

RELIGION AND STATE DURING THE REIGN OF MUGHAL EMPEROR JAHĀNGĪR (1605-27) : NONJURISTICAL PERSPECTIVES*

Modern scholars hold varying views on Jahāngīr's rule and personality. Some consider him a conservative and traditionalist, manifestly 'communal' ⁽¹⁾ in his outlook, when compared with his father, Akbar (1556-1605) and others opine that the religious and intellectual-cum-military elites supported Jahāngīr's accession to power rather than of Jahāngīr's son, Khusrau, whom Akbar favored because of Jahāngīr's promise to change Akbar's policies. ⁽²⁾ Still others point out that in 1606 Jahāngīr

(* Support for this research from the National Endowment for the Humanities, Translation Program, and the Graduate School of the University of Minnesota is gratefully acknowledged. I am also thankful to my colleague, Professor Lansiné Kaba, for carefully reading the first draft of this paper and making many insightful comments.

(1) Wilfred C. Smith, "The Crystallization of Religious Communities in Mughal India", *Yād Nāmah-i Irānī-i Minorshy*, Mojtabā Minovī and Iraj Afshār, eds. (Tehran, 1969), p. 208.

(2) According to Ishtiaq Husain Qureshi, Jahāngīr had to make a promise to his supporters that he would restore the Islamic traditions discarded by his father. *The Administration of the Mughul Empire* (Karachi, 1966), p. 34. Khaliq Ahmad Nizami in "Naqshbandi Influence on Mughal Rulers and Politics", *Islamic Culture*, 39, 1 (1965), 46-47; and Mohammad Yasin, *A Social History of Islamic India* (Lucknow, 1958), pp. 152-53, concur with Qureshi. The sources consulted for this paper give no indications of such a promise. On the contrary, Kāmgār Husaini's discussion of the issue of succession actually weakens Qureshi's argument. This discussion, favoring Jahāngīr over Khusrau, supposedly took place between emperor Akbar and Mirzā 'Aziz Kokah only a few days before Akbar's death. In recording the last days of emperor Akbar's life, a major contribution of Kāmgār's

ordered the execution of Arjun, the fifth guru of the Sikh community, and in 1610 of Nūr-Allāh Shūshtarī, a revered Shī'ī theologian, allegedly out of "bigotry" and "fanaticism."⁽³⁾ A thematic analysis of five pertinent nonjuristical sources (detailed below) will show that many prevailing views on Jahāngīr are arguable, if not erroneous and misleading, and that his faith or world view did not determine his state policies.

Mughal period, as we know, has attracted disproportionately more scholarly attention than any other period in Indian history. Political and ideological factors in modern times have contributed to a lively controversy on the nature of state in Mughal India, and on the policies of individual rulers like Akbar and Awrangzēb. Jahāngīr, by comparison, has aroused little scholarly interest. This lack of attention could be attributed, among other things, to his not having an Abū'l Faẓl as his court historian. Abū'l Faẓl made his "perfect man" Akbar immortal with the power of his pen and portrayed him as the epitome of liberalism, egalitarianism, and humanism.⁽⁴⁾ Jahāngīr, son of and heir to Akbar, has remained under the shadow of his father. The purpose of this paper is not to express another opinion or judgement or to bemoan historical inequities but rather to focus on the ideological aspects of Jahāngīr's administration. The following analysis will primarily focus on political ideas found in the primary texts, with some references to political institutions. It will discuss Jahāngīr's state policies, particularly those which had an impact on sectarian and communal relations. Since some authors have

work, he attributes these words to Akbar in nominating Salim to be his successor: "Salim patronizes his army, cares for his subjects, and possesses other moral qualities to be worthy of the office; furthermore, he is the first-born". *Ma'āshir-i Jahāngīrī*, Azra Alavi, ed. (Delhi, 1978), p. 53, text of Raza Library manuscript. In any case, the issue of Khusrau versus Jahāngīr, to succeed Akbar, in my opinion, was played up by a split in the nobility rather than by ideological considerations. For further discussion on the question of Sirhindi's role in Jahāngīr's accession see Yohanan Friedmann, *Shaykh Aḥmad Sirhindi, An Outline of His Thought and a Study of His Image in the Eyes of Posterity* (Montreal, 1971), p. 82 and notes 27-34.

(3) R. Strothmann, *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, vol. IV: 356. For further discussion on the issue of Nūr-Allāh Shūshtarī's execution and bibliographic references, see this writer's article: "Shī'ism in India During Jahāngīr's Reign", *Journal of the Pakistan Historical Society*, 27, 1 (Jan. 1979), 41.

(4) For a comprehensive study of Abū'l Faẓl as an historian, soldier, and administrator, see S. A. A. Rizvi, *Religious and Intellectual History of the Muslims in Akbar's Reign with Special Reference to Abu'l Faẓl* (New Delhi, 1975).

treated these topics theoretically, without referring to the practical realities, it is necessary to discuss them on both theoretical and practical levels.

I

The main sources of this paper are: two historical works, the memoirs of Jahāngīr, and two hitherto unexplored and unpublished manuals on statecraft which served as an impetus to writing this paper. These texts represent the diverse intellectual and academic background of the authors and their motives. All authors were connected with the imperial court. During the seventeenth century, as we know, the position of a thinker or writer was not marginal in society as it became in the subsequent period. He was part of the polity and very well integrated into the sociopolitical structure, closely associated with the political power. From this position, he could hardly be an impartial observer or critic of the regime; and his aspirations and hopes were closely tied with his patron—be he an emperor or a holder of civil or military appointment (*maṣabdār*). Patronage being crucial for social mobility, the artist or the intellectual could not ignore the expectations of his patron. The ideological, cultural and social factors played an important role in shaping the content and form of artistic and literary productions. Having said all this, it should be added that the thinkers and the *maṣabdārs* who were quite often one and the same were instrumental in implementing the political philosophy of the Mughals and in enhancing their composite culture. They enjoyed power, influence and reasonable intellectual freedom to express their views explicitly or implicitly. The authors chosen for this paper speak for themselves.

II

Muḥammad Sharīf Mu'tamad Khān's *Iqbāl Nāmah-i Jahāngīrī*, an important historical source, was completed approximately three years after the death of Jahāngīr in 1630. (5) Mu'tamad, in the Introduction to his work, did not

(5) Mu'tamad Khān, *Iqbāl Nāmah-i Jahāngīrī*, Urdu translation by Muḥammad Zakariyā Mā'il (Karachi, 1963). For some discussion on Mu'tamad, see Appendix of this paper, note 1.

follow the usual convention of the historians of medieval times of noting the rationale and purpose of his writing. In any case, although Mu'tamad was closely associated with the court, his work was not commissioned either by Jahāngīr or Shāhjahān. For our purposes, his views are significant not so much as a historian but as a member of the intellectual elite.

Khawāja Kāmgār Ḥusainī wrote *Ma'āsir-i Jahāngīrī* in the early part of Shāhjahān's reign, approximately three to four years after the death of Jahāngīr. (6) The rationale of writing the *Ma'āsir*, as put forth by Kāmgār, was that being an offspring of an imperial official (*khānazād*) and a witness to most of the events, he felt obliged to fill in the gaps in the historical narration of the memoirs of Jahāngīr especially the early years of the emperor's life, which Jahāngīr did not write. (7) In the view of Azra Alavi, the real motive of the author was to explain and defend the behavior of his uncle 'Abdullah Khān Firūzjung, an opportunist who betrayed Jahāngīr on several occasions. (8) It was, in any case, an independent and noncommissioned history written after Jahāngīr's death, and we do not know if it was ever presented to Shāhjahān. Nevertheless, the author was in Shāhjahān's service and could not ignore the outlook of the new administration regarding the previous regime. This factor is discernible in Kāmgār's recounting of matters such as Shāhjahān's rebellion against Jahāngīr in 1623, and in his attitude towards Nūrjahān during his struggle for the throne. (9) Thus Kāmgār's narration of Jahāngīr's rule is pragmatic, reflecting the thinking of an historian contemporaneous to Jahāngīr but writing after his death.

(6) For further details, see *Ibid.*, note 2.

(7) *Ma'āsir*, p. 1. For an analysis of the code of behavior of *khānazāds*, see J. F. Richards, "Norms of Comportment among Imperial Mughal Officers", *Moral Conduct and Authority: The Place of Adab in South Asian Islam*, Barbara Daly Metcalf, ed. (Berkeley, 1984), pp. 255-89.

(8) *Ma'āsir*, Introduction, p. 18.

(9) Both historians, Kāmgār and Mu'tamad did not remember the former queen with kind words. They regarded her nepotism and lack of foresight responsible for the rebellion of the crown prince Khurram (Shāhjahān) in 1623, which lasted until the death of Jahāngīr. They described the wrongdoings of Nūrjahān and her collaborators and portrayed emperor Shāhjahān, their new master, as falling victim to the "viciousness" and "stupidity" of the former queen over the issue of succession. *Ma'āsir*, pp. 349-54, 359; and Mu'tamad, *Iqbāl Nāmah*, pp. 178-85. See also, S. Nūrul Ḥasan, "The Theory of the Nūr Jahān 'Junta' — A Critical Examination", *Proceedings of Indian History Congress*, 21 (1958), 324-35.

Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī, the emperor's autobiography, the most important source for Jahāngīr's reign, served as a basis for all the histories of the period, including the aforementioned chronicles. From the historiographical viewpoint, the *Tūzuk* is acclaimed to be an objective source for the period.⁽¹⁰⁾ This work is of fundamental importance because it reflects the royal ideology and the emperor's views on various political, religious, and social issues.

Two other works, *Mau'izah-i Jahāngīrī* and *Akhlāq-i Jahāngīrī*, fall into the category of the "Mirrors for Princes" and are different in their form and content from the works discussed above. These deal with political thought but do not provide a systematic analysis or interpretation of political philosophy. However, they serve as an intermediary link between the juristical and philosophical works on the subject. Unlike the historians, the authors of these works are not constrained by the conventions of the genre and can express their views on the art of government in the form of anecdotes or didactic narrative. An emigre from Iran, Muḥammad Bāqir Najm-i Ṣānī, the author of *Mau'izah-i Jahāngīrī*,⁽¹¹⁾ was linked with the Mughal family through his marriage with the niece of queen Nūr-jahān.⁽¹²⁾ A man of both sword and pen, Bāqir symbolized the Indo-Persian social and cultural norms of the ruling elite. The *Mau'izah* and *Kulliyāt*⁽¹³⁾ are his two extant works. As a litterateur, he yearned to write a didactic treatise but struggled to find time for such an undertaking. Eventually, he wrote the *Mau'izah* in 1612 to satisfy his intellectual interests.⁽¹⁴⁾ Written in succinct, concise, and lucid prose, it represents a pragmatic

(10) Nūr al-Dīn Jahāngīr, *The Tūzuk-i Jahāngīrī or Memoirs of Jahāngīr*, 2nd Edition. Translated by Alexander Rogers (Delhi, 1968), vol. I, Preface, pp. viii-ix; and Beni Prasad, *History of Jahangir* (Madras, 1922), vol. I, pp. 454-55. Also see Appendix of this paper, note 3.

(11) I. O. Pers. Ms. 1666. The text of this manuscript has been edited and translated in English by this writer under the auspices of the National Endowment for the Humanities, Translation Program, and is being published by the State University of New York Press.

(12) For more details of his life and literary activities, see my article, "Shi'ism in India", *op. cit.*, note 3; Sayyid Ḥasan 'Askarī, "Mirzā Muḥammad Bāqir Najm-i-Thānī", *'Arshī Presentation Volume*, Malik Ram and M. D. Ahmad, eds. (Delhi, 1965), pp. 101-22; and Appendix of this paper, note 4.

(13) I. O. Pers. Ms. 1330.

(14) *Mau'izah*, fols. 3a-4b.

and practical approach to political problems. Bāqir ended this work with a praise of his patron Jahāngīr for his ideal rule and with a conventional prayer for his long life and an increase in his might and grandeur.⁽¹⁵⁾ There is no indication if this work was ever presented to Jahāngīr.

Qāḍī Nūr al-Dīn Khāqānī wrote his monumental work *Akhlāq-i Jahāngīrī* to admonish rulers in general and Jahāngīr in particular the art of government.⁽¹⁶⁾ Khāqānī, an 'ālim and a jurist, was a second-generation (?) immigrant from Herat and served as the *qāḍī* of Lahore. The religious and juristical background of the author determined the form and content of the *Akhlāq*. In style, it is like the *Akhlāq-i Jalālī* of Muḥammad Jalāl-al Dīn Dawwānī (d. 1501), which was an important part of the curriculum during this period.⁽¹⁷⁾ Khāqānī completed this work in 1622 and dedicated it to Jahāngīr as a token of his gratitude for the favors of his patron.⁽¹⁸⁾ Again, we have no information if this work was presented to the emperor.⁽¹⁹⁾

III

The topic of this paper deals with religion and state policies; therefore, the logical starting point of the thematic analysis of the sources is the concept of state. Modern scholars such as Prasad and Sarkar hold differing opinions on the Mughal state,

(15) *Ibid.*, fol. 62a.

(16) I. O. Pers. Ms. 1547, fol. 3a. For details, see Appendix of this paper, note 5.

(17) Rizvi, *Religious and Intellectual History*, p. 197.

(18) Khāqānī, *Akhlāq*, fol. 3b.

(19) Another noteworthy work having some juristical orientation is *Risālah-i Nurāniyyah-i Sulṭāniyyah*. Shaikh 'Abd al-Ḥaqq wrote it for Jahāngīr and dedicated it to him. Khaliq Ahmad Nizami, *Ḥayāt-i Shaikh 'Abd al-Ḥaqq Muḥaddiṣ Dihlavī* (Delhi, 1964), p. 197. (I could not locate this unpublished work). Sirhindī has also expressed his views on the issue of religion in state policies in his *Maktūbāt*. See Friedmann, *Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindī*, pp. 77-85. Secondary sources characterized by an apologetic or a polemical style, such as Sri Ram Sharma's rather outdated but often quoted *The Religious Policy of the Great Mughal Emperors* (Bombay, 1962), and M. P. Srivastava's *Policies of the Great Mughals* (Allahabad, 1978), are not discussed. These authors are among the many, Hindu and Muslim alike, who have used twentieth-century spectacles to view the medieval period.

referring to it variously as a "police state", a "culture state,"⁽²⁰⁾ or a state "limited, materialistic, and sordid in its aims."⁽²¹⁾ We have to judge how consistent are these opinions with Jahāngīr's contemporaneous views. The primary sources perceive the state to be Islamic by virtue of having a Muslim ruler. In the classical theory of an Islamic state are three important elements: community; state as protector of the community and its faith, Islam; and the implementation of the *Sharī'ah*.⁽²²⁾ The position of a temporal sovereign is central in this scheme to achieve the establishment and survival of an Islamic state. Bāqir and Khāqānī, like predecessor writers of the 'Mirrors,'⁽²³⁾ wrote their treatise specifically to counsel the ruler because of the paramount importance of his office. Overall, Bāqir, a Shī'ī, considered the Perso-Islamic court ethics appropriate for the ruler and polity; but while writing of kingship, he reiterated the Sunni theory of kingship.⁽²⁴⁾ In his words:

(20) Prasad, *History of Jahangir*, vol. I, p. 94.

(21) Jadunath Sarkar, *Mughal Administration* (Calcutta, 1972), p. 3.

(22) For philosophical, juridical and historical theories of Islamic state, see Ann K. S. Lambton, *State and Government in Medieval Islam, an Introduction to the Study of Islamic Political Theory: The Jurists* (New York, 1981); and E. I. J. Rosenthal, *Political Thought in Islam: An Introductory Outline* (Cambridge, 1968).

(23) For a detailed study of Islamic 'Mirrors', see Abdel Hakim H. O. M. Dawood, "A Comparative Study of Arabic and Persian Mirrors for Princes from the Second to the Sixth Century A. H." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation submitted to the University of London, 1965; and Ann K. S. Lambton, "Islamic Mirrors for Princes", *Problemi Attuali di Scienza e di Cultura, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei*. 160 (1971), 419-42. Among the well-known Iranian "Mirrors" are: Kaikā'ūs b. Iskandar, *Qābūs Nāmah* (completed in 1082); Nizām al-Mulk, *Siyāsat Nāmah* (written in 1092); and Muḥammad al-Ghazālī, *Naṣīhat al-Mulūk* (written in 1105-06). These works influenced the Indo-Islamic 'Mirrors' in content and form. My forthcoming article: "Images of Statecraft In Islamic India Seen Through the 'Mirrors for Princes' will discuss this literary tradition in the subcontinent.

(24) Within the framework of Persian theory of rulership in Islamic political thought, views of jurists, such as al-Ghazālī are particularly significant. See *Naṣīhat al-Mulūk*, Jalāl al-Dīn Humā'ī, ed. (Tehran, 1351 H.S.), p. 81. Also, Dawood, "A Comparative Study", pp. 244-51; Lambton, *State and Government*, pp. 107-29; Lambton, "The Theory of Kingship in the *Naṣīhat al-Mulūk* of Ghazālī", *Islamic Quarterly*, 1 (1954), 47-55; and L. Binder, "Al-Ghazālī's Theory of Government", *The Muslim World*, 45, 3 (1955), 229-41. I agree with Lambton that it is hard to distinguish between Shī'ī and Sunni writers of the 'Mirrors' on the theory of rulership. "Islamic Mirrors", p. 420. For the Shī'ī concept of *Imāmat*, see *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, new ed., s.v. "Imāma"; J. Eliash, "The lthnā 'asharī-Shī'ī juristic theory of political and legal authority", *Studia Islamica*, 29 (1967), 17-30; and Lambton, *State and Government*, pp. 219-41. See note 26 below.

After the Prophet—the last of the prophets and seal of the apostles—there ought to be no alternative but to have a powerful and prudent ruler with exalted authority maintaining order and strengthening the pillars of the true religion, regulating activities and conveniences for mankind, and achieving the blessings of peace and security. (25)

Khāqānī concurred with Bāqir and considered the rulers leaders of humanity and caliphs of God (*Khalīfat-Allāh*), on earth. (26) He agreed with earlier Iranian and Indian writers of the Islamic 'Mirrors' that some of the essential qualities of a successful ruler were: noble birth, comely appearance, kind disposition, integrity, manliness, bravery, knowledge, prudence, awe-inspiring grandeur, keen sense of justice and, above all, the ability to enforce *Shari'ah*. His patron, Jahāngīr, according to Khāqānī, was endowed with all these qualities. (27) He also stressed the personal piety of the ruler, in the vein of the Arabo-Islamic code of morality.

Jahāngīr, on the contrary, held more pragmatic views on the functions of rulership. Sovereignty, according to him, was a "gift of God," (28) not necessarily given to enforce God's law but rather to "ensure the contentment of the world." (29) In this opinion, he is in agreement with al-Ghazālī and others discussed above. Such ideas, scattered throughout the *Tūzuk* and other sources, indicate continued acceptance of the legitimacy of

(25) Bāqir, *Maw'izah*, fol. 6b.

(26) Khāqānī, *Akhlāq*, fol. 3a. Some of the earlier jurists discussed the concept of *Khalīfat-Allāh* at length. For example, Abū'l-Ḥasan al-Māwardī, *Al-Aḥkām al-Sulṭāniyyah*, Urdu translation by Sayyid Muḥammad Ibrāhīm (Hyderabad, Deccan, 1931), pp. 3-41. A later jurist, Faḍl-Allāh b. Ruzbihān Khunjī (d. 1521), addressed the issue of *Khalīfat-Allāh* in his work, *Sulūk al-Mulūk*. This work, written in 1514, shows a great flexibility in dealing with various practical problems of running a government. However, he opined that a sultan could be called *Khalīfah*, *Imām*, *Amīr al-Mu'minīn*, *Khalīfah-i Rasūl*, but not *Khalīfat-Allāh*. *Sulūk al-Mulūk*, Muḥammad Nizām al-Dīn, ed. (Hyderabad, Deccan), p. 48. This work, commissioned by the Uzbek ruler 'Ubaid-Allāh Khān Uzbek (d. 1521), is an indication of the continued desire of some Sunnī Muslim rulers to know the injunctions of *Shari'ah* regarding statecraft.

(27) Khāqānī, *Akhlāq*, fols. 52a, 59b, 66a, 138b, 160b, 176b, 188a, 200b, 214b, 263a-64a, 291b, 297a, 301b, 316a, 321a, 323b, 372b, 392b, 413a-b.

(28) Quoted by Khaliq Ahmad Nizami, "The Delhi Sultanate and the Mughal Empire: Genesis and Salient Features", *Islamic Culture*, 55, 3 (July, 1981), 174.

(29) Jahāngīr, *Tūzuk*, vol. I, p. 15.

temporal power, stripped of the theocratic trappings, in Sunnī political thought. Jahāngīr discussed his views on sovereignty further while referring to the rebellion of his son and contestant to the throne, prince Khusrau and his supporters. He opined that God chose an individual befitting the exalted position of rulership⁽³⁰⁾ and considered himself to be worthy of the throne. He did not claim to be the protector of Islam, nor did he promise to implement *Sharī'ah* through his office. Bāqir, writing in his *Biyāz* on the death of Akbar and accession of Jahāngīr, did not refer to the legitimacy of Jahāngīr's claim to the throne on the basis of his being the custodian of Islam.⁽³¹⁾ Even after the death of Jahāngīr, in his letter of condolence to the emperor's favorite queen Nūrjahān, Bāqir spoke of the keen sense of justice and other qualities of Jahāngīr rather than of his commitment to promote the injunctions of *Sharī'ah*.⁽³²⁾ All these remarks imply that the attitude of the writers, including Jahāngīr, toward the institution of rulership was not anti-Islam but a pragmatic and somewhat modified version of the classical Islamic doctrine of political power.

In theory, most of the thinkers mentioned in this paper considered the role of religion in governmental policies to be crucial. Administration according to and by means of *Sharī'ah* (*siyāsah Sharī'ah*) was a favorite topic of the jurist Khāqānī, and he devoted one chapter to the topic. He stated unequivocally that it was imperative for the ruler to use his power for the propagation of Islam (*tarwīj-i Islām*), integration of the community of the Leader of humanity i.e. Prophet Muḥammad (*tansīq-i millat-i Ḥaḍrat Sayyid-al anām*), and elimination of the enemies of the Faith.⁽³³⁾ He also urged the ruler to use his authority to curtail the power of his nobility (probably non-Muslim nobles), so they would treat the Muslims with respect and justice. In his discussion, he drew examples from Islamic

(30) *Ibid.*, p. 51.

(31) Bāqir, *Kulliyāt*, fols. 348b-49b. Compare the idiom used by the historians of Awrangzēb on his ascendancy to the throne. See Muḥammad Bakhtāwar Khān, *Mir'āt al-'Ālam, History of Awrangzēb (1658-1668)*, Sajida S. Alvi, ed. (Lahore, 1979), vol. I, Introduction, pp. 39-45.

(32) Bāqir, *Kulliyāt*, fols. 364b-65a. In this long letter of condolence, Bāqir mentioned only once the phrase of *Dīn-Parvarī* (defense of faith), in a general and secondary manner.

(33) Khāqānī, *Akhlāq*, fols. 385b-86a.

history, Sasanid Iran, and Greek heritage. The maxims taken from non-Islamic sources primarily dealt with the benefits of an efficient administration. He also explicitly mentioned that through his policies, Jahāngir endeavored to implement the sanctions and prohibitions of Islamic law and to solidify the *Sharī'ah*.⁽³⁴⁾ Muḥammad Bāqir supported the view of al-Ghazālī and others that religion and politics were like twins. In his words, "government is an adornment of the country and nation and an expedient for the welfare of religion and empire. "Without the ruler's regulation of administration" Baqir added "neither the decrees of *Sharī'ah* are promulgated, nor is the basis of empire strengthened."⁽³⁵⁾ He agreed with the previous writers of 'Mirrors' that after Prophet Muḥammad, responsibilities for the propagation of Islam and promulgation of the *Sharī'ah* rest with the rulers.⁽³⁶⁾ These ideas, however, occur as isolated statements in the *Mau'izah*. Contrary to Khāqānī, Bāqir stressed that the administration should be based on and formulated by justice *siyāsah 'adālah*; and devoted the first chapter of his treatise to the topic. To quote:

In systematizing rules and in maintaining procedures [of his administration] the ruler must exert the utmost care to achieve justice and impartiality. If the judge {ruler} does not regulate the affairs of the people, the clandestine rebel, abetted by tyranny, will destroy the lives of the nobility and plebian alike. If the light from the candle of justice does not illuminate the somber cell of the afflicted, the darkness of cruelty will blacken the entire country just as it does the hearts of tyrants.⁽³⁷⁾

It should be noted that Bāqir does not follow the juristical definition of justice as *dār-al Islām* and *dār-al 'adl*, according to which an Islamic state becomes a state of justice by following the precepts of Islam. The theorists of Jahāngir's period propounded the Perso-Islamic concept of justice popularized by Nizām-al Mulk and al-Ghazālī among others.⁽³⁸⁾

(34) *Ibid.*, fols. 139a, 160b.

(35) Bāqir, *Mau'izah*, fol. 11a.

(36) *Ibid.*, fol. 6b.

(37) *Ibid.*, fol. 9b.

(38) For more details, see A. K. S. Lambton, "Justice in the Medieval Theory of Kingship", *Studia Islamica*, 17 (1962), 91-119. Majid Khadduri, *Islamic Conception of Justice* (Baltimore, 1984).

Kāmgār and Mu'tamad, the historians, did not formalize their views on the nature of state and the role of Jahāngīr in determining the character of his administration. They expressed their views only indirectly in the course of their historical narrative. Kāmgār, for example, in his work *Ma'āṣir-i Jahāngīrī*, only by implication said that religion was not to be the primary concern of the sovereign. The main function of the institution of kingship, according to him, was to "maintain law and order on the earth through sagacity and implement justice [with unfaltering] perseverance."⁽³⁹⁾ Mu'tamad Khān, in *Iqbāl Nāmah*, repeated the views of jurists and historians when recounting the essential qualities of a ruler implicitly possessed by Jahāngīr. He identified these qualities as a sense of justice, superior intellect, an aggressive policy against infidelity, benevolence, and divine assistance for success.⁽⁴⁰⁾

None of the writers discussed the rights and responsibilities of the Muslim community in the pluralistic society of India vis-à-vis the Muslim head of the state, nor did they discuss the position of the non-Muslims in the state at a theoretical level. Because of the nonjuristical nature of the sources, there is no systematic exposition of theory of government, and the viewpoints discussed above transcend any specific school of thought regarding the nature of government and the role of religion in it.

IV

Moving from the theory to the practice, we look at the memoirs of emperor Jahāngīr himself. It appears that the propagation of Islam and the implementation of the *Sharī'ah* were not the primary aims of his government. It was only in the judicial department of the entire central structure of the Mughal administration where the Mughal rulers including Jahāngīr followed the Islamic juristical laws. In civil cases, Islamic law applied to Muslims. Criminal law was the same for Muslims and Hindus. In matters like marriage and inheritance, etc., both communities had their own laws.⁽⁴¹⁾ Among the twelve

(39) Kāmgār, *Ma'āṣir*, p. 1.

(40) Mu'tamad, *Iqbāl Nāmah*, p. 17.

(41) For details, see Muhammad Bashir Ahmad, *Judicial System of the Mughul Empire* (Karachi, 1978); and Ibn Hasan, *The Central Structure of the Mughal Empire*, 2nd ed. (New Delhi, 1970), pp. 324-27.

ordinances Jahāngīr issued after his accession, one ordinance prohibited the distilling and sale of wine or any kind of intoxicating drug. However, Jahāngīr did not invoke the injunctions of the *Shari'ah* as his motivating force; instead, he made a candid admission of his own drinking habit.⁽⁴²⁾ The first ordinance was to install a chain of justice to enable his subjects to have direct access to their ruler for seeking redress of their grievances.⁽⁴³⁾ Indeed, long before Jahāngīr's period, justice rather than right religion became an accepted norm in Sunnī political thought.⁽⁴⁴⁾ And in India, the issue involved the position of Muslims as a minority as well. The Mughals named the department of law and justice *Mahkamah-i 'Adalat* instead of *Mahkamah-i Shari'ah* (ecclesiastical department).⁽⁴⁵⁾ The Mughal emperors in general and Jahāngīr in particular are remembered for their special concern for and implementation of justice. Jahāngīr's reputation as a just ruler must have been widespread during his reign. For example, a sufi poet, 'Uṣmān, resident of Ghazipur, a contemporary of Jahāngīr but not associated with the court, heard about and applauded Jahāngīr's golden chain of justice in his long poem *Chitravali*.⁽⁴⁶⁾ Apart from these theoretical expositions on the virtues of justice and the laudatory compliments in the annals of their

(42) Jahāngīr, *Tūzūk*, vol. I, p. 8. Jahāngīr's casual mention of his drinking habit is in complete contrast to the attitude of fourteenth-century moralist, Zīā al-Dīn Baranī. In his extremely important work on statecraft, Baranī considered good personal conduct and an Islamic way on life important for the ruler, and if a sultan is unable to maintain an Islamic code of life, he should repent but still exercise his authority to enhance the cause of Islam. Therefore, according to Baranī, even his un-Islamic behavior will be legitimate. *Fatāwā-i Jahāndārī*, Saleem Khan, ed. (Lahore, 1972), p. 141. Baranī's views reflect the outlook of Muslim community in India in the early medieval period, when this minority group was still not feeling very secure in an alien land and looking beyond the frontiers of India for its cultural and religious identity. By Jahāngīr's time, however, there was much less concern for an Islamic code of morality for the ruler in political or behavioral spheres.

(43) Jahāngīr, *Tūzūk*, vol. I, p. 7.

(44) See note 38 above.

(45) Bashir, *Judicial System*, pp. 217-18.

(46) B. K. Singh, "Some Glimpses of Society and Polity in Usman's Chitravali," *Proceedings of Indian History Congress*, 25 (1958), 336. For a general discussion on Jahāngīr's concern for his subjects, see *Intikhāb-i Jahāngīr-Shāhī* in H. M. Elliot and John Dowson, *The History of India as told by its Own Historians* (London, 1875), vol. VI, pp. 449-50.

reigns, specific historical incidents show the serious effort of the Mughal emperors in their impartial rendering of justice. (47)

In their review of ruling institutions, none of the writers considered religion as the cornerstone of state policies. The Mughals had a highly centralized form of government. With absolute power in his hands, the Mughal ruler had to depend on the support of a linguistically, religiously, and ethnically diverse nobility for the success of his policies. The ascendancy of Jahāngīr's favorite queen Nūrjahān's family and other Iranians and Shī'is in the administration is a recognized fact. We also know of many Hindus who rose to prominent positions. (48) For example, Raja Kalyān, son of Todar Mal, was appointed governor of Orissa, Raja Vikramjit, governor of Gujarat; and Raja Mān Singh continued to serve as governor of Bengal despite his support for Khusrau and his opposition to Jahāngīr's accession to the throne. (49) In general, the Mughal emperors treated former chieftains and rulers, after their subjugation to the Mughal authority, with great respect and honor. The case of Raja Amar Singh of Udaipur and his son Karan is a good example of Jahāngīr's policy. After the Raja's fall in 1614, Jahāngīr made special efforts to make the father and son part of the polity by bestowing on them various honors and favors befitting their social status. In 1616, the emperor ordered stone-cutters "to carve full-sized figures of the Raja and his son, Karan, out of marble." (50) When they had been completed,

(47) Ibn Hasan, *Central Structure*, pp. 324-27.

(48) There is no detailed statistical study of Jahāngīr's nobility along ethnic or religious lines. Srivastava has provided some information on high-ranking Hindu nobles: *Policies of the Great Mughals*, pp. 98-99. For Nūrjahān and her family, see Prasad, *History of Jahangir*, pp. 186-201; Irfan Habib, "The Family of Nur Jahan During Jahangir's Reign, a Political Study," *Medieval India: A Miscellany*, I (1969), 74-95. For a critical view of Nūrjahān's nephew, Mirzā Aḥmad Bēg's abuse of power in Sind, see Yusuf Mirak, *Tārīkh-i Maḡhar-i Shāh-jahānī*, Ḥussām al-Dīn Rāshidī, ed. (Hyderabad, Sind, 1962), pp. 154-64. For a discussion on the Rajput princes as *manṣabdārs*, see Robert C. Hallissey, *The Rajput Rebellion Against Aurangzeb: A Study of the Mughal Empire in Seventeenth-Century India*, (Columbia, Missouri, 1977), pp. 22-31. For the composition of nobility during the later period but still useful for our purposes, see M. Athar Ali, *The Mughal Nobility under Aurangzeb*, (Calcutta, 1966), pp. 7-68. Another relevant article on the subject is: J. F. Richards, "The Formulation of Imperial Authority Under Akbar and Jahangir," *Kingship and Authority in South Asia*, J. F. Richards, ed. (Madison, 1978), pp. 252-85. Also see note 7 above.

(49) For details, see note 2.

(50) Jahāngīr, *Tūzuk*, vol. I, p. 332.

the emperor ordered them to be taken to Agra and placed in the garden below the *jharoka* (exhibition window).⁽⁵¹⁾ In dealing with his nobility, Jahāngīr did not, unlike his contemporary Ṣafavid rulers, display any religious pretensions.

Bāqir, in turn, did not, follow his coreligionists in Iran in their view of the Ṣafavid rulers as spiritual and temporal leaders. He did not consider his patron, the emperor, super-human, nor did he see him as divinely guided to unravel the complexities of governance.⁽⁵²⁾ He urged Jahāngīr to consult his advisers before making any decisions. Being a member of the polity himself, Bāqir wrote in detail about the virtues of consultation and enumerated the qualities of individuals who should serve as advisers. He emphasized experience, sagacity, honesty, and integrity more than piety or religious affiliations.⁽⁵³⁾ In *Akhlāq-i Jahāngīrī*, Khāqānī's discussion on consultation is relatively short. However, none of the writers suggested that the advisers ought to be only Muslims. A close look at the central administration of the Mughals shows that the advisory councils were not restricted to the ministers, and high ranking nobles irrespective of their race and religion were instrumental in making and implementing the state policies.⁽⁵⁴⁾

So far as the contribution of 'ulamā' in shaping and formulating the state policies is concerned, even Khāqānī, notwithstanding his position as a *qāḍī*, recognized it to be meager. Instead of outlining, in the usual laudatory tone, the reasons for the minimal role of the religious elite, he attributed it to "Jahāngīr's thorough training and education that the emperor himself was able to resolve the knottiest issues and problems of the state."⁽⁵⁵⁾ The function of the erudite and highly knowledgeable 'ulamā' and righteous and pious individuals, according

(51) Should we regard it as an honor or degradation for the Raja? This is open to question. Only important personalities or events, however, found their way into paintings. See the discussion on Jadrup later in this paper.

(52) On the Iranian scene, Iskandar Bēg Turkomān, in *Tārīkh-i 'Ālam-āra'-i 'Abbāsī*, Iraj Afshār, ed. (Tehran, 1350 H.S.), vol. II, part 2, pp. 1100-1101, considered his patron, Shāh 'Abbās I, to be divinely inspired in his every course of action. Even when in certain policies his counselors considered him wrong, according to Iskandar Bēg, he proved to be right because of the divine guidance.

(53) Bāqir, *Mau'izah*, fols. 16b-20a.

(54) For more details, Ibn Hasan, *Central Structure*, pp. 296-301.

(55) Khāqānī, *Akhlāq*, fol. 65b. Khāqānī does not follow the author of *Tārīkh-i 'Abbāsī*, in attributing it to divine inspiration.

to Khāqānī, was limited to spreading religious learning, and they were part of the polity only to satisfy the religious inquisitiveness of Jahāngīr. (56) Bāqir, however, was not so blunt in describing the impotence of the 'ulamā' in state matters. He wished to see Jahāngīr make a conscious effort to "pattern his policies after the advice, counsel, and judgement of the 'ulamā' to adorn the head of the [Muslim] community with the crown of felicity and vesture of the empire embellished with the magnificence." (57) His views could be offered only as suggestions. Jahāngīr did not heed this advice nor did he claim for himself any erudition in religious disciplines. We also know that the Sunnī 'ulamā', contrary to their counterparts in Şafavid Iran, did not succeed in forming a hierocracy of influence among the nobility. Although the judiciary and *hisbah* were the departments held and controlled by the 'ulamā' in Jahāngīr's administration, they were not the policy makers and had to serve as state employees and follow the state policies. It is true that Jahāngīr maintained the tradition of his predecessors in showing reverence to the sufis and some 'ulamā' and expressed enthusiasm for meeting with them to discuss religious and philosophical issues. Noteworthy among them were Shaikh 'Abd al-Ḥaqq Muḥaddiṣ (d. 1642), a leading traditionalist of the period, (58) Shaikh Miyyān Mīr (d. 1635), a sufi of the Qādriyyah order, (59) and Qādī Naṣīr of Burhānpur (d. 1621). (60) However, in describing his meetings with these individuals, the emperor does not indicate anywhere that he sought their advice in state matters. In 1611, his sixth regnal year, Jahāngīr issued an order to exempt individuals from *sijda* who were serving as Mīr 'Adl or Qādī. The act could be construed as his outward respect for *Sharī'ah*. (61) In general, however, we concur with Aziz Ahmad that the 'ulamā' never regained their prestigious position in the administration lost during Akbar's reign. (62)

(56) *Ibid.*

(57) Bāqir, *Mau'izah*, fol. 7a-b.

(58) Jahāngīr, *Tūzuk*, vol. II, p. 111.

(59) *Ibid.*, p. 119.

(60) *Ibid.*, p. 210.

(61) *Ibid.*, vol. I, p. 203.

(62) Aziz Ahmad, "The Role of Ulema in Indo-Muslim History," *Studia Islamica*, 31 (1970), 7.

The issue of the imprisonment of Shaikh Aḥmad Sirhindī warrants discussion. Some inconsistency is apparent in Jahāngīr's attitude towards religious personages. As discussed above, the emperor showed respect for Shaikh 'Abd al-Ḥaqq and others but did not hesitate to imprison Sirhindī. It is Sirhindī whom posterity has credited with initiating the reversal of the eclectic and liberal policies of Akbar that, according to Qureshi, found their "political culmination with the ascendancy of Awrangzēb to the throne."⁽⁶³⁾ We know from the primary sources that Jahāngīr did not have kind words for Sirhindī or acknowledge his erudition. He referred to Shaikh Niẓām Thanesarī as a *shayyād* (imposter), probably because of his support to Khusrau, and banished him to Mecca.⁽⁶⁴⁾ He characterized Sirhindī, likewise, as a *shayyād* and imprisoned him. To quote Jahāngīr:

At this time it was reported to me that *Shayyād*... of the name of Shaikh Aḥmad has spread the net of hypocrisy and deceit in Sirhind, and caught in it many of the apparent worshippers without spirituality,... He had also written a number of idle tales to his disciples and believers and had made them into a book which he called *Maktūbāt* (letters). In that album... of absurdities many unprofitable things had been written that drag (people) into infidelity and impiety. Amongst these he had written in a letter as follows: "..., I passed from the abode of the Vice-gerents (*Khulfa*) and attained to the highest rank." There were other presumptuous expressions which it would be too long to write... I according [sic] gave an order that they should bring him to the Court that is based on justice... To all that I asked him he could give no reasonable answer, and appeared to me to be extremely proud and self-satisfied, with all his ignorance. I considered the best thing for him would be that he should remain some time in the prison of correction until the heat

(63) Ishtiaq Husain Qureshi, *Ulema in Politics* (Karachi, 1972), p. 98; Khaliq Ahmad Nizami, *Ḥayāt-i Shaikh 'Abd al-Ḥaqq Muḥaddiṣ Dihlavi* (Delhi, 1964), Introduction. Friedmann, however, challenges this viewpoint of crediting Sirhindī with a decisive influence on Mughal state policies. See *Shaykh Aḥmad Sirhindī*, p. 81. For conflicting views of various scholars on the subject, and for the self-image of Sirhindī, see, *Ibid.*, pp. 82-83 and 23-31 respectively.

(64) Jahāngīr, *Tūzuk*, vol. I, p. 60.

of his temperament and confusion of his brain were somewhat quenched, and the excitement of the people also should subside. ⁽⁶⁵⁾

Although Sirhindī was not heading any organized revolt against Jahāngīr, the emperor did not approve of his religious activism. Sirhindī, in turn, did not favor Jahāngīr's policies wholeheartedly; however, his protests against state policies and his dissatisfaction with the status of *Shari'ah* and Islam were not as intense ⁽⁶⁶⁾ as Badāyūnī's feelings against Akbar's religious outlook had been. ⁽⁶⁷⁾ As a footnote to this discussion, it should be added that Jahāngīr, as he traveled through his empire, followed the tradition of his predecessors of visiting the tombs of former rulers and saints and giving charity generously to the custodians of those tombs. ⁽⁶⁸⁾ This policy suggests a genuine desire on the emperor's part to seek the blessings of the deceased and to maintain good public relations. ⁽⁶⁹⁾

Was Jahāngīr a sectarian? Some scholars interpreted Jahāngīr's execution of Nūr-Allāh Shūshtarī, a noted Shī'ī theologian, as an act of bigotry. The issue of Shūshtarī's execution is still unresolved. One commonly accepted view is that Nūr-Allāh was executed because of his practice of *taqiyah*—concealed his Shī'ī faith and acted as a Sunnī *qāḍī*. ⁽⁷⁰⁾ We also know him as a zealous Shī'ī who went to India for the propagation of Shi'ism. He wrote *Ṣawārim al-Muḥarriqah* and *Aḥqāq al-Ḥaqq* in defense of Shi'ism and refutation of Sunnī

(65) *Ibid.*, vol. II, pp. 91-93.

(66) For the text of Sirhindī's letter to Mir Muḥammad Nu'mān on the topic, see Friedmann, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

(67) For details, see Rizvi, *Religious and Intellectual History*, pp. 438-54.

(68) The historical annals and the *Tūzuk* are full of details of such sojourns by Jahāngīr. To cite only some references: Jahāngīr, *Tūzuk*, vol. II, pp. 101-2; Mu'tamad, *Iqbāl Nāmāh*, pp. 105-6; Kāmgār, *Mā'āsir*, pp. 111, 225-56, and 272. For the iconographic paintings, including Jahāngīr's meetings with saints and ascetics, see Ashok Kumar Das, *Mughal Paintings During Jahangir's Time* (Calcutta, 1978), pp. 213-28.

(69) In Iran, Shāh 'Abbās was showing similar respect to religious personages by visiting the shrines of Imāms and taking active part in the rituals of *Ta'ziyeh*. For details, see Naṣr-Allāh Falsafī, *Zindigānī-i Shāh 'Abbās-i Awwal* (Tehran, 1399 H.S.), vol. III, pp. 6-10; for his historic trip on foot to the tomb of Imām Raḏā, *Ibid.*, pp. 13-16; also Iskandar Bēg, *Tārīkh-i 'Abbāsī*, vol. II, part 2, pp. 610-11.

(70) *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, s.v. "Shūshtarī."

faith.⁽⁷¹⁾ It may be speculated that Jahāngīr took action against Sirhindī and Shushtarī not out of any bigotry but to curb religious activism and possible sectarian strife. Nevertheless, our sources reveal hardly any concern for sectarian issues during this period. In the early pages of the *Tūzuk*, Jahāngīr discussed the liberal policies of his father and the tolerant religious climate of India during Akbar's period. He lamented the preoccupation of the neighboring powers, the Šafavids, the Ottomans and the Uzbeks with sectarian concerns, whereas in India, "there was room for the professors of opposite religions, and for beliefs, good and bad, and the road to altercation was closed. Sunnis and Shias met in one mosque and Franks and Jews in one church, and observed their form of worship."⁽⁷²⁾ It could be inferred that a similar climate of liberalism characterized by freedom of religion for Muslims as well as for non-Muslim subjects, permission to build and repair their places of worship and respect for other faiths prevailed during the era under study.⁽⁷³⁾ As noted above, the Iranian immigrants whether Shi'ī or Sunnī enjoyed prominent positions in the administration. The *Tūzuk* contains only two references to the Shi'īs. One is in the context of Jahāngīr's preference for eating fish with scales, which, he said, was due only to his personal liking and not to be viewed in opposition to the Shi'ī juristical viewpoint prohibiting it.⁽⁷⁴⁾ The second mention comes in his detailed account of Kashmir and the composition of its population where, according to Jahāngīr, the soldiers were mainly *Imāmiyyah* Shi'īs.⁽⁷⁵⁾ Bāqir, a Shi'ī himself, refrained from showing his sectarian preferences in the form of government he propounded. The discussion of Qandhar in the *Tūzuk* and the *Ma'āšir* is likewise couched in the language of diplomacy and international politics rather than sectarianism. Even at this difficult and politically rather embarrassing moment, Jahāngīr maintained his composure and addressed the Šafavid ruler as "my brother."⁽⁷⁶⁾

(71) Sa'id-i Nafisi, *Tārīkh-i Naẓm va Nasr dar Irān va dar Zabān-i Fārsī tā Pāyān-i Qarn-i Dehom-i Hijrī* (Tehran, 1344 H.S.), pp. 662-63.

(72) Jahāngīr, *Tūzuk*, vol. I, p. 37.

(73) For more discussion and bibliographic references, see M. L. Roy Choudhury, *The Stats and Religion in Mughal India*, (Calcutta, 1951), pp. 203-11; 257-58.

(74) Jahāngīr, *Tūzuk*, vol. I, p. 188.

(75) *Ibid.*, vol. II, p. 149.

(76) For a detailed study of Shāh 'Abbās I and Jahāngīr's diplomatic relations, see Riazul Islam, *Indo-Persian Relations*, (Lahore, 1970), pp. 203-11; 257-58.

Another issue that should receive some attention is the inter-relationship of the Crown and the Hindus. Smith referred to Jahāngīr as a communalist.⁽⁷⁷⁾ Again, there is some difficulty in using this term for Jahāngīr with its present-day connotations in the subcontinent. Group solidarity indeed played an important role in the *manṣabdārī* system in Mughal India, but writers of the primary sources ordinarily did not refer to individuals or events in communal terms except in the case of rebellions or conflicts.⁽⁷⁸⁾ Guru Arjun, the fifth guru of the Sikh community, was executed on Jahāngīr's orders, not because of his faith or his position in the community, but because of his alliance with Khusrau. Guru Arjun created a well-knit Sikh community involved primarily in agriculture. However, he did not incite the Sikh peasantry to rebellion.⁽⁷⁹⁾ Jahāngīr himself mentioned Arjun's popularity, however, with the Hindus and the belief of many "ignorant and foolish followers of Islam" in the guru's sainthood. In retrospect, the executions of Arjun and Tegh Bahādūr by Jahāngīr and Awrangzēb (1658-1707), respectively, might have contributed to the growth, self-consciousness, and separatism of the Sikh community, as Smith argues; but it can also be ascertained that Jahāngīr's actions were not prompted by communal considerations. He was dealing with a rebel who happened to be the leader of the Sikh community. The primary sources attest that he did not harass or persecute Arjun's followers.

Such instances as Jahāngīr's frequent encounters with Gosā'in Jadrūp, a Hindu hermit, bear witness to a noncommunal attitude and liberal policies. Indeed, he had numerous private meetings with the hermit. For example, in his thirteenth regnal year, 1618, he recorded his meeting with Jadrūp and attributed the following statement to the hermit:

In what language can I return thanks for this gift of Allah that I am engaged in the reign of such a just king in the wor-

(77) Smith, "The Crystallization of Religious Communities," *Yād Nāmah*, p. 213.

(78) For example, Shāhjahān's revolt against Jahāngīr in 1623 was quite painful for Jahāngīr and his narrative reflected this anguish. He used the epithets *bī daulat* (wretched) for Shāhjahān and *sag-i Hindū* (dog of a Hindu) for his supporter, Sundar Bikramajit.

(79) Under the leadership of Arjun's successor Guru Hargobind, the situation changed and the Sikhs became quite militant. Irfan Habib, *The Agrarian System of Mughal India (1556-1707)* (Bombay, 1963), pp. 344-45.

ship of my own Deity in ease and contentment, and that the dust of discomposure from any accident settles not on the skirt of my purpose? ⁽⁸⁰⁾

Jahāngīr was equally impressed with Jadrūp's "unusual grace, lofty understanding, exalted nature, and a heart free from the attainments of world." ⁽⁸¹⁾ As noted above, Jahāngīr showed keen interest in meeting with notable Muslim 'ulamā' and sufis but never discussed with them matters related to state policies. But only with Jadrūp did he go beyond discussions on religious and metaphysical matters. It was at Jadrūp's suggestion that in 1619 Jahāngīr ordered a change in the weight measure *sīr* throughout his empire. A *sīr* was to become equal to 36 *dāms* rather than 30, as had been the case during Akbar's reign. According to Jahāngīr, Jadrūp quoted the Vedas as having mentioned 36 *dāms* per *sīr*. ⁽⁸²⁾ Mu'tamad Khān, in *Iqbāl Nāmah*, recorded another instance of Jadrūp's influence on Jahāngīr. According to him, during the 1619 visit of Jahāngīr, 'Azīz Kokah Khān-i 'Azam, emperor Akbar's foster brother, despite his bigotry towards the Hindus, secured through Jadrūp's mediation the release of prince Khusrau. ⁽⁸³⁾ Two extant paintings illustrating the emperor's meetings with the hermit provide further evidence of the importance of the relationship. ⁽⁸⁴⁾ From the narrative of the *Tūzuk*, it is apparent that this relationship was not inspired by political or any ulterior motives. Rather, it was the result of a genuine veneration for the learning and spirituality of Jadrūp and transcended all communal or religious barriers.

Fitna, or rebellion, is not tolerated by any ruler. After all, a primary function of sovereignty is to prevent anarchy and lawlessness. In the Mughal state, therefore, the defiance of imperial authority, whether coming from a prince or anyone else aspiring to political power, a Muslim or Hindu, was crushed in the name of religion or law and order. The justification of

(80) Jahāngīr, *Tūzuk*, vol. II, pp. 52-3.

(81) *Ibid.*, p. 105.

(82) *Ibid.*, p. 108.

(83) Kāmgār, *Ma'āsir*, p. 280; Mu'tamad, *Iqbāl Nāmah*, p. 122.

(84) For more details, refer to M. Abdullah Chaghtai, "Emperor Jahangir's Interviews with Gosain Jadrup and His Portraits," *Islamic Culture* 36, 2 (1962), 119-28.

such action by an author depended on his sociopolitical and educational background. Bāqir, an administrator, recommended the execution of such individuals and did not approve of forgiveness for them by the 'ulamā'.⁽⁸⁵⁾ Khāqānī, the jurist, on the contrary, enumerated the virtues of forgiveness for a successful statesmanship.⁽⁸⁶⁾ The historians of the period, who were for the most part courtiers, concurred with Bāqir and felt that they did not have to be apologetic about the specific case of the execution of the main supporters of Khusrau in 1606.⁽⁸⁷⁾ Shāhjahān's revolt against Jahāngīr in 1623 was likewise quite painful for Jahāngīr, and his narrative reflected this anguish in his abusive language for Shāhjahān and his supporters.⁽⁸⁸⁾ Kāmgār and Mu'tamad, while writing about Shāhjahān's revolt after his accession to the throne, however, could not use such language. In their effort to justify the actions of their patron, they simply accused Nūrjahān and her group.

The conversion of Hindus to Islam is another popular theme in the accounts of Islamic rule in India. As indicated earlier, among writers, Khāqānī in particular projected Jahāngīr as a champion of Islam without referring to any particular actions. By reviewing rulings, such as prohibiting the Hindus to marry Muslim women,⁽⁸⁹⁾ we may assume that he was conscious of his responsibilities as a Muslim head of the state. He also maintained the Islamic character of the judicial system. However, there was no policy of proselytization. On the contrary, he issued an order in 1611 to provincial governors that there ought not be any forcible conversions in the areas under their jurisdictions;⁽⁹⁰⁾ yet when individuals such as Rūz Afzūn, son of the Hindu Raja of Behar, converted to Islam in 1615, they were duly recognized.⁽⁹¹⁾ Nevertheless, such isolated conversions did not have any material, psychological, or religious impact on either community.

(85) Bāqir, *Mau'izah*, fol. 26a.

(86) Khāqānī, *Akhlaq*, fol. 350-72a.

(87) Kāmgār, *Ma'āsir*, p. 87; Mu'tamad, *Iqbāl Nāmah*, pp. 30 and 40.

(88) Jahāngīr, *Tūzuk*, vol. II, p. 256.

(89) Choudhury, *The State and Religion*, p. 211.

(90) Jahāngīr, *Tūzuk*, vol. I, p. 205.

(91) *Ibid.*, pp. 295-96.

V

In summary, this study demonstrates that the attribution of such terms as "fanatic," "bigot," or "communist," to Jahāngīr is open to question. The son of a Hindu Rajput mother, Jahāngīr refrained from making the precepts of Sunnī Islam the cornerstone of his state policies. A faithful Muslim, as evidenced by his memoirs, he expressed his gratitude to Allāh for his many victories, which he called the triumphs of Islam.⁽⁹²⁾ Nevertheless, Jahāngīr did not let his personal beliefs dictate his state policies. He had no qualms about the legitimacy of his rule, nor did he feel compelled to invoke Islam to assert his rule or to appease the 'ulamā.' In the ordinance that dealt with the construction of public works including mosques, which Jahāngīr issued after his accession,⁽⁹³⁾ for example, he did not encourage the desecration of Hindu temples or obstruct their construction or repairs, contrary to what writers of the Sultanate period, such as Baranī and Hamadānī, or Badāyūnī of Akbar's reign, would have liked their patrons to do.⁽⁹⁴⁾ The nonreligious character of Jahāngīr's India becomes even more prominent when we compare it with that of the Ṣafavid Iran. While the exaggerated Māhdistic claims of Shāh Ismā'il I had become considerably muted by the time of Shāh 'Abbās, Jahāngīr's contemporary, the Ṣafavid ruler still could not disregard the trappings of theocracy. The nonjuristical primary

(92) His narration of the conquest of the impregnable fort of Kangra in 1625 is a case in point. *Ibid.*, vol. II, p. 183. In the *Tūzuk*, there is also an invocation, a typical example of the Sunnī tradition in its content and form. The following quotation reflects the emperor's belief in the effectiveness of prayer (*du'ā*), an important element in the religious life of Islam:

Thou art mighty one, O Lord,
 Thou art the cherisher of rich and poor;
 I'm not a world conqueror or law-giver,
 I'm one of the beggars at this gate.
 Help me in what is good and right,
 Else what good comes from me to any one?
 I'm a master to my servants,
 To the Lord, I'm a loyal servant. (Vol. II, p. 32).

(93) *Ibid.*, vol. I, p. 8.

(94) Baranī, *Fatāwā-i Jahāndārī*, pp. 166-70; Sayyid 'Alī Hamadānī, *Zakhīrat al-Mulūk*, Sayyid Maḥmūd Anwārī, ed. (Tabriz, 1358 H.S.), p. 285. 'Abd al-Qādir Badāyūnī, *Nijāt al-Rashid*, Syed Moinul Haq, ed. (Lahore, 1972), p. 104.

sources used in this study reveal that Jahāngīr's tolerant and liberal policies, which followed the tradition of his father, facilitated further blooming of the Indo-Islamic composite culture. The concepts of secularism and theocracy are simply inadequate to define the form of government in seventeenth-century India.

Sajida S. ALVI
(Montreal, Canada)

APPENDIX

Notes on Sources and Their Authors

1. Little is known of the personal life and beliefs of Mu'tamad. An emigre from Iran, a man of humble background, he was introduced to Jahāngīr on his arrival in India and received the title of Mu'tamad Khān in 1608. He rose rapidly to higher ranks in the administration of Jahāngīr and Shāhjahān. (Shāhnawāz Khān, *Ma'āthir al-Umara'*, Urdu translation by Muḥammad Ayūb Qādirī (Lahore, 1970, vol. III, p. 364). Jahāngīr, in the *Tūzuk*, remembered him as an intimate servant; and in Jahāngīr's later years, because of the emperor's failing health, he appointed Mu'tamad (from 1622-24) to the task of taking notes and appending them to the *Tūzuk* with the emperor's approval. (Jahāngīr, *Tūzuk*, vol. II, p. 246). There are conflicting views on Mu'tamad's skills as an historian. Shaikh Farīd Bhakkārī, Mu'tamad's near contemporary, praised him for his being an outstanding historian of the period. (*Dhakhīrat al-Khawānīn*, Syed Moinul Haq, ed. [Karachi, 1970], vol. II, p. 253). Shāhnawāz, a later biographer, on the other hand, was not so complimentary to Mu'tamad for his historiography. (*Ma'āthir al-Umara'*, vol. III, p. 366).

2. Kāmgar was a second-generation immigrant from Samarqand and a descendant of the Naqshbandī saint Khawāja 'Ubaid-Allāh Aḥrār. (*Ma'āṣir*, Introduction, p. 5). Kāmgar's father Khawāja Yādgār and uncle Khawāja 'Abdullah

arrived in India during Akbar's reign, entered the imperial service, and established matrimonial relations with the Mughal house. (For details, see *Ibid.*, pp. 6-9). Little is known of the early life of Kāmgar, especially of his activities during Jahāngīr's reign, except that he accompanied the emperor to Kashmir. (*Ibid.*, p. 9). His career in Shāhjahān's administration is much better recorded in biographical dictionaries and the chronicles of Shāhjahān's period. He served Shāhjahān in various capacities and received the title of Ghairat Khān in 1631. (For details, see Shāhnawāz, *Ma'āthir*, vol. II, pp. 858-60; Bhakkari, *Dhakhīra*, vol. III, p. 131; and Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ Kanboh, *Amal-i Ṣāliḥ*, Ghulām Yazdānī, ed. (Lahore, 1967), vol. I, pp. 338-39).

3. In the pages of the *Tūzuk*, Jahāngīr—a naturalist and connoisseur of art and literature—through his straightforward style and simple diction, brought main political protagonists, major events, rebellions, and his own personality to life and did not hesitate to record even the conflicting traits of his personality. In a few instances like his rebellion against his father, however, there is some tendency to gloss over the facts.

4. Bāqir was a descendant of Amīr Yār Muḥammad Khān Najm-i Sānī, the powerful *wakīl* of Shāh Ismā'il Ṣafavī I. He rose rapidly in the administrations of Jahāngīr and Shāhjahān, and ended his political career as the governor of Allahabad. Jahāngīr affectionately called him son (*farzand*). In the *Mau'izah*, Bāqir did not follow the usual format of the 'Mirrors' by giving examples of former rulers or sages to substantiate his views on political ethics. The topics covered include pertinent personal qualities, such as generosity, magnanimity, and bravery that make a successful ruler. Practical aspects that the author discussed include the significance of justice, virtues of consultation, high standards in the recruitment and training of advisers and officials, and the patriarchal relationship between the ruler and high-ranking officials that would inculcate an intense loyalty of the subjects to their patron. In the *Mau'izah*, the author also offered advice to the employees as to how to rise in the administrative structure of the Mughals.

5. The didactic text of the *Akhlāq* is interspersed with philosophical and mystical discussions illustrated with maxims and stories from classical Islamic history and pre-Islamic Iran and

frequent quotations from the Qur'ān and *ḥadīth*. Khāqānī consciously adopted this style to help Jahāngīr rule effectively by learning from the experiences of former rulers. (*Akhlāq*, fol. 434a). In the twenty-two chapters of this work, some of the topics discussed are: divine love; virtues of knowledge; blessings of repentance (*taubah*); trust in God (*tawakkul*); generosity and condemnation of stinginess and jealousy; justice; bravery; virtues of consultation; and use of administrative power.