

JAHĀNGĪR'S VOW OF NON-VIOLENCE

ELLISON B. FINDLY

TRINITY COLLEGE

Histories of Jahāngīr (r. 1605–1627) ordinarily characterize the Mughal emperor as a man of great excess, focusing on his passion for the hunt, his clear addiction to wine and opium, and his random swings between extreme cruelty and extreme compassion. Rarely, if ever, is note made of his vow of non-violence taken in 1618 and rescinded in 1622, by which he forswore the killing of animals. Examination of his memoirs shows that Jahāngīr, in taking the vow at about age fifty, was acting out long held feelings of remorse for the murder of his father Akbar's friend and biographer Abū'ī Fazl. Highly sensitive to the vagaries of the father-son relationship, Jahāngīr then rescinded the vow in 1622 when his own son Shāh Jahān openly turned on him in rebellion. Finally, this pattern of vow-taking coincides with Jahāngīr's previously unexplained, and rather odd, policies toward the Jains, the one group openly avowing non-violence at the Mughal court.

IN THE MIDDLE OF 1618, at the commencement of his fiftieth year, Jahāngīr, the fourth of the great Mughal emperors of India (r. 1605–1627), vowed to renounce shooting with guns and injuring any living creature with his own hand.¹ He reaffirmed this vow later that year² and then again in 1619³ and, with only occasional violations, maintained his abstinence until 1622 when he (and his servants) took up the gun again.⁴ In a tradition where hunting was perhaps the most consistent passion of Mughal kings⁵ and where the exercise of cruelty against subjects was a measure of imperial authority, a vow of non-violence—limited though it may have been in Jahāngīr's case—is a startling if not an utterly anomalous event.

Traditional discussions of Jahāngīr's hunting acknowledge his great addiction to the sport.⁶ Rarely, however, do contemporary commentaries or secondary sources mention his 1618 renunciation of hunting and, when they do, their discussion of the vow is summary and dismissive, treating it either as an unexplained aberration or a momentary whim of no import.⁷ In this

paper, we will argue that the 1618 vow is not an incidental footnote to the events of his life but a pivotal component in the development of his personality and an important clue to understanding his attitude towards violence. Moreover, this vow reveals an underlying ambivalence towards his father, the emperor Akbar—or, more precisely, an underlying sense of guilt and remorse for his own behavior toward his father during the years 1600–1604—which, for Jahāngīr, could only be resolved by the vow later in his life.

Finally, events behind the vow help to explain Jahāngīr's unusually harsh and intolerant attitude towards the Jains. Although some scholars have singled out his treatment of the Jains as an exception to his normally tolerant policy towards religions, few have recognized its deliberately hostile nature and fewer still have attempted to seek an explanation of it. We will argue, then, that Jahāngīr's treatment of the Jains reflects the larger patterns of his ambivalence on issues of violence and non-violence which are found in his relationship with his father.

I. THE VOW

We have no reason whatsoever to doubt that Jahāngīr was an expert and experienced hunter. In addition to the many miniatures which record him hunting, painted

authority on Jahāngīr's life, hardly mentions his hunting and makes no reference to his 1618 vow. *History of Jahāngīr* (Allahabad: The Indian Press, 1922). Percy Brown notes that Jahāngīr was fond of shooting but gave it up for five years on account of a vow. *Indian Painting Under the Mughals* (New York: Hacker Art Books, 1975), p. 73.

¹ *The Tūzūk-i-Jahāngīrī, or Memoirs of Jahāngīr*, trans. Alexander Rogers, ed. Henry Beveridge, 2 vols., 2nd ed. (1909–1914; rpt. Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1968), II, 35.

² *Tūzūk* (R & B), II, 45.

³ *Tūzūk* (R & B), II, 83.

⁴ *Tūzūk* (R & B), II, 236–37.

⁵ *Tūzūk* (R & B), I, 45.

⁶ See, for example, Francis Gladwin, *The History of Jahāngīr*, ed. K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar (1788; Madras: B. G. Paul & Co., 1930), pp. 81ff, 153ff.

⁷ Gladwin mentions Jahāngīr's vow but is inaccurate in his details. Gladwin, p. 158. Beni Prasad, the contemporary

both before and after his accession to the throne in 1605,⁸ Europeans present at the court and in the countryside were often witness to him at his favorite sport. Pieter van den Broecke, the overseer of Dutch interests at the trading port of Surat during Jahāngīr's reign,⁹ Francisco Pelsaert, the senior factor at the Dutch factory in Agra at the time and van den Broecke's employee,¹⁰ and Sir Thomas Roe, the first official English ambassador to the Mughal court (1616–1619),¹¹ each attest to Jahāngīr's thorough addiction to

⁸ See, for example, those paintings in: *Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery*, "Prince Salīm hunting with his companions" (fr. *Dīwān* of Amīr Hasan Dihlavī, dated 1602); *Bellerive, Aga Khan Collection*, "Salīm and the captured cheetah" (by Āqā Rizā, ca. 1602) and "Jahāngīr's lion hunt" (by Farrukh-i Khurd-i Chela, ca. 1610); *Calcutta, Indian Museum*, "Jahāngīr out on a hunt" (unsigned, inscription on bottom "Hazrat Nūruddīn Muḥammad Jahāngīr Badshāh," ca. 1610), "Jahāngīr shoots a lioness" or "Jahāngīr showing his hunting skills to Karan" (No. R. 316) (prob. fr. a *Jahāngīr-nāma*, attributed variously to Nānhā and Manōhar, incident of 1615), "Narrow Escape of the Emperor Jahāngīr while shooting a lion" (No. 188) (ca. 1623); *Dublin, Chester Beatty Library*, "Jahāngīr inspecting dead animals on the hunting field" (ms. 50.1) (ca. 1600–1604); *Jaipur, City Palace Museum*, "Jahāngīr hunting;" *Leningrad, Academy of Sciences*, "Jahāngīr killing a lion" (fr. *Leningrad Album*, inscribed to Manōhar); *London, British Library*, "Salīm going out hunting while an angel fixes the stirrup" (Or. 7573, fol. 218) (*Dīwān* of Hafīz, unsigned, ca. 1610), "Jahāngīr hunting lion from elephant" (1974-6-17-021) (17thc.), "Jahāngīr hunting wild elephants" (Or. 1408, f. 85b) (18thc.), "Jahāngīr catching nilgai with his bow" (1920-9-17-0316) (18thc.), and "Jahāngīr hunting gazelles on the occasion when one of his men chased a gazelle and fell to his death" (Or. 1408, f. 213b); *London, Victoria and Albert Museum*, "A Mughal Prince [Jahāngīr] spearing the flank of a lioness which attacks his elephant" (I.S. 97-1965) (attrib. to Sūr Dās, ca. 1605); *New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art*, "The young Jahāngīr on a hunting trip"; *New York, Navin Kumar*, "Prince Salīm hunting rhinoceros" (style of Mansūr, ca. 1600); *Oxford, Bodleian Library*, "The Emperor Jahāngīr hunting lions"; *Portland, Edward Binney, 3rd, Collection*, "Prince Salīm in the hunting field" (ca. 1600–1605).

⁹ Pieter van den Broecke, *A Contemporary Dutch Chronicle of Mughal India*, trans. Brij Narain and Sri Ram Sharma (Calcutta: Susil Gupta (India) Limited, 1957), p. 91; see also pp. 41, 46.

¹⁰ *Jahāngīr's India, The Remonstrantie of Francisco Pelsaert*, trans. W. H. Moreland and P. Geyl (Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons, Ltd., 1925) pp. 51, 52.

¹¹ *The Embassy of Sir Thomas Roe to the Court of the Great Mogul, 1615-1619*, ed. William Foster, 2 vols. (Lon-

don: The Hakluyt Society, 1899), I, 156; see also II, 283, 392, 437. See also Edward Terry, *A Voyage to East-India* (London: J. Wilkie et al., 1777), p. 191, as well as William Hawkins' account in William Foster, ed., *Early Travels in India 1583-1619* (London, Humphrey Milford: Oxford University Press, 1921), p. 108.

hunting and to the obsessiveness with which he pursued his kill. Moreover, his own memoirs, the *Tūzuk-i-Jahāngīrī*, which begin in the year of his accession, are a persuasive record of most of his hunts, giving details of when he went, what and how many creatures he shot and, in many cases, who accompanied him. Although Jahāngīr would hunt wherever the opportunity afforded him, he most often went to what he called his "fixed hunting-places," and there either hunted at large or used the *qamargāh* or ring hunt, a method invented by his father whereby game would be driven into the center of a circular area of land for easy kill or capture.¹² Jahāngīr hunted large numbers of all types of animals, male and female,¹³ and once in early 1612 brought in as many as 917 head of deer, 641 of them alive.¹⁴ He often made detailed lists of the numbers and types of animals killed (or brought in), and none is so famous as the list he had drawn up on March of 1617, "of all the animals that had been killed in hunting" "from the commencement of my years of discretion [apparently, age 12] up to the present time." By this count, the total of those which "I killed myself with my gun or otherwise" amounted to 17,167 head during the course of about 37 years.¹⁵

Jahāngīr's pattern of hunting began to slow down, however, in 1617, a year he commenced with the unusual measure of a ban on smoking tobacco.¹⁶ Although Jahāngīr continued to hunt with a gun,¹⁷ he

don: The Hakluyt Society, 1899), I, 156; see also II, 283, 392, 437. See also Edward Terry, *A Voyage to East-India* (London: J. Wilkie et al., 1777), p. 191, as well as William Hawkins' account in William Foster, ed., *Early Travels in India 1583-1619* (London, Humphrey Milford: Oxford University Press, 1921), p. 108.

¹² E.g., *Tūzuk* (R & B), I, 83, 120, 121, 129, 136, 203; II, 181–82, 299, 231. Although the *qamargāh* game is Turkish and must have been known by Bābur and Humāyūn, no documentary evidence for this is available. Pran Nath Chopra, *Some Aspects of Society and Culture during the Mughal Age (1526-1707)* (2nd ed., rev.; Agra: Shiva Lal Agarwala & Co., 1963), p. 69n.

¹³ Jahāngīr was especially fond of the tiger hunt: "I have such a liking for tiger shooting that whilst I can get it I do not go after other sport." *Tūzuk* (R & B), II, 269. See also I, 136, 163, 166, 185–88, 255, 264, 268, 286–87, 341, 362–63, 375, 444; II, 40–41, 285.

¹⁴ *Tūzuk* (R & B), I, 204.

¹⁵ *Tūzuk* (R & B), I, 369.

¹⁶ It seems that smoking brought about a "disturbance . . . in most temperaments and constitutions." *Tūzuk* (R & B), I, 370.

¹⁷ See, for example, *Tūzuk* (R & B), I, 371, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 408, 409, 419, 439, 444.

increasingly recorded hunts at which he failed to shoot: when his consort, Nūr Jahān, shot instead of him,¹⁸ when he went out to hunt but gave it up because of heavy rains,¹⁹ and when he returned from a hunt almost immediately because of excessive mosquitoes and fleas.²⁰ This slowdown was followed in 1618 by the vow:

Sixteen or seventeen years ago I had vowed with my God at Allahabad that when I reached fifty I would give up shooting with gun and bullet, and would injure no living thing with my own hand.²¹

Although the vow was first promised because Jahāngīr had reached his fiftieth year, it seems, in fact, that the king had fallen ill once again with excessive fever and shortness of breath.²² While in this condition, Jahāngīr resolved that at the end of his fiftieth year he would visit his father's tomb in Sikandra—which he did in the following year—and “by God's help, seek the confirmation of my resolve from my father's holy elements, and renounce the practice (of shooting.)”²³ According to Jahāngīr, all signs of his illness then miraculously disappeared.

Jahāngīr reiterated the vow later that year on the occasion of Prince Shujāc, his grandson's, illness promising in return for the life of Shujāc the gift of the lives of many animals.²⁴ Then, with the final reaffirmation of the vow in 1619,²⁵ Jahāngīr was at last ready to activate the vow in earnest, stating clearly that it was only the renunciation of shooting and all injury to creatures but not of hunting per se (that is, not of the chase or capture) that was at the center of his vow. For the next few years, Jahāngīr adhered more or less

consistently to the spirit of the 1618 vow,²⁶ but in 1622, giving in to his unrestrainable addiction to hunting, he took up the gun again saying:²⁷

At this time, when I was greatly distressed at his [his son Khurram's] unkind behavior, I took again to sporting with a gun, and gave orders that nobody should remain in the palace without one.²⁸

The recantation of the vow was a result of Khurram's unsuccessful but determined revolt against Jahāngīr, ostensibly so that the king might better protect the palace and government. (Khurram's rebellion was to remain a cancerous stalemate for the next five years until Jahāngīr's death on October 28, 1627). It seems, however, that aside from the underlying psychological patterns evident in the recantation and discussed below, Jahāngīr's love of shooting was strong enough to overcome any resolve he had with regard to the vow. He was addicted to hunting in the same way that he was addicted to alcohol and opium, and moderation of any kind was out of the question. Khurram's revolt, then, offered an excellent excuse for the king to return to a pastime he greatly loved and, from this time on until his death five years later, Jahāngīr hunted as he had before. It appears from his memoirs, however, that the number of animals actually killed was very small and that, with the exception of only an occasional blue bull or wolf, he limited himself to the king of the hunt, the tiger.²⁹

In spite of the insistent reiteration of the vow, we must not assume that it was faithfully kept. In fact, the repeated affirmations of the vow seem instead to be assurances to the public and reminders to himself that, despite any basic inclinations otherwise, the vow really had not nor should not be broken. Nevertheless, Jahāngīr did break his vow occasionally during the years 1618–1622 and out of either an excessive sense of honesty which urged him to record without prejudice all significant events of his reign or, perhaps more likely, an urgent need to confess, he recorded several

¹⁸ *Tūzuk* (R & B), I, 375.

¹⁹ *Tūzuk* (R & B), I, 382–83.

²⁰ *Tūzuk* (R & B), I, 390.

²¹ *Tūzuk* (R & B), II, 35. This followed several hunts in which elephants were captured but not killed and Jahāngīr's request that others, not him, spear fish. See *Tūzuk* (R & B), II, 4–5, 8, 12, 24.

²² Jahāngīr's two younger brothers, Murād and Daniyāl, both died before Jahāngīr's accession to the throne of the effects of excessive alcoholism. *Tūzuk* (R & B), I, 34–35. Jahāngīr himself recorded in detail his own addiction to alcohol, and later opium, and his apparently half-hearted battle to moderate his consumption. Excessive fever, shortness of breath, and asthma were his constant companions.

²³ *Tūzuk* (R & B), II, 36.

²⁴ *Tūzuk* (R & B), II, 45. Gladwin, erroneously, says the illness was Shāh Jahān's. Gladwin, p. 158.

²⁵ *Tūzuk* (R & B), II, 83; see also II, 104–5.

²⁶ Note, for example, the events in *Tūzuk* (R & B), II, 104–105, 109–110, 125, 181–82, 229 where Jahāngīr participated in the hunt and in the preparation of *qamargās* but allowed others, such as Nūr Jahān or Khurram, to be the actual agents of destruction.

²⁷ Jahāngīr said that this is after “I had given it up for five years,” but this is clearly not the case, as the duration of the vow was shorter by at least a year. *Tūzuk* (R & B), II, 236. This mistake is repeated by modern scholars. See, for example, Gladwin, p. 158 and Brown, p. 73.

²⁸ *Tūzuk* (R & B), II, 236.

²⁹ *Tūzuk* (R & B), II, 269, 270, 275, 285.

such instances in his memoirs. He notes, for example, without comment and without any reference to the vow, that around the time of the 1622 New Year's festival he shot a sizable number of animals during a *qamargāh* hunt, some time before his official withdrawal of the vow.³⁰

Jahāngīr's wholesale renunciation of the killing of animals in 1618 was not the only vow of non-violence he took, however. Long before 1618, beginning in fact with an official proclamation at the time of his accession in 1605, he ordered that no animals be slaughtered for food on Thursday, the day of his accession, or on Sunday, the day of his father Akbar's birth,³¹ later announcing that this Thursday/Sunday vow had also included a ban against the eating of any meat on those days.³² This vow he broke when, for example, he shot a tiger late one Sunday night in 1610.³³ The long narrative that rationalizes the event was included in the memoirs as a good story which, being an exception to one of Jahāngīr's rules, also provided interesting evidence for his scientific record of his reign. Jahāngīr's primary reason for breaking his vow here seemed to be that he had a "liking for tiger-hunting" and couldn't resist.³⁴ Jahāngīr broke the Thursday/Sunday vow again in late 1616, and again it was on a Sunday and again on behalf of a tiger. That it was once more on a Sunday probably had no significance,³⁵ but that it was for a tiger was important, at least to Jahāngīr: not this time because he was particularly fond of tiger-hunting but because this animal was especially "noxious" and "ought to be done away with," presumably because of its danger to the people in the area.³⁶

II. ALLAHABAD: SYMBOL OF VIOLENCE BETWEEN FATHERS AND SONS

Given his fondness for hunting and his proclivity for breaking vows what, then, impelled Jahāngīr to make

the 1618 vow at all? When he first introduced his 1618 vow, Jahāngīr stated that it was a fulfillment of a earlier vow he had made in Allahabad, a vow that was to be activated when at the end of his fiftieth year he visited his father's tomb and "by God's help, . . . [sought] the confirmation of my resolve from my father's holy elements."³⁷ The experience at Allahabad that Jahāngīr referred to was clearly that time of his own revolt against Akbar (ca. 1600-1604), when he set up a separate court in this city, minted his own coins,³⁸ established his own painting studios, and for all practical purposes presided over his own opposition government. Although to an external observer this action would not have seemed necessary, as Jahāngīr, having no serious rivals, was due to inherit the throne in any case, the heir apparent (then in his mid-thirties) was anxious to rule and increasingly feared being supplanted by his own very popular son Khusrau.³⁹ Because of these various concerns, Jahāngīr (then Salīm) openly rebelled against his father for much of Akbar's last four years before they finally reconciled and Akbar officially designated him as successor prior to his own death in October of 1605.

In and of itself this revolt would probably have aroused enough unresolved guilt and remorse in Jahāngīr to have initiated the early vow of non-violence during the Allahabad years⁴⁰ and to have sustained the need for the vow for a full sixteen or seventeen years until its actual activation. There was more, however, that happened during the Allahabad period. Early in his own memoirs, Jahāngīr publicly admitted to the murder of his father's closest confidant, religious devotee, and biographer, Sheikh Abū'ī Fazl. Believing his father's friend to be duplicitous towards him and working to prevent his future accession to the throne, Jahāngīr felt it necessary to prevent the influential Abū'ī Fazl from remaining in Akbar's presence.⁴¹ The

³⁰ *Tūzūk* (R & B), II, 231. Gladwin, erroneously, states that the vow was "religiously observed." Gladwin, p. 158.

³¹ *Tūzūk* (R & B), I, 9; see also I, 189.

³² *Tūzūk* (R & B), I, 184-85, 309-10.

³³ That it was in fact Sunday night and not early Monday morning when the tiger-shooting occurred is clear from Jahāngīr's description of the time of the event: ". . . near the end of the day . . .," ". . . [when] not more than two gharis of day remained . . .," and ". . . time to light the lamps. . . ." *Tūzūk* (R & B), I, 184, 185, 187.

³⁴ *Tūzūk* (R & B), I, 185.

³⁵ Although Sunday is further from Friday by a day and would therefore carry much less effect of any proximity to the Muslim sabbath than Thursday.

³⁶ *Tūzūk* (R & B), I, 362-63.

³⁷ *Tūzūk* (R & B), II, 35, 36.

³⁸ See van den Broecke, p. 28.

³⁹ Hawkins says of Jahāngīr: ". . . he meant to have shortned his fathers daies and before his time to have come to the crowne." Foster, p. 107. In his *Ardhakathānaka*, the Jain merchant Banarasi notes that Jahāngīr's rebellion was so open that he confiscated imperial *jāgīrs* and redistributed them among his own men. Mukund Lath, trans. and annot., *Ardhakathānaka: Half a Tale* (Jaipur: Rajasthan Prakrit Bharati Sanstha, 1981), vss. 150ff. (See review by E. Bender in *JAOS* 105.4 [1985], pp. 779-80.)

⁴⁰ We have no evidence other than Jahāngīr's own word in 1618 that he actually made such a vow in Allahabad before his accession.

⁴¹ *Tūzūk* (R & B), I, 24. See also van den Broecke, pp. 28-29; Gladwin, p. 9. The one account that is favorable to Jahāngīr is

heir apparent arranged to have Abū^ḥ Fazl killed and, after the murder, received the victim's head at his court in Allahabad.⁴² When he heard the news of the murder of his friend, Akbar's anger and distress were great.⁴³ Jahāngīr himself noted the ill effects of his action on his father, but was quick to point out that in time Akbar's grief passed and the way was open for their final reconciliation.⁴⁴

In trying to understand the reasons behind Jahāngīr's vow we have no other recourse but to take him at his word. As an immediate circumstance, the 1618 vow of non-violence was taken to relieve the king of excessive fever and its consequences. Moreover, the vow was successful in this respect, for "as soon as this thought [i.e., the vow] occurred to me, my illness and trouble disappeared."⁴⁵ In the long-range context, however, the vow was taken in fulfillment of a decision made while Jahāngīr, then Salīm, was head of his own opposition court in Allahabad. The vow then would resolve (or put into motion the mechanism for resolution of) the still outstanding feelings of guilt and remorse suffered by Jahāngīr during his revolt against his father and, more specifically, occasioned by his murder of his father's closest friend. Jahāngīr said he had made the vow "sixteen or seventeen years ago" which would place the original vow in the year 1601 or 1602; Abū^ḥ Fazl was murdered in August of 1602.

That his revolt against Akbar and his murder of Abū^ḥ Fazl were indeed traumatic for Jahāngīr can only be a matter of conjecture. We do know that three years after the murder, on his accession in 1605, Jahāngīr sought to make amends for Abū^ḥ Fazl's death by promoting his son 'Abdu-r Rahman to the rank of 2000.⁴⁶ Writing some twenty-five years after the fact, van den Broecke notes the trauma for Jahāngīr

which must have resulted from the years of revolt: "he suffered doubly for the pain and worry that he had caused his old father Akbar."⁴⁷ Jahāngīr would have certainly felt the heavy weight of Abū^ḥ Fazl's murder, for he knew how much his father loved his friend (the Portuguese Jesuits called him Akbar's "Jonathan")⁴⁸ and how disturbing the murder would be to a king known for his own non-violent measures.⁴⁹ Given the closeness of his father to Abū^ḥ Fazl, Jahāngīr's guilt and remorse for his murder of this man must, at some level, have been guilt and remorse for a type of patricide. Akbar died a full three years after Abū^ḥ Fazl, and certainly not overtly of a broken heart, but Jahāngīr's yearning for a throne of his own and the violent nature of much of the military maneuvering of his rebellion (not to say of the murder itself) must have created a terrifying picture of his own intense violence against his father. We know that Jahāngīr did not kill Akbar, but he certainly made his last years most miserable, and the father's life could not have been extended because of it.

Other details of Jahāngīr's vow are somewhat puzzling. That the vow was to begin in his fiftieth year has no apparent correlation to Akbar's life nor to any religious timetable Jahāngīr observed. Although it may simply have been a convenient number picked at random, there are suggestions that Jahāngīr had ties to the Jains for whom age fifty/fifty-five marked the half-way point in a man's life.⁵⁰ If Jahāngīr chose age fifty because of Jain belief, this would support the argument

found in the *Maāsir-i-Jahāngīrī* which argues that the murder of Abū^ḥ Fazl was necessary in order to eradicate a proud and arrogant man who sought to come between a son and his father. H. M. Elliot and John Dowson, *The History of India*, VI (London: Trübner, 1875), pp. 442-444.

⁴² *Tūzūk* (R & B), I, 25.

⁴³ Van den Broecke, p. 29.

⁴⁴ *Tūzūk* (R & B), I, 25.

⁴⁵ *Tūzūk* (R & B), II, 36. It does seem quite likely, as Prasad suggests, that the year 1618 marks the beginning of the decline in Jahāngīr's health, when he suffered from influenza and the onset of asthma as well as the continued debilitating effects of alcohol and opium. His decreasing physical strength must have had an encouraging influence on his slowdown in hunting. Prasad, pp. 22, 25, 292.

⁴⁶ *Tūzūk* (R & B), I, 17. Prasad calls the murder "one of the great crimes of his life." Prasad, p. 121.

⁴⁷ Van den Broecke, p. 92. Gladwin says, "the murder of Abulfazel is an indelible stain on his character, notwithstanding the pains which he has taken, in his memoirs, in pleading the political expediency of so horrid a deed." Gladwin, p. 159.

⁴⁸ J. S. Hoyland, trans., and S. N. Banerjee, annot., *The Commentary of Father Monserrate, S. J., on his Journey to the Court of Akbar* (London, Bombay, H. Milford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1922), p. 54.

⁴⁹ R. Krishnamurti, *Akbar, The Religious Aspect* (Baroda: Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda, 1961), p. 86.

⁵⁰ Banarasi's *Ardhakathānaka* was written in 1641 when the merchant himself was fifty-five. The title of his autobiography, perhaps the only one in the Indian tradition, makes reference to an ancient Jain tradition that a man's full life span is one hundred and ten years, making the halfway mark fifty-five (verse 665). In his commentary Lath notes another old tradition in which the normal life of a man is one hundred years. Lath, pp. i, 210-11. That Jahāngīr would have known of this seems quite likely for the emperor is mentioned throughout the *Ardhakathānaka* as being in close contact with Jains.

below that his attitude toward the Jains was directly correlated to his views on non-violence. That Jahāngīr renounced shooting with a gun bears no intrinsic relation to the murder of Abū^cl Fazl, who was killed with a spear, but simply makes reference to the weapon most available to him. The correlary vow, however, which is a wholesale renunciation of all injury to creatures by his own hand, does suggest Jahāngīr's sense of guilt over his previous commissions of violence. Finally the one person Jahāngīr mentions telling of his intention is Muqarrab Khān, a close and intimate friend of the king, as well as a physician to many members of Jahāngīr's immediate family, who had, however, no holdover connections with the period at Allahabad.⁵¹ It appears, then, that the significant parts of the vow are the Allahabad reference, his father, and the age, fifty, at which he took it.

If Allahabad was the immediate source of the 1618 vow, where else in Jahāngīr's life do we find support for the psychological dynamics suggested by the vow? We find it, first, in Jahāngīr's adult obsession with Akbar and in his identification with Akbar in matters of violence and non-violence. Dominated by the memory of his father, Jahāngīr opened the *Tūzuk* with an account of Akbar's tragic lack of an heir and his eventual success (with the birth of Salīm) through fanatic devotion. He then described Akbar's physical appearance in minute detail: the fleshy mole on the left side of his nose, the broad chest, and the wheaten color of his skin.⁵² Though many sons might give such intimate accounts of their fathers, few would subsequently make the kind of elaborate and consistent parallels between their policies and their father's as Jahāngīr did:

In the fight at Chitor, the king [Akbar] with his own hand killed Jitmal, the leader of the men in the fort. He had no rival in shooting with a gun . . . I may be reckoned a true pupil of his.⁵³

At that time⁵⁴ my father was engaged in hunting with cheetahs. As that day was a Friday, for the purpose of

my safety he made a vow that during his life he would not hunt with cheetahs on Friday . . . I also in obedience to him until now have never hunted with cheetahs on a Friday.⁵⁵

Jahāngīr's identification with Akbar extended to the prohibition of animal slaughter. At the beginning of his reign, Jahāngīr instituted a number of regulations. Number Eleven begins:

In accordance with the regulations of my revered father, I ordered that each year from . . . my birthday, for a number of days corresponding to the years of my life, they should not slaughter animals (for food).⁵⁶

With the exception of the Chitor passage, the sweeping parallels which Jahāngīr made with his father most often involved issues of non-violence. We suggest, then, that these identifications were not merely ordinary filial admirations, but an attempt by Jahāngīr to resolve his early guilt and remorse through an interesting type of transformed sympathetic magic: *early signs of violence against a victim are commuted by the exact replication of the victim's own acts of non-violence or, more precisely, the most efficacious punishment for one's early sins against a victim is to actually "become," sympathetically, that victim himself by adopting, in this case, his non-violent behavior.*

Support for the psychological dynamics of the vow are found, secondly, in Jahāngīr's inordinate concern for other cases of violence between fathers and sons. He abhorred parricide and, according to Terry, ordered grisly punishments in two such cases: a man convicted of killing his father was tied to the hind leg of an

Akbar then made this vow in order to preserve the life of his unborn child. *Tūzuk* (R & B), II, 45-46.

⁵¹ *Tūzuk* (R & B), II, 46.

⁵² *Tūzuk* (R & B), I, 9. Jahāngīr later described his father's vegetarianism, though did not in either case assert a similar practice for himself: "Of the austerities practised by my revered father, one was the not eating the flesh of animals. During three months of the year he ate meat, and for the remaining nine contented himself with Šūfī food." *Tūzuk* (R & B), I, 45. Chopra, after an examination of the evidence in the *Ā'in-i-Akbarī* has confirmed that the total number of Akbar's *sūfīyanah* days amounted to nine months out of the year. Chopra, pp. 33n-34n. Among the words of advice given to disciples of Akbar's unique religion, the *Dīn-i-Ilāhī* or "Divine Faith," were the following, that ". . . he must not kill any living creature with his own hand, and must not fly anything. The only exceptions are in battle and the chase." *Tūzuk* (R & B), I, 61.

⁵¹ Muqarrab Khān was a known and trusted figure in Jahāngīr's circle, holding the governorship of Gujarat (1616-1618), of Bihar (1618-1626), and of Bengal (1626-1627). At one time he was in charge of the ports of Surat and Cambay and was instrumental in procuring novel articles for Jahāngīr from the Europeans. For a while he converted to Christianity when in Goa for the emperor.

⁵² *Tūzuk* (R & B), I, 33-34.

⁵³ *Tūzuk* (R & B), I, 45

⁵⁴ Jahāngīr is here referring to the time when, still in his mother's womb, he stopped moving as other children did.

elephant and dragged about ten miles until the flesh wore off his bones, and a man convicted of killing his mother was to be stung to death by snakes.⁵⁷ Another time Jahāngīr came across the tomb of Nāsir-ud-dīn, who had murdered his father in his eightieth year, and ordered the tomb broken open and the remains of the murderer burned.⁵⁸ Jahāngīr abhorred filicide as well, and was especially incensed and confused when he heard that his arch-rival, the King of Persia, Shāh ʿAbbās I, had executed his eldest son for no apparent reason.⁵⁹ He himself had consistently refused to kill his own eldest son, Khusrau, even though the imperial ethic of the time justified such an action in extreme cases of seditious offspring.⁶⁰

In spite of such sanctimonious attitudes, however, the father/son relationship was hardly free of violence for Jahāngīr. His capacity for familial cruelty which bore fruit in the Abūʿl Fazl affair, erupted again in an incident with his youngest son Shahriyār. Hawkins records that Shahriyār, aged seven, repeatedly refused to cry when Jahāngīr humiliated him at court, and the king became so incensed that he had a bodkin thrust through the child's cheek. Much to Jahāngīr's ire, Shahriyār never shed a tear that day.⁶¹ In another famous incident, Jahāngīr had a maid belonging to his queen Nūr Jahān buried up to her armpits in earth, there to die while a eunuch was tortuously executed in her sight. Their crime had been a kiss.⁶²

This is the same man, however, who was outraged when a noble of his beheaded a man at a party for making an innocuous joke,⁶³ who granted wholesale amnesty to criminals at the beginning of his reign,⁶⁴ and who forbade those around him from wearing blue, the Muslim color of death.⁶⁵ What emerges is a pattern of behavior that is at best contradictory. Jahāngīr was outraged by the violence of others against their parents and children, and yet he himself was willing to inflict great injury on his own father and sons never, however, depending upon one's interpretation of the Abūʿl Fazl incident, to the point of murder. He was also outraged

at the wanton executions ordered by others, and yet he himself was capable of the same and even more. Is this a simple case of a double standard, of an imperial ethic which allowed Jahāngīr to indulge in capricious violence but which prohibited others from it?

Certainly the Mughal ethic allowed, and even encouraged, imperious behavior on the part of its kings. But Jahāngīr's rule, though by legend tempered with a strict application of justice, was riddled with an excess that could pervert even the most liberal interpretation of imperial prerogative. In Jahāngīr, in fact, we have a king whose office gave him the power and legitimacy through which to enact into sovereign policy those unresolved feelings which belonged originally to his relationship with his father. Because of the traditionally anxious circumstances of Mughal succession and the unfortunate happenstance of an amoral temperament, these feelings resulted in a capriciously destructive political personality. Jahāngīr's oscillations between excessive hunting and abstentions from the kill, and between cruel punishments and outlandish magnanimity, can only reflect an internal struggle between a desire for absolute power and a weakness for his father and his father's policies.

The 1618 vow, then, attempted to control a capacity for violence which found its most extreme expression in the Abūʿl Fazl murder but which appeared in many other guises throughout his life. Jahāngīr's ambivalence over the issue of violence became symbolized in the incidents of Allahabad and, through this symbol, violence between fathers and sons became Jahāngīr's paradigm for all violence. The 1618 vow was to have resolved this far-reaching pattern of ambivalence toward violence by renouncing that form of violence over which Jahāngīr had most control: hunting with a gun. All other forms of less controllable violence were to have subsided through the ubiquitous effects of this one vow.

History, however, came full circle in 1622 with the revolt of Prince Khurram. The vow that was to atone for his own violence against Akbar was not, in the end, able to prevent his own son's violence against him. Since the vow had proved ineffective in preventing conflict between a father and son and was powerless against the traditional forces of dynastic change, its revocation allowed Jahāngīr to turn to the more practical matter of arming the palace guards against his son's army.

Notwithstanding the psychohistorical patterns which lie behind the 1618 vow and its subsequent revocation, *ahimsa* was a perfect match for Jahāngīr's courtly life. Handed a large, well-administered, and prosperous empire upon his accession, Jahāngīr had little need to concern himself with conquering more territory or

⁵⁷ Terry, p. 362-63

⁵⁸ Remembering, however, that God as Light would be polluted by the touch of fire (=light) with the criminal remains, Jahāngīr then ordered the bones and decayed limbs to be thrown into the river instead. *Tūzūk* (R & B), I, 365-67.

⁵⁹ *Tūzūk* (R & B), I, 294

⁶⁰ *Tūzūk* (R & B), I, 122.

⁶¹ Foster, p. 117

⁶² Terry, pp. 387-88; Roe, I, 215.

⁶³ *Tūzūk* (R & B), I, 420-21.

⁶⁴ *Tūzūk* (R & B), I, 10.

⁶⁵ Terry, pp. 381-82.

reorganizing the structure of government. Able to content himself with leisure-time activities such as patronage of the arts and encouragement of scientific studies, a vow of non-violence suited the lifestyle to which he was born and, had it not been for his love of hunting and his capacity for actions like the Abū'l Faẓl murder, *ahimsa* might have been more visible in his rule. Moreover, one could argue that the alcohol and opium which were endemic to courtly life so diluted Jahāngīr's cruelty that a non-violent policy masked what were already "benign" character tendencies.⁶⁶

III. JAHĀNGĪR'S INTOLERANCE TOWARD THE JAINS

It has become a truism to say that while Akbar's religious tolerance was born of a genuine quest for spiritual knowledge, Jahāngīr's openness to religion was nothing more than a blind and neglectful continuation of his father's policy. Jahāngīr is usually treated as a naive, unreflective Muslim carrying on his father's generous tolerance of other religious traditions, but with his own hedonism and slothfulness preventing any real involvement in spiritual issues.⁶⁷ On the whole it is true that Jahāngīr was not oriented toward matters of the spirit (his flirtations with Christianity amounting to nothing more than a teasing of European traders and missionaries with an eye to the goods and protection they could bring), and that his openness to the variety of religions presented to him at the court was very often a formality. Nevertheless, his reaction to the Jains indicates that these men represented no ordinary reli-

gion to him but one which struck deep cords inside, unfortunately often with negative results.⁶⁸

The Jains of the Mughal era were a significant religious group in northern India, especially in Gujarat, if not in number than certainly in social and economic position. The Jain merchants (Banias) of Gujarat were known as the fairest of all dealers, much more fair, for instance, than the Muslim merchants of Lahore.⁶⁹ Jain monks and ascetics (*yatis*) were among those who regularly participated in the religious discussions at the Mughal court, and Jain conduct in general had a strong influence on the ethical life of the time, particularly with regard to *ahimsa*. Under Akbar, Jainism flourished. Deeply impressed by the long train of Jain monks who came through his court,⁷⁰ Akbar continued throughout his reign to issue numerous *farmāns* (imperial orders) forbidding the killing of animals and fish⁷¹ and discouraging the eating of meat. He also liberally awarded land grants to Jains as well as to Hindus and Parsees⁷² and himself took, under the

⁶⁸ R. Sharma says Jahāngīr "placed no restriction, except in the case of the Jains, on the public celebration of religious fairs and festivals." Srī Ram Sharma, *The Religious Policy of the Mughal Emperors* (Humphrey Milford: Oxford University Press, 1940), p. 90.

⁶⁹ Salyid Athar Abbas Rizvi, *Religious and Intellectual History of the Muslims in Akbar's Reign* (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1975), p. 21. Note, however, the French jeweller Tavernier's assessment: "These Banians are in business a thousand times worse than the Jews, and more cunning than they in all kinds of dodges and in malice when they wish for revenge." V. Ball, trans., and William Crooke, ed. of second edition, *Travels in India by Jean-Baptiste Tavernier*, 2 vols. (2nd edition; London, Humphrey Milford: Oxford University Press, 1925), I, 111. There is evidence that some of the best of these Jain merchants, like the wealthy jeweller Hiranand, worked directly for the emperor Jahāngīr. *Ardhakathānaka*, 220-228. See also Lath, pp. 170-71.

⁷⁰ The first Jain monk to influence Akbar was probably Padmasundara; he was followed by a series of great Jain teachers: Hīra Vijaya Sūri, Śāntichandra Upādhyāya, Bhānuchandra, Siddhicandra, Vijaya-Sena Sūri, Jinachandra Sūri and Jinasinha Sūri (Mān Singh). Akbar's association with the Jains lasted for about 45 years. Krishnamurti, pp. 73-81. See also Mohanlal Dalichand Desai, ed. and trans., *Bhānuchandra Caritra by his Pupil Gaṇi Siddhicandra Upādhyāya* (Singhī Jaina Series, No. 15; Ahmedabad-Calcutta: Sañchālaka-Singhī Jaina Granthamālā, 1941), pp. 5-15.

⁷¹ Note the *farmāns* of June 1584; 1591; August 14, 1601; and 1604 translated in Desai, pp. 77-82.

⁷² Krishnamurti, pp. 73-81; Rizvi, p. 169.

⁶⁶ We could also argue the opposite, that his cruelty was exacerbated by a heavy use of alcohol and opium.

⁶⁷ For Alexander Dow in 1770 Jahāngīr was "destitute of all religion, yet full of superstition and vain fears." Alexander Dow, *The History of Hindustan*, rpt. ed. (New Delhi: Today & Tomorrow's Printers & Publishers, 1973), III, 101. According to C. H. Payne, "unlike his father, Jahangir had no feeling for religion . . . he was in no real sense a seeker after the truth. The study of religious problems was with him nothing more than a hobby . . . Jahangir would have subscribed to one set of doctrines as readily as to another; but he had very little use for any religion, and at none all for one that would not permit him as many wives as he wanted." C. H. Payne, trans., *Jahangir and the Jesuits, From the "Relations" of Father Fernao Guerreiro, S.J.* (New York: Robert M. McBride & Co., 1930), pp. xviii-xix. And A. K. Das says, "a single grand or sublime thought, or serious search for truth can hardly be found in the *Tūzūk*." A. K. Das, *Mughal Painting During Jahangir's Time* (Calcutta: The Asiatic Society, 1978), p. 18.

influence of Jain monks, vows of limited abstinence from meat-eating, saying:

Were it not for the thought of the difficulty of sustenance, I would prohibit men from eating meat. The reason why I do not altogether abandon it myself is, that many others might willingly forego it likewise and be thus cast unto despondency.⁷³

Jahāngīr retained much of his father's policy with regard to the Jains. Jain monks were present at the court, along with devotees of other religious traditions,⁷⁴ and some of them like Bhānucandra and Siddhicandra were granted special favor.⁷⁵ Jahāngīr, who had himself been taught by Jain monks as a child, along with his brother Daniyāl,⁷⁶ engaged monks like Bhānucandra to give religious instruction to his own son Shahriyār.⁷⁷ Moreover, during Jahāngīr's reign a number of Jain idols were consecrated and installed in temples, including some with the inscription "Pātaśāha Jahāngīra."⁷⁸ Perhaps most important, however, were the series of *farmāns* Jahāngīr issued on behalf of Jainism. For example:

- 1) 1605, just before Akbar's death, by Prince Salīm, confirming the *farmān* of Akbar prohibiting the slaughter of animals during nearly six months out of the year and making the Jain port at Unā tax free.
- 2) 1608, by Emperor Jahāngīr, ordering new work on Jain temples and resting-places, allowing them to visit their Śatrunjaya Tīrtha tax free, and prohibiting animal slaughter on certain days.
- 3) 1610, by Emperor Jahāngīr, prohibiting animal slaughter throughout his kingdom during the twelve days of the Jain Pāryuṣana festival.
- 4) 1615, by Emperor Jahāngīr, making a permanent grant of ten bighās of land in Akbarpur near Cambay to a prominent Jain monk.
- 5) 1616, by Emperor Jahāngīr, allowing complete freedom of worship to the monks of the Jain community.

⁷³ Rizvi, p. 387.

⁷⁴ Amongst the Jain teachers at the court were monks like Bhānucandra, Siddhicandra, Jinacandra Sūri, Jinasinha Sūri, Vivekaharsa, Paramānanda, Mahānanda, Udayaharsa, Vijayadeva Sūri, Nemisāgara Upādhyāya, Dayākuśala, Dharmamūrti, and Kalyāṇasāgara. Desai, pp. 19–22.

⁷⁵ *Bhānucandra-caritam*, IV. 227ff.

⁷⁶ *Bhānucandra-caritam*, IV. 114–115; Desai, p. 59.

⁷⁷ Desai, p. 62.

⁷⁸ "It is said, some out of malice or fanaticism reported to him that his name was being engraved at the foot of the idols. He was greatly enraged. In order to passify [sic] him, his name was engraved on the heads of the idols." Desai, p. 18.

- 6) 1618, by Emperor Jahāngīr, asking the Jain monk Vijayadeva Sūri to pray for the permanence of his empire.⁷⁹

The motivation behind these edicts was most certainly religious, especially since the last surviving one was issued in 1618, the pivotal year of the vow. There may also have been heavy economic incentive for the *farmāns*, as travellers at the time record large sums of money being given to Jahāngīr by Banias, a vegetarian merchant class usually ascribing to Jain beliefs, to redeem animals from the slaughter.⁸⁰ How well these *farmāns* were obeyed, however, is another matter. Father Guerreiro records a story of Jahāngīr and two of his sons disguising themselves as poor men in a city one night and taking to task those found selling meat.⁸¹ In fact, such advocacy of Jainism by Jahāngīr was strong enough that at one point Jain monks called him in to mediate when a factional dispute broke out between their two principal sects.⁸²

Despite this advocacy, however, Jahāngīr often fell out with the Jains.⁸³ We first hear of his problems

⁷⁹ Desai, pp. 82–91. See also Das, pp. 110, 114, and Pelsaert, p. 49.

⁸⁰ "... they [the Banians] give yearly large sums of money unto the Mogul to redeem them [other creatures than humans, kine] from slaughter." Terry, p. 335. "*Banians* ... often buy many dayes respite in charety from kylling any flesh at all, in such a Province or Cytty," referring to money paid to local governors of provinces like Gujarat. Roe, I, 123–24. Sharma ascribes this practice in Roe to "rich Jains of the place." Sharma, p. 86. Finally, according to Pelsaert, Hindu rājās and Banias "occasionally obtain by bribery a general order from the King, or from the Governor of a particular city, that no one shall catch any fish for several days, or for as long a period as they can secure." Pelsaert, p. 49.

⁸¹ Eventually, however, the offending officers were restored to favor. Payne, p. 38. That the local violations reflected in this story were true is confirmed by Krishnamurti, who states of Akbar's reign that "... the orders of the emperor prohibiting animal slaughter seems to have met with scant respect from the local officials. This is made clear by the constant repetition of the same order in numerous farmans. ... The bewildering repetition of farmans suggest [sic] that the regulations of Akbar were neither obeyed by the majority of officials and people nor really effectively enforced by the emperor." Krishnamurti, pp. 82–83.

⁸² Desai, pp. 62–64; Das, p. 114.

⁸³ Even Akbar himself was not wholeheartedly supportive of the Jains, once afraid that the charge of atheism that had been made against them was correct, and once brought in to end

during the final years of Akbar's reign when, prior to his revolt against Akbar, Gujarat came under Salīm's sway. Akbar had for a long time prohibited animal slaughter but news reached the court that Salīm and the officials of Gujarat had revived not only animal-slaughter but religious taxes as well, much to the dismay of the subjects. Akbar stepped in and, in an action dated August 15, 1601, renewed his edicts in favor of the Jains.⁸⁴ It is not until after he acceded to the throne that we hear again of Jahāngīr's problems with the Jains this time, however, over the issue of asceticism. About 1613 a handsome young Jain monk named Siddhicandra was at Jahāngīr's court. Jahāngīr was much struck by his beauty and wondered why he preferred the dryness of austerity to the pleasurable company of women. In a fit of drunkenness, he tried to get Siddhicandra to break his vows and marry.⁸⁵ When the monk consistently refused, Jahāngīr banished him and all other Jain monks in his empire to the forest. It was only because of the sadness of Bhānucandra, the monk's teacher, that Jahāngīr ordered Siddhicandra's return and, at the latter's bidding, all of the other monks as well.⁸⁶ There is some evidence that for several years after this Jains continued to feel Jahāngīr's displeasure.⁸⁷

Jahāngīr's next recorded outburst against the Jains is in a 1617 passage of his memoirs.⁸⁸ He described the Jains as "a tribe of infidel Hindus" who wore no shoes or headgear, who plucked out their hair, who would wear no garment that was sewn, and whose "central principle . . . [was] that no living creature should be injured."⁸⁹ He noted their close ideological ties to the Bania traders and then charged the Jains with idol worship, with perverting the behavior of female Banias, and with political sedition.

I therefore ordered that the Sewras should be expelled, and I circulated farmans to the effect that wherever there were Sewras in my empire they should be turned out.⁹⁰

persecution of them because they were charged with possessing magic to stop the rains. Krishnamurti, pp. 84, 85. Some of these charges seem to have been instigated by jealous brahman priests. *Bhānucandra-caritam*, IV, 19-47.

⁸⁴ *Bhānucandra-caritam*, IV, 168-173.

⁸⁵ *Bhānucandra-caritam*, IV, 237-246.

⁸⁶ *Bhānucandra-caritam*, IV, 338-346, 354-358.

⁸⁷ Das, pp. 110.

⁸⁸ His reference is to the Śvetāmbara sect, or "Seyamvara" in Prakrit and "Seurā," "Seorā," "Siura," or "Sewra" in the literature of the day.

⁸⁹ *Tūzūk* (R & B), I, 437.

⁹⁰ *Tūzūk* (R & B), I, 438.

The immediate cause of these slanderous passages and of Jahāngīr's abrupt action was his hearing of the death of Mān Singh. Mān Singh had been a leader among the Śvetāmbaras (Sewras) and, upon Jahāngīr's accession in 1605, had prophesized that Jahāngīr's reign would last no more than two years. When it became clear that Jahāngīr's reign would be long and glorious, Mān Singh contracted leprosy and lived for a time in misery. In 1617 Jahāngīr remembered him and called Mān Singh back to court but on the way the frightened monk took poison.⁹¹ Sometime afterward, however, Jahāngīr's 1617 edict ordering the expulsion of all Jains was withdrawn,⁹² but there remained no doubt that Jahāngīr's behavior in this instance had been an act of deliberate persecution.⁹³

The charges of idolatry and of the pollution of local women were also made in the contemporary text *Intikhāb-i-Jahāngīr-shāhi*. Calling the Jains infidel and superstitious, the unknown author⁹⁴ condemned their use of "false gods" and their immoral behavior⁹⁵ and said that Jahāngīr ordered the Jains banished from the empire and their temples destroyed, and by this hoped to disgrace Jainism and glorify Islam.⁹⁶

Jahāngīr's wildly contradictory policy with regard to the Jains is explainable only in light of their practice of non-violence. Although he toyed with other religions (note his treatment of the Portuguese Jesuits), Jahāngīr was rancorous only in the case of the Jains.⁹⁷ Moreover,

⁹¹ *Tūzūk* (R & B), I, 438. Desai reports that this story of Mān Singh's prediction could not be true because "Jaina monks are prohibited from predicting anyone's future by a religious injunction." Desai, p. 18.

⁹² "The Persian chroniclers do not mention the withdrawal of the order against the Jains, but the Jain works of the period are clear on the point." Beni Prasad as quoted in Desai, p. 19. One obvious testimony to the withdrawal of the edict is Banarasi's story in the *Ardhakathānka* of how much he suffered under Jahāngīr's 1617 persecution of the Jains and how the suppression "ended as suddenly as it had begun." Lath, pp. vii, 185-86. Given evidence such as this, Das's comment that Jahāngīr's "derogatory remarks . . . about the Sewra Jainas are not corroborated by authentic Jaina works" is indeed puzzling. Das, p. 15.

⁹³ Sharma, p. 79.

⁹⁴ Although unknown, the author was probably a servant of Jahāngīr's. See Prasad, p. 420.

⁹⁵ Desai contends, however, that "it is false & malicious aspersion to attribute adultery to them." Desai, pp. 18-19.

⁹⁶ Elliot and Dowson, VI, 451. Das correctly doubts whether these acts were ever meant to glorify Islam. Das, p. 14.

⁹⁷ One exception to this was Jahāngīr's execution of Arjun, a Sikh guru. His crimes seem to have been a combination of

his persecution of the Jains was based on things, save one, they shared with other groups: Jahāngīr had seen asceticism like Siddhicandra's, for example, in the Hindu monk Jad rūp, sedition like Mān Singh's in many of his courtiers, and idolatry like Jain temple worshippers³ in the populace at large. It was only the practice of *ahimsa* which was the pre-eminent jurisdiction of the Jains. Non-violence was not only the first of a Jain monk's vows but that by which most Jains were known. In their memoirs of the period, travellers like Roe,⁹⁸ Terry,⁹⁹ Nicholas Withington,¹⁰⁰ Pietro della Valle,¹⁰¹ and Jean-Baptiste Tavernier¹⁰² each describe the Jains as having such reverence for life that they refrained not only from eating meat but from injuring any living creature as well. To be sure, Hindus practiced *ahimsa* also,¹⁰³ but it was such a mark of the Jains that Jahāngīr himself asserted, "their central principal . . . [was] that no living creature should be injured."¹⁰⁴

Jahāngīr's denunciation of the Jains becomes clear in the context of his outburst of 1617. The recall of Mān Singh and Jahāngīr's expulsion of the Jains from his empire appear to have had no immediate catalyst in the events recorded in the *Tūzuk*. Jahāngīr recalled the monk out of his self-imposed exile a good twelve years after Mān Singh's unfortunate but certainly innocuous prophecy, giving no reason for the sudden need, in 1617, to attend to the monk.¹⁰⁵ What is noticeable,

idolatry and complicity with the rebellious Khusrau. *Tūzuk* (R & B), I, 72-73.

⁹⁸ "Banians . . . will not kyll the Vermyne that bytes them." Roe, I, 123-24.

⁹⁹ ". . . those which are most tender hearted in this case are called Banians, . . . they cannot abide to kill any living creatures." Terry, p. 333; see also pp. 307ff.

¹⁰⁰ "[The Banians] . . . will eate noe beefe nor buffellow, but honor them and pray unto them. They will kill noe living thinge, nor eate anye fleshe, for all the goods in the world." Nicholas Withington in Foster, p. 218.

¹⁰¹ ". . . the strictest among them . . . not onely kill not, but eat not, any living thing; and even from herbs tinctur'd with any reddish colour representing blood they wholly abstain." Edward Grey, ed., *The Travels of Pietro Della Valle in India*, 2 vols. (Hakluyt Society, No. LXXXIV; London: Hakluyt Society, 1892), I, 86.

¹⁰² Tavernier, p. 61.

¹⁰³ See the remarks made by Ralph Fitch, Foster, pp. 14, 19, 28, and Pelsaert, p. 76, which describe not only the Hindu policy of noninjury and gentleness toward animals but the restrictions Hindus placed on the types of plants that could be eaten as well.

¹⁰⁴ *Tūzuk* (R & B), I, 437

¹⁰⁵ *Tūzuk* (R & B), I, 438. See also Lath, pp. 185-86.

however, is that it is in the next year, in 1618, that Jahāngīr takes his most important vow of non-violence. Why, then, would Jahāngīr who must have been internally preparing for the vow for some time, denounce that very group which upheld as its central principle exactly what he himself was about to embrace?

The decided slowdown in Jahāngīr's hunting patterns in 1617 indicates that, at least subconsciously, he was anticipating his vow of non-violence the year before he took it. This mental preparation is evident not only from the drastically fewer number of animals he shot but precisely from his actions towards the Jains. The one issue in Jahāngīr's life over which he oscillated the most and the one issue which was at stake in the major events of his life was the issue of violence and his own capacity to use and abuse it. Likewise the one religious tradition which received the most inconsistent treatment from Jahāngīr was the Jains, known not incidentally for the policy of non-violence. The Mān Singh incident, then, represents one of the last upheavals in Jahāngīr's struggle with issues of violence before he actually committed himself to the 1618 vow. It is noteworthy that there are no significant proclamations by Jahāngīr about the Jains after that year¹⁰⁶ for, with the vow, some resolution to his own ambivalence on violence was made. Jahāngīr's contradictory behavior towards the Jains prior to 1618, therefore, reflects his oscillation on the issue, and his 1617 denunciation of the Jains reflects the violent and conflicted nature of his internal preparation for the vow which he must have anticipated for some time.

It is not insignificant, moreover, that the man whose murder Jahāngīr was atoning for was a close friend and confidant of the Jain monk Bhānucandra. It was Abū'l Fazl who was responsible for introducing Bhānucandra to the court of Akbar and it was Abū'l Fazl who continued to act as messenger, and at times interpreter, between the monk and the emperor. Abū'l Fazl himself took instruction from Bhānucandra, keeping notes on his interviews,¹⁰⁷ and it was he who advised Akbar to confer on the monk the title of *upādhyāya*.¹⁰⁸

Jahāngīr may not have had the spiritual depths of his father but he was capable of being moved by religious concerns. The Jains touched a central nerve in Jahāngīr and because of this suffered the consequences. Although Jahāngīr's positive identification with his father on non-violence was more or less completed by 1618, the overt expression of his ambivalence on this

¹⁰⁶ Desai, p. 91.

¹⁰⁷ *Bhānucandra-caritam*, II, 179.

¹⁰⁸ *Bhānucandra-caritam*, II, 34-65.

issue remained unresolved, for the vow proved ineffective in preventing further violence (e.g., Khurram's revolt) and could not ward off the pleasures of the hunt. Nevertheless, Jahāngīr's vow ended years of inner turmoil with regard to his father, and allowed an identification with the Jains on doctrinal as well as

psychological issues. The fifty/fifty-five year mark of the Jains,¹⁰⁹ then, provided an easy timetable for putting to rest the vacillations of Jahāngīr's youth.

¹⁰⁹ *Ardhakathānaka*, 665.