

The Migration of Persian Artists to India in the Safavid Period

Kefayat Koosha

(2012)

Abstract

Shah Tahmasb I, in a letter to the imprisoned Seal Keeper, Jalal-ed-Din Amir-Beik, unambiguously mentions a significant event of Safavid times, namely the Persians' efforts at migrating to India. Although this course of events is also widely reflected in his contemporaries' notes, and has been studied by many researchers, but our knowledge in this regard is still scarce. At first glance, it may appear that the lack of direct evidence will prevent any significant headway to be made in this concern. Yet, only a small part of the texts and sources related to this subject have been investigated so far, and many relevant historic clues are yet unknown. Therefore, it appears that a wide-ranging systematic search in the texts and sources of this period can be fruitful. Hence, relying on existing documents, the present research attempts to examine the massive migration of Safavid artists to India, which reached its peak during the long reign of Shah Tahmasb, an era of crises that culminated in harsh social changes.

Generally speaking, no complete account of Shah Tahmasb's personality and life is available, and we have to make do with the terse, incomplete and occasionally contradictory descriptions given by existing sources in order to reveal the face of an otherwise little known monarch. Sources record that he was almost eleven years old upon his accession to the throne in 930 AH / AD 1523.2 Almost all the sources of the time also unanimously record that, in his young age, the king was greatly attracted to the arts and artists, to the extent that he not only took painting and calligraphy lessons, but also promoted these arts among his courtiers. He kept to this policy in later years.

As some sources indicate, the offspring of prominent families were educated at the court. In fact, they were being trained as future office-holders. Sharaf-Khan, who had been educated at the court, writes that the king had his generals' and courtiers' children brought to court and given a comprehensive education equal to that reserved for princes. Sharaf-Khan's

explanations show that, among the different curricular subjects, the king considered necessary for himself, the princes and his courtiers to take painting courses: "... As they reached the age of growth and discrimination, he taught them the martial arts, shooting with the bow, playing polo, galloping on horseback, and the rules of warfare and humanity, and he told them to also devote some of their time to painting, by which one acquires a straight taste." At the time, art workshops affiliated to the court also existed in which manuscripts were illustrated for the king. These workshops undoubtedly constituted the country's main center of cultural activity, as well as its highest center of art education, where young artists were trained by professors attached to the court on a permanent basis, who were often close confidants of the Shah. On the evidence of different sources, we know that the Shah himself also took courses with these professors. The Royal Library at Tabriz, together with its painting workshops, was directed by Kamal-ed-Din Behzad until 942 AH. Such great painters as Soltan-Mohammad, Aqa-Mirak, Mir-Mosavver, Doost-e Divaneh, and others were employed at the Royal Library.

Budaq and Eskandar-Beik-e Torkaman say that Shah Tahmasb learned painting with Soltan-Mohammad, while Mostafa 'Ali believes that the Shah's teacher was Khajeh 'Abd-ol-'Aziz Esfahani. Budaq, Rumloo, Qazi Ahmad and Eskandar-Beik also speak of the Shah's predilection for painting and calligraphy, noting that he "was keenly fond of penmanship and artistry" all along his childhood and adolescence. Budaq, Rumloo and Eskandar-Beik say that it was in this frame of mind that he gathered such eminent painters as Soltan-Mohammad, Behzad, Mirak-e Esfahani, Mir-Mosavver, and Doost-e Divaneh at his court. They continue: "The king devoted them full attention and kindness." They also quote a diptych by Booq-ol-'Eshq, which reflects the unrestrained progress of this period's painters.

Eskandar-Beik has spoken in similar words about the poets, and it has also been said that, besides painting, the Shah also had some talents in calligraphy, poetry, and carpet design. However, the policy pursued in those years was soon abandoned. The Shah and his court changed their previous attitudes and stopped supporting and funding the artists. The events that occurred in the subsequent years raise innumerable questions for which no clear answers exist for the time being. Budaq and Qazi Ahmad speak of the Shah's "displeasure" with the artists and write that he became disenchanted with the artists and dismissed all of them except (the scribe) Doost-Mohammad Gavashani. In the author's opinion, understanding the motives and wherefore of this disenchantment calls for a full knowledge of all the social, cultural, political and economical problems of Shah Tahmasb's time, and

justifying them encompasses a wide spectrum of causes and factors left behind in history. Extreme prudence is imperative in this examination, because the court's change of heart was the outcome of events that took place in this vital period of Persian history. In fact, that crisis, which reflected the government's creeds, mirrored the political and social conditions of the time, which eventually put an end to the golden era of Persian painting.

The discontinuation of Shah Tahmasb's support of the artists is often attributed to religious grounds. Many sources relate the Shah's dreams and visions concerning his forgoing wine and other prohibited things, and his repetitive amends in 939-41 and 963. In this concern, in Shah Tahmasb's biography (probably an autobiography), we come across detailed reports on his amends. Although these texts appear so unequivocal as to leave no possibility of a doubt, the facts are a bit more complicated than they seem. In two unique sources of this period, one is confronted with a different narrative of the matter, which appears worthwhile of being studied in terms of the covert realities of Safavid times.

Budaq-e Monshi and Mahmood ebn-e Khandmir both relate how, while Bahram-Mirza was besieged by 'Obaidollah-Khan within the ramparts of Herat, at the time of Shah Tahmasb's departure towards Khorasan, several of the Shah's servants attempted to assassinate him by poisoning his wine, but fled when their plans failed. Further on, after lengthy digressions, Budaq states that, after that event, the Shah "began thinking about repentance, and that this included," included "abstinence from drinking wine and spirits, committing adultery and sodomy, and other prohibited matters." And that contemporary religious figures were not without influencing the Shah's decision to make amends.

Shah Tahmasb is said to have been as resolute in his atonement as to relinquish the very thought of the pleasures of wine and sex. The story of the Shah's infatuation with Mirza-Mohammad ebn-e Khajeh Qebahat (the Shah's young cup-bearer) appears in all the sources of the time. These facts are recorded in texts in which matters are usually expressed in conservative terms. A miniature painting depicting this relationship exists in Bahram-Mirza's Moraqqa' (Album), preserved at the Topkapi Saray Library in Turkey, in which the Shah's youthful "balm of the heart and soul" is offering him a cup of wine. Examining these relationships is a worthwhile occupation, because it provides a complete image of the social conditions prevailing in Safavid times. This story, and the miniature, probably date prior to 939 and the Shah's repentance, when he was 19 or 20 years old. The same is true about a story narrated by Mahmood ebn-e Hedayat Afushte'i Natanzi about Morad-Khan, the Shah's comely chamberlain.

In his description of this event, which took place after the Shah's repentances, and which he writes to highlight the Shah's resolution in his atonement, Afushte'i says that, while admiring Morad-Khan's graceful saunter in performing his duties, "... he felt a substance of pleasure building within him, and immediately repented and, by way of atonement, submitted the sum of twelve Tomans to the treasurers.

He goes on to say that, after this event, the Shah ordered his servants to "hereafter wear *kelijehs* sewn down to the knee during service." The Shah's atonement soon took on vaster dimensions and emulating him became a guarantee of survival throughout the country; indeed, violators from every rank and occupation were put to death.

A king's atonement may be nothing new. We know that Babur made similar amends in 933 AH (AD 1526), but the aim of the present research is to examine the eventual effects of Shah Tahmasb's atonement on Safavid art. Numerous theories have been put forth in this regard. Some art connoisseurs try to explain the Shah's interrupted patronage of artists by magnifying his religious zealotry, but, as we shall see, contrary evidence exists as well, because the Shah's ban was supposed to touch only the painters and musicians, whereas Budaq affirms that such was the Shah's displeasure with artists that he even discharged his scribes.

Other sources are silent about the causes of this displeasure, but, besides the Shah's repentance and his dislike of artists, other reasons come to the fore in this concern. In his famous travel account, written in the fifty-first year of Shah Tahmasb's reign, Vincenzo d'Allessandri, the Venetian ambassador at his court, writes, after describing his appearance: "... What is most striking in him is his melancholy temper, for which there are many signs, the most important being that he has not set foot outside his palace for eleven years. In the meantime, he has neither gone hunting nor amused himself with anything else." And Qazi Ahmad writes: "Such were that unique king's acumen and wisdom that he adopted the *Dar-os-Saltaneh* of Qazvin as his residence for twenty years and never felt the need to travel or migrate elsewhere."

Rumloo also speaks of the Shah's strange habits. He writes that the Shah "considered most substances impure and had the remains of his food thrown in water or burnt to ashes, and he did not eat during ceremonies." He also narrates that it took the Shah a whole day to clip his nails and that he spent the next from dawn to dusk in his bath, and Qazi Ahmad notes that "That divine king's obsession with cleanliness went beyond human endurance."

This anti-social behavior is not easy to analyze, but one may ask whether the Shah's contradictory dealings with Homayun, his harsh treatment of his brothers and sons, and his curtailment of patronage of artists, were not other symptoms of his cold, melancholy nature.

The Shah had another negative trait; he was extremely rapacious and fond of accumulating riches. Many sources speak of his avarice and his constant scheming to invent new revenues, which were gradually amassed in his treasury. Chardin gives an interesting account of the treasury of the Safavid kings: "The Shah's treasury is a truly bottomless pit, because everything disappears in it and only a little comes out of it." D'Alessandri estimates Shah Tahmasb's yearly income at three million gold coins. Concerning the expenses paid by the Shah, he says: "The country's expenses, which are in fact paid by the treasury, are insignificant, because the Shah is only bound to pay the wages of five thousand soldiers known as Qurchis... But Shah Tahmasb does not pay these Qurchis in cash, but rather supplies them, as down payments, with uniforms and horses which he sells them at whatever price he wishes." More evidence is available in this concern. Rumloo unequivocally states that, in the last years of his reign, the Shah had left his troops and Qurchis unpaid for fourteen years. Elsewhere he writes: "As His Majesty delayed sending a law enforcement officer, incessant feuds broke out among the population of Azarbaijan, and [yet] he was so popular with the army that, although he had paid them no wages for fourteen years, no one complained and all went on serving in earnest..." Imagining how these Qurchis met their expenses during these years is most interesting, because Shah Tahmasb, whose avarice was constantly growing, rewarded his troops with authorizations of pillage, etc.

Sharaf-Khan (the supreme commander of the Kurds), whom Shah Esma'il II had charged with the mission of preparing a list of Shah Tahmasb's riches, reveals further facts: "... Shah Tahmasb ... was extremely avid of amassing wealth in his treasury; so much so that no king of Persia or Turan after the affair of Changiz-Khan, nay, since the advent of Islam, [had] ever so tenaciously devoted efforts at bringing together goods, fabrics, gold vessels and silver utensils..."

Qazi Ahmad writes, in his *Kholasat-ot-Tavarikh*: “He amassed more gold, land, population and furnishings than anyone could imagine. His cash money, gems, gold and silver exceeded a thousand [times] thousand Tomans, and removing seventy thousand camel-loads of his household furnishings [would have] left the lot almost undiminished.”

Reza-Qoli-Khan Hedayat gives a similar description in his *Rowzat-os-Safa-ye Nasseri*. Budaq and Rumloo also say that the Shah handled all financial affairs personally, and that none had the right to interfere in pecuniary matters without his authorization. D’Allessandri gives us more interesting information. He says: “... This king sells jewels and carries other business as well, and he enters into bargaining as any other lowly, cunning merchant...” He continues: “[Shah Tahmasb] ... did myriad things unbefitting ordinary people, let alone a king...” D’Allessandri explains that the Shah was a shrewd trader of velvet, silk and woolen fabrics from Aleppo, Khorasan and the Orient, and that he had garments of these sewn and “... sold at ten times their price to his troops...” Most importantly, d’Allessandri unveils another of Shah Tahmasb’s visages: that of a usurer. He says that “[those, rendering services] are granted loans in proportion to their services. Some receive twenty thousand, others twenty-five thousand, and a few a thousand escudos, for a period of ten years for some, and of twenty for others, and every year he takes off his interest for his own use. These royal attendants then give these sums in loan to important courtiers looking forward to the king bestowing titles and offices upon them, at interest rates varying between sixty and eighty percent, and in exchange of solid estate guarantees ... and no delay is allowed in the repayment of the interests...”

Other sources speak extensively about the other aspects of the Safavid kings’ unlimited prerogatives, which made them the total masters of their subjects’ lives and belongings. The Shah was the absolute proprietor of the country and of all its lands and resources. Often his displeasure signified people being murdered and all their movable and immovable properties seized. Chardin says about the absolute power of Safavid kings: “... Nothing offers protection against the insane whims of these Shahs; be it probity, merit, sincerity, or past services... As soon as they playfully make an expressive gesture, uttered in a few words or as a significant glance, on the job individuals holding important positions and most valuable creatures are immediately discharged and deprived of all their belongings, and all this takes place in the absence of any kind of trial and without concern about proving the alleged guilt.”

As can be seen in most sources of Shah Tahmasb's time, no one was safe from the sharp edge of malicious accusations. Depending on his mental and physical disposition, his edicts were often unpredictable, as he occasionally pardoned some accused persons. An example in case was the scribe Budaq: "... under the late king, while innocent and for no reason at all, I time and again suffered acrimony and torture, and repeatedly paid nearly seven hundred Tomans..."

Obviously, no one's life or belongings were safe in such conditions. On one hand the harsh repression jeopardized social peace of mind, and on the other jealousies, hatreds, and intrigues within the court undermined security particularly among office holders. Naturally enough, the conditions necessary for the development of culture and arts did not exist.

In this concern, we quote Edward Browne, who asked Mohammad Qazvini why no great poets existed in Safavid times. Qazvini's answer was: "... Safavid monarchs ... devoted the better part of their efforts to disseminating the Shi'ite creed ... however, they not only manifested no enthusiasm for the development of literature, poetry, mysticism, etc., which they referred to as Kamaliyat—as opposed to Shar'iyat—but even resorted to all sorts of devices to harass and ridicule their representatives, because these representatives were often not established in religious laws and ceremonials in general."

These factors—the court's cessation of its patronage of artists and its unwillingness to invest in the development of arts—together with the absence of security in a society on the verge of collapse in which everything was permanently in danger, led to the massive emigration of artists; a phenomenon known today as 'brain drain', which results from unfavorable living and social conditions.

Nevertheless, Safavid artists had the unique chance that a Dar-ol-Aman existed for them in a faraway land. Therefore, faced with the dire conditions of their homeland, they aptly took the opportunity to set out towards India, where they could find strong economic backing. It has been said that, while these migrants only sought a mere daily bread, they obtained the patronage of wise promoters of arts who put an end to their distress and gave them an opportunity to acquire world-wide fame. "... and anyone who reaches India, even if he had embarked only to earn a mere daily bread and wanted no more than that, within the first week comes to support a numerous family and within a short time and without the slightest effort mingles with the nobility and gives undreamed-of sums to beggars..."

As records indicate, these migrations begin at the very establishment of the Safavid and Gurkani dynasties, i.e., during the reign of Shah Esma‘il I, the contemporary of Babur, and reach their peak at the time of Homayun and Akbar, the contemporaries of Shah Tahmasb. Thus, Homayun, who had become acquainted with the painters of the School of Shiraz during his exile in Persia, deployed every effort at attracting them to his court, to the extent that the Gurkani court’s patronage of Persian artists and poets gave rise to massive migrations in the wake of which new artistic and literary schools were born. Homayun’s meeting with Khajeh ‘Abd-os-Samad Shirazi, a young painter of the School of Tabriz, is described in Akbarnameh. Undoubtedly, the social situation in Persia and the Shah’s change of heart towards artists did not remain hidden from Homayun’s keen eyes. Therefore, during his meetings in Tabriz with different artists, he called upon them to join his future court, promising them all sorts of rewards, which he did his best to fulfill. It has been said that, unlike Shah Tahmasb, he was very generous. Writing about Homayun’s generosity, Rumloo says that his recompenses were never less than a lak, and Badvani says that “fearing his recompense, representatives never spoke the name of gold in his presence, for he was not as motivated as his father by keeping a full treasury.” Sadeqi-Beik describes him as a king “infinitely charitable, forgiving, liberal and tasteful,” and compares him with Soltan Hossein- Mirza, and Khandmir writes that every day “the treasury keepers brought in several pure gold badrehs in His Exalted Presence so that anyone He wished to remunerate with pieces and garments of gold could receive these without delay.” Also concerning Homayun’s attachment to arts and artists, one reads in Indian sources that, all along his perpetual feuds with various rivals, particularly Prince Kamran, he never neglected his artists and always gave priority to conversing with them.

He manifested his affection for his artists by bestowing the title of Nader-ol-Molk to Mir-Seyyed-‘Ali and that of Shirin-Qalam to ‘Abd-os-Samad. To better understand the esteem in which these Persian artists were held, one must mention Homayun’s letter to the ruler of Kashghar, in which he introduces his artists and which he accompanies by samples of their works. Bayazid says that the text of this letter had been communicated to him by ‘Abd-os-Samad, in Lahore, in 999 AH, that is in the thirty-sixth year of Akbar Shah’s reign.

As can be gathered from what Homyun and Jahangir have said, Persian artists soon gained precedence over many courtiers in their meetings with the emperor. In fact, they were their patrons' teachers and always served them as trustworthy companions. They were also among Homyun's retinue during his conquest of India, and their names appear, in Akbarnamah as well as in Homyun's and Akbar's biographies, as escorting their royal patrons during this important historic event.

Homyun's successor, Akbar, surpassed his father in fostering the arts, and it was during his reign that Persian immigrants began pouring into the Gurkani court. Soon, the courtiers began emulating their emperor's patronage of arts. Notable among them was Bayram-Khan, who "enriched a hundred-fold all those to whom he had so promised in Persia and none remained without a share of his bounteousness."

It is also said that Bayram-Khan's son, Khan-e Khanan 'Abd-or-Rahim, whom 'Abd-ol-Baqi Nahavandi describes as having made another Persia out of India, caused many Persian artists and poets to emigrate to India in search of fame and fortune. "This chieftain has made it his duty to ascertain that whoever from the province or other countries of the Inhabited Quarter takes refuge at his court soon achieves esteem and fame..."⁵⁶ It has been said about Mahabat-Khan (Zamaneh-Beig), who translated into Persian the realities of life during the reign of Babur, that "his generosity and goodwill are cited in example among the Indians..." It has also been said about him that he "loved conversing with Persians.

He said that they were the epitome of creation." Mention must also be made of Navvab Zafar-Khan (Mirza Ahsanollah)'s keen interest in arts, "the like of him was never found after 'Abd-or-Rahim Khan-e Khanan in appreciating the arts and artists and supporting literary and lofty minds, and the arrival of most Persian poets to India was due to his auspicious inclination."

Badvani speaks of 166 poets named Akbar who reached fame in India. Most of these poets were Persian immigrants and 59 of them are said to have found their way into Akbar's court. Shafiq Owrangabadi, in his Tazkere-ye Sham-e Ghariban, written in 1197 AH, gives a list of Persian poets who immigrated to India in different periods, and Ahmad Golchin-e Ma'ani refers to one such classified list of 745 Persian poets who migrated to India during the Gurkani reign. It is therefore not without reason that, in 990 AH (AD 1582), the Persian language was proclaimed the official language of the Indian government by Akbar's order.

Akbar's first Persian Malek-osh-Sho'ara (Head Poet) was Ghazzali Mashhadi, and his successor at this position was Fayzi. But the main consequence of the migration of Persian poets to his court was the emergence of a literary style known as 'Indian', which constitutes a branch of Persian literature. It was also at the same time that, with Akbar's support, more than a hundred Indian painters began learning Persian painting under the supervision of Persian painters. The upshot of this current was the birth of the "Indo-Persian" school of art. Percy Brown refers to this school as a branch of Safavid painting. Notable among the masterpieces produced in this period was an illustrated manuscript of the Hamzehnameh. On the evidence of various sources, we are aware of the existence of three Persian painters at Homyun's court. The first was Doost-e Divaneh, or Doost-e Mosavver, who had joined Kamran-Mirza's court long before the two other set foot in India, and Mir-Seyyed-'Ali and Khajeh 'Abd-os-Samad, who arrived in Kabul, upon Homyun's invitation, in 956 AH (AD 1549). Many art experts believe that the history of Gurkani painting actually began with the arrival of these three artists. However, these theories have undergone radical change in recent years, and other art experts now believe that the pioneering role of Doost-e Divaneh/Doost-e Mosavver along this path must not be neglected. While trying to exert utmost caution in depicting the portraits of painters involved in the formation of the "Indo-Persian" school, the author feels compelled to give credit to the assumption that other, lesser known, painters probably also contributed to this movement, but that their names and dates of arrival to the Gurkani court are unknown for want of sources. Thus, while Bayazid asserts that Doost-e Divaneh/Doost-e Mosavver was the greatest painter of the time in Kabul, one should bear in mind that in those days no lists similar to those written about poets were compiled for painters, and that it was only under Akbar, upon his initiative and thanks to Ab-ol-Fazl's efforts, that such lists were first prepared, making a few such outstanding painters known to us. Yet, even in these writings, these artists are depicted on a background of regal events and their individual character is seldom brought in focus. These documents can and must be examined more thoroughly. Many obscure points still exist that need to be clarified by finding new documents. Here, in an attempt to reach a more rational conclusion, we put together some details that sources have made available to us. In A'in-e Akbari, we are faced with the narrative of the painter Mani's emigration to India. Budaq, Qazi Ahmad, Sadeqi-Beik and Mostafa 'Ali speak of Khajeh 'Abd-ol-'Aziz and 'Ali-Asghar Kashi being lured to "set out towards India" by Mohammad ebn-e Khajeh Qebahat, the Shah's favorite cup-bearer, and soon arrested along their way, returned home and punished.

Budaq also speaks of Soltan Mohammad's son, who "did not let his father's efforts go to waste, migrating to India after his death and making great progress there." He also reports that Mir-Mosavver followed Mir-Seyyed-'Ali on his way to India. Scholars also record the presence of the painter Mirak and the calligrapher Mir-Doost at Babur's court. Relying on this mass of evidence, one can visualize a stream of artists and poets, whom we shall call the 'unknown', migrating to India for various reasons. Identifying these figures and altering the conventional views of the past depend on discovering new sources.

However, artists, artisans and poets were not the only ones to join the Gurkani court. Mystic scholars, philosophers and physicians also emigrated en masse. Molla 'Abd-on-Nabi Fakhr-oz-Zamani thus writes about his emigration to India: "... But when the author of these lines reached the age of nineteen, setting out on a pilgrimage to the shrine of Emam Reza (PBUH)... he came to Mashhad... where he stayed for almost a month. While staying at the shrine, day after day, anywhere he went, he heard merchants and passers-by giving lavish descriptions of the safe haven that was India. Yielding to his eagerness to see that land, he resolved to travel there. Leaving behind stage after stage, he traveled by way of Kandahar to eventually reach Lahore, quite ill and weakened. He stayed four months in that city before the fatigue of the road dissipated. He then busied himself with exploring Lahore. What a land it appeared to his humble self! One of inexpensive and abundant goods. Another quality of India was that anyone could live there in any way he wished, without anyone having the right to restrain him from doing so. I told myself, 'This is where you should live, not in the Dar-os-Saltaneh of Qazvin.'"

Thus, the flow of emigrations continues. The author of *Tazkere-ye Maykhaneh* says elsewhere: "... It is well known throughout the world that whoever has had the opportunity of traveling across India and benefiting from this bounteous country, upon returning to Persia, if he does not die on the way between, he indeed dies wishing he were there."

Amin Ahmad Razi has thus described India: "... The wealth of good things that exist in this land is unequalled in any other country. 'Abdollah ebn-e Salam once said that joy was created in ten parts, nine of which were given to India, and the remaining part to the rest of the world. One good thing in India is that travelers need not carry provisions, because food, fodder, and a place to rest are available at every stopover and the chain of arrivals and departures is never broken... Another is that, whatever kind of individual one may be, one is neither hindered nor compelled. [The means of] satisfying personal desires such as those available to frivolous and young people in India exist in no [other] country..."

Taleb Amoli was Jahangir's Malek-osh-Sho'ara, and such painters as Farrokh-Beig and Aqa-Reza, who had joined Akbar's court during Jahangir's life as heir to the throne, were the most illustrious painters of his time. These two artists in fact led the second wave of emigrations and the Persian elements of the "Indo-Persian" school were strengthened anew with their arrival in India. In that period, when the pioneer painters had disappeared, the "Indo-Persian" school was headed by Farrokh-Beig. His name is recorded as the supreme painter in Tuzuk-e Jahangiri, where it is also said that he was awarded the sum of two thousand Rupees.

Other Persian painters certainly existed at the time whose names do not appear in the sources of Jahangir's time, which were vastly influenced by Tuzuk-e Jahangiri. And Jahangir himself only mentions four of his famous painters: Farrokh-Beig, Ab-ol-Hasan, Mansoor, and Beshandas. As we see, even a renowned painter such as Dowlat is omitted from the king's journal, while 'Abd-os-Samad's son, Sharif, plays a large role in it, not as a painter but as commander in chief of Jahangir's army.

The famous painters of this period, Ab-ol-Hasan, Mansoor, and Dowlat, may be considered to constitute the third wave of Persian artists at the Gurkani court. However, information concerning their past lives is scarce, and this is not surprising, for their lives actually began, as it were, upon their joining the Gurkani court!

Unfortunately, what we know at the present time is hardly sufficient to draw up a general history on the matter. The scope of our investigations in this domain is narrow, and this is not our fault; reliable sources in this concern are quite insufficient, but Jahangir is more perceptive about some artists. He writes about Ab-ol-Hasan: "Ever since his childhood he has always been careful in his education before reaching the present standing..." One should bear in mind that Jahangir's inclinations immensely influenced the painters of this period. Hence, following the king's changing interests, different tendencies—portrait painting, representation of courtly scenes, painting from nature, floral and animal illustration, etc.—emerged among these painters. A keen lover and supporter of the arts, beauty and nature, Jahangir was also a great collector and an authoritative critic.

He himself said that he was able to discern the brush strokes of each of his painters in works created in common. Yet, unlike under Akbar, seldom do we come across such collective works in this period, and this highlights another essential point: that Jahangir's inclinations created opportunities for the painters' individualities to manifest themselves and their personal aptitudes and singularities to be revealed. This period was also characterized by the impact of Western painting and the appearance of *moraqqa's* (albums), which replaced the illustrated books produced during Akbar's reign.

The flood of migrations to India continued unabated under Shah Jahan. It was in the early years of this period that Sa'eb Tabrizi visited India, and stayed there for six years.

In this period Kalim Kashani was the court's *Malek-osh-Sho'ara* for a while. The famous Persian painters of this period included Mir-Hashem, Mohammad-Nader and Mohammad-Morad Samarqandi. Although the famous Safavid painter Mohammad Zaman is said to have joined Shah Jahan's court⁸⁶ in this period, no sufficient evidence corroborates this assertion. Portrait painting and album making continued to flourish under Shah Jahan, but it was during his reign that the first steps towards the decentralization of painting were taken. Thus, painting breaks free from the monopoly of the royal court and, with painters joining local courts, the way is paved for painting to become localized under Owrang-Zib. In this period, the Persian elements fade away and the 'Indo-Persian' school begins withering. Also, with the discontinuation of the Gurkani kings' patronage of arts and artists, the flow of migrations to India dwindles, causing the Persian elements of this school to further decline under Owrang-Zib. Meanwhile, with the downfall of the Safavid dynasty, even members of the royal family emigrate to India.

In conclusion, it is appropriate to quote a remark by Percy Brown, which throws a glance on both sides of the coin: "The artists were fortunate in that their patrons had an insatiable desire for their work, while on their part Mughals were fortunate in finding such talent ready and awaiting their orders."

From this viewpoint, the Gurkani kings's need for the specialties and capabilities of Persian migrants equaled the Persian migrants' need for their bounteous patronage. Shah 'Tahmasb I is said to have once asked Jahangir's Persian-born emissaries why the Mughals did not send Indians as diplomats to Persia, and heard the following answer: "If there were men in India no one would give us bread. In India there are no [capable] men."

Reference

Qazi Ahmad Monshi Qomi, Kholasat-ot-Tavarikh, emended by Ehsan Eshraqi, Tehran University Publications, 1359/1980, p. 155.

Sharaf-Khan ebn-e Shams-ed-Din Badlisi, Sharafnameh, compiled by Vladimir, known as Veliaminov Zernov, vol. 1, St. Petersburg, 1860 (1276), pp. 449-50.

Budaq, op. cit., folios 114, 298 & 299; Rumloo, op. cit., p. 488; Qazi Ahmad,

Golestan-e Honar, p. 137; Eskandar-Beik, op. cit., p. 174, who writes: "His Majesty lavished utter kindness upon this class."

Azarpad, Hasan & Heshmati Razavi, Fazlollah, Farshname-ye Iran, Tehran, Cultural Studies and Research Center (Pajuheshgah), 1372/1993, p. 15, but these researchers cite no source for their assertions.

Consultative Assembly, 1314/1935, p. 284, and other sources.

Budaq, op. cit., folios 113-114, who writes: "... In the end when the king became displeased with this lot..."; Qazi Ahmad, Golestan-e Honar, pp. 88 & 99; Eskandar-Beik has also written in this concern, op. cit., pp. 174 & 178.

Budaq, op. cit., folio 307; Mahmood ebn-e Khandmir, Tarikh-e Safaviyeh,

microfilm at the central library of Tehran University, no. 5497, folio 121; Qazi Ahmad also mentions these facts in Kholasat-ot-Tavarikh, pp. 224-6.

Budaq, op. cit.; Rumloo records this event as having taken place in 940 AH, after the Shah's amends, and he refers to the royal wine cup as the royal sherbet cup. See Rumloo, op. cit., pp. 253-4.

Mostafa 'Ali Afandi, op. cit., p. 105; Qazi Ahmad, Golestan-e Honar, pp. 101-2, who gives fresh information about him and quotes two diptychs deriding him. Also see notes 72 & 73.

Mahmood ebn-e Hedayat Afushte'i Natanzi, op. cit., p. 16.

Dickson, M. B. & Welch, S. C., The Houghton Shahnameh, Cambridge, 1981, vol. 1, pp. 119, 123-4; Welch, S. C., Wonders of the Age, Harvard University, 1979-80, p. 27.

“Vincenzo d’Alessandri’s Travel Account”, in Safarname-ha-ye Venizian dar Iran, translated by Dr. Manuchehr Amiri, Tehran, Kharazmi Publications, 1st printing, 1349/1970, pp. 437-8.

Qazi Ahmad, Kholasat-ot-Tavarikh, vol. 1, p. 599.

Rumloo, op. cit., p. 489.

Qazi Ahmad, Kholasat-ot-Tavarikh, vol. 1, p. 599.

Chardin, Jean, Voyages du Chevalier Chardin en Perse, translated by Mohammad ‘Abbasi, vol. 8, Tehran, Amir Kabir, 1345 (1966), p. 307.

“Vincenzo d’Alessandri’s Travel Account”, op. cit., p. 448.