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This analysis of the Mughal imperial hunt and its pictorial representation focuses on a painting of Shah-Jahan’s son Dara-Shikoh engaged in a drive hunt with decoy animals, a practice not before depicted by Mughal artists. From descriptions of this ancient hunting technique found in European as well as Sanskrit and Mughal Persian texts—where it is called shikār-i ḏū bā ḏū (hunting antelope with antelope)—we learn that the principal hunter was brought into close, prolonged contact with his surroundings. This seems to have raised in the imperial patrons a greater interest in a more realistic pictorial rendering to which Payag, one of Shah-Jahan’s leading artists, responded with the closely observed and strikingly naturalistic landscape of Dara-Shikoh’s hunt, the first in a series of related images. This study draws attention to the connection between content and form as a characteristic phenomenon in the arts of Shah-Jahan.
When Milo Beach asked me in June 1994 to talk in October that same year at the Freer and Sackler Galleries about a recently acquired, then still unpublished Mughal hunting picture, I agreed immediately; although I had not seen the painting. I knew, however, that it showed Prince Dara-Shikoh (1615–1659), the eldest and favorite son of the Mughal emperor Shah-Jahan (ruled 1628–58) hunting nilgais. I felt that the painting would give me the opportunity to discuss some of my findings on the Mughal hunt, a topic largely ignored and in which I got interested because of my research on the hunting palaces of Shah-Jahan.

However, when I went to Washington and actually saw the painting (frontispiece and fig. 5), I realized that it would not be as simple as that. One could not possibly treat a masterpiece of Mughal painting as a mere document to illustrate the Mughal hunt, an approach made even less justifiable considering the fact that here the theme of the hunt was taken by both painter and patron as an occasion to break out of the stylistic confinements of official Shah-Jahani court painting, while at the same time remaining within its format and expressing its characteristic concerns. This raised the issue of how the representation of Dara-Shikoh’s hunt related to other Mughal hunting pictures, a question made more difficult since as yet there exists no comprehensive study dedicated to the hunt in Mughal painting, although hunting scenes were a major theme up to the time of Awrangzeb (ruled 1658–1707) and later. There was no question of considering the hunt of the Mughals and the painting separately. On the contrary, it appeared that the composition of the painting and the peculiar way in which landscape and nature are treated here can be explained only by the form of hunt represented.

Ebba Koch
Vienna, Austria
Note on Transliteration

The transliteration of Persian and Arabic words follows the system of the *Cambridge History of Islam*, with the exception that “ṣ” is used for “ṣ” (dotted ẓā), and that the diphthong “aw” is used for “au.” Diacritical marks have been confined to the transliteration of technical terms and to the citation of Persian, Arabic, and Sanskrit sources in the notes and bibliography.
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The Mughal dynasty ruled much of the Indian subcontinent from 1526 to 1858. The dynasty’s first six rulers, called the Great Mughals because of their extraordinary personalities and achievements, were all dedicated to *shikār*, or hunting, the royal pastime par excellence. Hunting was viewed not only as a royal pleasance but also as a means of self-representation and an instrument of rule. According to the Mughal theory of kingship, which was inspired to a large extent by ancient Persian models, the hunt of the ruler symbolized his power to overcome the forces of evil; this was often meant in a political sense. A hunt—in particular a lion or tiger hunt, which was a privilege of the emperor and the princes—would be performed as an auspicious omen before a campaign. Hunting demonstrated territorial dominion, and as a peacetime extension of warfare, it was used to consolidate the power of the Mughals over their vast empire. A hunting expedition was often undertaken in connection with a campaign, or as a campaign in disguise, to warn rebellion-prone chiefs. Hunting was also used to establish a bond between the Mughal emperors and the indigenous Rajput clans of India because it appealed to the *kṣatriya* (warrior) ideals of this Hindu caste.

In India, however, the royal sport was not without critics, a reaction hardly surprising in a country where royal hunters since the days of Emperor Asoka (ruled ca. 272–231 B.C.) have run into conflict with *abhinśā*, the doctrine of noninjury to human beings and animals. Muslim rulers were not insensitive to Indian feelings about nonviolence. The enlightened Zain al-Abidin, who ruled in Kashmir from 1420 to 1470, was so impressed by *abhinśā* that he “dissuaded men from the pursuit of game, and he himself ate no flesh or meat.” The Mughal emperor Akbar (ruled 1556–1605) did not go quite so far, but at certain periods he would abstain from meat and forbid the killing of animals “to please the Hindus,” according to his historian Bada’uni. His son and successor Jahangir (ruled 1605–27), despite being one of the Mughal dynasty’s most enthusiastic hunters, felt compelled to follow his father’s example. But when his hunting passion got the better of him, on forbidden days
or when he had bound himself by a vow not to kill with his own hand, he circumvented his own promise with royal ingenuity by either hunting with cheetahs or asking his wife, Nur Jahan, to shoot in his place!*

The royal hunt thus had to be defended. Abu’l Fazl, the historian of Akbar and the main engineer of the image of Mughal kingship, justified the ruler’s hunting as a way of gaining knowledge about the condition of his country without any intermediaries and of administering justice on the spot. He presented hunting as an instrument of good government, and the true prey of the imperial hunter was the hearts of his subjects: “At this time the lord of the universe in accordance with his noble ways were [sic] continually outwardly engaged in hunting while inwardly he walked with God and was employed in the capturing of souls.”

Hunting also enabled the ruler to have spiritual experiences by meeting religious recluses and ascetics. Akbar fell in a trance while hunting wild ass in the Punjab in late 1570 or early 1571, comparable to the epic heroes of Sanskrit literature who experience the forest as the place of their self-realization.

The self-representations of the Mughals as hunters could at times take very public forms. Akbar incited his orthodox critics by lining the major roads of his empire, not with philanthropic caravanserais and gardens, but with milestones in the form of small minarets, which were studded with trophies of his game. He elaborated here on an Iranian tradition, which can be traced as far back as the Sasanians, of exulting the ruler as a hunter.

Jahangir raised a hunting palace, called Hiran Minar, at Shaikhupura near Lahore (completed in 1620) as a memorial to his favorite antelope (āhū) Hansraj, “which was without equal in fights with tame antelopes and in hunting wild ones.” Shah-Jahan built a number of large hunting palaces; one of them, near Palam at Delhi, had a shooting box in the form of a hunting tower, emulating no less a structure than the famous Qutb Minar, founded at the end of the twelfth century by Qutb al-Din Aibek as a monument to the establishment of Muslim rule in Delhi. It seems that the revivalistic allusion to the Qutb Minar was meant to celebrate Shah-Jahan as a “better Qutb al-Din Aibek” who conquered his subjects not by war but by justice brought to them through his hunt.

Allusions to the hunt were also part of Mughal ceremonial representation. In the famous Freer Gallery painting of the imaginary meeting of Jahangir and Shah ‘Abbas of Persia (fig. 1), the Mughal ambassador to the Persian court, Khan-i Alam, holds in one hand a precious hunting falcon, and in the other a clockwork with the gilt group of
Figure 1. Jahangir Entertains Shah Abbas, from the St. Petersburg Album. India, Mughal dynasty, ca. 1618. Opaque watercolor and gold on paper, 25 x 18.3. Freer Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution, F42.16

Figure 2. Automaton: Diana on a Stag by Joachim Fries (ca. 1579-1620), ca. 1619. Silver, partial gilt, enameled, 37.5. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, gift of J. Pierpont Morgan, 1917, 17.190.746
Diana, the Roman goddess of the hunt, seated upon a stag. Such Diana groups were produced in Augsburg, Germany, around 1600 (fig. 2) and represented one of the most popular artifacts of the time. The object testifies to Jahangir’s taste as a collector of the latest European art and to his passion for the hunt, which is also reflected in his autobiography.
Hunting
techniques

Descriptions of the Mughal hunt are found primarily in the official histories of the emperors and their illustrations, later also in individual hunting pictures. The type of hunt most often discussed and represented was the qamargāb hunt, the great battue in the Mongol tradition of Chingiz Khan. The imperial battue was a vast affair in which thousands of beaters herded the game into a large circle that was often enclosed by nets or fences to form a stockade. In this temporary game park the animals were then brought down systematically. First, the emperor would go in on horseback or on an elephant, often assisted by cheetahs and dogs (fig. 3), afterwards “attendants [or relations] of the holy harem (muqarrabān-i ḥarīm-i qudā)” and the grandees of the empire were allowed into the enclosure, then lesser nobles and, lastly, individuals from the army, specially singled out for this honor. Typical game would be black buck (āḥū sīāḥ, Antilope cervicapra), Indian gazelle (chinkāra, Gazella bennetti), and blue bull (nīla gāū or nilgai, Boselaphus tragocamelus), the largest of the Indian antelope varieties. Representations of the qamargāb hunt emphasize the warrior aspect of the ruler, who often appears in these paintings as he would on the battlefield.

The Mughals gave much attention as well to lion and tiger hunts because of the challenge and thrill they provided and because of their symbolic value. More than any other hunt, they expressed the emperor’s power to overcome the forces of evil. Akbar, Jahangir, and the young Shah-Jahan were proud of confronting lions in direct personal combat (fig. 4). The general tendency of these representations in literature and painting up to Shah-Jahan’s reign is to show the royal hunter in heroic action as the performer of the great imperial hunt.

There were, however, other forms of the hunt that did not require the whole imperial apparatus of hunting. Akbar’s historian Abu’l Fazl provides the first indication that the Mughals were becoming interested in these less official hunting methods. In his great encyclopedic work of the Mughal empire, the Ā’in-i Akbari, which he wrote at the end of the sixteenth century, Abu’l Fazl provides more information about these lesser hunting techniques than about the great qamargāb hunt or imperial combats with lions. He adds, however, that these methods had little appeal for Akbar, who preferred to take his game in a noble and sporting
Figure 3. Miskina (tah) and Mansur (amal), Akbar Holds a Qamarqah Hunt near Lahore in March 1567, from the Akbarnāma. India, Mughal dynasty, 1590s. Opaque watercolor on paper, 32.1 x 18.8. Victoria and Albert Museum, London, I.S. 2-1896 56/117

Figure 4. Jahangir Hunting a Lion. India, Mughal dynasty, early 17th century. Watercolor, ink, and gold on paper, 26.2 x 16.8. Act and History Trust; courtesy of the Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, Smithsonian Institution, LTS1995.2.1028
fashion." This may explain why no pictorial documentation of these types of hunt exists from Akbar’s period.

As time passed and the Mughals started to shed the nomadic traditions of their first hour and became more sedentary and courtly, they were increasingly drawn to these less exerting hunting practices, which guaranteed success with little physical effort from the main hunter. This was also in accordance with the recommendations of Muslim Mirrors for Princes (counsel books for rulers), which warned that reckless and unguarded hunting presented an unnecessary risk to the life of the ruler. Consequently, humbler forms of the hunt now became the subject of Mughal painting. The Sackler image of Dara-Shikoh Hunting Nilgais (fig. 5), which, on the basis of the age of the prince, may be dated to the late 1630s or early 1640s, seems to be the first in a group of related hunting pictures showing members of the imperial Mughal family engaged in such subtler forms of the hunt (see figs. 6, 7, 8).

Several men, using decoy animals, cattle or antelopes tamed for this purpose, drive the game slowly to a waiting hunter with a gun, a procedure that takes advantage of the fact that the game has less distrust of a four-legged animal than of a two-legged one. "One had to create a delicate and fluctuating balance in the state of mind of the deer, between their trust of other four-legged grazing beasts and their instinctive fear of the scent and the small sounds of man. If the latter took over too strongly, they might run away to one side before they reached the ambush, or race through it at a speed which made shooting difficult. If they really panicked, the day was probably lost; if they simply trotted away and disappeared," the hunters had to take up their trail "and the procedure was repeated."

The painting of Dara-Shikoh hunting and a later one of his younger brother Shah-Shuja, from the Museum of Art, Rhode Island School of Design (fig. 6), dating from the 1650s, show two different aspects of the drive hunt with decoy animals. In Dara’s hunt the driving assistants hide behind bullocks; in Shah-Shuja’s, they lead a tame female nilgai to divert the attention of their prey. In both, the animals hunted are nilgais.

Shah-Shuja’s hunt depicts the moment “one of the beasts froze and stared, and, moved perhaps by a whiff of human scent and by that half-doubt which any man who has hunted other animals has seen enter the mind of his quarry.” The painting of Dara-Shikoh, the focus of this discussion, shows the conclusion of the hunt.

In the clearing of a forest, grown with bushes, small trees, and tufts of high grass, the prince has taken advantage of the vegetation as
Figure 5. Attributed to Payag. Dara Shikoh Hunting Nilgais. India, Mughal dynasty, ca. 1640. Opaque watercolor on paper, 15.8 x 22.1. Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, Smithsonian Institution, 51993.423
camouflage while positioning himself with his matchlock gun, the barrel of which rests on a fork (fig. 9). (The pose of the prince can be better understood when compared with figure 10, a drawing in the Chester Beatty Library, datable to the 1620s, showing his father, Shah-Jahan, in a similar position taking aim with his matchlock). Dara-Shikoh has just fired a shot at the nilgai bull. Hit in the shoulder, the bull drops mortally wounded, while his tan-colored female bounds to escape.

With the prince are eight hunting companions; three stand right behind him, three others are barely visible in the high grass of the left foreground. One hunter hides adroitly behind a pair of bullocks right under our eyes in the immediate foreground, turning us, the viewer, into accomplices in the deception of the nilgais (fig. 11). This leads us to believe that the pair of white oxen in the background might be less innocent than it may have appeared to the nilgais, and indeed a close-up reveals another hunter using the pair of bullocks for cover (fig. 12). Concealed from the nilgais by the cattle, the hunters have driven their prey toward the stationary huntsman who has been waiting in hiding to shoot at the game (fig. 13).

In essence this technique is quite old, and similar forms of the drive hunt are described in earlier Indian hunting texts and also in all medieval European hunting books. The twelfth-century Sanskrit manual Mānasollāsa, a work that deals with the duties and amusements
Figure 7. Shah Jahan Hunting Black Buck with Dara Shikoh and Nobles. India, Mughal dynasty, ca. 1645, from the Padshahnama, fol. 165a. Opaque watercolor and gold on paper, 32.9 x 21.6. Royal Library, Windsor Castle, The Royal Collection, Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, OMS 1635

Figure 8. Awrangzeb Hunting Nilgais. India, Mughal dynasty, ca. 1660s. Opaque watercolor on paper, 23.7 x 34.4. Chester Beatty Library, Dublin, 11A.27
Figure 9. Detail, fig. 5.
Dara-Shikoh firing a bullet from his matchlock gun.

Figure 10. Shah-Jahan
Taking Aim. India,
Mughal dynasty, ca.
1620s. Brush drawing
on paper, 10.2 x 11.
Chester Beatty Library,
Dublin, 114.4

Figure 11. Detail, fig. 5, huntsman taking cover behind a pair of decoy bullocks.
Figure 12. Detail, fig. 5, huntsman taking cover behind a pair of decoy bullocks.

Figure 13. Line drawing of hunting formation of Dara-Shikoh Hunting Nilgais (fig. 5)
of kings, believed to have been written by the Deccani king Somesvara III Calukya, describes drive hunts with decoy antelopes and bullocks among the hunting techniques employed by kings:

*Dipamrga*. Young robust and elegant male deer [*mrga*, here rather antelope] are trained. Bridles with bits made of iron and tin are then applied to them like horses. Female deer are similarly trained. They are called *Dipamrga* which . . . may be translated as decoying deer or deer to serve as a bait. . . . The king accompanied by such *Dipamrgas* and two hunters should go to the forest. . . .

There is another way of attracting the deer by *Balivardatirodhāna* (literally, “hiding behind a bullock”) method. Hunters conceal themselves behind bullocks, move as the bullocks move and allow the unrestrained deer to move with their eyes toward the hunters. Thus the hunters (keeping themselves behind the bullocks) surround the deer on all sides. Then the king takes his seat along with the ladies among the trees around him. When at the appointed place the hunters bring the decoying deer along with the forest deer, the latter are killed by the king with arrows.41

Abu’l Fazl also mentions the drive hunt with decoy animals among the various forms of the hunt he describes in his *Ā’īn-i Akbarī*.42 He lists it among the techniques of *shikār-i ābū bā ābū*, hunting antelope with antelope:

In former times, two persons at most enjoyed together the pleasures of antelope [*ābū*] hunting. They would even, from fear of timidity of the antelope, alter the style of their dress, and lie concealed among shrubs. Nor would they employ other than wild antelope; they caught them somehow, and taught them to hunt. His Majesty [Akbar] has introduced a new way, according to which more than two hundred may at the same time go antelope hunting. They drive slowly about forty cattle (*gāū*) towards a place where antelope are; the hunters are thus concealed, and when arrived enjoy the chase.43

This subtler form of the hunt did not require large resources and was originally intended to provide sustenance, not spectacle. It seems that in the Mughal context the *shikār-i ābū bā ābū* recommended itself first in particular to the princes who were not entitled to stage a great *qamarāgh* or a lion hunt. This form of the hunt also attracted imperial interest (see figs. 7, 8) as a less dangerous technique in which firearms—then still unreliable and slow to handle—could be used to greater advantage.44
Already the Mānasollāsa suggested that for the hunt with decoy animals the huntsmen should be dressed fully in green, with weapons of green color. Abu'l Fazl also mentions this aspect of the shikār-i āhū bā āhū but more as a curiosity, because for the qamargāb hunt such camouflage was not necessary. The growing interest in the shikār-i āhū bā āhū eventually prompted the Mughal court to adopt green robes for all forms of hunting, with the favorite flower designs of Shah-Jahani court dress. Even the imperial halo was at times depicted in green, as camouflage totale, so to speak.

Inducing animals to move to a point where they are vulnerable to the attack of waiting hunters is actually a feature of tribal hunting. That the Mughals were fascinated by Indian tribals and their hunts is apparent from a number of paintings depicting indigenous forest people, such as the Bhils of central and western India, and their hunts. A painting datable to the late seventeenth century in the Keir Collection deliberately juxtaposes the tribal hunt with the great imperial hunt in a nocturnal landscape (fig. 15). On the left is a train of imperial hunters led by two figures who are probably sons of Emperor Awrangzeb on horseback. On the right, tribal hunters employ the trick of a lantern in conjunction with a bell, called “low-belling” in England. Abu'l Fazl knew it too, and in his Ā'īn-i Akbarī described it under the term ghantābera. The sounds of the bell would attract
the deer, while the light would dazzle it and allow the hunter to take it down with a bow.

The Keir hunt seems to be the source of numerous later versions, two of which are in the Freer Gallery; they date from the eighteenth century and show a reduced number of figures. Several of these later versions reproduce only the tribal ghantābera hunt. The image might have acquired this popularity because it held a strong erotic and mystic element.
For the Persian-educated Mughal court the hunting technique of blinding prey with a lantern or torch must have evoked the image of the proverbial moth being fatally attracted to the candle's flame, the favorite metaphor of Persian poetry of the lover giving himself up for the beloved. For Muslim mystics, it was a metaphor of the soul seeking total union with God.6

When court poets of the period use the image of the self-sacrificing lover in their interpretation of the imperial hunt, they clearly seek to exculpate their imperial patron. Shah-Jahan's poet laureate Abu Talib Kalim writes:

Longing for the emperor's arrow, the game leapt and jumped
so in the hunting ground
That the wild animals wishing they could run faster [toward the emperor], envied the speed of the birds. . . .
The yearning of the prey for the hunter was greater than the emperor's desire for the prey.
When the king's arrow missed the game, it was humiliated in the hunting ground.7

The idea of the prey offering itself voluntarily to the hunter directs one's attention also to the emotional tension between the hunter and the hunted.9 Its visual expression in Dara-Shikoh's hunt is the more dramatic version of a theme that had become important in Mughal miniature painting during Shah-Jahan's reign, namely princes sitting in "rapt contemplation of their women or the words of sages."9 Dara-Shikoh's hypertrophic eye establishes a similar rapport between him and his prey (see figs. 5, 9). One is even tempted to see in his passionate attention and in the romantic animation of the landscape an allusion to the mystical interests of the prince,6 but it is difficult to read such a specific spiritual message into the painting besides the connotations already mentioned. Although he was a prolific writer, Dara-Shikoh's works fail to provide something more than the occasional and rather
general use of the hunt as a metaphor in his mystical poetry. Given his Weltanschauung, one wonders why the prince hunted at all, the more so because he was interested in not only Muslim mysticism but also Hindu thought. One imagines that Dara-Shikoh would have been impressed by *ahimsā* (nonviolence to living beings) to the extent that he would not hunt or at least not have himself represented as a hunter, but this was clearly not the case, and he also appears in depictions of other hunts of the period (see figs. 7, 19). The portrayal of Dara-Shikoh as a hunter was perhaps intended to counterbalance his involvement in mysticism and philosophy, to construct his public persona as the designated successor to the Mughal throne. Since he did not profile himself in the battlefield or in matters of administration, there remained little else but to represent the prince as a hunter, to show him involved in a traditional princely occupation. Dara’s philosophic and mystical interests, presented by his brother Awrangzeb as heresy, served as the pretext to oust him from succession and to execute him in 1659.
The subject of the Sackler painting is not only the hunt but also landscape and nature. Hunting brings about contact with nature.

It is well known that the Mughals had always had a keen interest in nature, expressed first by the founder of the dynasty Babur (ruled 1526–30) in his autobiography, the Bāburnāma, which contains detailed descriptions of the flora and fauna of Hindustan. Jahangir further expanded this dynastic interest by ordering his painters to produce, based on European models, nature studies of flowers, birds, and animals, including the game he hunted. Dara-Shikoh continued these interests, and his patronage of painting includes an album dated 1641/42, which is famous for its nature studies.

However, nothing in these elegant and rather cool depictions of plants and birds—which had only further refined an already stylized tradition of nature studies in Mughal miniature painting (fig. 16)—prepares one for the revolutionary naturalism of the landscape of Dara-

Figure 16. Attributed to Muhammad Khan, Flower Study with Tulips and Insects. India, Mughal dynasty, ca. 1630–35, from the Dārā Shikoh Album, assembled ca. 1633-42. Opaque watercolor on paper, 16.7 x 10.6. British Library, Oriental and India Office Collections, London, Add. Or. 3129, fol. 65b
Figure 18. Hunting scene from a Khusrav and Shirin by Nizami, Iran, Tabriz school, early 15th century. Color and gold on paper, 21.7 x 15.8. Freer Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution, F32.33.
Shikoh’s hunt or for its romantic passionate mode, which breaks entirely with earlier Mughal hunting imagery. The change appears quite drastic when we look back to early Mughal hunting images. The illustration of an episode during Akbar’s hunt of wild ass of late 1570 in the *Tārīkh-i Khāndān-i Timūriyya* (ca. 1584–86) manuscript in the Khuda Bakhsh Library, Patna, presents a similar hunting situation (fig. 17). In the Akbari painting the figures of the hunter and his prey are characteristically piled up in an unrealistic vertical composition with a high horizon. The movements of the flattened figures are projected on the plane of the painting with few attempts to create the illusion of depth. Landscape is basically space between the figures, with stylized elements of rocks and trees on the top for background. Such compositions derived from older Persianate conventions (fig. 18) with a different color palette and a more natural approach to figures and landscape elements.

Under Jahangir’s early patronage, the representation of the hunt did not change very much in paintings, which were still indebted to Akbari forms of expression (see fig. 4). A more naturalistic approach is taken in landscapes of later hunting images of Jahangir’s atelier, such as the qamargāb scene in *Hunt in a Hilly Country* in the Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum, Jaipur; an illustration of the *Jahāngīrīnāma* dated by Asok Kumar Das to circa 1612; or the two lion hunts in the Indian Museum at Calcutta, also intended for the *Jahāngīrīnāma*, datable to the 1620s. It seems, however, that landscapes dedicated to the hunt were not necessarily the best way for Jahangir’s artists to respond to their patron’s interest in nature. Their most striking treatment of vegetation appears in a painting of Mirza Kamran’s garden at Lahore, where Jahangir’s rebellious son Khusrav is led captive into the emperor’s presence before a magnificent group of trees pulsating with growth.

Careful examination of Mughal hunting images strongly suggests that the representation of landscape is connected to the hunting technique depicted. For qamargāb hunters racing after the game, landscape and nature were perhaps interesting only with regard to how fast the terrain would allow horses or elephants to move. Landscape could thus be rendered largely with conventional formulas, modernized with a Europeanizing view in the background and the insertion of various details observed from nature (see fig. 3).

In the more subtle form of the *shikār-i āhū bā ābū*, the chief hunter came in intimate, prolonged contact with his surroundings. While he lay quietly in waiting he had the leisure to closely observe nature. Consequently, the painter commissioned to express his patron’s hunting experience had to give landscape more attention as well. This
shift in hunting technique, and the corresponding shift in artistic focus, may have been a major incentive for the change in landscape representation in Mughal hunting pictures, of which Dara-Shikoh Hunting Nilgais seems to be the first most experimental, unrestrained example.

The painting provides the illusion of a spontaneous look into the partly sunlit clearing of a forest (see frontispiece and fig. 5), opening on the right into grassland, which continues into the far distance. The viewer is drawn in so closely that the horizon disappears. The absence of the horizon is a distinctive feature of this composition and helps to produce the sense of containment and intimacy that make this picture so unusual and special in the context of Mughal painting. At first glance the hunting scene almost looks like an immediate photographic impression of reality; it is, however, the result of a carefully constructed composition, which, as a cross between figural and landscape painting, uses the formation of the hunt and hierarchical figure arrangement as guidelines for a confident, new exploration of depth.

The prince, in the middle ground, and the two groups of hunters hiding behind bullocks in the fore- and backgrounds, form the points of the hunting triangle, a compositional device that governs spatial recession (see fig. 13). The men and the animals are not rendered freely but according to the pictorial protocol of Shah-Jahani court painting. The prince and those next to him are presented in pure profile, an artistic convention used in all formal representations of the imperial family and preferred as well for the ruling elite. Less stylized or restricted views were generally reserved for the backgrounds. When used in the main scenes to depict other figures, such unrestricted treatment is applied, as a rule, to those who were not part of court society, namely the lower orders, foreigners, and those who had dropped out of the system, either by rebellion or death. Such artistic considerations also extended to the representation of animals, as demonstrated here by the nilgais. The male, fatally hit, drops down in perspectival contortion while the female, the present opponent and thus formal counterpart of the prince, is shown in linear side view, creating within the compositional triangle a hierarchically correct linear figure plane for the sphere of the prince. The bullock groups, which form the other two points of the hunting triangle, conform largely to this planar design; pictorial depth is suggested through overlapping and the proportionate reduction of the figures. The pair of bullocks in the foreground and the hunter who adroitly takes cover behind them—in the tension of his contorted posture one of the most expressive figures of Mughal painting—produce a convincing repousoir effect (see fig. 11). The second bullock group
appears proportionally reduced in the distance. Here, the artist has made fullest use of his “background freedom” in the almost Rembrandtesque figure of the huntsman crouching down en face behind the second animal, which, like him, turns his head to the viewer. The bullock in front of this group conforms to the side view of the main figures (see fig. 12).

The planar figure arrangement corresponds with the linear system of bringing about depth in the landscape. The middle ground, that is the open jungle area before the dark mass of the trees, is structured by a succession of horizontals arranged parallel to the plane of the picture. The distance between these horizontals and their length diminish successively as they approach the vanishing point, marked by the bullocks and the background hunter. In the entire painting these depth-producing horizontals are rendered as small ridges and furrows, grown with shrubs or small trees and grass populated by fleeing and hiding animals (see fig. 14), so that we are unaware of their compositional function. The ground assumes an intensely diversified life of its own. Around the prince’s hunting companions and in the forest the vegetation becomes thick, but what at first glance appears to be an amorphous mass of plants is actually—as in nature itself—individual layers of grass wisps, shrubs, bushes, and small trees. Flora and fauna, light and shadow, as well as the human figures are observed in intense detail; a combination of minute line drawing, color washes, and microscopic brush strokes in a free interweaving of design and color brings about the extraordinary effect of the painting. Nature becomes animated, reflecting the mysteries of the hunt. Also new is the naturalistic tone of the colors. A subtle variety of greens in the foliage and khaki tones for the grass, together with fine brown brush drawing, are used to render growth and texture.

The stylistic innovations of Dara-Shikoh Hunting Nilgaïs can be connected with Payag, the leading master of Shah-Jahan’s court atelier. Payag also seems to have painted Shah-Shuja’s hunt, which shows a similar, natural approach to the portrayal of landscape combined with a carefully considered arrangement of figures; we find here the same emotional tension between the hunter and his prey (see fig. 6).

The conflicting demands of planar figure arrangement and recessional designs are mastered with striking dramatic effect in another hunting picture of the period, Shah-Jahan and His Sons Hunting Lions in the Keir Collection, datable to the late 1650s (fig. 19). The Keir Lion Hunt, which could also be attributed to Payag or one of his followers, presents the most daring use of foreshortening in Mughal landscape painting. The great nullah (Hindi, nullā), or ravine, which runs at an
angle of almost ninety degrees deep into the background," becomes the main subject and ordering force of the composition. Branching off from the perpendicular nullah—like ribs of the spinal column—are the same parallel horizontals used to structure the landscape of Dara-Shikoh's hunt. They allow the artist to integrate without effort the imperial hunters on their elephants in hierarchically correct side views into the spacious, illusionistic landscape, seen almost in bird's-eye view from above. Although the nullah is placed off center, the composition is clearly conceived under the influence of that favorite ordering principle of Shah-Jahani art, qarīna, or correspondence, a symmetrical arrangement of features on both sides of an axis with emphasis on the central feature. The structure of the landscape is fleshed out with a similar, though more restrained, naturalistic treatment of surface and texture as the Dara-Shikoh hunt and enlivened by freely painted anecdotal detail in thin, almost monochrome brown brush lines. One notices in particular (above the large buffalo on the left side of the nullah) a hunter being knocked down by a lion, a common motif of Mughal hunting scenes made popular by a famous imperial hunting episode in 1610.

The naturalism of these new Mughal hunting landscapes was, like other great creations of art, "engendered by two heterogenous forces, namely the experience of nature and the study of art." For naturalistic representations the Mughals turned traditionally to European art,
which, as is well known, was collected and studied systematically from the time of Akbar onward. Payag specialized in the adaptation of the latest seventeenth-century achievements of European painting, in particular chiaroscuro, nocturnal scenes, and psychological portraiture. As seen in his hunting pictures, he also closely studied Flemish and Dutch landscape painting. His group of trees in Dara-Shikoh’s hunt shows an awareness of woodscapes in the manner of Gillis van Coninxloo (1544–1607) that date around 1600 (compare fig. 5 with fig. 20), which had already inspired a close Mughal copy of a forest view in the British Museum.  

Payag did not simply copy a European landscape, however. He merely subtracted techniques of composition and illusion in order to portray the scenery of his own Indian surroundings. While transposing Western forms of representation into the formal conventions and techniques of Mughal painting, he achieved, with all the necessary attention to detail, a free mode of expression. In the development of his art Payag could rely on the work of earlier Mughal painters because he already represented the third generation of artists who explored European naturalism for the aims of Mughal art.

A painterly mode of free, open brushwork with no precedent in Islamic or Indian art had already appeared in the formation period of Mughal painting, in particular in several illustrations of the Cleveland  

Ṭūṭīnāma (Tales of a Parrot), now dated around 1570, or of the astrological manuscript in the Raza Library, Rampur (ca. 1567–70). Milo Beach has drawn attention to the similarity of this unorthodox painting technique with that of Albrecht Altdorfer (1480–1538) and the circle of the Danube School (Donauschule). If we compare the Ṭūṭīnāma illustration *A Fowler Captures the Wise Parrot Who Claimed to Have Unusual Powers to Heal Humans* with Altdorfer’s miniature landscape *St. George and the Dragon* (dated 1510) in Munich, the amorphous mass of trees in both images has been indeed rendered with tiny dabs of color (compare the trees on the left side of fig. 21 with fig. 22). Christopher Wood sees the importance of *St. George and the Dragon* not only as a pure landscape but also in its experimental position between panel and miniature book painting. Individual paintings in this tiny format could have made their way more easily to Mughal India than entire illustrated manuscripts and would have provided an important source of inspiration for Mughal painters next to the more widely distributed prints.

It appears that the free painterly style inspired by such images proved too wild for the aims of courtly Mughal miniature painting because it was eventually discarded for the main subjects. It was, however, not abandoned entirely, but went background, so to speak. Mughal backgrounds were traditionally a field of experiments with European modes of expression. The artists of Akbar’s painting studio had created a specific form of background landscapes in which they transformed the contemporary genre of Flemish “world landscapes” in the tradition of Joachim Patenier (ca. 1485–1524) and his followers—wide panoramic bird’s-eye vistas composed of agglomerations of varied types of scenery—into Indian scenery by changing the elements of the landscapes (compare the backgrounds of figs. 23 and 24). Eventually Mughal backgrounds developed a life of their own and became the area of retreat for the free illusionistic style.

The tendency to juxtapose the formal style of the main subject in the fore- and middle grounds with free illusionistic backgrounds culminates in Shah-Jahani painting. The stylistic dichotomy finds its most unmediated expression in a type of full-length portrait in which the figure, presented in formal side view and in opaque colors, appears abruptly without middle ground before an atmospheric background landscape painted in the thinnest washes of color. Payag’s *Shah-Jahan with His Gun* (fig. 25) (perhaps his favorite gun, Khājspān), ca. 1630–36, in the Chester Beatty Library, is a particularly apt illustration of this genre in the context of our discussion because it alludes to the connection between hunt and war by showing Shah-Jahan in opulent hunting

Figure 22. Albrecht Altdorfer (ca. 1480–1538), Forest with St. George and the Dragon, 1510. Oil on parchment attached to a limewood panel, 28.2 x 22.5. Alte Pinakothek, Munich, inv. 29.
Figure 23. Don Luis Manrique and Pieter van der Borch, engraving by Pieter van der Heyden, Pietaris Concordiae (Union through Piety), first title page (1566) of vol. 1 of the Royal Polyglot Bible (Antwerp: Christophe Plantin, 1568–72), detail with harbor landscape in the background. Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna.

Figure 24. Mukund, Fanjin, and the Gazelle, from a Khamsa of Naṣīrī. India, Mughal dynasty, 1596. Opaque watercolor on paper, 17.2 x 10.7. British Library, Oriental and India Office Collections, London, Or. 12268, fol. 19a.
attire standing on a globe before a landscape with the surrender of a fortress in light brush drawing and green washes. In the illustrations of the Windsor Castle *Padshāhnāma*, the chief d’oeuvre of Shah-Jahan’s atelier, the foreground scenes with their conventional compositions and often stiff, schematic linear figure arrangements conform to the hierarchical requirements of official Shah-Jahani court style (fig. 26), while the backgrounds may be painted in the freest illusionism imaginable (fig. 27). The virtuosity of the microscopic technique, with its amazing potential for monumentality, is revealed in photographic blowups; scenes covering only a few inches of a miniature fully stand up to enlargement. Such minute landscapes may provide stunningly true portraits of the Indian scenery (compare figs. 28 and 29)." In *Dara-Shikoh Hunting Nilgais* these illusionistic background landscapes become the main subject of a painting. The free naturalistic mode of the wooded landscape absorbs and transforms the narrative of the hunt, the hierarchically correct figures, psychological portraiture, and intimately studied nature—all typical concerns of Mughal painting of the period—into a masterly synthesis full of tension and expressive power. But it was to be only a brief moment in Indian painting created by a master artist’s ingenious response to the specific interests of his

---

Figure 25. Payag, Shah-Jahan with His Gun. India, Mughal dynasty, ca. 1630–36. Opaque watercolor and gold on paper, 26.4 x 11.5. Chester Beatty Library, Dublin, 78.28
Figure 26. Tezdašt, The Capture of Orchha by Imperial Forces in 1635. India, Mughal dynasty, ca. 1637, from the Pāñdhārīnāma, fol. 174a. Opaque watercolor on paper, 34.2 x 23.2. Royal Library, Windsor Castle, The Royal Collection, Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, oms 1637.

Figure 27. Detail, fig. 26, elephant and troops storming through the jungle of Orchha.
Figure 28. Detail, A Mughal Princess Hunting Game-Birds. India, Mughal dynasty, ca. 1660, from the St. Petersburg Album. Opaque watercolor on paper, 32.4 x 47.6. Purchase—Anonymous donor and the Friends of Asian Arts, Freer Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution, F1994.4

Figure 29. The lake at Bari seen from Shah-Jahan's hunting palace, 1993
patrons; soon afterwards representations of the *shikār-i āhū bā āhū* inspired by the work of Payag once again became schematized and determined by more traditional Indian aesthetic ideals (fig. 30). The technique of the hunt persisted but not the manner of artistic representation it had brought about.

Payag’s confident and insightful orchestration of the conflicting tendencies of Shah-Jahani court style challenges as perhaps no other work of the period the view that Mughal painting under Shah-Jahan was losing its creative power and that the artists of the imperial atelier were concerned merely with formalism and decorative aspects.
1. Since then, *Dara-Shikoh Hunting Nilgais* (s1993.42abc) has been published by Milo Cleveland Beach ("Characteristics of the St. Petersburg Album," *Orientations* 26, no. 1 [January 1995]: 66–79, figs. 1, 3), who shows that it was once included in the St. Petersburg Album. See also Beach in Oleg F. Akimushkin, Anatoly A. Ivanov, Yury A. Petrosyan, and Stuart Cary Welch, *The St. Petersburg Muraqqar: Album of Indian and Persian Miniatures from the 16th Through the 18th Century and Specimens of Persian Calligraphy by 'Imad al-Hasani* (Milan: Leonardo Arte, 1996), p. 126, pl. 236. The original painting (s1993.42a) measures 15.8 x 22.1 and was extended along its top and side margins (16.8 x 25.8) for inclusion in the album page. See also Amy Gamerman, "The Gallery: Curator Decodes a Mughal Hunt Painting," *Wall Street Journal*, 23 June 1994.

2. Because short vowels are not spelled in Persian, there are according to F. Steingass (A Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary, 2d ed. [New Delhi: Oriental Books Reprint Corporation, 1981], p. 756) two ways of transliterating the component shikāb in Dara-Shikoh's name: either shikāb (terror) or shukāb (majesty, grandeur), meaning Of the Terror of Darius or Of the Grandeur of Darius, respectively. Both forms are used in the literature. Like Dr. Yunus Jaffery, with whom I discussed this problem, I favor Dara-Shukoh, which is also the spelling used by the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2d ed. However, here I have adopted Dara-Shikoh because it is the form used by the Freer and Sackler Galleries. The fact that Shah-Jahan named his first son Dara after a king of ancient Persia demonstrates his interest in the Persian notion of kingship, which, from Humayun to Shah-Jahan, played a significant role in the self-understanding and self-representation of the Mughal dynasty. For the Mughal dynasty, see n. 5 below.


4. Much of what has been written on Mughal painting is shaped by the fact that it was produced for exhibition catalogues, the assessment of illustrated manuscripts and albums, or individual collections. Also, scholars have focused on the chronological development of Mughal painting and the style of individual artists or painting schools rather than on themes. For treatments of Mughal hunting representations (which also consider various aspects of the Mughal hunt), see Asok Kumar Das, "Mughal Royal Hunt in Miniature Paintings," *Indian Museum Bulletin* 11 (1967): 1–5, who discusses a lion hunt of Jahangir in the Indian Museum, Calcutta; Robert Skelton, "Two Mughal Lion Hunts," *Victoria and


8. For example, Muhammad Salih Kanbò, Amal-i Saliib; or, Shab-Jabhanaa, revised Persian text ed. Wahid Quraishi based on the Calculata ed. (1912-46) by Ghulam Yazdani, 2d ed., 3 vols. (Lahore: Majlis-i Taraqqi-yi Adab, 1967—72) (henceforth cited as Kanbò), i: 58—59, telling us about Shah Jahan hunting lions as a good omen for his Udaipur campaign of the end of 1613 to 1615, when he was still a prince. See also Bernier, Travels, p. 379.

9. Kanbò (i: 269) states that while Shah Jahan’s expedition to Gwalior at the end of the first year of his reign (1628—29) was clad in the apparent form (babas i zabi) of pleasurable hunting, its real meaning (mawada) was to favor friends and to annihilate enemies, or more precisely to warn the rebellion-mongering Bundela chief Jajhar Singh. See also fig. 25, which could refer to one of the Bundela campaigns.

11. “Hunting was usually among the chief of his [the Indian king’s] pleasures, and though the doctrine of non-injury discouraged it, a tacit exception was made in the case of kings and nobles.” A. L. Basham, The Wonder That Was India (1954; reprint, Calcutta: Rupa & Co., 1981), p. 92. The problem of the hunt in ancient India is treated by Erich Hosfatter, Der Herr der Tiere im alten Indien (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1980).


15. Abu’l Fazl followed here a line of thought expressed in the classical Persian literary tradition certainly since the twelfth century. Compare Hanaway (n. 6 above), pp. 27ff., with Ā’īn-i Akbārī, trans., 1: 292. For the connection of hunt and justice, see Koch, “Renaissance Calendar Illustrations.”


17. Kings visiting hermits during a hunt were a popular theme in Mughal painting. See, for example, Amina Okada, Indian Miniatures of the Mughal Court, trans. Deke Dusinberre (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1992), figs. 62, 64, 148.

18. Akbarsāna, trans., 2: 522–23; for illustrations of the event, see Geeti Sen, Paintings from the Akbar Nama: A Visual Chronicle of Mughal India (Calcutta: Lustre Press and Rupa & Co., 1984), pp. 136–37, pl. 60. The same hunt—although not the moment of Akbar’s trance—is also depicted in our fig. 17.


22. For the problematic etymology of the name “Manṣrāj” in Rogers’s translation, see the translator’s n. 1 of Jahangir, i: 90. The Persian text ed. of Muhammad Hashim (Jahangirnāma [Tehran: Bunyād-i Farhang-i Iran, 1359/1940–41], p. 53, which serves as basis for the forthcoming new translation by Wheeler Thackston) has “Hansrāj.” I thank Wheeler Thackston for clarifying this point.

23. Jahangir, trans., i: 90–91; for the building complex, see also 22: 182; cf. the Persian text ed. Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan (Aligarh, 1864), p. 44. See also Rabbani, “Haram Munara.”


27. The fact that the Jahangirnāma reads at times like a game book has led Robert Skelton to assume that Jahangir had started upon the project of recording his hunts and game taken, and that elements of this unfinished shikārnāma were integrated into the emperor’s autobiography. For references, see n. 68 below.

28. The passage forms part of the description of Akbar’s great qamargāb hunt near Lahore in March 1567, Akbarnāma, 2: 281–82; trans., 2: 416–17; and our fig. 3; cf. Salim Ali (n. 3 above), i: 839–40; Divyabhanusinh, “Hunting in Mughal Art.” This type of hunt had to be planned like a campaign by the Master of the Hunt, the mir-i shikār, and his huntsmen, the qarānwāls. When the hunt turned out to be successful, the imperial huntsmen were rewarded sumptuously. Such rewards could include even the gift of an elephant, the ultimate Mughal status symbol. For the illustration of the hunt in our fig. 3, see Sen, Paintings from the Akbar Nama, pp. 99–103.


30. On the painting, see Abolala Soudavar, Art of the Persian Court: Selections from the Art and History Trust Collection, with a contribution by Milo C. Beach (New York: Rizzoli, 1992), cat. no. 130, p. 122. Later, in Shah-Jahan’s reign, the imperial lion hunt became more guarded, and the Mughals would employ nets to control the lions. See the discussion of Mughal lion hunts by Koch, King of the World, cat. nos. 30, 46, pp. 76–78, 110–11, 176–77, 198–99.


32. Ibid., i: 205, 211; trans., i: 294, 303.

34. Dara-Shikoh was born in 1615; he does not look much older than his twenties. Beach ("Characteristics of the St. Petersburg Album," p. 74) suggests a somewhat later date of ca. 1645.

35. Jahangir's tame antelope Hansraj might have served in hunts of this type. See n. 22 above.


40. The head of the hunter is now almost entirely rubbed off; it was in better condition when photographed by Robert Skelton, who in 1993 kindly provided me with a slide, the source of fig. 12.

41. See n. 36 above. Various forms of the drive hunt are described in the thirteenth-century Latin manual De Arte Bersandi, attributed to a German knight named Guicennas; in the Livre du roy Modus et de la royne Ratio (ca. 1354–76) by Henri de Ferrières; and by the great hunting authority of the Middle Ages, the French count Gaston de Foix (nicknamed "Phœbus" because of his dazzling hair), in his famous Livre de chasse, which he began to write in 1387. The literature is discussed by Marcelle Thiebault, The Stag of Love: The Chase in Medieval Literature (Ithaca, N.Y., and London: Cornell University Press, 1974), esp. pp. 26ff.; and by Cummins, The Hound and the Hawk, pp. 47ff.

42. The term mrga describes "huntable grazing animals" such as deer, antelope, gazelle, and the like. See Hofstetter, Herr der Tiere, pp. 6–7, 46ff. The term dipamrga does not appear in the dictionaries; it seems to be a late hunting term composed of dipa (lamp, light, lantern) and mrga, meaning literally "lantern animal," which makes sense because a decoy animal attracts the game like a lamp. I thank Joachim Deppert for explaining this etymology. The term is of particular interest with regard to another hunt form with deceiving devices that also interested the Mughals, namely the tribal hunt with lanterns, explained below.

43. Mānasollāsa of King Somēvara, ed. Gajanan K. Shrigondekar, 2 vols., vol. 2 (Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1939), Sanskrit text, pp. 277ff. The quote is from the summarized translation on pp. 44–45. The work was brought to my attention by Divyabhanusinh, End of the Trail, esp. pp. 25ff., et pass. For a brief assessment of the Mānasollāsa, see Basham, The Wonder That Was India, pp. 301–3.

44. A’ in-i Akbarī, t. 210–11; trans., t. 301–03.
45. Ibid., 1: 210; trans., 1: 302. I have substituted Blochmann and Phillo's translation of ābū with "deer" for "antelope." In light of the balāv bardairodhāna, the hiding-behind-a-bullock method of the Mānasollāsa, Akbar's innovation seems less original than Abu'l Fazl claims.

46. This was pointed out to me by Lisa Golombek, with whom I discussed hunts and guns in the Muslim context in New York on 21 June 1995.

47. Mānasollāsa, 2: 43. Also Phoebus recommended in his Livre de chasse that the huntsmen should be in green, with green twigs around their heads to camouflage the face. Cummins, The Hound and the Hawk, p. 49.

48. See his remarks about the šikūr-i ābū bā ābū quoted above.

49. See, for example, the green halos of Jahangir in Prince Khurram Attacking a Lion in King of the World, cat. no. 30, and of Awrangzeb Hunting Nilgais in the Chester Beatty Library, our fig. 8; for a color illustration, see Leach, Mughal and Other Indian Paintings, 1: 498, pl. 76. (For the halo in Mughal imperial portraits, see Koch, King of the World, cat. nos. 3–4, p. 160, with further literature.) The touch of humor in the representation of courtly hunting camouflage is also evident from the dainty way in which the hunter in the left lower foreground of Awrangzeb's hunt holds a twig in front of his face.

50. From Abu'l Fazl's description of Dandes (Khandesh) (Ā'īn-i Akbarī, trans., 2: 233), we get a glimpse of what the Mughals saw in these mysterious forest people: "The provincial force is formed of Kolis, Bhils and Gonds. Some of these can tame lions, so that they will obey their command, and strange tales are told of them." My attention to this passage was drawn by Sumit Guha, "Forest Polities and Agrarian Empires: The Khandesh Bhils, ca. 1700-1850," Indian Economic and Social History Review 33, no. 2 (April–June 1996): 135.

51. Skelton ("Indian Painting of the Mughal Period," in Islamic Painting and the Arts of the Book, ed. B. W. Robinson [London: Faber and Faber, 1976], p. 268, cat. no. v.93, pl. 132) attributes the hunting scene to a pupil of Shah-Jahan's court painter Payag, who is discussed below.

52. Cummins, The Hound and the Hawk, p. 244. In Europe, the method was used mainly for taking birds.


54. Freer Gallery of Art, 07.199, 07.210; a version in reverse dated 1734–35 by the mid-eighteenth-century artist Mir Kalan Khan is in the St. Petersburg Album; see A. A. Ivanov, T. V. Grek, and O. F. Akimushkin, Albom indiiskikh i persiiskikh miniatury xvi-xvii vv., ed. L. T. Gyuzalian (Moscow: Vostochnaiia Literatura, 1962), pl. 73. Most recently, see The St. Petersburg Mazarqa (see n. 1 above), pl. 214, fol. 56a, pp. 117–18, 140.

55. Freer Gallery of Art, 07.229. For other eighteenth-century examples, see the Free Library of Philadelphia, no. m109, box 50, described under this number in the typewritten catalogue by Muhammad Ahmed Simsr, "Oriental Miniatures: John Frederick Lewis Collection [at] the Free Library of Philadelphia" (Philadelphia: Free Library of Philadelphia, 1941), where it is dated erroneously to the first half of the seventeenth

57. Abū Tālib Kalīm, *Pādshāhīnāma*, British Library, Oriental and India Office Collections, Ethé 1570, fol. 282b, unpublished typed transcript by S. M. Yunus Jaffery, p. 542. I thank Wheeler Thackston for his assistance in translating these verses. The concept of the game being eager for the bullet of the ruler also connects to popular Hindu thought, in which it is believed that game shot by a king will be reborn into a better station in life. Personal communication by H. H. Gaj Singh, Maharaja of Jodhpur, Washington, D.C., 15 May 1997.

58. The hunt is used openly as a metaphor for erotic pursuit in a Chester Beatty Library painting (no. 78 38) depicting a nocturnal scene of women bathing in a pool before a wooded landscape in which a man hidden behind trees stalks two black buck antelopes; the Mughal artist (Payag?) clearly intends to draw a comparison between the women being exposed to the gaze of the beholder and the deer being preyed upon by the hunter. I thank Robert Skelton for drawing my attention to this painting, for which see Leach, *Mughal and Other Indian Paintings*, t. 450–51, cat. no. 360; color pl. 70, p. 446. For the theme of hunt and sexuality in the older Sanskrit literature, see Hofstetter, *Herr der Tiere*, esp. pp. 130ff.


60. Similar thoughts were expressed by Terence McInerny and quoted by Gamerman in “Curator Decodes a Mughal Hunt Painting” (see n. 1 above).

61. See, for example, the verses “Give the glad tidings to all hunters: the falcon came [by himself] into the net—Congratulations! which make use of the image of the prey offering itself voluntarily to the hunter discussed above, *Divān-i Dārā Shikhl*, ed. Ahmad Nabi Khan (Lahore: Research Society of Pakistan, University of the Punjab, Lahore, 1969), *ghazal* no. 65, pp. 36–37; see also *ghazal* nos. 24, 80, containing allusions to hunting,

62. Dara was a student of Sufism and a mystic himself and was in close contact with the leading Muslim and Hindu mystics of his time. His works *Majnat-ul-Bahratin* and *The Mingling of the Two Oceans* by Prince Muhammad Dārā Shikhl, ed. and trans. M. Machfuz-ul-Haq (1929; reprint, Lahore: Royal Book Company, 1990) and *Sīr-i akbar*, a translation of the fifty-two principal *Upanishads* (1657), are significant contributions in the attempt to arrive at a cultural synthesis between Hindus and Muslims. See *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2d. ed., s.v. “Dara Shukoh”; Bikrama Jit Hasrat, *Dara Shikhl: Life and Works* (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1979).

63. Depictions of Shah-Jahan hunting when still Prince Khurram clearly served the purpose of legitimating the prince as the rightful successor to the throne. See Koch, *King of the World*, cat. no. 30, p. 188. Since Xenophon’s *Cyropaedia* (Education of Cyrus of Persia), written in the first half of the fourth century B.C., the hunt has been considered a way to educate and prepare princes for leadership in war. See J. K. Anderson, *Hunting in the Ancient World* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1983), pp. 17ff., 57ff.


65. “Although King Babar has described in his Memoirs the appearance and shapes of several animals, he had never ordered the painters to make pictures of them. As these animals [a turkey and a monkey brought by Muqarrab Khan from Goa in 1612] appeared to me to be very strange, I both described them and ordered that painters should draw them in the Jalāṅgīr-nāma.” Jalāṅgīr, trans., 1: 215. For a discussion of the naturalistic interests of the Mughals, see also Ebba Koch, Shah Jahan and Orpheus: The Pietre Dure Decoration and the Programme of the Throne in the Hall of Public Audiences at the Red Fort of Delhi (Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlaganstalt, 1988), esp. pp. 8–9, 22, with further literature.


67. For this hunt and its representations, see also n. 18 above.

68. A group of early hunting representations commissioned by Jahangir when he was still Prince Salim, rebelliously holding court at Allahabad, has prompted Robert Skelton to believe that these paintings were intended as illustrations for a game book, a shikārnāma. See Skelton, “The Arts of the Book: Sultanate and Mughal India,” in Islamic Art in the Keir Collection, ed. B. W. Robinson (London and Boston: Faber and Faber, 1988), pp. 43–45; cf. Okada, “Le Prince Salim à la chasse,” pp. 320–22; Leach, Mughal and Other Indian Paintings, cat. no. 2.169, pp. 308–10, color pl. 45. Skelton feels that the detailed accounts of Jahangir’s hunts in the Jalāṅgīr-nāma might have been originally intended for his shikārnāma.

69. Asok Kumar Das, Treasures of Indian Painting from the Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum, Jaipur, ser. 1 (Jaipur: City Palace, 1976), pl. 1. For the Calcutta hunts, see Brown, Indian Painting, pl. xliii, ca. 1623, and Das, “Mughal Royal Hunt.”

70. The episode illustrated in the painting, also an illustration of the Jalāṅgīr-nāma, in the Raza Library, Rampur, took place in May 1606. For illustration, see Brown, Indian Painting, pl. 49.

71. This was a typical reaction of Western art historians to whom I showed Dara-Shikoh Hunting Nilgais.


73. These include two rabbits in which Terence McInerney sees a signature in disguise of the artist, Payag; see Gamerman, “Curator Decodes a Mughal Hunt Painting.” The artist is discussed below.


75. Smart, “A Recently Discovered Mughal Hunting Picture.”

76. Skelton in “Indian Painting of the Mughal Period,” p. 264, cat. no. v.8.4, pls. 110–31, dates it ca. 1660, but in a personal communication has agreed that an earlier date would also be possible.

77. This compositional tour de force is used earlier in Mughal painting, though in a less extreme form; see, for example, Nar Singh’s Laike Visiting Majmun in the Wilderness, an illustration to a Khamsa of Amir Khusrav Dihlawi, dated 1597–98. For illustration, see Milo C. Beach, Early Mughal Painting (Cambridge, Mass., and London: Harvard University Press for the Asia Society, 1987), fig. 73. Closer to the dramatic and naturalistic expression of the device in the Keir Hunt is its use in Netherlandish painting where it was most famously realized by Meindert Hobbema in his Avenue of Middelharnis of 1689. See Wolfgang Stechow, Dutch Landscape Painting of the Seventeenth Century (1966; 3d ed., Oxford: Phaidon Books, 1981), p. 32, fig. 47; for related examples, see figs. 46 and 48.

78. For a discussion of garina, see Koch, King of the World, pp. 135, 143 n. 22.

79. See Beach, Koch, and Thackston, King of the World, cat. no. 30, pp. 76–78, 187–89. Cf. n. 10 above.


82. The drawing of the Temptation of Christ in a woodscape in the Antwerp Cabinet of Prints has been attributed to Coninxloo or to one of his followers by Heinrich Gerhard Franz in Niederländische Landschaftsmalerei im Zeitalter des Manierismus, 2 vols. (Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlaganstalt, 1969), text vol. pp. 286ff. Franz also discusses its later versions by Jan Brueghel the Elder (1568–1625) and Jan Saderel (1530–1600). The Saderel family (active sixteenth and seventeenth centuries) were among those artists whose engravings were studied and copied by the Mughal court atelier. See Milo C. Beach, “The Gulshan Album and Its European Sources,” Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Bulletin 63, no. 332 (1965): esp. pp. 73–90.

83. London, British Museum, BM 1942.1–24.03. See Robert Skelton, “Landscape in Indian Painting,” in Landscape Style in Asia, a colloquy held 25–27 June 1979, ed. William Watson, Colloquies on Art & Archaeology in Asia, no. 9 (London: University of London, School of Oriental and African Studies, 1980), p. 158, pl. 32; for the most recent color reproduction, see Beach, “Characteristics of the St. Petersburn Album,” fig. 19. The British Museum woodscape shows an almost identical view into a forest as the famous and often reproduced woodscape by Gillis van Coninxloo of 1918 in the Collection of the Prince of Liechtenstein at Vaduz. For a discussion of this painting, see Stechow, Dutch Landscape Painting, pp. 64–67, pl. 122.


87. Beach, *Early Mughal Painting*, p. 17 (see n. 77 above).

88. St. George and the Dragon, in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich, is executed in oil on parchment attached to a limewood panel, measuring 28.2 x 22.5.


90. On this point, see also Koch, "Renaissance Calendar Illustrations."

91. The background tendencies of the painterly style in early Mughal paintings are also addressed by Seyller, "Overpainting in the Cleveland Tutinama," p. 307.


93. Our fig. 24 comes from the illustrations of a *Khamsa* of Nizāmī, illustrated by Akbar's court atelier in 1595 at Lahore; for color illustrations, see Barbara Brend, *The Emperor Akbar's Khamsa of Nizami* (London: British Library, 1993). This manuscript presents the most fluent and extensive adaptation of Flemish-styled world landscape vistas in Akbari painting. The landscapes of the *Khamsa* are also discussed by Koch, "Renaissance Calendar Illustrations."


95. For color illustration, see Leach, *Mughal and Other Indian Paintings*, cat. no. 3.32, pp. 419-21, pls. on pp. 416 (color pl. 65) and 417 (black-and-white detail).

96. For a discussion of this stylistic dichotomy, see Koch, "The Hierarchical Principles of Shah-Jahani Painting," in *King of the World*, pp. 133-44; for *The Capture of Orchha by Imperial Forces in 1635*, illustrated in our fig. 26, see ibid., cat. no. 35 on pp. 184-85.

97. The detail of our fig. 28 is from the painting *A Mughal Princess Hunting Game-Birds*, now in the collection of the Freer Gallery of Art, 1994.4; see Beach, "Characteristics of
the St. Petersburg Album,” fig. 21, where it is dated to ca. 1660. The miniature format of these landscapes conforms to Kenneth Clark’s observation (Landscape into Art [1949; 5th printing, London: John Murray, 1973], p. 16) that “throughout history landscapes of perception have been small.” He observed this in the context of Netherlandish painting while noting that the “first modern landscapes [in early fifteenth-century Netherlandish painting, namely the miniatures of the manuscript known as the Hours of Turin, painted by an unknown master between 1414 and 1417] were exceedingly small—only about three inches by two inches.”

98. Our fig. 30, showing a Mughal Prince Hunting Nilgais, ex-collection of George P. Bickford, sold at Christie’s on 25 May 1978, Christie’s sales catalogue Important Indian Miniatures and Paintings (New York, 1978), no. 109, where it is dated 1670–80 and where the main hunter is identified as Aurangzeb’s son Azam Shah. Stanislaw Czuma (Indian Art from the George P. Bickford Collection [Cleveland: Cleveland Museum of Art, 1973], no. 50) believes the main hunter to be Muhammad Shah (ruled 1719–48). The hunting scene belongs to a group of hunting images datable to ca. 1680 showing a similar combination of wide Europeanizing vistas and naturalistic detail; they are clearly indebted to Payag’s innovations of the 1640s and 1650s but translate them into a more stylized schematic idiom, moving toward the more traditional Indian concept of landscape as an ideal and symbolic place. On the concept of Indian landscape, see Skeiton, “Landscape in Indian Painting.” To this group belongs also Emperor Aurangzeb Hunting Nilgais, ca. 1680, from the St. Petersburg Album, Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto, 924.12.146; and A Mughal Prince Hunting Game-Birds in the Freer Gallery of Art, 1994.4; both are illustrated by Beach, “Characteristics of the St. Petersburg Album,” figs. 21 and 22. For the latter, see also n. 97 above. Another example of this group is A Mughal Prince Hunting, identified as Bahadur Shah in the Bibliothèque nationale, Paris, Rés. Od. 44, fol. 1 (Maguy Charritat, cat. no. 188/a in Arabesque et jardins de paradis, exh. cat. (Paris: Editions de la Réunion des Musées Nationaux, 1989), p. 246.

99. See, for example, Leach, Mughal and Other Indian Paintings, p. 354. This view has been questioned by Welch (“The Two Worlds,” p. 355) and refuted by Koch, King of the World, esp. pp. 132, 141–42.
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