him to smoke in front of him, though the use of tobacco was banned in Persia. Bishandâs’s picture shows the Shah examining a crystal or jade cup presented by the Mughal emperor while an attendant brings a small huqqa to Khân-i-‘Alam. The picture is mounted on a hashiya showing late Shâh ‘Abbâs period drawings of attendants carrying guns, swords, falcons or preparing

178. IBP, 10, 12, 23; Tuzuk, I, 140-1.
179. Cat-MFA, VI, 46-8.
180. Tuzuk, I, 370-1. R. Pinder-Wilson thinks the little glass huqqa-bowl held by the servant standing behind Khân-i-‘Alam as the earliest representation of a huqqa in Indian painting: "A Glass Huqqa Bowl," BMQ: XXV, 92. The crystal cup held by the Shâh may be the one sent by Jahângîr to him.
sīkh-kabāb. A number of copies of this picture and a Persian version of the scene are also known. The best likeness of the Shāh painted by Bishandās is to be found in a fine miniature in the Leningrad Album (Plate 85). This shows him seated under a canopy in a garden and examining a falcon. Only a few of the large number of portraits that Bishandās must have painted during his long stay in the Iranian Court are known to us. The portraits of Khodabanda Mīrzā (Plate 88), who abdicated in favour of his son 'Abbās in 995 Hijra/1586-7 and was long dead at the time of Bishandās's visit in the Nasir-ud-din Album, and of 'Isā Khān Qurchī Bashi, a general of Shāh 'Abbās, in the Baron Maurice de Rothschild Collection, Paris, must have come from this group.

The portraits of Bahadūr Khān Uzbek and Khīzr Khān Khāndeshī in the Berlin Album and the double portrait of

184. I. Schoukine, "Portraits Moghols, IV..." RdAA, IX, 197. Not reproduced. A copy of Khadabanda Mīrzā's portrait is preserved in a folio in the British Museum (No.1920-9-17-013(24)).
185. Bahadūr Khān Uzbek: F 22 of the Berlin Album, IBP, Pl.35. He visited the Mughal Court at the end of 1620. (Tuzuk, II, 192). The portrait is signed by Bishandās. But the portrait of Khīzr Khān Khāndeshī on f 4b: IBP 22, Pl.7 (colour), is not signed. He also met Jahāngīr in 1620 near Gokula. (Tuzuk, II, 196, 198, 211).
Râo Bhâro and Jassâ Jâm in the Wantage Bequest, Victoria and Albert Museum 186 represent Bishandâs's work after his return from Persia. The last-mentioned picture along with the picture of Râjâ Sûraj Singh Râthôr bearing Shâh Jahân's autograph 187 and the folio showing an imaginary assembly of three Kings Bâbar, Tîmûr and Humâyûn, attended by two unidentified nobles, also found in the Nasir-ud-din Album 188, seem to have been prepared for Shâh Jahân at about the same time or later during his reign.

The unsigned picture of another imaginary meeting of Jahângîr and Shâh 'Abbâs in the Freer Gallery of Art (Plate 109) could not have been painted before Bishandâs's return, because the likeness of the Shâh is very close to Bishandâs's portrayal of him in the garden scene in the Leningrad Album (Plate 185). Apart from the wine vases and curiosities noted by Ettinghausen it also shows the dagger, the hilt of which was made of wâbrâs ivory (dandân-i-mâhî) sent to Jahângîr by the Shâh through his employee Hâfiz Hasan in the middle of 1619 190 and the Shâhîn falcon presented to Khân-i-'Alam by the Shâh. 191

188. Y. Godard, op.cit., fig.63. Cf: Martin, II, Pl.214 for another version painted by Hashim in 1604 Hijra.
189. PSKI, Pl. 13 (colour) and text.
190. Tuzuk, II, 94.
191. ibid, II, 107-8.
Mansur

It was not very easy for any painter to match the enthusiasm and acumen with which Jahangir looked at the animal and vegetal world: of all his leading artists only the genius of Mansur could breathe life into birds and beasts and an eternal freshness into trees and flowers. The rare birds and unfamiliar animals described in the Tuzuk become real and familiar when we look at his inimitable portrayals of them.

Mansur like his illustrious colleague Manohar, started his career in the Akbari atelier when it was at its zenith. However, his was a humble beginning as he was neither a Khânazâd nor related to any of the leading masters; starting from the position of an assistant or naqqâsh, preparing ornamental unwans\(^{192}\) or colouring designs of the famous masters like Basâwan\(^{193}\), Miskina\(^{194}\) and Nânha\(^{195}\), Mansur gradually established himself in the Mughal studio as a leading exponent of animal art. By the

\(^{192}\) In the Khâmsa of Amir Khusrau dated 1597/8. PSEI text of Pl. 6.

\(^{193}\) Folio 112 of Akbarnâma MS in the Victoria & Albert Museum was designed by Basâwan and painted by Mansur.

\(^{194}\) Folio 56 of the same MS was designed by Miskina and painted by Mansur.

\(^{195}\) Jami‘ut-Tawârikh, dated 1596/7, Gulistan Library, Tehran; one folio designed by Nânha and painted by Mansur. The portraits were added by Mâdhav: A. Godard & B. Gray, Iran, Pl. XXX.
time when copies of the Babarnâma were being prepared. Mansûr's talent as a specialist in animal painting became apparent. Many of the unsigned animal portraits of the Moscow Babarnâma, Bharat Kala Bhavan Anwâr-i-Suhailî and the Chester Beatty-Cowasji Jehangir 'Iyâr-i-Dânish MSS may have come from his brush.

He does not seem to have worked in the Salîm Studio, as no miniature in the British Museum Anwâr-i-Suhailî is signed by him. On the other hand, four miniatures of the British Museum Akbarnâma bear his name. The miniature portrait of an unidentified musician playing a vînâ (Plate 89) signed by him is generally assigned to this period. The portrait of a falconer wearing a gold jâma curiously embroidered with birds, animals and hunting scene in the Heeramaneck Collection may also be by Mansûr. The only other portrait attributed to him is that of Jahangîr seated on a throne in the Leningard Album (Plate 52).

196. British Museum, Or 3714: ff 387a, 387b, 389b. V.A. Smith, HFA, 1911, Fig. 249-50. He also contributed in the Agra College Babarnâma. Also a Stray folio in the Fraser Gallery.

197. British Museum, Or 12988. ff 35b, 110a, 110b and 112. Under two of these the name is given as Usâd Mansûr and in one folio it is written as Mansûr Naqqâş.

198. AMI, 31, Pl. 18; B. Gray, AIP, 98, 159, No. 717. Gray & Moti Chandra identify him with Naubat Khan; Ars Islamica, XV-XVI, 146-9; AMI, 165.

199. AMI, 31, Pl. 19; Cat-Heeramaneck, No. 203. (No credence should be given to Karl Khandalava's unjustifiably harsh criticism: Lalit-Kala, XI, 9-13.)
not signed by him but attributed jointly to him and Manohar in the inscription written on the inner border. 200

Though Mansūr concentrated on natural history drawings and numerous delightful studies of birds, animals and flowers carry his name, it is not very easy to draw up a chronological sequence of his work. Mansūr’s name is mentioned in the Tuzuk for the first time in 1618 - when the well-known remarks of the emperor on his connoisseurship and on his paintings were recorded201. He was already given the title Nādir-ul-'aṣr and recognised by the emperor as ‘unique in his generation’ in the art of drawing. Yet his pictures, coming as they do from the early days of Jahāngir’s reign, are by no means common. Evidently, he was ready at hand when Muqarrab Khān returned from Goa with the Turkey-cock, as Mansūr’s vigorous and lively portrayal of the bird, preserved in the Victoria and Albert Museum (Plate 96) reveals202.

A large number of bird and animals drawings are collected in the later murqqa’s like the Minto Album203.

200. T. Grek, Leningrad Album, English résumé p.8. Her opinion that this is a coronation portrait of Jahāngir is not backed by any corroborative evidence.
202. supra, Chapter VII.
203. Distributed between Chester Beatty Library and Victoria and Albert Museum: Cat-CB, I, Ind. MS. 77 11a.
the Wantage Album\textsuperscript{204}, the Kevorkian Album\textsuperscript{205}, Leningrad Album\textsuperscript{206}, Dārā Shukoh's Album\textsuperscript{207}, and Nāṣir-ud-dīn Album\textsuperscript{208}, and most of them are attributed to Mansūr at various times. Only a few are, however, actually signed by the master, or authenticated by autograph notes of Jahāngīr or Shāh Jahan. Amongst these authenticated ones are the pictures of a Zebra (Plate 101), a pair of Indian cranes, a bustard (Plate 93) and a hornbill (Plate 94). The picture of the zebra not only carries a long note written by Jahāngīr on it, but is also described in detail in the \textit{Tūzuk}:

At this time I saw a wild ass (gūr-khar), exceedingly strange in appearance, exactly like a lion [tiger]. From the tip of the nose to the end of the tail, and from the point of the ear to the top of the hoof, black markings, large or small, suitable to their position, were seen on it. Round the eyes there was an exceedingly fine black line. One might say the painter of fate, with a strange brush, had left it on the page of the world. As it was strange, some people imagined that it had been coloured. After minute inquiry into the truth, it became known that the Lord of the World was the Creator thereof. As it was a rarity, it was included among the royal gifts sent to my brother Shāh' Abbās.\textsuperscript{209}

\textsuperscript{204} In the Victoria \& Albert Museum: Clarke.
\textsuperscript{206} Leningrad Album.
\textsuperscript{207} In the India Office Library, London, largely unpublished. Only a few pictures published in MFA \& IPM.
\textsuperscript{208} Y. Godard, Athar-e-Iran, 1937, 179-277, fig. 63-113.
\textsuperscript{209} Tuzuk, II, 201.
The painting is inscribed: "A zebra which the Turks who came with Mir Ja'far brought from Abyssinia in the year 1030 Hijra. Its picture was drawn by Nâdir-ut-'Āsrû Ustad Mansûr in the 16th year." The picture vividly depicts the deep grey stripes on its yellowish body which appeared so wonderful to the emperor.

While drawing his bird and animal studies Mansûr gives all his attention to its appearance and behaviour. He avoids unnecessary details or an elaborate background, and uses only a few symbolic shrubs or boulders or a faint indication of the horizon, and sometimes in order to indicate the exact environment of the subject an occasional tree or rock. The pair of cranes drawn in a fascinating study now in the Victoria and Albert Museum may represent the pair of cranes domesticated and paired by Jahângîr and described in so great detail in the Tuzuk. The single

210. AIP, 158, No. 714, Pl. G (colour).
211. Tuzuk, II, 16-8, 23-4, 32-3, 39, 42.
In a letter to the Victoria & Albert Museum, Mr. G.S. Keith of the American Museum of Natural History writes: "Scientifically it is interesting because these are not in fact the common Indian Sarus Crane, Grus antigone. They are a rather rare Tibetan crane Grus nigricollis, which nests in Tibet and winters in the Yunnan. It does not occur in India at all." I am grateful to Mr. R. Skelton for showing this letter. Vide, Chapter X, Note 124.
crane studied in another miniature (Plate 97) may represent one of the offsprings of the pair. Though this picture is not signed, its very minute brush work and the stamp of distinctiveness expressed in its posture can only occur in Mansûr's work.

Amongst others the turkey-cock (Plate 96), the bustard (Plate 93) and the Himalayan Cheer Pheasant (Plate 91) have already been noticed. The pictures of a pair of peafowl in the Maurice de Rothschild Collection (Plate 92) and of a vulture in the Chester Beatty Library (Plate 100) are not signed by Mansûr nor are they referred to in the Tûzuk. Many of these animal and bird pictures are found in pairs, one, evidently the master-copy signed by Mansûr rather in an elaborate fashion, and the other a close replica not signed by the master. Even after a close and careful examination only minute differences are noticed in the second copy. So it is not improbable that these were painted either from the charba of the original

212. supra, Chapter VII.
213. Peafowl is a common motif painted in numerous miniatures in Akbari MSS. A fine example of a pair of this beautiful bird is preserved in the British Museum Babarnâma MS (Or 3714, f 383b lower: HFA, 1911ed. fig. 245). Cf: Bâbar's description in the Babarnâma: *tx. A.S. Beveridge, II, 493.*

or the master himself might have drawn the outline while his assistants applied the colours. A study showing a cinerous vulture and a Griffon vulture with white neck signed by Mansur is found in the Kevorkian Album, so the fully coloured version in the Chester Beatty Collection may be a contemporary or slightly later copy.

The picture of a black and white great hornbill in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (Plate 94) and that of a 'White Eye' which was in the Eckstein Collection (Plate 95) are authenticated by inscriptions. Similar studies of Chameleon, West Himalayan Spotted Forktail, Indian Red-wattled Lapwing, Himalayan Blue-throated Barbet, Partridges etc. signed by Mansur are also found in the above-mentioned

215. Sotheby's Sale Catalogue, 12 December 1929, Lot 144.
216. Cf: similar duplicate versions of the Victoria & Albert Museum Turkey Cock (Plate 96) in the Indian Museum (IPM, Pl. LIII); of the Victoria & Albert Cheer Pheasant (Plate 91) in the Rothschild Collection (IPM, Pl. LIV) of the Metropolitan Museum Hornbill (Plate 94) in the collection of G.C.N. Sturt (Lilliput, 1948, April 2, AIP, No.718), and many more.
218. Sotheby's...op. cit., Lot 147. The bird is identified on the base of Salim Ali, Indian Hill Birds, London, 1959, 57, Pl. 28.
221. Formerly in the V. Golobe Collection: Martin, II, Pl. 219. Other pictures of the bird is found in the Vever Collection, (LPI, Pl. XXVb) and Pozzi Collection (E. Blochet, Les Peintures Orientales de la Collection Pozzi, 1928, Pl. XIXd.)
albums. Numerous unsigned bird and animal pictures in his style are known to us. This proves the success of Mansûr's creative style, which made the study of wild life and natural history subjects a fascinating part of Mughal painting. Though Mansûr cannot be regarded as an innovator of this mode, he can certainly be called its most successful systemiser.

At the time of his first visit to the vale of Kashmir during his reign, Jahângîr was enchanted by the charm of the numerous flowers and verdure of the place. The tour lasted from late spring to autumn in 1620. Even before he entered the vale he saw long stretches of the hilly countryside covered with many known and unknown flowers. After reaching the valley he spent his time in looking at them and writing their accounts in a language charged with emotion. Not unexpectedly, Nadîd-ul-‘abîr Ustâd Mansûr was ready at hand to draw delightful picture of these beautiful flowers. In one place the emperor records the number of pictures painted by Mansûr as exceeding 100, and this was not long after the royal party arrived at Srinagar. Practically no example of Mansûr's

223. Ibid, II, 145.
drawings of Kashmir flowers is preserved for posterity.
Only a single authentic example of his work is preserved
in the collection of Sitaram Shahu, Benaras (Plate 111).
It shows a shrub of bright red tulip-like flowers, full­
blown and bud, and a butterfly of many colours224. Madame
Godard refers to a few drawings of flowers in the Nâṣir-ud­
dîn Album, but none of these is reproduced225. The tradition
of flower painting was enthusiastically continued by
Muḥammad Nâdir Samarqandî, whose work are found in
various collections226.

Before concluding this rather unfairly short note
on Mansûr, mention should be made of the fine picture of
a chanâr tree in the India Office Library, London (Plate
112). This large and highly finished picture of many
colours takes a close look at the life of a family of
squirrels. The large number of frolicking, playing, alert
and frightened are rendered with a scientific acumen and
an almost unbelievable sensitiveness. The picture
is generally ascribed to Abu'î Hasan227. Abu'î Hasan

224. Reproduced in colour: N.C. Mehta, Studies in Indian
Paintings, Bombay, 1926, 79f, Pl. 31.
225. Godard, op.cit., 271, 274.
226. Cat-Cowasji, Colour Pl. E.; Blochet, Eulumineries,...
Pl. CLXVIII, British Museum No.1920-9-17-013(24);
LPI, Pl. XXVIa etc.
227. AIP, 163, No.737; J.V.S. Wilkinson, Mughal Painting,
Pl.6 (colour), W.G. Archer, Indian Miniatures,
London, 1960, Pl. 25 (colour).
painted a few pictures of birds and beasts\textsuperscript{228}; but a study of such scientific precision, close familiarity with the animal behaviour and sympathetic rendering could only have been painted by Mansur. No reliance can be given on the late attribution written on the back of the picture\textsuperscript{229}, because it contains not only N\^{a}dir-uz-Zam\^{a}n's name but also of N\^{a}dir-ul- 'Asr's.

\textsuperscript{228} e.g.: Sotheby's Sale Catalogue, 12 December, 1929 Lot. 146.
\textsuperscript{229} AIP, 163.
PART THREE

SEARCH FOR NEW STANDARDS
CHAPTER 9

Abu'l Hasan, Bichitr and the Iconographical Drawings

The course of Mughal history changed rather suddenly after Shâh Jahân left Lahore for the Deccan in December 1620, and within a few years many unexpected events occurred: Parwîz, so long neglected and despised for his mediocrity, was recalled from Allahabad; Shahriyâr was married to Lâdî Begam, daughter of Nur Jâhân by her previous marriage; Jahângîr himself became gravely ill; immediately after his recovery he decided to embark on yet another tour of the Vale of Kashmir and of the newly conquered fort of Kangra; news of Khusrau's suspected murder by his brother Shâh Jahân was coldly received and recorded by the emperor; Qandahar was annexed by the Shâh of Iran and finally Shâh Jahân, the most beloved and efficient of the princes, declared open rebellion. So, when Jahângîr reached his 53rd year in 1622 the political situation of his vast empire had become confused and complicated. In addition he lost one of his most efficient advisers, the mild-tempered, learned and responsible I'timâd-ud-daula, who died in January 1621.
We may discern a pattern in these reverses resulting from the diminishing authority and power of the emperor and from the rivalry between the able but ambitious and haughty Shâh Jahân and his step-mother, the shrewd but somewhat tactless empress Nur Jahân. The exact course of development of this conflict has been the subject of recent historical controversy\(^1\), but the fact remains that Jahângîr was too powerless and physically sick to intervene. The 'World Gripper' had to remain content with his own imaginary world where defeat was an ugly word and victory was a matter of will; where kingly rights were unquestionable and approached the divine; where power and authority were bestowed by God and inalterable by human actions. Such were the political situation of the empire and the psychological state of the emperor when the court painters tried to please their patron by preparing a series of paintings of excellent quality where the eulogies of the flattering court poets and the outward semblance of authority of the emperor were presented as real and inevitable. Jahângîr's unorthodox and tolerant religious outlook and the remnants of his father's Dîn-i-Ilâhî,

accorded well with the theophany emphasized by the painters. There is no reason to think that the ideas depicted in these pictures were evolved by the painters themselves, or that these pictures were not commissioned by the emperor. The emperor must have reacted with satisfaction in the same manner as when at the beginning of his reign he heard and recorded the fulsome flatteries of the Rajput 'Châran' poet brought by Râjâ Sûraj Singh Râthôr, who found the world devoid of night for the resplendence of the emperor. As we have tried to show the idea of a divine inspiration for his birth and for the events leading to his accession to the throne was deep-rooted in his mind, and his dreams, his belief in astrology, numerology and omens taken from Hâfiz, and his fondness for religious company all tended to encourage this belief in his destiny.

The pictures mirroring this self-complacent and contemplative attitude of Jahângîr may be divided into two groups. Those which depict him meeting ascetics and holy men, bestowing favours on them, or which depict his dreams and pious intentions should be included in the first group.

2. **Tuzuk**, I, 140-1.
3. **supra**, Chapters I, V.
The second group consists of a number of pictures where the emperor is shown in impossible assemblies, performing impossible feats or receiving divine inspirations (Plates 107, 108, 109, 110).

 Jahãngîr associated with learned and devoted men from his early life. To help the poor and needy, to look after the selfless devotees, and to discuss religion and philosophy with pious and learned doctors were considered by him as his primary duty. The regard that he expressed for some of them was not just a perfunctory courtesy of his royal office but reflected his own sincere belief. The religious discussions held at Agra in 1608-9 of which the Jesuit fathers keep a full record may appear as frivolous, but the interviews he held with Gosvâmî Chidrup (Plate 79) were of a more serious nature, as Jahãngîr's reactions recorded in the Tuzuk, reveal. Such seriousness on his part is also noticeable in the episode narrated by Roe when Jahãngîr made the English ambassador's surprise, embraced and much of a religious beggar, "a poor silly ould man, all ashd, ragged, and patched." Jahãngîr's attitude towards religious leaders was uniformly sincere, except when they tried to

4. vide, Chapter I.
5. J & J, 49f, 58, 63-7; E. Maclagan, JASB, 1896, passim.
7. Roe, 328.
foment political troubles, which he always took as a serious
threat to his kingly authority. Usurpation of power on the
part of a devotee in any form was always ruthlessly
suppressed by Jahangir.

Pictures of meetings of the prince and the devotee
modelled according to the set Persian pattern were painted
in large numbers in Mughal literary MSS, and Abu'l Hasan's
first major work found in the British Museum Anwar-i-Suhaili
MS is devoted to this subject (Plate 27). The commissioning
of Abu'l Hasan is interesting, because his first dated work
(Plate 118) is copied from Dürer's St. John, a religious
subject. Jahangir takes pleasure in mentioning the fact
that Abu'l Hasan was his favourite painter who grew up in
the imperial household and developed his style under his
careful attention. So the selection of Abu'l Hasan to
draw many of the iconographical and allegorical subjects
should be regarded as more than coincidental.

Abu'l Hasan was born in Jahangir's household after
his father Aqa Rizâ took service in the Salim Studio. The

8. vide, Chapter I; S.A.A. Rizvi, Muslim Revivalist
Movement in Northern India, passim.
9. Cf: R. Ettinghausen, "The Emperor's Choice", fig.13,14;
Mughal Miniatures of the Earlier Periods, Pl.19
(wrongly identified as Akbar); British Museum, No.
1948,10-9,080; 1920,9-17,04; (unpublished); India
Office Library, Johnson, XXVI, f3, VI f12; H. Goetz,
Indian & Persian Miniature Painting, Amsterdam,1958,Pl.6.
The copy of Dürer’s St. John (Plate 118) painted in 1599–1600 is claimed to have been painted by him when he was only thirteen, which was indeed a marvellous feat. At that time Jahangir was living a rebel life at Allahabad and the painters of his studio were, among other things, absorbed in the task of copying European pictures on the ḥāshiya of a murqqa’ which was being prepared.\(^{11}\)

By the time when Daulat painted the series of portraits of his principal colleagues (Plates 40–43) Abu’l Hasan had established himself as a leading painter. The slightly-built fair-complexioned young man drawn by Daulat (Plate 40) was already destined to be an artist of fame. The picture of the "old pilgrim" in the Rothschild Collection\(^ {12}\) closely resembling the figure of sage Bidpāî in the British Museum Anwâr-i-Suhaftî miniature (Plate 27), was probably drawn before Daulat made his portrait-study. None of the ḥāshiya details of the Murqqa’-i-Gulshan or of any other folio belonging to the Jahangirî murqqa’s bear Abu’l Hasan’s name, but this should not prevent us in attributing many of the European details painted on the ḥāshiya to Abu’l Hasan as most of the ḥāshiya details are unsigned. The ḥāshiya

\(^{11}\) vide, Chapter, III.
\(^{12}\) IPM, Pl. XVIII, fig. 1.
showing the same figure of St. John, though drawn in reverse (Plate 114) may well have been decorated by him.

None of the excellent illustrations of the tiny Diwan-i-Hafiz MS are signed, and so no certainty can be lent to their attribution. However, the miniature showing Jahangir setting out for hunting (Plate 22) may have come from Abu’l Hasan’s brush as it shows a notable feature: a winged angel modelled on a European original. The depiction of an angel kissing the stirrup of the emperor is an early example of these symbolical pictures exalting the Kingship of Jahangir. Abu’l Hasan was capable of doing justice to similar situations and it seems likely that he was selected to draw this picture.

Jahangir does not mention anywhere in the Tuzuk the date and occasion when he conferred the title Nadir-uz-Zaman on Abu’l Hasan and Nadir-ul-'Asr on Mansur. If our identification of the picture of Jahangir contemplating the Picture of Akbar (Plate 51) with the episode of Jahangir’s dream of his father requesting him to release Khân-i-A’zam is correct, Abu’l Hasan got his title before 1614. The subject illustrated in this picture is somewhat unusual.

13. It is not clear from the passage in II, 20-1, of the Tuzuk.
15. supra, Chapter VII.
What could be the reason of Jahāngīr's contemplating his father's portrait and why should it be illustrated? Jahāngīr's devotion to his father is unquestionable, as it is borne out by numerous passages of the Tuzuk. The portrait of Jahāngīr is mentioned to have been painted in his 30th year (1599/1600) by another artist whose name is damaged in the inscription below the arm of Jahāngīr. The miniature portrait of aged Akbar is, however, definitely stated in the inscription written on the globe held in his hand as a work of Nādir-uz-Zamān. The use of the term Hazrat 'Arsh Ashīyānī necessarily implies that Akbar was already dead.  

The picture could not have been painted before 1614, since Jahāngīr wears a shining pair of pearls on his newly-bored ear-lobes, which was done only a few days before the dream.  

In view of the circumstances in which the other iconographical pictures were commissioned Jahāngīr's contemplation of his father's picture long after his death may be the result of a

---

17. Ibid, I, 267: the idea of boring the ears was the result of an "occurrence".
dream or a divine revelation. Another dream sequence was illustrated by the same painter in a more elaborate and highly finished picture, now in the Freer Gallery of Art (Plate 108). The episode is not described in the Tuzuk, but indicated in inscriptions written all over the picture by the artist. Ettinghausen has ascribed the work to 1618-1622, but he overlooks the fact that Abu'l Hasan "restored" the likeness of the Persian emperor on the basis of first-hand descriptions combined with his own imagination and artistic skill. This would have been unnecessary after 1619, when Khan-i-'Alam and Bishandas returned from Iran with albums of portrait-studies of the Persian monarch.

A number of complicated iconographical formulae are vividly presented by Abu'l Hasan in this remarkable picture. In his attempt to portray an imaginary meeting

18. Another important development took place during this time when Jahangir decided to issue the last series of the famous set of "Portrait Muhrs". In this series he holds a gourd shaped wine-cup (not a goblet like the earlier series). His head is shown against a halo. A small radiating sun, a couplet and the legend "Ya Mu'In", are inscribed on the reverse. For a very interesting and learned paper on the "Portrait Muhrs", vide, S.H. Hodivala, Historical studies in Mughal Numismatics, Calcutta, 1923, Chapter XI.

19. PSEI, Pl. 12, text.
of the two emperors, visualised in a dream, Abu'l Hasan depicts it as an unearthly, supernatural event. The scene is set against an immense halo composed of the resplendent sun and a fantastic crescent moon in the blue sky. Jahângîr, the holder of the whole world, proudly stands on a huge globe, and embraces the bending figure of the dark-complexioned Shâh. The figure of Jahângîr is bigger in size than the Shâh and the attitude of the Mughal emperor is that of a great monarch generously patronising an inferior rival. This highly partial assessment of their relative strength is symbolised in the animals on which they stand. Jahângîr stands on a sturdy lion, the King of beasts, whereas the Shâh is made to stand on a meek lamb. The globe on which they stand symbolically illustrates the whole world which they have divided between themselves, with of course the lion's share going to the Mughal. The terrestrial globe which is very close to European examples of the period, shows with some cartographical accuracy the regions of the world and their names are written upon it. A pair of winged cherubs taken from European paintings complete the composition.

21. According to Abu'l Hasan's inscribed note on the picture the dream was set "in a well of light" as experienced by Jahângîr.
The Freer Gallery of Art has another miniature of interesting iconographic content, painted by Abu'1 Hasan (Plate 108). At first it appears to be one of the numerous assembly scenes with Jahangîr as the presiding figure. In fact, it depicts something more than an ordinary assembly scene. Jahangîr is shown in full figure, seated on a rectangular throne under a red canopy. He looms large amongst the other members of the assembly. His expression is calm and his distant gaze is directed outwards to the left of the picture. He rests his feet on a carefully painted globe placed on a golden stand, cleverly introduced for emphasizing his victory of the world, as his name symbolically indicates. The globe has a key-hole which is visible in the picture. On the red velvet velvet of the curved canopy are painted a pair of winged perîs in gold who hold an arabesque in their hands on which the name of the emperor is written. Above it is another canopy painted in green, violet and purple where a Western type crown is held by a golden winged cherub indicating divine authority for Jahangîr's sovereignty.

The symbolism of the picture will be easy to understand and the definite date of its execution could be ascertained if the princes and courtiers shown in it are correctly identified and the circumstances leading to
its painting are properly explained. Abu'l Hasan writes on the globe that the picture was painted by him at Ajmer. Jahāngīr came to Ajmer in 1613. But it could not have been painted before 1615, because it depicts both Prince Khurram and Prince Karan. They arrived at Ajmer only in February 1615, after Khurram's successful campaign against Rānā Amar Singh. Ettinghausen suggests several emendations of Stchoukine's description of the picture. He correctly reads the name of the mace-bearing foreigner standing to the extreme upper right of the picture as 'the Emperor of Rūm in ancient times.' He points out that the boy-prince standing near the feet of the emperor cannot be Shuja' because Shujā' was not born until June 1616. Ettingausen also notices the name of the place where the picture was drawn, and reads the word Bakshi written after Khwâja on the paper held by the courtier standing in the lower left corner. Both Stchoukine and Ettingausen are however wrong to identify the handsome youngman standing near the emperor as Parwiz, because Parwiz never visited Ajmer during the period of Jahângîr's stay. The richly bejewelled prince does not seem to be anyone else but Khurram and the handsome youngman may be identified as Jahângîr Qulî Khân, the

22. R. Ettinghausen, op.cit., 112 note 45.
capable son of Khân-i-A‘zam. From the presence of Dayânat Khân, Murtaza Khân, Ibrâhim Khân and Prince Karan the date of the picture can be fixed precisely at February/March 1615. Dayânat Khân was imprisoned at Gwalior for insulting I’timâd-ud-daula within a few days after Khurram’s arrival. A few weeks afterwards Murtaza Khân was sent to Kangra and Ibrâhim Khân left for Bihar. Prince Karan returned to Mewar within about four months of his arrival.

Jahângîr attached much importance to his son’s victory as is apparent from the lengthy accounts in the Tuzuk, and from his taking an omen from the Diwan-i-Hâfiz. The quantity of gifts and favours showered on Prince Karan was also unusual. Abu’l Hasan’s pictorial commentary of the emperor’s "grand achievement" aptly portrays the emperor as the world-siezer, who holds the key to the globe on which he rests his feet. The key is the "Key of victory over the two worlds......entrusted to his hand." The presence of the ruler of ancient Rum with a royal insignia in that assembly adds weight to his prestige and power.

23. Tuzuk, I, 278.
24. ibid., I, 283.
25. ibid., I, 286.
26. ibid., I, 293.
27. ibid., I, 272-8.
28. This is noted in an autograph note written two days before Khurram’s victory on f73a of the emperor’s personal volume of Hâfiz’s Divan, now in the Bankipur Oriental Library: Cat-Bankipur, I, 231-59
29. vide, R. Ettinghausen, op.cit., 112. Written on the picture reproduced here as frontispiece. See infra.
A miniature in the same collection again illustrates the theme of Jahāngīr’s exaggerated might and employs a number of iconographic symbols (Plate 109)\(^{30}\). The name of the painter is unfortunately not preserved, but the picture has all signs and stylistic elements of Abu’l Ḥasan’s brush. It depicts an imaginary meeting of Jahāngīr and Shāh ‘Abbās. Both of them sit on a raised cushioned throne. Jahāngīr, as in similar representations, is of a slightly larger size than his friend and brother\(^{31}\) Shāh ‘Abbās. They are attended by Ḥāṣaf Khan, who offers wine in a small gold cup, and by Khān-i-‘Alam who holds a European metal wine-vessel shaped like Diana riding on a stag in one hand and a majestic Shāhīn falcon in the other. Various flagons and Venetian and Chinese wine cups are placed on an Italian table. Metal incense-burners, rare fruits and valuable jewels etc., are set out before them in trays and dishes of different colours.

The entertainment takes place not under a canopy or within a shamiyāna, but under the blue-green open sky, amidst the gold and violet-pink clouds. Both the emperors are haloed, but the splendour and importance of Jahāngīr are exaggerated by his majestic posture and by the number of

---

30. PSEI, Pl. 13, text.
valuable gems and jewelled ornaments he wears. His importance is further emphasized by a golden half-circle held by two winged cupids and part of the blazing sun. On the golden half-circle seals giving the names of his exalted line are drawn. The emperor's name is written on the partially visible sun.

Ettinghausen reckons the date of this picture at 1618-1622, and believes that it immediately follows the painting illustrating Jahangir's dream (Plate 108). In view of the introduction of some details which can be identified, the picture may be attributed to a more definite date. The close similarity of the Shah's portraiture with that of Bishandás's signed study (Plate 85), the presence of Khan-i-'Alam with the much-praised Shāhīn falcon by the Shah and the walrus-ivory handle of the daggers depicted in it rule out any possibility of a pre-1620 date. The lower chronological limit of March, 1622 is most likely because Jahangir could no longer have addressed the intruder in his empire as his brother. The presence of Aṣaf Khan instead of his much respected father I'timâd-ud-daula probably points

32. vide, supra, Chapter VII.
to a date close to the latter's mortal illness. Jahangir, in fact, addresses Shâh 'Abbâs as his brother in two entries made in the Tuzuk during the end of 1621 when he sent him some golden oriole (murgh-i-zarrin) through the Iranian ambassador.

The most important picture in this iconographic series is found in the Chester Beatty Library (Plate 110). The painter is again Abu'l Hasan. In this picture all previous symbolic elements are combined with many new ones. It shows Jahangir shooting arrow on the severed head of a

33. Tuzuk, II, 222, end of January 1622. The couplet of Anwâri recited by him at the time when Jahangir came to see him on his death-bed is revealing:

Were a mother-born blind man present
He'd recognise Majesty in the World-Adorner.

34. Tuzuk, II, 221. The Shah's envoy came a few months earlier: ibid., II, 209. The bird described as murgh-i-zarrin is translated by Steingas as 'yellow-hammer' or 'golden finch(?)' and by Rogers & Beveridge as golden birds or goldfinches, but it seems that either golden pheasant or golden oriole is meant by the word.

35. Cat-CB, I, 31-2, where the inscriptions written all over the picture by Abu'l Hasan are translated. The picture became a stock motif and was often copied. Three notable ones amongst them are: 1) Freer Gallery of Art: R. Ettinghausen, op.cit., fig 12; 2) Berlin & A Museum; H. Goetz, Geschichte der Indischen Miniaturmalerei, Berlin 1936, Tafel 10; 3) Present whereabouts unknown; Loan Exhibition of Antiquities, Pl. XXXIX a 7 b (here the composition is more elaborate).
dark-complexioned man. The emperor wears richly embroidered ankle-length dress and gems and jewelled ornaments in profusion. He balances his feet on a globe which although placed on a European metal frame, is held by an ox on its back standing on an enormous fish. The severed head of Malik 'Ambar, as the inscription reveals his name, is placed on the piercing blade of javelin planted in the ground. An owl sits on the head, while a dead one dangles from it, probably to illustrate the idea given in the inscription written near it 'the face of the rebel has become the abode of the owl'. The emperor draws a bow as if to despatch an arrow, although an arrow has already pierced through the mouth of the severed head. From the clouds above a pair of Western-inspired cupids supply arrows and a sheathed sword to the emperor, indicating a divine support for him. A line of golden bells is hung from the globe to the javelin, and a pair of perfectly balanced scales hang from this chain symbolising the emperor's sense of justice: "through the justice of Shâh Nûr-ud-dîn Jahângîr the lion(sic) has sipped milk from the teat of the goat." The metaphor is fully illustrated on the globe where a cow is shown nursing a lion, a tiger a goat and cats and mice are shown sitting together. Behind

36. Representing the Chain of Justice hung by Jahângîr soon after his accession: Tuzuk, I, 7.
the emperor is a stand similar to a European candlestick over which the elaborate seal of Jahāṅgīr. It depicts nine circles enclosing the names of Jahāṅgīr's nine predecessors around his own name. It is topped by a European style crown with feathers. A bird of paradise flies over it. An inscription near the seal declares: 'Thy mine ancestors were crowned by God.'

Two possible dates for the picture can be given, 1621 or 1625. In 1621 Afzal Khān brought the news of Shāh Jahān's victory over the Deccani Sultanates dominated by Malik 'Ambar. The detailed entries in the Tūzkūk extol the victory and it is not improbable that Abu'l Hasan was directed to illustrate the glorious victory in a suitable manner. The alternative date is 1625, when Malik 'Ambar died at the ripe age of 80. It was then no longer possible for the emperor to intervene in the affairs of the Deccan as he had been made powerless by the rebellion of Shāh Jahān. Some of the inscription written by Abu'l Hasan on the picture, e.g.

37. The Mā'āshī-ul-Umara records an incident (MU, 99) when after the news of 'Abdullāh Khān's foolish retreat from the Deccan in 1611, Jahāṅgīr asked his painters to prepare portraits of him and other generals and made comments on seeing them.
Thy arrow that lay the enemy low, sent out of the world 'Ambar, the owl who fled from the fight.... The belly of they pig-like enemy is sated with blood through thy spear.... When thou dost come in the bow, thou dost drive colour away from the face of the enemy

point to a date after Malik 'Ambar's death, for which no credit could possibly be given to Jahangir.

A picture of Jahangir in the Kevorkian Album depicts him standing on a golden footstool wearing a curious dress for battle and a helmet. It bears the signature: Ḫamīrīn Murīzāda ikhlāṣ Mādir-uz-Zamān. Jahangir, in addition to the shield and sword, carries an orb of sovereignty on which the symbolic co-existence of the lion and other domesticated animals is depicted. The battle dress and helmet are also symbolic for his desire to lead the army against Shah 'Abbās, which however was beyond his capacity.

All these inconographic symbols, lying down together of the lion and the lamb, the scale of justice, the little cupids carrying the imperial insignias of sword, crown and parasol, the praying mullahs and the halo, are repeated in a picture of Shâh Jahân found in the same Kevorkian Album. He is similarly shown as standing on a globe. The picture appears to be a coronation portrait

38. Sotheby's Sale Catalogue, 12 December, 1929, Lot 110 plate.
as it was painted by Hashim in 1038 Hijra/1628\textsuperscript{39}.

The iconographical drawings were further developed by another painter: Bichitr. We are not aware of his earlier activities. His first few works are associated with Jahângîr, although his main works were drawn in Shâh Jahân's time. Of all his pictures the most famous one is the unique study in the Freer Gallery of Art, showing Jahângîr paying attention to a Sufî Shaikh while ignoring the kings (Plate 107). Professor Ettinghausen has devoted a long and thought-provoking paper to this picture. He has tried to show how the self-complacent thoughts of the old, physically sick, politically overshadowed Jahângîr verged towards theophany and made possible the conception of such a theme, unique in Islamic art\textsuperscript{40}.

Very little needs to be added beyond what Ettinghausen has written. His suggestion regarding the identity of the figure shown in the lower left corner, however, is not acceptable. The presence of the painter in an ordinary

\textsuperscript{39} ibid, Lot 111. Another version of this picture in the Chester Beatty Library, \textit{Cat-CB}, I, 32; III, Pl.63. A Hindu prince paying homage is added to the composition. A third version which includes the portraits of Shâh Jahân's four sons is also found in the same Collection: \textit{Cat-CB}, I, 29-30, not reproduced.

court scene is not an impossibility, but in an allegorical picture depicting rulers of different lands the figure of a painter serves no apparent purpose. The rule of tying the jamā in different ways for Hindus and Musalmans was never strictly observed by Jahāngīr's painters. The figure, therefore, is not necessarily a Hindu. In the company of these other rulers, he is most likely to be a King. From his sharp facial features, thick-set beard, typical Deccani turban, and from the relatively smaller size of his figure he seems to be the King of Bijapur, Ibrāhīm 'Adīl Shāh II. He is depicted as looking towards the Mughal emperor holding a picture on which an elephant, a couple of horses and a man bowing down are painted. Probably this was to indicate the lesser but friendly ruler's homage to the 'Great King' Jahāngīr, who looms large in the composition.

A further symbolic drawing by Bichitr in the Chester Beatty Library (Frontispiece) shows Jahāngīr standing holding an orb in his right hand. As Arnold and Wilkinson point out, this is the right part of a double-page composition, the other part showing an old dervish clad in pure white.

41. Cf: PI, Pl. on p. 127; vide, R. Skelton, Ars Asiaticae, V, 124-5 for a full bibliography of portraits of Ibrāhīm 'Adīl Shāh II.
42. Cat-CB, I, 30-1; I, Frontispiece (colour).
He is incorrectly identified by them as Shah Daulat, but during Jahangir's lifetime Shah Daulat could not be as old as the Shaikh depicted in the picture. The Shaikh is shown as symbolically presenting the emperor a globe on which is written: 'the key of victory over the two worlds is entrusted to thy hand.' The same words occur on the picture of the emperor. In these pictures the iconographical symbolism is restricted to the globe and the orb, which are adopted from Christian engravings. The fact that the Shaikh is depicted as bestowing the charge of the two worlds adds emphasis to Jahangir's preference to the seekers of the Divine, a theme recurring in a number of miniatures coming from the later years of his reign. As his last days brought bitterness and frustration he tried to get solace from his religious belief. All along his life he enjoyed material prosperity and towards the end of his life it was agony and despair. In order to escape from it he turned against the world of kingship, and looked towards his inner

43. Mr. R. Skelton proposes the identification of the Shaikh as Shaikh Mu'in-ud-din Chishti, the guardian saint of the Mughals.

44. A copy of the same picture of Jahangir is in the Collection of Shanti Kumar Morarji, Bombay: Rai Krishnadas, Mughal Miniatures, Pl. X.

45. Notable examples are found in the Walters Art Gallery, British Museum, Chester Beatty Library, Victoria & Albert Museum, India Office Library, etc: R. Ettinghausen, op. cit., figs. 2, 4, 5, 9, 10.
self and the allegorical world of spiritual force. \(^{46}\)

Abu’l Hasan was equally skilful in painting portraits, court assemblies and genre scenes. A number of his studies dealing with these subjects are found in the royal muraqqa’s. As he continued to paint for a good many years during Shâh Jahân’s reign, it is often difficult to isolate the examples which come within our scope. Three excellent pictures of Jahângîr, Shâh Jahân and an unidentified infant prince, out of a large number of portrait-studies of the emperor and his family should be noted here.

The well finished portrait of Jahângîr, \textit{ex} collected in the Polier Album, British Museum is a tiny miniature of 4.5 x 8.8 cm.\(^{47}\) In this picture the emperor stands with a falcon on his right hand while his left hand holds the jewelled hilt of a knife. He appears healthy and vigorous, and as he is not wearing the pearl ear-rings, Abu’l Hasan’s study is likely to be of a pre-1614 date.

The picture of Prince Khurram (Plate 60) can be dated with a fair amount of accuracy as it bears a note in Shâh Jahân’s handwriting: “A good portrait of myself in my

\(^{46}\) A number of portrait studies of Jahângîr in his old age depict him as a weak and drawn man, clasping a crown, a globe or an orb. Two of them, in the Chester Beatty Library, are signed by Hashim: \textit{Cat-CE}, I, 30, No.12,13; III, Pl. 61. See: British Museum, J & J, frontispiece; R. Ettinghausen, \textit{op.cit.}, fig. 11.

\(^{47}\) British Museum, 1920,9-17,0110, Unpublished.
twenty-fifth year well done by Nadir-uz-Zamânât.\(^{48}\)

The third picture on our list shows the liverly study of a chubby infant whose name is not mentioned\(^{49}\). It is excellent and interesting picture, revealing obvious familiarity with European prototypes\(^{50}\). S.C. Welch identifies the infant prince as Shâh Shujâ', Jahângîr's favourite grandson, who was born in 1616.

Abu'l Hasan is the painter of the fine study of Jaswanta, the Jâm of Kathâwâr, found in the Berlin Album\(^{51}\). An old man of good health and dark-complexion, he visited Jahângîr's court at Ahmedabad in early 1618\(^{52}\). The portrait of 'Abdulla Khân Firûz-jang in the Minto Album, shown standing with a severed head, bears the signature of Nadir-uz-Zamân\(^{53}\). It may depict the incident of Khân Jahân Lodi's death in 1631, but the breast-plate worn by 'Abdulla Khân shows Jahângîr's name. The portrait of 'Abdulla Khân pasted on a folio of the Berlin Album seems to be a work of Bishandâs, rather than

---

\(^{48}\) vide, supra, Chapter VII.

\(^{49}\) AMI, Pl. 31.

\(^{50}\) The Jesuits refer to the picture of Child Christ as very favourite to Jahângîr: A & J, 127, 187; J & J, 33.

\(^{51}\) IBP, 10, 21-2, Pl. 37.

\(^{52}\) Tuzuk, I, 443-4; II, 3. Cf: AMI, Pl. 34 (colour) for a study by Bishandâs.

\(^{53}\) Victoria & Albert Museum, IM, 16-1925. There is a close copy of the same subject in the Kevorkian Album, signed by one Muhammad 'Alam.
that of Abu'l Hasan. As many as five versions of a picture showing old 'Abdullâ Khan Uzbek hawking in a hilly region, are associated with Nâdir-uz-Zamân's name. Of these only the Victoria and Albert Museum copy appears to be the original because it bears Abu'l Hasan's signature and a note in Shah Jahan's handwriting, saying: "This is the picture of 'Abdullâ Khan Uzbek done by Nâdir-uz-Zamân." The Leningrad version (Plate 87) is also signed, Nâdir-uz-Zamân. It seems to be a duplicate coming from his brush.

Lastly, reference should be made to a number of copies prepared from European engravings which are associated with Abu'l Hasan. Of these the fully-coloured miniature of the youthful Christ in the Chester Beatty Collection deserves special attention. Abu'l Hasan's early acquaintance with European materials certainly helped him to develop his individual style. His portrait studies are accurate and

54. IBP, 18-9, Pl. 6 (colour): Is it the copy mentioned in the Ma'âshir-ul-Umarâ (tr.99)? vide note 37, supra.
lively although they lack the penetrating depth and sensitiveness of the portraits painted by Daulat or Manohar. Jahangir praised Abu’l Hasan highly for his mastery in evolving and developing the elaborate iconographic symbolisms which, to a great extent, fulfilled his inner desire, and his superficial claim for greatness. Abu’l Hasan’s familiarity with Christian pictures provided him with a wide repertoir of iconographic symbols prevalent in European religions art, such as, the orb, the globe, the cherubs and cupids, the birds of paradise (in preference to the huma or simurugh), the golden crown, the key and so on. These were intermingled with such accepted Islamic and Indian symbols as the halo, the gesture of the hands, the fish, the co-existence of ferocious and domesticated animals, the sun and the moon, etc. The appearance of dervishes and servants became meaningful and symbolic. Soon their identity was lost and their use became more frequent to bestow boons and moral support, as well as to
lend a touch of the Divine to the princes and emperors.\footnote{\textit{vide}, R. Ettinghausen, "The Emperor's Choice", 114-118. The sentiment is best expressed by a quatrain of Ḥakīm Ṣadrā Maṣḥ-uz-Zamān, quoted in the \textit{Tūzuk} (I, 304):

\begin{quote}
Although we have the business of kingship before us, Every moment more and more we think about dervishes, If the heart of our Dervish be gladdened by us We count that to be the profit of our kingship.
\end{quote}

This is confirmed by the inscription written above and below the Freer drawing (Plate 107):

\textit{Shāh Nūr-ud-dīn Jahāṅgīr, son of Akbar Pādishāh. 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 dervishes (for guidance).}
Jahangir's quest for new aesthetic ideals was to a large extent stimulated by the presence of a considerable number of European pictures, engravings and various kinds of decorative arts in the Mughal court. In order to assess the true impact of these European art-objects of novel styles on the art of the Mughals, the whole background of the introduction of Europeans and European art in Mughal India needs to be briefly re-examined.

Since the establishment of a Portuguese base at Goa in 1510 sporadic visitors, traders and art objects of European origin were not altogether uncommon. A serious interest in Europe, its learning, its religion and its art was however shown for the first time by Akbar when he met a Portuguese delegation led by Antony Cabral during the siege of Surat in 1573. He next came across a European in 1576/7 when the Portuguese commandant of Satgaon in Bengal, Pedro Tavares, came to Fatehpur Sikri. Obviously

1. AN, III, 37; A & J, 217n2.
2. AN, III, 349; A & J, 14-5.
with them a few European objects of art also reached the Mughal Court. Tavares found the emperor interested in Christianity and told him about Julian Pereira, the Portuguese priest-in-charge of Satgaon who was invited to Fatehpur Sikri. But Pereira failed to satisfy the emperor's inquiries about Christianity and the Scriptures in the evening assemblies of the 'Ibâdatkhâna in 1578/9. On Pereira's recommendation Akbar sent his special envoy 'Abdullâh Khân to Goa with a royal farman requesting the immediate despatch of a few capable Christian scholars to the Mughal capital. It resulted in the arrival at the end of February 1580 of the first Jesuit mission under the leadership of the learned Father Rudolph Aquaviva with Francis Henriquez and Antony Monserrate.

The mission received a warm and courteous welcome from the emperor, and a new period of intercourse between Muslim India and the Christian world commenced. Akbar

3. Already there were Christian pictures, including those of Jesus, the Virgin and Moses, when the first Jesuit mission arrived in 1580: Commentary (See infra, note 6), 29.

4. JGM, 23-4. Bada*6ni*s reference to the presence of Firangi priests in the Mughal capital in 1575/6 (MT, II, 215) remains uncorroborated. Julian Pereira was introduced to Akbar by Pedro Tavares.

5. Father Hosten's translation of the farman is quoted in JGM, 24.

6. Father Monserrate's latin work Commentarius... is the main source of our knowledge about the activities of this mission: For its English translation: J. Hoyland & S. Banerjee, The Commentary of Father Monserrate, Oxford, 1922.
wanted to gather a first-hand knowledge of the Christian faith and the nonsense of his expected conversion to Christianity was nothing but a pious and unrealistic hope of the zealous Jesuits. From that point of view the continuous presence of Christian priests was a frustrating failure, though from the point of mutual understanding between two worlds, different in cultural and religious matters, the arrival of Father Aquaviva’s mission ushered in a new era in Mughal history.

The learned fathers vigorously defended their faith in prolonged religious debates in the 'Ibâdatkhâna, and presented various books, religious paintings, statuettes and other art objects to the emperor. Few people read those Greek or Latin books but many looked at the illustrations, few people tried to understand the sermon preached by the fathers in their small chapel at Fatehpur Sikri, but many of them went there to look at the large

7. The point was made quite clear by Abu'l Fažl in his remarks: A & J, 36.
8. Their first present was an atlas of the world (Commentary, 28), followed by a set of seven sumptuous folio volumes of Christopher Plantin's Polyglot Bible. The work was printed in Antwerp in 1569-73 for King Philip, and was completed in eight volumes. It contains frontispiece and illustrations by Jan Wierix, Philip Galle, Peter van der Heyden etc. (M.C. Beach, Bull-MFA, No. 332, 94n2; reproduced: AM, Tafel 36, Ab. 105; W. Staude, RdAA, V, 102-5, Pl.XLVIII-LII) Then gradually paintings of Jesus and the Virgin were presented to Akbar: A & J, 19-20; Commentary....., 49, JGM, 225-6. Father Xavier saw at least 20 volumes of Christian literature in Akbar's library when he came to the Mughal Court in 1595: A & J, 63, JGM, 68-9. For other references to presentation of pictures to Akbar: A & J, 82, 110-1, 134, 166.
pictures of Christ, the Virgin and the Saints, which were hung inside it by the fathers. When they imported the famous pictures of the Madonna and the Adoration of the Magi, unending streams of visitors of all faiths thronged in the Jesuit church to see them.

The arrival of these paintings, engravings and illustrated printed books of a new style and novel technique must have opened up a new horizon to the artists of the Mughal studio. At that time the highly Persianised early Akbari style was already undergoing a process of transformation by a synthesis with indigenous stylistic elements, and the European works, the products of long years of artistic and technical development, came as a boon to inspire the Mughals in their attempts to solve many technical problems. The Mughal interest in European works is evident in the interesting pictures copied and coloured by Kesavdâs

9. The emperor with his sons visited the Father's Chapel housed near the royal chambers: Commentary, 59; for Salîm's visits: ibid, 48, 60. Also: A & J, 25-7 & JGM, 32-3.
from European engravings or drawings\(^{11}\). Similar studies made by such leading Akbari masters as Basâwan, Sânwala and Mishkinâ also testify to their serious interest in European workmanship\(^{12}\). Slowly, their own works began to show occasional introduction of European figures\(^{13}\), and a considerable improvement on the techniques of shadowing, depiction of perspective and effective modelling. The distant backgrounds of many Mughal miniatures of contemporary times were almost replicas of similar features in European pictures\(^{14}\).

---

11. LPI, Pl. XIX; A Bull-MFA, No.332, fig 1 & 1a; IBP, Pl.42: there is another unsigned picture of Madonna on the same folio of the Berlin Album, which may be attributed to Kesâvadâs; Cat-CB, III, Pl.83: another signed Kesâvadâs - Tobias Recounting His Marvellous Adventure to His Father Blind Tobit - Ind. MS.41(2); the coloured copy of a houri with two attendant angles (Ind.MS.62(2)) may also be from Kesâvadâs's brush.

The story of Kesâva's presentation of an album of copies of European works (IPM,167; HFA, 2\(^{nd}\) edn, 220, JGM, 236) is based not on any sound evidence but probably on A. Weber's misreading of the Devanâgrî inscription in a Jahângîrî album miniature (IBP,Pl.39) signed by Kesâva: A. Weber, Indian Antiquary, VI,(London,1877), 353-4.

12. For Basâwan: supra, Chapter VIII, Note...., for Sânwala Cat-CB, III, Pl.81; For Mishkinâ; JGM, pl. facing p.23, Y. Godard, Athar-e-Iran, 1937, 222, No.29.

13. Cf; PSEI, Pl.7; Pl. Pl.88; AMI, Pl.25A; IPM, Pl.XXI; S. Tyulayev, The Baburnamah Miniatures, Pl.16,27; Also: Plate 76.

14. Cf: IPM, Pl.XXXV; AIP, 95; Pl.124,131; LPI, Pl.X,XX: Pl, 86-9,92; J.V.S. Wilkinson, The Lights of Canopus, Pl.21; etc.
Although these features may not be regarded as sufficient to alter the whole character of Mughal painting, nevertheless, their adoption considerably inspired the Mughal painters in their search for a new direction. In Jahângîr's atelier the impact of European art became even more apparent because the painters were not happy with the use of the same motifs and at that time they were making a great effort to create a new iconography for which the European religious motifs and symbolisms were of great value to them.

Before examining the specific instances where the impact of European ideas made itself felt, some indications of Jahângîr's obsession for European art-objects should be given.

When the first Jesuit mission came to Fatehpur Sikri, Akbar entrusted the teaching of his second son Murâd to the fathers, but the traditional method of education continued for the prince-regent Salîm. Salîm, however, led the way by showing a lively interest in the activities of the strangely-dressed Jesuits, and particularly in the pictures, engravings and art or craft objects brought by

15. supra, Chapter I.
them. In his letter of 20th August 1595, Father Xavier wrote to his Provincial how Salīm became seriously angry with the Muslim guide who went to Goa 'for not bringing with him no image of the Mother of God' and bade another 'to make extensive purchases' and not to fail to bring with him a fine picture of our Lord. In the same letter the Father requested the Provincial to send Akbar and Prince Salīm 'a beautiful and large picture of the Holy Virgin of the Nativity', which they would receive 'with much affection and kindness'.

When Salīm started building up his own collection, he was eager to possess as many European pictures as possible. Father Xavier relates the episode of how Salīm who went to the Jesuit Chapel in Fatehpur with Akbar, wished immediately after seeing replicas of the Child Jesus and a crucifix, to have similar images made of ivory by his own workmen. He borrowed European pictures from the fathers

17. JASB, op. cit., 67: mentioned in Father Xavier's letter of August 20, 1595. A picture of youthful Christ as the Master Mariner is painted on the hāshiya of a Jahāngīrī Album folio, now in the Freer Gallery of Art (Plate 117). The British Museum possesses an ivory plaque of excellent quality (No. 1959, 7-21, 1), which depicts the same subject in a precisely similar manner. It is described as an early 17th century Goanese work but almost certainly is the same piece made by Salīm's ivory-carvers. I am grateful to Mr. Simon Digby for suggesting its identification and to Mr. Douglas Barrett giving facilities for its study.
for copies to be made by his own painters and even employed an unknown Portuguese painter to copy a beautiful Picture of Madonna brought by the fathers in 1596, which his own painters are said to have 'failed to copy properly'.

Further requests for 'large and beautiful pictures of the Holy Virgin or of the Nativity' were made to the Provincial by Father Xavier and in his letter he added:

Salīm was so anxious for things imported from Portugal and [Peninsular] India and especially for the picture of our Saviour and the Blessed Virgin, the Queen of Angels (to whose care he says he commends himself) that he excites our wonder.

Such examples can be multiplied as Father Xavier noticed on many occasions the Prince's enthusiastic pursuit of the collection and study of similar Christian pictures. It went on unabated even after he became the emperor. The Father found him going through the albums (registros).

18. A&J, 67,82; JASB, op.cit, 67,76. Father Xavier's letters of August 20,1595 and July 26,1598. For similar references in Roe's diary: Roe, 223, etc: supra. It is not impossible that some of the coloured copies prepared by Kesāvadās found in the Jahāngīr Albums and elsewhere were, infact, prepared for Salīm, because the date of the Oxford St. Matthew is not far from the date of Father Xavier's first letter.

19. Father Xavier's letter of December, 1597: JASB, op.cit 73-5. Also see A&J, 190: "...Indeed, the Fathers could make him no more acceptable present than a well-executed representation of either; though he employed the most skilled painters and craftsmen in his father's kingdom in making him the like."

20. J&J, 49,58 ("one evening, the King was looking through a portfolio containing the pictures.""). Also: A&J, 190-1: "He [Salīm] also had painted in a book pictures illustrating the mysteries of His life, death and passion,..." Some pictures from the royal collection were lent to the fathers in the Christmas celebrations of 1607 at Lahore: A&J, 45.
selecting original engravings for preparation of coloured replicas or enlarged designs for wall-paintings and supervising the works of his painters. He used to send them to the Jesuit chapel for consulting the fathers "as to the colour to be given to the costumes and to adhere strictly" to what the fathers told them.

When Jahangir settled down in Agra in 1608 regular sessions of religious discussions were held in the evenings in which the royal murqqa's were brought by the librarian (Maktûb Khân, Plate 104) and Christian pictures were picked up for initiating prolonged and controversial discussions of them. The emperor wanted to know their underlying symbolism, questioned their credibility and noted their subtle qualities. Thus the large number of European pictures that arrived at the Mughal court were not only collected with enthusiasm but also studied with interest. When the walls of the halls and chambers where

21. Father Xavier's letters of December, 1597, July 26, 1598 and September 24, 1608: JASB, op. cit., 74. The letter of September 24, 1608 gives a detailed description of the numerous drawings of Christian subjects painted on the walls of the Mughal palace at Agra. This important letter has been translated by Father Hosten, JPHS, VII, 60-2 and quoted in full by E. Maclagan; JGM, 238-40.
the emperor gave his audience, held his private assemblies in the evening and spent his time in holding pleasure parties were fully covered with such pictures, it is not difficult to imagine the number of European pictures going to Mughal India and the kind of attention they received.

Not unexpectedly most of the pictures presented by the Jesuits were of religious character. The pictures of

24. The walls of private and public chambers of all palaces and garden-houses were painted. Jahangir himself records such paintings executed in a wonderful manner by his painters at Srinagar and at Lahore (Tuzuk, II, 151, 161-2, 183). Roe observed pictures including that of the Kings of France and other Christian Princes painted on the walls of the newly built garden-house called Chasma-i-Nūr at Hāfiz Jamāl, near Ajmer (Roe, 211). Similar observations of wall-paintings are made in the letters of the Jesuits (Father Xavier's letter of September 24, 1608: JGM, 238-40) and in the accounts of William Finch and William Hawkins. Finch gives a graphic description of the wall-paintings and the subjects illustrated there, seen by him at Fatehpur (ETI, 149-50), Sirhind (ibid, 158), Lahore (ibid, 162-5), Allahabad (ibid, 177-8) and Agra (ibid, 186-7). He does not refer to the paintings of Sikandra noticed by later travellers (JGM, 237-8), so, it seems that these paintings were added after his visit in 1611. Also: See: Roe, 70n, Cat-CB, I, P XXXII; E. Smith, Moghal Architecture of Fathpur Sikri, I, Pl. CIX; JGM, 237-42. Cf: Plates, 62-3, 65, 80, 107; and G. Warner, op. cit. II, Pl. CXXII, IPM, XXIV; Clarke, Pl. 7.

25. J & J, 49, 58, 63-7, 78; JGM, 247-8, passim. The only recorded exceptions are the pictures of Albuquerque and of the Portuguese Viceroy Saldanha (A & J, 154) presented to Akbar in 1602, and of Ignatius Loyola presented earlier (A & J, 82).
the Christ Child and the Madonna had a natural appeal to the Mughals and a large number of them must have found their way into India. These pictures were collected with equal enthusiasm not only by the Mughal emperors but also by the principal nobles like Mahabat Khan, Asaf Khan, Khan-i-'Azam, Muqarrab Khan and Mir Jamâl-ud-dîn Hûsain Înjû, as the records of the Jesuits and the English factors reveal. With declining influence of the Jesuits and the increasing interest of the English traders the character of European pictures arriving in India changed. Instead of the large number of religious pictures the English factors selected portraits of their King and Queen, the director of the East India Company and of known and unknown society women, as presents. Requests for scenes

26. Cf: Plates 80, 104, 116, 117, 132 & 134. For a number of adaptations found in the Berlin Album: IBF, Pl. 29, 30, 41, 42, and in the Gulshan Album: Y. Godard, Athar-e-Iran, 1936, fig. 1; M.C. Beach, Bull-MFA, No.332, fig. 4, 5, 9. See infra.

27. Mahâbat Khân: Letters Recd, III, 64; Âsaf Khan: ibid, III, 64, 91-2, Roe, 415n; JGM, 241 (quoting Manrique); Khan-i-'Âzam, JGM, 232; Muqarrab Khan: Roe, 167; Letters Recd. II, 138 (reference to the picture of "Tamberlaine" given to Muqarrab Khan which he subsequently presented to Jahângîr: Tuzuk, I, 153-4); Mir Jamâl-ud-dîn Hûsain Înjû: Roe, 215. Pictures were also presented to Mirzâ Beg (Roe, 143) and Zulfîqar Khân (Letters Recd., IV, 82).

28. Letters Recd. I, 239, II, 138, 246; III, 15, 63-4, 85-6, 91-2; IV, 82, 207-8; V, 49, 72. For Roe's evidence of these paintings exhibited during Naurûz: Roe, 125-6, 357.
of 'some story with many faces', of royal hunt and the King in Parliament and later on of battle pictures, comic scenes and even of nude studies were sent to the principals by the factors. The miniature portraits created a tremendous impact in the court and easily won the emperor's approval. Sir Thomas Roe's letters to the East India Company were full of requests for such pictures, and always with a special reminder of their quality:

Your pictures not all woorth one penny. Here are nothing esteemed but the best sorts: good cloth and fine and rich pictures, they coming out of Italy overland and from Ormus; soe that they laught at us for such as wee bring.

Good pictures of beautiful women were warmly greeted. The picture of a Diana presented by Roe gave much content to the Mughals and the account of an excellent portrait of a mysterious woman narrated at great length by Roe evidences the sort of interest these pictures evoked in the Mughal Court.

29. Letters Recd, III, 68 ("....and for the King and some of the Chiefs...some courtlike pictures, as the running at tilt, the King and nobility spectators, the King sitting in Parliament, and suchlike will be graceful and give content, being done curiously, that his own people may come short in imitation, of whom he hath and some skilful...")], 88; Roe, 99.


33. Roe, 459.

34. Ibid, 189-90, 199-200, 222-4. See also, Terry, op. cit, 135.
The accounts of the Jesuit fathers, European travellers and Roe are aptly corroborated by a series of original European engravings and European-inspired drawings preserved in the Jahângîrî muraqqa's as well as in the later muraqqa's. From the number of original engravings pasted on the folios of the royal muraqqa's some indication of Jahângîr's collection of European engravings can be had. Many of these were coloured or copied, in some cases, with minor variations, by his painters. More interesting examples are found on the hâshiyas of the folios of calligraphic qit'as in the royal muraqqa's, where various details and figures forming integral parts of these engravings were cleverly introduced. This unique method provided the Jahângîrî painters with a wonderful opportunity for studying the engravings and making experiments with them. They must have felt fascinated by this exercise and by the decorative and figural details which were slowly synthesized in their own productions. The result of this synthesis is obvious in the iconographical drawings discussed in the previous chapter. Though portrait painting was already an important branch of Mughal art and Jahângîr's leading painters were great masters in this branch, the presence of European portraits of excellent quality certainly helped them to a great extent in their pursuit of new ideals.
Of the large number of original European engravings only those which were pasted on the folios of the royal murāqqa’s can be securely put in a chronological order, as the time of their arrival and their collection by Salīm is noted in most instances by the fathers. For the rest it is a matter of conjecture. However, with ever-increasing trade connections between the English and the French the flow of Catholic pictures must have diminished to a large extent.

The Berlin Album contains a Massacre of the Innocents and the Holy Family Journeying to Nazareth engraved by Jan Sadeler after Martin de Vos along with the small prints of the 'Four Evangelists', 'Descent of the Holy Ghost' and on another folio those of 'Adoration of the Kings' and 'noli me Tangere'35. On folio 8a there is a Flaying of Marsyas engraved by Theodor Galle after John Stradanus along with a couple of small engravings of the 'Resurrection' and 'Descent into Hell', probably forming part of Raphael Sadeler the younger's Little Series of Passion36. Folio 9a contains St. John the Evangelist (signed R.S.) along with the Ape on tree, adopted from Albrecht Dürer's famous Madonna. (Heller No.642)37. Milo Beach has recently published two folios from

35. IBP, 2, 3; folios 3a & 7b.
36. Ibid, 3, 58; the Galle engraving is not reproduced but the small engravings are illustrated on Pl. 42.
37. Ibid, 4, 50; only the Dürer Ape is reproduced Pl.43.
the Gulshan album - one contains five small engravings by Hans Sebald Beham and two 'putti' panels by two different German Monogramists, while the other contains four small engravings and two panels engraved by Hans Sebald and Barthel Beham, The Battle of Achilles and Hector and The Winged Helmed Genii. The folios in the Náprstek Museum described by Hájek contain four original engravings of similar size. Another small engraving showing St. George is pasted on a Leningrad album folio. Ettinghausen publishes a few folios from a private collection in Tehran forming a part of the Jahângîr Album, which have four original European engravings pasted on them. One of them shows Jan Sadeler's Madonna Feeding the Child engraved in 1581 after Martin de Vos's work, along with a Descent from the Cross and Interment of Christ apparently by the same artist. The second folio shows Christ with the Women of Samaria at the Well by Hieronymus Wierix. Madame Godard mentions two more original engravings of the Virgin and a European prince in the Nasir-ud-din Album at

38. MC. Beach, Bull-MFA, No.332, 67-9, fig. 1, 2.
39. IMM, 70-75 Pl. 10 illustrates two of them, Pl. 9 reproduces the center-piece but does not reproduce the other engravings.
40. Leningrad Album; Pl. 50 (folio 92).
41. R. Ettinghausen, Perennitas, 392, fig 4.
42. ibid, fig. 5.
The number of original engravings, which were coloured with slight alterations by the Mughal artists is not very less. The Muragga'-i-Gulshan has two fine pictures, coloured by a female artist called Nādirā Bānū whose name is inscribed on them (Plates 121, 126). The colour scheme of Nādirā Bānū's pictures closely corresponds with the originals of Peter Candido and Martin de Vas, from which the engravings were made by the Sadeler Brothers (Plates 125, 130). There is no evidence to show that coloured reproductions of these pictures ever arrived at the Mughal court; it seems that she was guided by the Jesuits resident in the court. In fact, Father Xavier reports of painters being sent to them by Jahângîr to ascertain the colour-scheme of the originals while preparing large size sketches for the wall-paintings or "illustrating some small pictures by putting on colours and pigments".

Nādirā Bānū is an unexpected name and no other works signed by her are known to us. As she mentions in her

---

43. Y. Godard, Athar-e-Iran, 1937, 275, not illustrated.
44. Other examples. British Museum Nos. 1942-1-24-003, 1920-9-17-031, 1954-4-8-02. Johnson Album XIV folio 5 (India Office Library), and elsewhere.
45. Bull-MFA, No. 332, 70-1, 73, figs. 4, 10.
47. J.G.M., 239.
signature the name of Aqâ Rizâ as her instructor so it seems these pictures were prepared in the Salîm Studio about the time when the young Abu'l Hasan copied the Dürer engraving of St. John (Plates 118, 119) in 1599-1600. Another female artist whose name is found on a drawing in the Gulshan album is Râqiyyâ Bânû. But Râqiyyâ copied a Persian drawing and the European figure of a seated male nude copied from the figure of Adam occurring in an engraving by Jan Sadeler after Crispin den Broeck's Adam and Eve after the Fall remains unsigned. If it is attributed to her then the same figure painted independently on a larger scale, now preserved in the Chester Beatty Library, should also be attributed to her.

The painter whose name is closely associated with coloured copies of European works is Kesavadas. We have no definite means to connect him with the Salîm Studio, though a number of his works occur in the royal murâqqa's. It is

48. supra, Chapter III.
50. Cat-CB, I, 44; III, Pl. 77.
51. supra, Note 11.
not impossible that while still in Akbar's employment he prepared a series of copies from European works for the crown-prince or he served Salîm for a few years after the third Jesuit mission arrived at Lahore in 1585. The motif of a love-lorn lady, writing letters or eagerly waiting for one, looking pensive and morose, sitting in a pavilion or in a landscape, alone or being accompanied by an angel or a group of men, seems to be a favourite theme developed by Kesavadâs from some European source for Jahângir. At least in one instance the picture bears his signature. The theme of a love-lorn heroine, the nāyikâ, was becoming increasingly popular at that time after the composition of the famous romantic work Rasikapriyâ by poet Kesavadâs of Orchha. The analogy is not fortuitous because the patron of the author of Rasikapriyâ was Râjâ Bir Singh Deo Bundela, Salîm's close friend and trusted courtier. A Jahângir period MS of this work lavishly illustrated with the

52. Bull-MFA, No.332, fig. 1; Other examples: ibid, figs. 2, 4 (lower); Cat-MFA, VI, 50, Pl. XXXIXb; British Museum 1948-10-9,072 (unpublished, late?); Cat-CB, I, 45; III, Pl. 81 (the central fig.). The original from which Kesavadâs adopted his motif remain unidentified. An engraving of a similar style is found in Palomino de Castro y Velasco, El Museo Pictorio y Escala Optica, Madrid, 1715-24.

53. The Rasikapriyâ was composed in 1591.

54. The murderer of Abu'l Fazl.
miniatures in the traditional style but showing great similarity with Mughal art, especially in costumes, architectural details and in the depiction of female figures, are known to us through a few folios and a number of miniatures detached from them.\footnote{55}

A few miniatures of excellent quality faithfully copied from European engravings or carefully overpainted directly on the originals are also preserved. The best-known one is to be found in the Wantage album in the Victoria and Albert Museum, which shows a copy of Jerome Wierix's The Martyrdom of St. Cecilia delightfully coloured (Plate 113). The name of the painter as written on the lower mount in what appears to be Shâh Jâhân's handwriting, is Nînî. From the name the painter appears to be a woman, but nothing definite can be added beyond that. A tinted drawing

\footnote{55} Cat-MFA, VI, 19-29. Pl. VIII-XIX; Pl., 109 (colour); Cat-Khajanchi, 27, No. 15 fig. 25. One miniature from this MS is in the British Museum. Other folios or miniatures are found in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York and the Preussisch Staatsbibliothek: H. Goetz, Geschichte der Indischen Miniaturmalereie, Berlin, 1936, Pl. 12b; Metropolitan Museum Studies, III, 1930; AIP, 111-2, No. 407; E. Gray, Treasures of Indian Miniatures, London, 1951, Pl. VI, VII; Cat-MFA, V, Pl. CC.

\footnote{56} JGM, 255; Clarke, Pl. 33 text.
of Nativity based on what appears to be an Italian original of the late 16th century\(^57\), a finely-coloured copy of Albrecht Dürer's well-known work, The Virgin and Child Seated by a Tree\(^58\), a coloured copy of The Virgin, Child and the Angel signed by an otherwise unknown painter named Mahabbat\(^59\), an unsigned picture of Christ, the Virgin and St. Anne\(^60\), a fully coloured copy of Tobias (Plate 133)\(^61\) and a coloured version of a European picture showing a visiting scene painted by Sânwala\(^62\), may also be included in this category.

57. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; Cat-MFA, VI, 50-1, Pl. XL.
58. Windsor Castle Library: AIP, No.666, Pl. 121.
   Gray reports that the colours of this fine picture conform to the European fashion of the late 16th century and that it may have been copied from a hand-coloured engraving. The same subject is repeated on the hâshiya of folio 5\(^a\) of the Berlin Album, but there it is shown without the tree or the landscape of the Dürer original. Furthermore, it was not copied after Wierix's engraving, which is in reverse to the Dürer (Alvin 625), as thought by Maclagan: JGM, 249: reproduced: IBP, 47, Pl. 30.
59. Bodleian Library, M\(\text{S}\). Douce Or a1, f 42\(b\):
   E. Wellesz, Akbar's Religious Thought...., Pl. 37.
60. James Ivory Collection, New York; AMI, Pl. 14.
61. Musée Guimet, No.3619 H.\(\text{a}\); LMI, 18, No.15.
   Signature of Husain on the lower mount.
62. Chester Beatty Library: Cat-CB, I, 45; III, Pl. 81.
The pictures of the Holy Family with St. John⁶³, Women and Angels at the Tomb of Christ⁶⁴ and Christ and the Instruments of His Passion⁶⁵, all vividly coloured and found pasted on the folios of Jahângîrî Albums are, in fact, original engravings overpainted by Jahângîr's painters. The popular subject of Madonna and the Child is coloured, copied and adopted in various forms from various sources. Three versions of an unidentified original are known; a copy directly based on the original is pasted on a folio of the Gulshan Album⁶⁶, while the same theme is repeated in a picture signed by Muḥammad Mîrzâ al-Ḥasanî, now in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, but in a reverse manner⁶⁷. A copy of the original design is painted on a reduced scale on the hâshiya of the Gulsâhan Album where the details of the setting have been omitted⁶⁸. Figure of the Madonna and Child is also found on a folio of the Gulshan Album (Plate

⁶³. IBP, 57, 64-5, Pl. 41. The original Sadeler engraving is reproduced: ibid, Pl. facing p. 54.
⁶⁴. ibid, 57, Pl. 41.
⁶⁵. H. Goetz, East & West, 1957, 166fn35, Pl. IX. On the authority of Prof. R. Berliner, Goetz identifies it as a copy of some Netherlands-German Romantist of probably the Circle of Sustris 1524/26-1599. Also see, Wilkinson & Gray, Burl.Mag., 1935, 174.
⁶⁶. IMM, 78-9, Pl. 32 (colour).
⁶⁷. Cat-MFA, VI, 49-50, Pl. XXXIX.
⁶⁸. Bul-MFA, No.332, 72, fig. 5.
which appears to be a slightly altered version of a copy of the world-famous Santa Maria Maggiore in Rome (Plate 116). Another version of this picture is found in the Leningrad Album which may belong to a slightly later period.

Figures of the Madonna copied from other models are also found on the same Gulshan Album folio discussed above (Plate 115); on another folio where the design is copied by 'Ali Quli with much variation from a Jan Sadeler engraving The Early Education of Jesus; in the India Office Library, Pozzi Collection, Indian Museum, Calcutta, the Leningrad Album, and in many other collections of Mughal paintings throughout the world. Of particular interest amongst them are two examples in the Leningrad Album (Plate 134) and in the British Museum. The Leningrad picture is of excellent quality and shows the graceful face of the young Virgin with a lotus bud in

70. Leningrad Album, Pl. 54.
72. ibid, fig 9a; R. Ettinghausen, (Perennitas, fig.4) reproduces another folio from the same album where the original Sadeler engraving is presented.
73. India Office Library, Johnson, XIV, f2; LPI, Pl.XXIIa.
74. E. Blochet, Les Peinturs Orientales de la Collection Pozzi, Paris, 1928, Pl. XXXVII; Pl. XXVIa shows a late version.
75. Rupam, [Calcutta, 1930], 23-24.
76. Leningrad Album, Pls. 51, 54, 55.
77. JEM, 250-2.
in her hand, carefully copies from a picture of Mary engraved by Jan Sadeler after an original by Aachen. The main interest of the British Museum monochrome drawing of the Virgin and Child lies in the fact that it was drawn by Ghulâm for Prince Salīm, both of whose names are inscribed on the picture.

The details on the ḥāshiyas of the royal murāqqa's show a wide variety of subjects, many of which were copied from a large number of European engravings. In most cases these were drawn in thin gold lines, and sometimes on a smaller scale so that they could be properly enclosed with the cartouches and arabesques designed on the folios. The figures are generally isolated details thoughtlessly lifted from well-knit compositions, resulting in a considerable loss of dramatic effect. So, in many instances the figures gaze outside at no one, raise their hands for no apparent reason or show meaningless poses and attitudes.

78. Leningrad Album, English résumé, 12-3, No. 50.

For other Mughal pictures copies from European engravings:

British Museum Nos. 1920, 9-17, 031; 1920, 9-7, 013(21); 1942, 1-24, 03; (based on an engraving of a painting by Isaac Gillisz Coninxlo 1544-1609); 1954, 5-8, 02 (engraved portrait of François Dauphin de France by Thos. de Léu, 1600). India Office Library, XIV-8, XXII-13.
Of the painters and engravers whose works reached the Mughal Court Dürer and the Sadeler Brothers were very popular. Whether the Mughal painters were aware of the fame and greatness of Albrecht Dürer is not known to us, but they did not fail to recognise the vigour and clarity of his lines, and the subtle sensitiveness of the faces in his works, which they seriously studied. Apart from his St. John (Plate 119) copied by Abu'l Hasan at the age of 13 (Plate 118), the Virgin under the Tree copied by an unknown painter and Madonna With the Ape referred to above, a few more of his well-known works were copied by Jahāngīr's painters. There are as many as four details copied from his works on a folio of the Berlin Album, whereas a Gulshan Album folio shows a fine study of his Frederick the Wise of Saxony. The figure of his Burgandian Standard bearer was drawn on a folio now in the Musée Guimet, while the young prince seated on a throne drawn on a folio in the M. le duc de Luynes Collection was modelled on the figure of the old man from his engraving Jesus and Caiphe. Madame Godard refers to a picture of a

80. *IBP*, 47, Pl. 30: Two original Dürer engravings reproduced: Plate 119, 120.
derwish drawn by Mishkina which was adopted from Dürer's work, and Kühnel writes of a slightly later work in the Berlin Collection which was again copied from Dürer.

The Sadeler Brothers were fairly prolific in their production of engravings and the number of their works arriving at the Mughal court seems to be quite large. Along with Jan Wierix, Goltzius, Crispin van den Broeck, the three Sadeler Brothers, Jan, Aegidius and Raphael, belonged to the Antwerp Guild. In the sixteenth century Antwerp was a key centre of book-production and painting, and it was from there that the Jesuits brought most of their books and pictures to the East.

Besides the signed works of Kesavadas, Nadirâ Bânû and Alî Qullî mentioned earlier, the picture of Dialectics of a Leningrad Album folio signed by Abu'l Haşan, the fine copy of the Holy Family with St. John in Berlin Album and a couple of female figures drawn on a Gulshan Album folio copied from a picture of St. Mary Magdalen praying, were

---

84. Y. Godard, Athar-e-Iran, 1937, 222, not illustrated.
85. E. Kühnel, Miniaturmalereien im Islamischen Orient, Berlin, 1922, Tafel 141.
87. supra.,
88. Leningrad Album, Pl.12.
89. IBP, Pl. 41; the original reproduced on pl. facing p.54.
90. H. Goetz, East & West, 1957, 166, Pl.10 and fn.36.
based on engravings made by the Sadeler Brothers\textsuperscript{91}.

The engravings of Hans Sebald Beham are also pretty common in the royal muraqqa's of Jahangir\textsuperscript{92}. Similarly, the series The Seven Liberal Arts and the Five Senses engraved by George Pencz were also popular with the Mughals\textsuperscript{93}. Motifs from George Pencz's St. Joseph Telling his Dream to His Father were spread over the hashiya of a Gulshan Album folio\textsuperscript{94}.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{91} For other Sadeler engravings copied by Jahangir's painters:

\begin{itemize}
\item Bull-MFA, No.332, fig. 11 & 11a, 12 & 12a; Cat-CB, I,49, (the identification proposed in it has now been proved wrong); III, Pl.77; Leningrad Album, Pl. 50 & 51B.
\end{itemize}

\item According to Kühnel & Goetz the hunting figures on f 15\textsuperscript{b} of the Berlin Album (IBP, Pl.27) were adopted from Aegidius Sadeler's engraving made after R. Savery (ibid, 47)

\item For his engravings: Berlin Album, f 4\textsuperscript{a}, 9\textsuperscript{a}, 11\textsuperscript{b}:

\begin{itemize}
\item IBP, 2, 47-8, Pl. 29 (only f 11\textsuperscript{b} reproduced) and Pl. facing p.55 showing the Beham original. Gulshan Album: Bull-MFA, No.332, fig. 5; J.V.S. Wilkinson & B. Gray, op.cit., Pl. 1B (the St. Lukas was adopted from H.S. Beham). E. Kühnel, "Die indischen Miniaturen der Sammlung Otto Sohn-Rethel", Pantheon, VIII, Abb.3.
\end{itemize}

\item Bull-MFA, No.332, figs. 6 & 6\textsuperscript{a}, 7 & 7\textsuperscript{a}, 7\textsuperscript{b}. A better version of Arithmetic from the Seven Liberal Art Series was drawn by Manohar (Leningrad Album, Pl. 20). The figure of Geometria from the same series was repeated on the hashiya of a royal muraqqa' folio\textsuperscript{95} now preserved in the Gulshan Album (Suttinhausen, Perennitas, fig 7).

\item Bull-MFA, No.332, fig. 3. The original engraving is traced by Mrs. Cabot and reproduced in ibid, fig. 1a. See fig. 1 for another adaptation from the same engraving; Cf. Plate 29.
\end{itemize}
The works of Theodor Galle\textsuperscript{95}, Etienne Delaune\textsuperscript{96}, Crispin de Passe\textsuperscript{97}, Jacob Goltzius\textsuperscript{98} and Cornelius Jacobz Drebbel\textsuperscript{99} also appear on the hashiyas of these muragga' folios.

Apart from these many other European pictures illustrating various Christian subjects including portraits of the Saints were copied by the Mughals. According to the reports of the Jesuits, Salim had pictures made of the life and death of Christ and ordered "the insertion in a book of a picture of Christ crucified and of the Virgin with her infant Son with His arms about her neck"\textsuperscript{100}. The Muslim belief based on a Qura'nic passage (IV.156) that Christ did not die on the Cross because someone else of His appearance was placed there instead, was thus disregarded by the Mughals. Along with the original Descent from the Cross engraving, the Gulshan Album has other representations of the Crucifixion\textsuperscript{101}.

\textsuperscript{95} IBP, 3, 58; not illustrated.
\textsuperscript{96} Bull-MFA, No.332, fig. 3 & 3a.
\textsuperscript{97} \textit{ibid}, fig.8. The copy is much modified with many drastic additions and alterations from de Passe's The Sacrifice of Noah, engraved after Martin de Vos: \textit{ibid}, fig. 8a.
\textsuperscript{98} \textit{ibid}, fig 10 (top right); for the original: \textit{ibid}, fig. 10a.
\textsuperscript{99} \textit{ibid}, fig 11 (top right); for the original: \textit{ibid}, fig. 11b.
\textsuperscript{100} This nude figure of Poetry was often copied by the Mughals. Govardhan's slightly altered version is reproduced by N.C. Mehta in \textit{Studies in Indian Painting}, Pl.36. Another late copy is found in the Cowasji Jehangir Collection: \textit{Cat-Cowasji}, No.54.
\textsuperscript{101} JGM, 226; A & J, 190.
\textsuperscript{102} Ettinghausen, \textit{op.cit.}, fig. 4.
\textsuperscript{103} Wilkinson & Gray, \textit{op.cit.}, 174, not illustrated.
In one folio, while copying the Pencz engraving of Geometria shown (in reverse) the ingenious Mughal artist has transformed Geometria as a painter examining a panel held by a young attendant showing Crucifixion. Folio 106 of the Berlin Album has a Woman and Angel at the Tomb of Christ where the figures were taken from more than one source but effectively amalgamated.

The MSS of different Christian works translated into Persian by Father Xavier were illustrated with many miniatures. The Victoria and Albert Museum picture showing the Inn at Bethlehem is one of these. A few miniatures from a small MS of a Christian biographical work in Persian from the collection of Mr. Howard Hodgkin were sold at Sotheby's auction. A large folio of excellent quality showing a Prophet, perhaps Moses, disputing with a Crowd in a landscape, sold in another Sotheby auction held a few days before.

103. Bull—MFA, No. 332, fig. 7.
104. IBP, Pl. 41.
105. JGM, 70, 203; J & J, 101. For a list of Father Xavier's Persian works: JGM, Chapter XIV, & A. Campos, IC, XXXV, 166-76.
106. JGM, Pl. facing p. 203.
years ago, may also have come from a Christian work. Such subjects as Noah's Ark, King Solomon's Court, or the Good Shepherd, with parallel stories in Islamic mythology, were often illustrated by Mughal painters and in many cases from European models.

After making a thorough study of all the European materials at their disposal the Mughal painters tried to introduce motifs and designs from them into their works. Occasional figures of European origin were painted in places where their appearances were most unexpected. We have noted a few examples of this kind appearing in a number of miniatures painted by Basawan, Mishina, Kesavadas, Sânwala and Manohar, mostly coming from the atelier of Akbar.

108. Sotheby's Sale Catalogue, 15 June, 1959, reproduced; found in an album belonging to Prince Khurram whose calligraphic handwriting dated 1020H/1611 is found on the reverse of each folio. Three other pictures found in this album were copied from European works. Another folio of a similar size (31 x 18.5) showing Idris Teaching the Art of Weaving is in the collection of the India Office Library: Johnson, VIII, f5.

109. Indian Museum, Calcutta: AM, Tafel 80, Abb.215; Freer Gallery of Art; S.C. Welch, Margy, XI, No.3, & Islamic Art, Cleveland, 1944, Pl. 24. The later example is attributed by Welch to Mishkin.

110. Private Collection, U.S.A.: S.C. Welch & M.C. Beach, Gods, Thrones & Peacocks, Pl. 5; AO, III, fig.11. Bodleian Library, Douce, Or a1, f 51B; etc.

111. JGM, Pl. facing p.23; India Office Library, Johnson, XVI, f1, XXII f B; etc.

112. supra, Chapters VII & VIII.
In Jahângîr's time such outright incorporation of foreign figures was not so common, unless the likeness of Jesuit priests or European traveller present in the court were purposely added (Cf Plates 62, 63, 71, 75, 80, 107, 144). The impact of European art on Jahângîrî paintings became apparent in three directions: in such technical matters as colouring, modelling, indications of depth and true perspective, and the like; in changing the general attitudes of both the painters and the viewers; and in incorporating various motifs and symbols, mainly of religious nature, to evolve a sort of iconography for depicting the theophanic ideas of Jahângîr.

The colour schemes of many late Akbarî miniatures, especially in the poetical works where the miniatures were painted from start to finish by one painter, show a wonderful

---

113. Two Portraits of unidentified Jesuit priests, fully coloured and probably drawn from life, are found in the Chester Beatty Library (Ind MS 41(2), unpublished) and in the National Museum of India, New Delhi (EWA, X, Pl. 121). Portraits of European travellers or soldiers and European men and women in period costume, in most cases drawn by Mughal painters, are frequently met with. Precise indication of date of many of these cannot be given - e.g., Museum of Fine Arts, Boston: Cat-MFA, VI, Pl. XXVI; Victoria & Albert Museum; AIP, 162, No. 735, H. Goetz, Geschichte der Indischen Miniaturmalerei, Berlin, 1936, Tafel 6; Martin, II, Pl. 170, 171; LPI, Pl. XIXa. A few later examples are found in the British Museum: 1955, 10-8,016; 1936, 6-13,01; 1948, 10-9,072; 1955, 10-8,017; all unpublished.
feeling for effect achieved through a very judicious use of mixed colour tones often juxtaposed with strong primary colours. This is particularly true of a number of painters including Basawan, La'l, Sûr Gujarati, Miskina and Mâdhav. Farrukh Beg stands apart because his highly effective use of a limited range of colours was of a different kind\(^1\). The leading Jahângîrî painters, Daulat, Abu'l Hasan, Mansûr and Govardhan adopted a different technique, which shows a substantial improvement of colour-mixing and the use of new materials\(^2\). Daulat's earlier works, as we have already noted, were remarkable for his use of strong patches of violet, blue and yellow\(^3\). The same tendency is noticeable in Abu'l Hasan's early works in the British Museum Anwâr-i-Suhàiîî folio (Plate 27) and in the picture of an "old pilgrim" in the Rothschild Collection\(^4\). A similar tendency characterises the early signed works of Govardhan, unlike his later works which showed a different technique: a crisp and mellow colour-scheme, a strong and powerful line work and an

\[^{1}\text{supra, Chapter VIII.}\]
\[^{2}\text{The English traders imported the costly scarlet dye-staff collected from Mexican Cactû called cochineal: Letters Recd., VI, 124, 149.}\]
\[^{3}\text{Cf: Plate 16, and E. Wellesz, Akbar's Religious Thought... Pl.35, Pl.97 (colour), attributed here to Daulat; and ff 168\(^b\) and 169 of the Chester Beatty Akbarnâma; Cat-CB, III, Pl.27,28. vide, supra, Chapter VIII.}\]
\[^{4}\text{IPM, Pl. XVII.}\]
unusual emphasis on the expressions of the principal characters. This emphasis on the facial expression of a figure in order to correctly depict his exact psychological situation is an important feature of all successful Jahângîrî works, and the placid Madonnas or pensive Mary Magdalens, and the Saints with their emotionally charged expressions, may have inspired the Jahângîrî painters in this line. Of course, it would be wrong to suggest that the colouring of all pre-Jahângîrî miniatures is ineffective and dull and the faces of the numerous characters presented there are devoid of all subtlety and expression; Our purpose here is to suggest that the moving characters of the Jahângîrî world and the distinctive compositions and colour-schemes of the Jahângîrî miniatures probably indicate something more than the logical course of development of a style. This is largely the result of the stimulus received from the emperor's personality and taste as well as from the presence of these European art objects. In the succeeding years these tendencies became far more pronounced and the stamp of the impact of Europe became unmistakable.

From the lengthy account of Sir Thomas Roe of the tremendous interest created by an Isaac Oliver miniature,
'a small limned picture of a woman', in the Mughal court, there can hardly be any doubt about the popularity of the pictures of women. Since the days of the Salīm Studio the interest in woman has been keen and objective. The first definite indication of the practice of portraying the empress is given by the picture showing the Reception of Shāh Jahān on his triumphant return from the Deccan. This change in attitude made the pictures of nude women (Plate 126) and nude athletic men possible. The appearance of numerous amorous scenes of loving couples, of dancing girls and of shapely princesses in the next few years must have resulted from this slackening of moral attitude which made the figures of delightful damsels of the Rāgas and Rāginīs, of the heroines of Hindu romantic works quickly accepted by the court and court-artists.

118. Roe, 189-90, 199-200; 190n. Note the numerous figures of women in marginal drawings of the royal muragga's Vide, Chapters III & VI.

119. Clarke, Pl. 5 & R. Ettinghausen, Perennitas, fig 1. The pictures of Christ and the Virgin on the outer wall of the garden pavilion in the background are especially noticeable. Vide, supra, Chapter VII.

120. Bull-MFA, No.332, fig 12; Cat-CB, III, Pl. 77. There are figures of nude or semi-nude women in the Dārābnāma MS (British Museum, Or 4615) but these are not painted in a naturalistic way. Vide, Chapter III (RājKunwār MS).

121. Vide, infra.
The change of attitude is also noticed in the choice of subject-matter, painted both on the āshiyas of the royal murāqqa's and elsewhere. The large number of genre scenes and details showing ordinary occupations of the humble folks were almost certainly inspired by European antecedents. The natural history drawings by Mansūr not only mirror the personal wish of the emperor to preserve the likeness of strange and rare birds, animals, trees, fruits and flowers for posterity but also reveal change in the attitude for bringing nature closer to man and discarding the sterotyped scenes of battles and atrocities which filled the pages of the historical MSS prepared in the early days. Birds and beasts, creepers and flowers appear in numerous forms, shapes and colours as motifs and designs on the āshiyas of the murāqqa's, on buildings, on metal objects, glassware, and on textiles. There was nothing new in the idea, but there was definitely a new impetus to make them look more realistic and lively. Much similarity is noticed in some of these floral and vegetal designs painted in Shâh Jahan's time with the illustrations of drawings of herbs and plants which were being published in England and in Europe during this time.

122. J.V.S. Wilkinson & B.Gray, Burl. Mag., 173; point out some similarity with the Luttrell Psalter. Vide, supra, Chapter VI.
123. Cf. a slightly later work: J. Gerarde, The Herball or Generall Historie of Plantes, London, 1636. I am grateful to Mr. R. Skelton for this reference. Mr. Skelton is working on these floral motifs and result of his research is expected soon. Also: Crispium de Pas, Jardin de Fleurs, Contenant ensoy les plus Rares et plus excellentes Fleurs que pouvoient être. [Book of Engravings of Flowers], 1615.
The process seems to have set in earlier from Jahângîr's time, because even a few of Mansûr's animal drawings were modelled after foreign materials.\footnote{124}

The other notable result of the impact of European art was the appearance of European-inspired iconographical symbols associated by the Mughal painters with Jahângîr and continued during Shâh Jahân's time and later. This has been fully discussed in the previous chapter.

On the whole, the presence of European art objects considerably influenced Jahângîr's taste and attitude and also the styles of his painters. Jahângîr was a cultured man who was not very easily susceptible to fads. However, he was not one of a very rigid temperament, so he did not hesitate to accept whatever suited his taste, helped to develop it and enlarged the sphere of his knowledge and idea. Most of the European materials in his collection must have seemed thematically dull to him, since their subject-matters were not always of his liking, but their aesthetic contents and decorative details do not appear to have escaped his discerning eye. His painters, who were already making great

efforts to break new grounds, readily accepted the superior technique of the Europeans and for the sake of variety and emphasis on certain aspects of their works introduced many decorative details found in the European pictures. Talented artists as they all were, whatever they accepted from the West was thoroughly integrated in their style leaving nothing more than some faint traces of what they borrowed.
Epilogue:
Stylization and Disruption

Mughal painting developed remarkably in Jahangir's time. The progress from the suave naturalism and simple charm of the Rāj Kunwār or Anwār-i-Suhallî of 1610 to the complex allegorical drawings of Abu'l Hasan and Bichitr was tremendous. The portraits painted in Jahangir's atelier were vigorous and lively, the studies of birds and animals realistic and exciting. In every single production of the Jahangir atelier a conscious attempt to render movement and meaning became apparent. The balanced composition, harmonious colour scheme and technical perfection of a fully-developed Jahangiri picture could hardly be surpassed.

The rarefied sophistication achieved in Jahangir's time, however, proved self-destructive. The atelier was fully devoted to picturising the activities, dreams and ideals of the patron and hinged on his personality. With the turbulent political situation during the later part of his reign, the personal capacity of the old and sick emperor became limited, and as an inevitable consequence art became repetitive and insipid. Isolated from the mainstream of Indian life, Jahangiri painting lost quickly
its creative vigour. With their iconographical symbolisms and ample borrowings from the West the sophisticated productions of Jahângîr's atelier turned into carefully-nurtured hot-house plants. Once the glass walls of imperial patronage were withdrawn they faced virtual destruction.

However, the achievement of Mughal art was so enormous and great that the process of disintegration was necessarily slow and gradual. The miniatures of a couple of MSS devoted to Sa'dî's twin classics produced only within a year of Jahângîr's death show some evidence of that decadence of the style. The imperial studio did not cease to function, but the quality of miniatures produced there, with the exception of the works of a few notable masters like Govardhan, Bichitr and Hashim, was nowhere near the style of Akbarî or Jahângîrî examples.

From now on the artistic genius of India was set itself at work not in the imperial studio, but outside it, in the modest establishments of wealthy nobles or vassal chiefs. Instead of confining itself to the depiction of royal life or preferences, it started portraying the basic

sentiments and moods of Indian life as expressed in romance and poetry, in religious lores and music. Early in his career, in the Salīm Studio, Jahāngīr showed some interest in these aspects of Indian life. The delightful pictures of the Rāḍ Kunwār MS testify to it. But in the atmosphere of splendour and prosperity of court life the interest was no longer kept alive.

The reorganisation of the imperial atelier must have rendered surplus a considerable number of talented painters, most of whom were employed by the wealthy nobles and vassal kings. Some of them continued to work in the Persianised tradition, although in a much inferior manner, while the others followed their own indigenous styles. At least two richly illustrated MSS dealing with Hindu romantic works and prosody, the Rasikapriyā and the Mādhavanala-Kāmakandala, point to the continuity of this tradition.

2. vide, supra. I am grateful to Mr. J.G. Burton-Page for showing me photographs of two folios from the same set, now in the Freer Gallery of Art. The no. of the EM miniature is: 1925, 12-9, 01. Professor Ettinghausen has dated the whole set in C. 1617. I am not aware of the reasons given to advance such specific dating. The provenance of the whole set may well be Agra. Our knowledge of Rājâ Bīr Singh Deo's studio is not sufficient for attributing the set to Datia. I am also grateful to Mr. R. Skelton and Mr. S. Digby for showing me photographs of wall paintings found in Bīr Singh's palace.

Unfortunately, these MSS are incomplete and without
dated colophons. No definite information of either their
provenance or of the authorship of the numerous miniatures
of unsurpassable excellence found in them is known to us.
Pramod Chandra has devoted considerable attention to these
miniatures and tried to trace their style in the parallel
tradition prevalent throughout the early Mughal period\(^4\).
His nomenclature of this parallel style is 'Popular Mughal',
a term which all scholars think unhappy and inadequate\(^5\).
We do not propose to re-examine the whole mass of materials
as we restrict ourselves within the sphere of the imperial
court, but a few points need to be added to our study.

Painters were freely available and pictures regularly
painted outside the Mughal court even during the heyday of
early Mughal art. The situation obviously became somewhat
desperate after Jahangir adopted the policy of employing only
a limited number of masters in the royal atelier. Besides
the thriving atelier of 'Abd-ur-Rahim Khan-i-Khanan, a number
of other leading nobles including Shihab ud-din Ahmad Khan,

\(^4\) "Ustad Salivahana and the Development of Popular
\(^5\) Cat-Khajanchi, op. cit., 15; Mr. B. Gray prefers
the term Provincial Mughal: PL, 107-14.
The governor of Gujarat, Shaikh Farid Bukharî, Bahadur Khan Uzbek, Jafar Beg certainly employed calligraphers and artists because a number of MSS commissioned by them have survived.

'Abd-ur-Rahîm's eminence as a scholar, writer, bibliophile and connoisseur is well-known to all students of Mughal history. Choice MSS, copiously illustrated with

6. The Anwar-i-Suhailî dated 1009H/1600-1 in the British Museum (Or. 6317 - to be published by Mr. R. Pinder-Wilson in a forthcoming paper) was produced at Ahmedabad. The style of its 143 miniatures is not very far from that of Khân-i-Khânân's studio.

7. A Diwan-i-Kasân dated 1010/1601, now in the Bankipur Library was prepared for Shaikh Farîd (Scott O'Connor, An Eastern Library, 65).
A Silsîlah al-Zahab MS, now in the Chester Beatty Library, (Ind. MS. 8, Cat-CB, I, 38-9; III, Pl.73) was produced for his library after he received the title Murtaza Khân. His likeness was included by Salîvâhanâ in the court scene illustrated in the Vijnaptipatra prepared in 1610; P. Chandra, op.cit., 30 fig. 1.

8. A Khamsa of Nizâmî dated 1022-3/1613-4 was prepared for the library of Bahadur Khân Uzbek (Ab'ul Nabi): Cat-CB, I, 76-7; III, Pl. 96.

miniatures, were prepared in his atelier. A few painters originally associated with the imperial studio might have joined his services: such names as Ibrāhīm, Govind, Qāsim, Madhav, Banwārī are found in Akbarī and Jahāngīrī MSS as well as in the Khamsa of Amir Khusrau Dihlavi, Razmāna, Shāhnāma, produced in the Khān-i-Khānān's establishment. Similarly, talented painters originally working in his atelier were chosen to work in the imperial studio. A notable name amongst them is that of Hashim, who worked for the Khamsa of Amir Khusrau Dihlavi (Plate 140),

10. Among the illustrated MSS produced in Khān-i-Khānān's atelier are:


The following MSS, though do not bear Khān-i-Khānān's seal or any note written by him, may be attributed to his studio on the ground of stylistic similarity of their miniatures:

1. Shāhnāma, (British Museum, Ad. 5600). The miniatures are signed by Bulā, Banwārī, Bhagwati, Kamal, Madhav, Qāsim and Somāl.
2. Diwan-i-Jāmi, (Mme. de Behague Collection). With illustrations by Husajn Naqqash.

produced in the Khân-i-Khânân's atelier in 1617 or slightly afterwards, but ultimately became a leading painter of Shâh Jahan's court.  

This 'Lesser style', however, was not continued for a long period because most of the influential and wealthy nobles became entangled with the political conflict between Shâh Jahan and his father. This gave an opportunity to the indigenous painters to produce a large number of Râgamâlā series, and illustrated MSS of biographical works and Hindu religious and romantic texts. Their style was not as refined and Mughal-inspired as that of the Rasikapriyâ and Mâdhavanala-Kâmakandâlâ.  

The pictures of the Mâdhavanala-Kâmakandâlâ series show a remarkable similarity to the 1597 Razmânâma and the Râj Kunwâr. The close resemblance of the female types (Cf. Plates 9 and 146), of the general colour-scheme, architectural and decorative details and costumes certainly point to a chronological proximity of the Mâdhavanala series to the Râj Kunwâr. A similar resemblance of the female type is also noticed in a Râginî picture, now in the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay.  

11. vide: PSEI, Pl.7, text.  
12. vide, Pramod Chandra, op.cit., 38-46; Supra, Chap. IV.  
13. ibid, Pl.43 d; Cat-Khajanchi, 27-29, No.17a-17j; Col. pl. 5, fig.24.  
a graceful lotus-eyed girl (Plate 147) is closely similar to the figure of the princess in the Kāj Kunwār (Plate 9).

That painters of good calibre were available for taking commissions outside the court is evidenced by an illustrated Vijñaptipatra now preserved in the Sri Hamsavijayaji Jaina Gyana Bhandar, Baroda. This valuable document was painted by Ustad Śālivāhana, described in the inscription as a "patishāhī Chitrakāra" or a royal painter, in 1610. It illustrates the event of Jahāngīr's granting a generous farman prohibiting animal slaughter on certain days. It not only provides us with a vivid description of the royal court (Plate 144 shows two Europeans present) as seen by someone outside the influence of the emperor, but also shows certain features which help us to determine the character of the so-called Popular Mughal style. The female type (Plate 145) is well-set and closely akin to the figures of the Hindu works referred to above.

From the evidence of the English factors we know that the English engravers produced prints of the portraits of Jahāngīr which were such bad replicas that their sale had to be withdrawn. Probably the factors could procure

15. P. Chandra, op. cit., fig. 1-4 and details in col. Pl.A, fig. 5-8.
16. Letters Recd., III, 67: "The Mogoll's picture drawn in England is nothing like him; so will serve no use at all."
only a poor likeness of the emperor which they sent to England. Roe collected a similar poor quality picture of the emperor which when shown to him caused his annoyance. The emperor promised to give an authentic likeness of himself to the English ambassador. Though other authentic pictures of the emperor autographed by him found their way to England (Plate 136), this particular picture has never been found. These humble "commercial painters", whose existence is thus proved beyond doubt, may be called Popular Mughal painters. The large number of pictures found in many collections which show early Mughal early features expressed in crudely painted drawings of bad quality may have come from the brushes of these painters.

The reorganisation of the Mughal atelier during the early years of Jahangir and its gradual decentralisation in the last few years of his reign resulted in yet another kind of change: the indigenous traditions which were being continued from the early days in non-Moghal centres became more and more exposed to the improved technique and variegated decorative details of the Mughal paintings.

17. Roe, 200-1: "Wherat I showed him a picture I had of His Majestie farr infearior to be woorke I now sawe, which caused mee to judg of all other by that which was delivered mee as the best. He asked me where I had it? I toûld him. Why said hee, doe you buy any such thing? Have not I the best...."

18. vide: Roe, Introduction by W. Foster: pp.LXXVIII-LXXIX.
Coming from the outlying centres of the empire like Gujarat, Gwalior, Kashmir and from the adjacent regions of Bundelkhand and the present-day Uttar Pradesh the Āhirs and other indigenous painters brought about revolutionary changes in the Persianised art imported by Humāyūn and continued in the first few decades of Akbar's rule. Now even the traditional biographical works, Hindu and Jaina religious texts and the Rāgamalā series produced in centres relatively less exposed to Mughal cultural influence started introducing Mughal costumes, carpets, decorative art objects, and technical know-how of the Mughals (Cf Plate 142)\(^\text{19}\). No wonder, a MS like the Salībhādra Charitra produced in 1624 shows undoubted Mughal features (Plate 138)\(^\text{20}\).

Like many other invading peoples and cultures before them the Mughals became in course of a short period just an integral part of the Indian way of life and culture.

The End

---


20. P.S. Nahar, "An Illustrated Salībhādra MS", op.cit., I, 1933, 64-7, plates; Sarabhai Nawab, Jaina Chitra Kalpadruma, Ahmedabad, 1939, pl. LXXXVI-LXXXIX; Pramod Chandra, op.cit., fig.9-12. etc.
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