Proceedings of ICEIPI 2025 Symposium: Understanding Religious Identity in Educational Contexts
DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.ND26265

The Impact of Gifts along the Silk Road-How Objects Moved People, Power, and Meaning

Kalin Cutler

Storm King School, NY, USA
collegekalin@gmail.com

Abstract. This paper argues that gift-giving along the Silk Road was not peripheral to diplomacy—it was its primary medium. Gifts functioned not merely as symbols of goodwill or displays of wealth, but as strategic instruments employed to negotiate power, manage relations, and communicate intent across linguistic and cultural divides. They formed the basis of alliances, diffused tensions, and conveyed political positioning. Yet these objects did not circulate only between courts. They moved through markets, caravans, and everyday lives—shaping the rhythms of ordinary people as much as those of kings. Drawing on sources such as The Shiji, The King's Road, and The Sogdian Ancient Letters, this study examines how gifts were selected, the purposes they were intended to serve, the social and logistical networks they activated, and the consequences of their refusal or misinterpretation. It argues that diplomatic gifts were not simply gestures—they were choices, with repercussions both symbolic and material.

Keywords: Silk Road, diplomacy, gift exchange, Sogdians, Xin Wen

1. Introduction

For centuries along the Silk Road, rulers, envoys, merchants, and monks—many of whom shared no common language or religious framework—engaged in gift exchange. Horses, bolts of silk, metalware, relics, and ornamented vessels changed hands not as gestures of generosity, but as calculated attempts to establish recognition, legitimacy, or mutual interest.

This paper contends that gift-giving was not a supplemental activity within diplomacy, but rather a primary method through which diplomacy was practiced. Gifts conveyed intent, expressed hierarchy, reinforced status, and opened channels of interaction across vast distances and cultural boundaries. A gift might signal a desire for peace, a claim to shared values, or a reminder of dominance. Its selection was rarely incidental.

Each section of this study addresses a different facet of this system: the strategic considerations behind gift selection, the reception and circulation of diplomatic objects among non-elite communities, and the consequences of misaligned or misunderstood gifts. This study aims to uncover how material exchanges structured relationships across one of the most intricate trade and political networks in early history.

© 2026 The Authors. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.ND26265

2. The strategy: gifts as diplomatic tools

Gift-giving along the Silk Road was not spontaneous—it was deliberate. Before a gift was dispatched, it was first conceived as a strategic act: a response to specific geopolitical needs, cultural expectations, and power asymmetries. The sender had to weigh not only what they could afford to part with, but what message the gift would carry, and what response it was intended to elicit.

Han dynasty records, particularly The Shiji, describe a sustained effort to manage frontier relations with the Xiongnu through material offerings—silk, grain, gold, and imperial brides [1]. These were not offered as gestures of goodwill, but as instruments of stabilization. According to Tamara Chin, the Han practice of marrying women into Xiongnu leadership functioned less as symbolic alliance and more as political concession, embedding treaties within kinship ties and gendered hierarchies [2].

This pattern extended far beyond East Asia. The Periplus Maris Erythraei, a 1st-century CE navigational manual, advised Roman and Egyptian merchants to approach ports in India and Arabia with preselected goods: silver, coral, saffron, wine. These were not casual offerings but diplomatic prerequisites. Trade and negotiation were often impossible without them [3].

Geography itself was structured by such demands. In The Parthian Stations, Isidore of Charax outlines a sequence of cities functioning as political checkpoints across Central Asia, where movement depended on the capacity to present offerings deemed acceptable to local authorities [4]. The road became a channel not only of travel and commerce but of tribute and obligation. The capacity to give—and to give correctly—shaped one's ability to proceed.

In the Red Sea region, as Andrew Wilson notes, rulers frequently exchanged luxury goods—frankincense, pearls, ivory—as diplomatic overtures rather than commodities. These items reaffirmed alliances and signaled shared elite values across fragmented polities [5]. Their movement marked political boundaries more sharply than commercial ones.

What unites these examples is the recognition that diplomatic gifts were rarely optional. They were expected, often required, and frequently tied to reciprocal terms. A gift could be declined—but not without consequence. Each item selected carried implicit meaning, and a misstep in form, quality, or timing could undo months of negotiation. Thus, the gift was less a token than a tactic: a measured response to the political conditions of the moment, crafted with intention and deployed with risk.

3. The ripple effect: gifts that touched the ground

Diplomatic histories often remain confined to palaces, treaties, and elite actors. Yet on the Silk Road, the circulation of gifts involved far more than rulers and envoys. Objects passed through extended logistical chains—caravans, relay stations, local markets—where they left discernible impacts on everyday life. The consequences of gift exchange were material, emotional, and infrastructural, shaping the lived experience of diplomacy at all levels of society.

The King's Road opens not with a royal decree but with a song. Villagers in Dunhuang chant verses anticipating the arrival of foreign envoys and their offerings:

"The ten thousand commoners sing songs with full bellies like drums, [living in] a time like that under [the sage kings] Shun and Yao. Do not worry about the eastern road being blocked. In the spring, the heavenly envoys will arrive, and they will contribute large jin-silks with coiled dragons, and different kinds of damask, gauze, plain silk, colored silk." [6]

The song reflects more than seasonal optimism—it reveals an economic and psychological reliance on diplomatic contact. As Xin Wen argues, peace and prosperity were envisioned not as

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.ND26265

divine favor but as consequences of continued exchange [6]. Gifts were not abstract symbols of distant politics. They were tangible resources, expected by the populace and woven into the rhythms of local life.

Such expectations also reshaped infrastructure. The Xuanquan Manuscripts, analyzed by Jidong Yang, include precise inventories and instructions for provisioning diplomatic travelers. Records list amounts of grain, types of firewood, numbers of laborers, and procedures for hosting envoys [7]. These were not improvised gestures but institutional routines—evidence that gift-based diplomacy activated entire local economies. Villagers prepared lodgings. Officials allocated supplies. Tradespeople adapted to the flow of diplomatic passage.

Moreover, gifts did not remain within the elite sphere. A bolt of silk intended for a ruler might be sold, repurposed, or redistributed along the way. In this sense, diplomatic goods often blurred into the broader circuit of trade and consumption. As with the letters of the Sogdian diaspora, we glimpse these downstream effects most clearly in moments of failure. One merchant, writing in the Sogdian Ancient Letters, expresses distress over a gift undelivered. His concern is not merely commercial but reputational. The failure to fulfill this obligation risks social rupture, even exile from trusted networks [7].

These episodes challenge the view of diplomacy as a discrete and elite-bound process. Instead, diplomatic exchange—especially through gifts—was distributed. It altered the movement of goods, the use of space, and the expectations of ordinary people. A gift did not only signify a political message; it produced consequences. For those who encountered it along the road, it meant evidence of stability, access to resources, or, at times, the burdens of preparation and risk. In this way, gift exchange served as a mechanism of state presence—visible not only through edicts and armies but in the hands of traders, servants, and villagers who made diplomacy function.

4. When a gift goes wrong

This is the most dangerous part of gift-giving: misreading the moment. In Histories Book 3, Herodotus describes how the Persian king Cambyses sent gifts to the Ethiopian king: a gold bracelet, myrrh, perfume, and wine. But what was meant to impress instead exposed a cultural divide. The Ethiopian king mistook the gold bracelet for a prisoner's shackle—because, in Ethiopia, gold was so common it was used to bind criminals. He dismissed the myrrh and perfume, showing the envoys a natural spring that made his people fragrant without any imported oils. Only the wine pleased him. But the gifts as a whole failed to earn his respect. He saw through the mission, calling the envoys spies, and returned a massive bow with a message: don't come back unless your men are strong enough to draw this. Cambyses, enraged, launched a campaign into Ethiopia, which ended in starvation, cannibalism, and retreat [8].

This isn't just a story of rejection. It's about how a gift becomes a mirror—reflecting the giver's assumptions back at them. Cambyses thought wealth would impress; the Ethiopian king saw weakness, arrogance, and ignorance. A gift meant to create alliance ended in disaster. And more importantly, it reminds us that a gift can only succeed if it understands the world of the person receiving it.

One of the most dangerous moments in diplomacy is when a gift becomes a demand—and a demand becomes a war.

The clearest example of this is the Han dynasty's pursuit of the Ferghana horses. Known as Tianma or "Heavenly Horses," these animals—sleek, fast, bred in the Ferghana Valley (modern Uzbekistan)—were everything the Han army lacked. Their own Central Asian and Mongolian horses were strong but slow, good for endurance but not for the speed and agility cavalry warfare

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.ND26265

increasingly demanded. As horse warfare evolved from chariots to mounted archery, the Han realized that to fight the Xiongnu of the northern steppes, they would need better horses—or they would keep losing.

So they turned to the Dayuan. Initially, the relationship was peaceful. Gifts were exchanged, envoys were sent, horses were brought east. The Ferghana horses quickly became one of the most valuable commodities in the region. But as the Han appetite for these animals grew, the Dayuan cut off the supply. They stopped sending horses. And for Emperor Wu of Han, this was more than an inconvenience. It was an insult. He interpreted the withdrawal of gifts not just as bad trade, but as resistance.

So he responded with war. From 104 to 101 BCE, the Han–Dayuan War raged. The Han won, eventually. But the deeper point is this: what began as gift exchange—prestige diplomacy—turned into a military campaign. A gift that once symbolized cooperation came to represent refusal, control, and threat.

This wasn't just about horses. It was about power. Gifts are emotional technologies. They can create peace—but they can also expose need, and once need is exposed, power imbalances get clearer. The Han needed those horses. And when that need was unmet, the mask of politeness fell. Underneath was an empire determined to take what it could not convince someone to give.

This is what makes gift-giving along the Silk Road so volatile. As Xin Wen puts it, the diplomacy of the Silk Road was "part performance, part gamble." When the gamble failed—when a gift was misread, rejected, or cut off—it wasn't just a diplomatic hiccup. It was a signal. A trigger.

Whether it was Cambyses marching into the Ethiopian desert after being mocked, or the Han launching a war for Ferghana stallions, the lesson is the same: gifts are never just things. They're moves. And sometimes, when the board shifts, they become declarations.

This is the emotional risk of diplomacy. Not just that your offer might be rejected, but that your intentions might be twisted. According to Xin Wen, gift-giving on the Silk Road was "part performance, part gamble"—and when the performance went wrong, the fallout wasn't symbolic. It was real [6].

When we treat gifts like ornaments, we miss the danger they carried. Gifts could spark wars, end marriages, redraw borders. They weren't soft gestures. They were sharp moves. And they were personal, even when they were political.

5. Conclusion

This paper has shown four things: Gifts were used strategically to build influence and control movement; they passed through and affected common people, not just the elite; when they failed—when misread or refused—they could spark serious harm; behind all of this was a constant effort to communicate across distance, across difference, through objects that tried to mean something.

To give a gift on the Silk Road was to try to be understood. And sometimes, that worked. Sometimes it didn't. But every time, it mattered.

References

[1] Sima Qian, Shiji [Records of the Grand Historian]; Ban Gu, Hanshu, Book 96.
[2] Tamara Chin, Defamiliarizing the Foreigner: Sima Qian's Ethnography and Han-Xiongnu Marriage Diplomacy.
[3] Lionel Casson, The Periplus Maris Erythraei.
[4] Isidore of Charax, The Parthian Stations.
[5] Andrew Wilson, Red Sea Trade and the State, in Ancient Economies in the Red Sea Region.
[6] Xin Wen, The King's Road: Diplomacy and the Remaking of the Silk Road, Princeton University Press.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.ND26265

[7] Jidong Yang, Transportation, Boarding, Lodging, and Trade Along the Early Silk Road: A Preliminary Study of the Xuanquan Manuscripts; Étienne de la Vaissière, Sogdian Traders: A History; Sogdian Ancient Letters.
[8] The Histories. Translated by Aubrey De Sélincourt and John Marincola, London, Penguin Books, 2003.