Chapter IX

THE SALARY BILL
OF THE MANSABDARS

The greatest charge on the jama (or the total net revenue realization) was represented by the talab or pay-claims of the Imperial civil and military officials - the mansabdars. The talab of the Mughal mansabdars was determined by their mansab (numerical ranks). An understanding of some features of the mansab system is thus necessary before one can attempt an estimate of the total expenses incurred by the Mughal administration in paying the emoluments of the mansabdars.

It is generally held that from the 18th regnal year of Akbar, the Mughal nobles were assigned numerical ranks (mansabs), consisting of a pair of numbers, the first designated

1. It is generally held (Noveland, 'Ranks (mansab) in the Mughal State Service', JNAS, London, 1936, p.650; and Abdul Aziz, Mansabdari System and the Mughal Army, London, 1945, pp.147-9) that the recipient of high ranks (under Akbar 500, and under Shahjahan 1,000) were designated umara while the word mansabdar was used for those holding lower ranks (below 500 or 1,000). However, Abul Fazl (Akbarnama, III, 671; Ain, I, pp.187, 188, 190) and Mutamad Khan (Igbalnama, II, p.288) use the term mansabdar for all rank-holders without any distinction. It is, however, true that the word umara to judge from the Tabaqat-i Akbari, p.456, was reserved (under Akbar) to those holding mansabs exceeding 500.
and the second sawar. However, before the 40th regnal year of Akbar (1595) we have no actual reference to the paired ranks, and in the two lists of Akbar’s nobles, prepared before 1595, only a single rank is recorded.\(^2\) The existence of two ranks before the 40th regnal year thus becomes rather suspect. This impression is reinforced by the fact that the text of the \(\text{\text{"Ain-i Akbari}}\) seems to speak of only a single rank; and neither the term zat nor sawar is unambiguously employed in the sense of either of the two ranks. Since the \(\text{\text{"Ain-i Akbari}}\)’s text mainly pertains to the 40th regnal year (1595–5), the existence of the paired ranks, prior to this date, cannot legitimately be taken for granted.

According to Abul Fazl, it was in the 18th regnal year (1573–4), that the dag\(\text{h}\) was introduced and the ranks of the Imperial officials were fixed.\(^3\) These innovations were actually put into effect during the next year (1574–5).\(^4\)


2. \(\text{\text{"Ain}}, \text{I}, \text{pp.222-32; Tabaqat}}, \text{II}, \text{pp.425-56.}

3. \(\text{\text{"Akbarnâme}}, \text{III}, \text{p.69.}

4. Ibid., \text{III}, p.117.
Muhammad giving the details of the measure says:

"...The munsabas were fixed according to the capacity for maintaining and organising a contingent......

Munsabas from dehshahi (10) to panjharari (5,000) were established and the salary for each was fixed. A regulation to the effect that the munsabdas would separately bring their personal horses and elephants for branding (dēgh) was imposed. A trooper, if capable of being a seh-espa (horseman 'with three horses'), would bring three horses; if capable of being a do-espa ('with two horses'), two horses; and if capable of a vak-espa ('with one horse'), he should bring one horse for the dēgh. In this way the pay ('alūfa) for everyone was fixed."

Thus, in addition to making no suggestion that there were two (zāt and savār) ranks, Muhammad Khan indicates that the single rank he is referring to represented the size of the contingents maintained by the munsabdas. He is, of course, writing after Akbar's death; but contemporaries are no less explicit. Badauni relates the munsabas directly to the number of munsabdas' troopers (tābinān) in a striking passage.2

1. Iqbalnāma, II, p.283.
Most important of all, Abul Fazl, not only says that the mansabs were fixed on the basis of the capacity for organising (sar-kardan) a contingent, but elsewhere makes it plain that the number of the single rank represented directly the size of the contingent. He says that the troops (sipāh) of nobles do not exceed 5,000, while the ranks (mansabs) of princes were fixed at higher figures. Thus the words sipāh and mansab appear here as perfectly interchangeable.

Statements by Nizāmuddin Ahmad and Bāyāzīd Biyat also show beyond dispute that the single rank which was in vogue uptill the 40th regnal year was directly related to the size of the military contingent. In his concluding remarks to his list of Akbar's nobles, Nizamuddin Ahmad says:

"..... Let it be known that such of the Imperial servants as maintain only 500 retainers (nankār) are not counted among the umarā'(plural of amīr).”

Here again the parity of number of retainers (nankār) with the number of the mansab is assumed, Nizamuddin adds

1. Akbarnama, III, p.117.
2. Ibid., III, p.219.
that he has only given in his list such nobles as had the rank (palla) of over 500. He acknowledges that he has used the list of the nobles given by Abūl Fazl. This list again gives only one rank; one can thus deduce that contrary to the general assumption, the mansabs given in the Ain's list are not zāt ranks, but the single comprehensive ranks that represented the number of troopers (while determining also the personal pay).

Finally Bāyazīd records that he was made a do-sādi (i.e. held the rank of 200 — in later parlance do-sādi would always mean 200 zāt), and then goes on to account for the two hundred sawāra that he was so obliged to maintain.

A change is noticeable, first of all, in the 40th regnal year (1595-6) itself. The paired rank makes its first (and very uncertain) appearance. It occurs in the following passage of the Akbarnāma:

“During this year the mansabs were grouped into three categories. First, those whose sawāra (sawāran, horsemen) are equal to their mansabs; second, one half or more; the third

---

1. Ain, I, pp.222-32


less than that (one half of their mansabs), as is described in the last volume (Aīn-i Akbarī). 1

The Aīn-i Akbarī practically reproduces this text. 2

The description of this measure, read with the passages from Badauni and Bayazid, implies two things: First, the mansabdārs were expected to maintain horsemen equaling their mansab number; secondly, this expectation was not fulfilled by many of the mansabdārs. The Mughal administration acknowledged the force of reality and modified the system accordingly. From now on the number of sawārs, actually expected, began to be distinct from the mansab number. The single mansab that was in force now became valid for the payment of salary for the person (gāt) of the mansabdār only, while a new sawār-number was suffixed, against which the barawurdi or partial rates were paid.

The origin of the name gāt for the first rank and barawurdi for the second (or sawār) rank lies here. The terms were clearly in the final stage of evolution (but not yet established completely) when the main text of the Aīn was being


2. Aīn, I, p.179. "A difference in monthly pay was instituted to accord with the sawār (cavalry). (The Emperor) gave him who has cavalry (sawār) equal to his mansab, the first grade (pāya); to him who has half or more, the second; and he put him who has less than that, into the third."
drafted (in or about the 40th regnal year). Even in the 41st year the distinction is not complete: Shahrukh is granted 5,000 zāt, half the sawāṛ being baɾāwrdi. 1 This means that 5,000 zāt still implied a theoretical strength of 5,000 (cavalry), though only half thereof (2,500) were paid for by baɾāwrdi. Soon afterwards this would be spoken of simply as 5000 zāt, 2,500 sawār. However, another reference to the two ranks occurs soon afterwards in the same year — 5,000 zāt and sawār 2 — meaning 5,000 zāt and 5,000 sawār. Here the two ranks appear to be given full recognition.

Henceforth zāt determined the personal pay and the number of khāsa (personal) animals to be maintained according to the schedule in force. The sawār indicated the number of horsemen the pansābdar was required to maintain. The pay due against the sawār rank would be worked out from the rank-numbers by use of separate schedules sanctioned for the purpose.

It is thus clear that the two ranks (zāt and sawār) made their appearance, though not immediately with firm separate designations, in the 40th—41st regnal year (1595-7). When the Āin was completed (1595-6) the separate zāt and sawār ranks were still in an embryonic form. As is evident from

2. Ibid., p.721.
Mutamad Khan's account of the introduction of the (single) mansab in the 19th regnal year (1574-5), the payment for tabinān (the mansābdār's troopers) was from the beginning distinct from the personal pay of the mansābdār. The regulations given in the Ain confirm that the payment for the zāt or 'person' (in the literal sense) of the mansābdāras was separate from that for his horsemen. It is indeed laid down that when a promotion in mansab was given, the increased pay for his person (zāt) was allowed immediately on the enhanced rank, but the amount for the additional troopers implied by the increase in rank was paid only after the dāgh (brand). The rule shows that when it was formulated the mansab was still a single, not dual, rank; yet the payment for the person and cavalry of the mansābdār was separately made.

Therefore, though the zāt and sawār ranks were not distinguished until the 40th or 41st regnal year, and then also not without ambiguity, the actual situation prevailing immediately earlier was not very different from what it was after the 41st year (1596-7). The single rank was in one sense already the zāt rank; i.e. it indicated the personal pay and the number and composition of animals to be maintained on his 'personal' account by the mansābdār. It was also no longer a

direct index of the size of the military contingent, as it was originally intended to be. By the 40th regnal year, it rather represented the maximum limit for the size of the contingent that the noble could present. But already the contingent, which the noble might actually present, or for which barāwuri payment might be made in anticipation, was much smaller. This situation provided the basis for the formula for the three scales of 'personal' pay of mansabdāra, based on the ratio of the contingent to the total mansab, spelled out in the 40th regnal year. This 'contingent' was really the future second or sawār rank.

In the following sections, not only is the separate existence of the two ranks assumed for 1595-6 (this would in any case in accordance with fact), but for convenience of exposition the designations zāt and sawār are also employed for them, though, strictly speaking, this anticipates the later terminology.

II

We may now attempt to estimate the total expenditure on the personal pay of the mansabdāra.

The Āin-i Akbarī sets out the schedule of pay, as well as the detailed requirements of horses, elephants and beasts of
burden which were to be maintained by the 

mansabdârs as their personal contribution (khâsa). Since the schedules give the pay separately for each of the three grades of ranks created in the 40th regnal year, it follows that the pay-schedule of the Âin cannot be of a date earlier than 1595-6.

The mansabs listed in the schedule start from 10,000 and come down to 10. According to Abul Fazl there were in all 66 ranks, equalling the numerical value of the letters in the name of God (Allah).¹Blochmann's text and the British Museum MS Add 7652, however, list only 65 ranks, while against the rank of 600 two sets of figures specifying salary and animals are given. The schedule is given correctly in British Museum MS Add. 6552, which records the rank 1,250, omitted in the other MSS. It is assigned the pay that is given in the printed text and other MSS against 1,200. Then onwards, the pay of each rank in Add. 6552 is the one which is given in the printed text to the next lower rank; so down to 600, against which the second of the pair of g figures in the printed text is entered. Thus Add. 6552 enables us to restore the correct form of the schedule, with 66 ranks in all.

The schedule provides the salaries for all the three grades against each rank but no such grades exist above 5,000.

---

1. Âin. I, 179.
For the three ranks above 5,000 the salary is given only for the first grade. While the zāt salary varies among the remaining ranks according to the grades, the number of animals remains the same for all the three grades of each rank.

Abūl Fażl says that in the 18th regnal year, together with the institution of dāgh or branding, a classification of animals was laid down, and schedules of the sanctioned 'average' costs of maintenance of various breeds of horses, elephants, camels, oxen, mules and carts were issued. By the time the schedule actually reproduced in the Āin had been formulated, this classification seems to have undergone some changes. The Ishānāna-i Jahāngīrī, giving the earlier classification, records five breeds of horses, while the Āin-i Akbarī gives seven classes. The Āin sets out the costs of maintenance with a detailed break down. This gives the cost calculated originally and the subsequent enhancements. In the case of horses three increments were granted. The first of these is said simply to have been made out of the Emperor's concern for

1. Āin, I, p.176.
2. Ishānāna, II, p.283.
3. Āin, I, p.176.
4. Ibid., pp.176-8. The most superior breed (ārabī) was not included among the horses required to be maintained as khass (Āin, 180-6) nor is the salary of horsemen with an arab horse set out in the 'dāgh' rates (Āin, p.188).
the comfort and welfare of the army. The rise in copper price of the rupee from 35 to 40 dāms in 29-30th regnal year,\(^1\) compelled the Emperor to sanction another increment in rates. This suggests that though the costs were calculated in dāms, those were commuted into rupees at the time of actual payment. For elephants it is specifically stated, obviously by way of exception, that the payment remained fixed in dāms, and was unaffected by changes in the copper value of the rupee. An enhancement in rates for elephants was indeed sanctioned, but the reason is not recorded.

These rates (Ā'īn-i Jārīrān) were apparently sanctioned for payment for the animals, carts, etc., of the mansabāds to be maintained as their khās and for those maintained by their troopers, after they had been actually branded (dāgh). This is evident from Abul Fazl's language as well as from the context. The rates precede the chapter on the mansabāds setting out their zāt obligations and salaries. On the other hand, they follow the chapter entitled 'Ā'īn-i Sipāhābādī', giving the barāwūrdī-rates\(^2\) and details of muster and branding. The columns of animals and carts in the mansab pay-schedules are arranged in exactly the same order in which they are given in

---

1. Ā'īn, I, p.28.
2. Ibid., pp.175-86, for the significance of barāwūrdī-payments, see infra, sec. II.
the Āīn-i Jāndārān. The decisive piece of evidence is to be found in Abūl Fazl’s statement concluding the chapter on Āīn-i Jāndārān to the effect that elephants and carts were allowed only to mansabdārs and superior troopers (gazīn-sawār) to bring camels and oxen only for the brand.¹ This means that the rates applied both to the animals maintained by mansabdārs under their ‘zāt’ ranks, and those by their troopers, in fulfilment of the obligation against the mansabdārs’ ‘sawār’ ranks.

To know the actual expenditure against what later was called the zāt rank, it has to be decided whether the maintenance cost of animals was paid over and above the stated salary or was included in it. Abūl Aziz has assumed that the mansabdārs were obliged to maintain these animals out of their own salaries, and the animals belonged to the State.² But this, as will be shown in the following paragraphs, is not possible, in view of the evidence of the Āīn itself.

The detailed specifications of average expenses in the Āīn-i Jāndārān could only be relevant if the Mughal administration had to use them to make payments at some stage. If it

¹ Āīn, I, p.178. Abūl Fazl says (p.168) that troopers having more than one horse (ghair-i vak-aspa) were paid the allowance for a camel or an ox, equal to half the rate sanctioned for animals of superior horseman (gazīdā sawār).

was obligatory for each mansabdār to maintain the animals out of his own salary set out in the mansab pay-schedule, there would not be any need for the Imperial administration to make these meticulous calculations, especially since for the Imperial Stables such details are separately furnished. To work out the salaries, only rough estimates would have sufficed. Furthermore, the Ain says that for the elephants the payment was always made in dāms. If it was not a separate payment it would have been difficult to assimilate it to the salaries which are given in rupees.

The crucial evidence is Abūl Fazl's statement that certain enhancements in the sanctioned costs of maintenance were made to provide relief to the army, i.e. the mansabdārs. This could hardly have been the case if the payments for these animals were made by the mansabdārs out of their own salaries. Clearly, it was the mansabdārs themselves who received the enhanced rates, in order to have drawn any benefits from the enhancements.


2. To anticipate a possible suggestion that these enhancements might have been assimilated through increase in gat (personal) pay, we should remember that (i) there is no statement in the Ain to justify the supposition of such a second round of adjustments; and (ii) the adjustments for enhancements in maintenance costs would have resulted in detailed figures for mansab-pay, whereas the pay figures are invariably (with just one or two exceptions) in round numbers or, in case of low ranks, with 5, as the last digit.
There is one more argument still, for refuting Abdul Aziz's hypothesis: If the monthly salaries stated in the schedules include the allowances for animals, on subtracting the expenses on these obligations from the stated salaries, we should have the net salaries. But we find that calculations on this basis give us impossibly low net salaries for some ranks. For example, the holder of rank 20 in category I would have Rs. 21.50; category II, Rs. 11.50; and category III, Rs. 150 only. But the pay of even a vakaspa (trooper with one horse) was Rs. 12 per month, allowed on the most inferior horse (jandala). Further, if we go on calculating on the basis of Abdul Aziz's hypothesis, the net salary fixed by the Mughal administration for the rank of 10 would turn out to be higher than that for 20 and for the rank of 300 slightly higher than that for 350. Moreover, there would hardly have been any difference between the net salaries for the ranks (category I) of 3,500 and 3,000; 800 and 700; and 200 and 150.¹

One must therefore, accept what the Ain plainly implies, viz., that the allowances for the animals and carts were paid in addition to the personal (zāt) salaries, and were not assimilated to them.

¹. These calculations are made by simply deducting the figures for allowances of animals in Table I (below) from the sanctioned monthly salaries.
It is also not possible to assume with Abdul Aziz that the animals maintained by the nobles according to the pay schedule of mansabdārs were those of the Imperial stables, lent to them for maintenance and use. The Iqbalnāma giving the account of the 19th R.Y. explicitly refers to the mansab-dārs' own 'personal' elephants and horses (fil-o-esma-i khāṣa-i khud),¹ which were to be brought for muster and brand. According to Abul Fazl, somewhere before the 40th R.Y., the practice of the mansabdārs' bringing the elephants to the brand was discontinued,² a thing hardly possible if these were Imperial elephants.

It seems that the practice of assigning the Imperial elephants to the mansabdārs and obliging them to maintain these out of their own salary (khwurak-idawāb) was a later development, though its origin might be traced to Akbar's time. Abul Fazl does not say that the Imperial elephants were divided into halqas and were placed under nobles; but he explicitly adds that fodder (khwurash) for them was supplied by the state.³ For horses too there were similar arrangements; the fodder (āliq-o tazim) however was supplied by the Imperial Establishment.⁴

---

1. Iqbalnāma, II, p.288.
3. Ibid., p.135.
4. Ibid., p.141.
Thus, for determining the expenses against the 'zāt' rank one has to add the allowances sanctioned for the animals to the salaries recorded in the pay-schedule. The Ain's detailed break-down of costs and specification of animals and carts to be maintained makes it possible to calculate the amount paid for the animals and carts, which may then be added to the zāt salaries. The total payments so worked out are given in Table I. Figures in it are worked out only for 'effective' ranks, i.e. the ranks actually awarded, being those specified in the Ain's list of mansabdāra.

Table I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mansab</th>
<th>Monthly Salary (in rupees)</th>
<th>Allowances for animals &amp; carts (in rupees)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>20,849.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>16,992.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>14,643.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>30,000 29,000 28,000</td>
<td>10,703.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>26,000 25,800 25,700</td>
<td>9,416.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>22,000 21,800 21,600</td>
<td>8,422.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>18,600 18,400 18,300</td>
<td>7,702.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>17,000 16,800 16,700</td>
<td>6,568.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>14,000 13,800 13,700</td>
<td>5,254.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>12,000 11,900 11,800</td>
<td>4,219.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>9,000 8,900 8,800</td>
<td>3,431.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>7,700 7,400 7,100</td>
<td>2,838.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ac</td>
<td>Ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>4,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>3,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With this schedule at hand, once we can determine the number of mansabdars in each rank at a particular point of time, we may compute the total amount required to meet the entire pay-claim against the 'zat' ranks, as well as the
proportion that it bore to the expected net revenue-income or the "jara" of the Empire.

As mentioned above, two lists of Akbar's mansabdars are available. The first is given by Abul Fazl in his Ain-i Akbari.¹ This list, closed in the 40th year of Akbar, contains the names of all the mansabdars of 500 and above, whether dead or alive at the time the list was compiled. Abul Fazl also gives the names of mansabdars holding mansabs below 50 but not less than 200, confining this list professionally to those alive in the 40th R.Y. As for the mansabdars of below 200, he contented himself with providing the number of recipients in each rank in that year.²

According to Abul Fazl, the list was completed in the 40th regnal year (1595-6), but it seems to have been partially out of date even before this year. Though the Tabaqat-i Akbari, which closed in 1593, and which contains the second list, refers to Abul Fazl's list, it shows some significant changes.³ It adds 15 new names of those alive, while for 28 mansabdars it gives mansabs higher than those

¹ Ain, I, pp.222-31.
² Ibid., 223.
recorded in the Ain. Evidently, the Ain's list was originally compiled sometime before 1593, and though additions were undoubtedly made to it by Abūl Fazl himself, in order to include promotions or new appointments, these additions were not comprehensive enough. The Tabagāt does us further service by omitting to assign any mansab to those whom Abūl Fazl has awarded fictitious 'posthumous' mansabs. It also takes care to specifically mention the fact of their demise against such nobles as were no longer alive.

Supplementing and correcting the Ain's list with that of the Tabagāt, one can determine with a fair expectation of accuracy, the number of mansabdārs of each rank alive in 1995.

Though, as we have seen, the mansabs given in these two lists are formally the single mansabs, determining the personal salaries as well as the size of the contingent, these mansabs afterwards continued as the gāt ranks (see Section I) and can be used to compute the total payment on account of the personal monthly salaries and allowances for animals. Here the only difficulty since the size of the contingent maintained by each mansabdār is not known, it is not possible to work out the number of the mansabdārs in each of the three categories.

(based on the ratios of size of contingent to number of rank) in which each rank was subdivided. One cannot thus determine the exact amount of total pay against the rank. However, the category-wise variations in the pay schedule are marginal and a range can be worked out by assuming two extreme possibilities, viz., that all the nages belonged to the first category; and, that alternatively, all belonged to the third category.

Table II gives the total number of nages against each rank, together with the total pay plus allowances for animals and carts worked out for them.

**Table II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nages</th>
<th>No. of holders</th>
<th>Total zat Salary (in rupees)</th>
<th>Allowances for animals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60,000 (60,000) (60,000)</td>
<td>20,849.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50,000 (50,000) (50,000)</td>
<td>16,992.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45,000 (45,000) (45,000)</td>
<td>14,643.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>270,000 261,000 252,000</td>
<td>96,331.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26,000 25,800 25,700</td>
<td>9,416.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66,000 65,400 64,800</td>
<td>25,268.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37,200 36,800 36,600</td>
<td>15,404.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>63,000 62,200 61,800</td>
<td>26,273.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42,000 41,400 41,100</td>
<td>15,764.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>108,000 107,100 106,200</td>
<td>37,372.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>62,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>123,200</td>
<td>118,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>56,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>7,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>51,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77,500</td>
<td>71,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>28,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27,550</td>
<td>26,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44,800</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13,800</td>
<td>13,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>78,975</td>
<td>76,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>46,375</td>
<td>45,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>37,310</td>
<td>34,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>61,200</td>
<td>58,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>3,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>57,980</td>
<td>52,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6,825</td>
<td>6,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>33,750</td>
<td>31,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>22,400</td>
<td>18,480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $18,15,810 17,23,865 16,39,225 7,73,793.45$

Total (dim/ year): $87,15,88,800 82,74,55,200 78,68,28,000 37,14,20,856$

1,19,88,76,056
It appears that while the total number of the mansabs on the pay-schedule was 66, appointments were actually made to 33 only. Placing all the mansabdars in each of the three categories by turn, three different sums have been worked out for total salary and allowances for animals against the gat-ranks. The pay-schedule in the Ain records the salaries in terms of rupees per month. These I have converted into āmā per annum, at the Ain's own rate of 40 āmā to the rupee. We get a minimum of 78.68 crores āmā per annum if all the mansabdars belonged to category III, and a maximum of 87.16 crores, if all of them were in category I. Perhaps the total based on category II, viz., 82.75 crores is likely to have been closest to the actual salary bill for the 'āt' ranks. The total allowance for animals works out at 37.14 crores. This remains constant for all the three categories. Adding this to the expenditure on salaries we have a maximum of 124.30 crores and a minimum of 115.62 crores of āmā per annum.

Since the effective āmā of the Empire given in the Ain works out at 4,05,37,39,223 āmā for 1595-6, the expenditure on the 'āt' salary comes to between 28.56 and 30.65% of the expected net income of the Empire. It would be practically 29.56%, if one assumes that all the mansabdars belonged to Category II.
As we have seen in Section I, it became a practice from 1595 onwards to designate separately the number of cavalry men that the mansab-holder was to keep, it being never more than the number of his rank. This led to the creation of an additional, sawar, rank, the original rank coming to be designated as zat. The fixation of amounts paid for a the cavalry (sawars) maintained by the mansab-holders, remained a complex process, both before the emergence of a separate sawar-rank and afterwards. The fixation was 'initially carried out in two stages. At first, while a person was awarded a 'sawar'-rank (either at the first appointment or by way of promotion), he was paid in anticipation at a uniform rate per unit of 'sawar'-rank. This rate was known as barawardi. It was an ad hoc payment to be adjusted after the recipient presented his men and horses for inspection and dash (brand and descriptive roll). The final salary was fixed

1. Cf. Irfan Habib, 'Mansab-System', op. cit., p.227, where the significance of barawardi, as an estimated pre-dagh rate, was brought out for the first time.


3. Ibid., I, p.176. If a mansabdar found it difficult to muster horsemen, he was given some enrolled ('branded') troopers (peasah-nizir-raftaqan), as part of his contingent. But he was not paid the allowance for them. These troopers, designated dakhili, obtained their salaries directly from the Imperial treasury on verification by the mansabdars to whom they were assigned (p.191). However, the dakhili troopers were assigned only to mansabdars of 500 or above, and only up to a proportion of their rank. Thus the mansabdar of 5,000 could only have dakhilis for meeting the obligations of the rank of 500, and so on; the mansabdar of 500 could have them up to 100,
on the basis of the contingent of troopers (tābi'īnān) actually brought to the brand (dāgh).¹ The pay sanctioned upon branding was determined by such factors as the number of horses per trooper, the breeds of the horses and the race to which the mansabdār belonged.²

The Akbarnāma gives the ḥarāmūrdā rates as revised in the 40th R.Y. The new schedule allowed 1,000 dāms a month for a sīh-aspa ('with three horses'), 800 dāms for a dō-aspa ('with two horses'), 600 dāms a month for a yāk-aspa ('with one horse'). In the case of Rajput mansabdārs, the rates were lower, viz., 800 dāms a month for a sīh-aspa and 600 dāms a month for a dō-aspa.³

The need to fix the rates separately, for horsemen with three, two and one horse seems to have arisen, owing to


3. We come across another schedule in a MS of Iqtālīnāma-i Jahāngīri (Br. Mus. Or 1834), allegedly in force in 1605; the rates given are 1000, 800 and 400 tankas respectively (cf. I. Habib, Mansab System, op. cit., p.235). The tankas here seem to be a mistake for dāms, though in the case of yāk-aspa, the rate would be too low. Even for the maintenance of the tanka horse the sanctioned amount was 240 dāms a month (Aīn, I, p.177); the amount left for the trooper would be a mere 160 dāms per month, if the Iqtālīnāma rates were followed.
the requirements, separately fixed, of different numbers of each category of troopers in each contingent of ten horsemen (lit. the contingent maintained by a 'dehbasli'). At an earlier stage the formula for such composition was 2-chabar aspas (4-horse troopers), 3 sikh-aspas, 3 do-aspas, and 2 yak-aspas. But by the time the Ain was compiled, the standard requirement had been altered to 3 sikh-aspas, 4 do-aspas and 3 yak-aspas. On the basis of this formula, the average rate per unit of tabinm ('sawar' rank) works out at 800 dana or Rs.20 per month. This rate of Rs.20 a month obtains further confirmation from the earlier barawardi rates recorded in the Ain. This schedule which is professedly for barawardi, allows Rs.25 a month for (horsemen serving) Irans and Turans, Rs.20 for Indians and Rs.15 for revenue collectors of the Imperial Establishment ('namal pardak-i khelisa'). It, therefore, seems that in the schedule of 1595 the standard amounts have not been revised (since 1,000 dana = Rs.25; 800 dana = Rs.20; 600 dana = Rs.15). What was altered was the basis on which the rates were sanctioned. The rates were now fixed on the more reasonable ground of the number of horses per trooper. However,

1. Ain, I, p.188.

2. See W.H. Moreland, 'Rank (mansab) in the Mughal State Service', JRAS, op.cit.; Irfan Habib, 'Mansab-System', op. cit., pp.294-5; the interpretation offered of this passage by the latter seems rather forced.

3. Ain, I, p.175.
the revision did place the Rajput 

mangādārs in a less advan-
tageous position. For the Rajputs now the average rate per unit of 'sawār' rank works out at 660 ḍāma a month only.

The "Ain-i Akbari also gives the rates of pay of yak-aspas, varying according to horses of various breeds.¹

The amount allowed for the trooper in each case can be calculated by subtracting the cost of maintenance of the horses of the different breeds, given elsewhere in the "Ain.²

Table III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pay of yak-aspa</th>
<th>Sanctioned rate for horses</th>
<th>Balance theoretically left with the trooper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iraqi</td>
<td>Rs. 30</td>
<td>Rs. 17</td>
<td>Rs. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mujannes</td>
<td>,, 25</td>
<td>,, 14</td>
<td>,, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turki</td>
<td>,, 20</td>
<td>,, 12</td>
<td>,, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yahu</td>
<td>,, 18</td>
<td>,, 10</td>
<td>,, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td>,, 15</td>
<td>,, 8</td>
<td>,, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jangla</td>
<td>,, 12</td>
<td>,, 6</td>
<td>,, 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To judge from the documentary evidence of Shahjahan's

---

1. "Ain. I, p.188.
2. Ibid., I, pp.176-7.
time, the horses most commonly in use were Turki and Yabu. It would be a fair assumption to take Rs.8 per month as the amount normally allowed for the personal subsistence of the trooper. It then becomes evident that for calculating the barāvardi-rate, the Mughal administration allowed for the most inferior horse, that is, jangla (with its monthly maintenance cost at Rs.6). The rate for a standard contingent of 10 can then be worked out as follows:

3 *sib-aspas* : Rs.3 x (6x3+8) = 78
4 *do-aspas* : Rs.2 x (6x2+3) = 80
3 *vah-aspas* : Rs.3 x (6x1+8) = 42

Total 10 horsemen Rs. 200

A total of Rs.200 allowed for 10 horsemen gives us a monthly rate of Rs.20 or 800 *dīnas* per unit of cavalry or *sawār*-rank (*tābinān*); and this happens to be exactly the rate which we have derived from the *Akbarnāma*‘s barāvardi rates for the 40th year.

1. R.A. Alavi, 'New Light on Mughal Cavalry', *Medieval India: A Miscellany*, Vol. II, p.73. In a sample of 1775 troopers, with 1775 horses, the Turki horses numbered 981 (54%), Yabu 422 (24%) and Tazi 340 (18%). There were only 31 Jangla horses, amounting to less than 2%. No horses superior to Turki were recorded.
While the barāwurdī payment was sanctioned at the same rate as for the most inferior horse, enhanced payment on account of horses of superior breeds was made when such horses were actually brought to the brand (dāgh). The dāgh rate therefore might change for a mansabdār at each dāgh-i mukarrar (subsequent brand), even if his rank remained the same.

It, therefore, does not seem possible to calculate the actual Imperial expenditure on the cavalry of the mansabdārs. Nevertheless, one may place a lower and upper limit for such expenditure. The minimum expenditure can be worked out by assuming that the payment was made according to barāwurdī-rates against the entire 'sawār'-rank. The maximum dāghi payments can be estimated by proceeding on the assumption that all the horses brought to the brand (dāgh) were of a superior quality, say, Turki (whose sanctioned maintenance cost was $8.12/month). To take them all as Iraqi or Mujannas, the two most superior categories would, of course, be unreasonable.

The monthly dāghi rate per unit of 'sawār'-rank, if all the horses were Turki, may be worked out as follows

---

(calculating for the standard contingent of ten horsemen):

\[\begin{align*}
3 \text{ sinh-aspas} & : 3 \times (12 \times 3) + 8 = 132 \\
4 \text{ do-aspas} & : 4 \times (12 \times 2) + 8 = 128 \\
3 \text{ yak-aspas} & : 3 \times (12 \times 1) + 8 = 60 \\
\text{Total} & = 320
\end{align*}\]

This would give Rs.3,840 per annum for 10 horsemen
Rs.384 (i.e. 15,360 dāms) per annum for one unit of sawār-rank.

Now, with the barāwūrdi and dāghi rates at hand, as the floor and ceiling of expenditure per unit of 'sawār'-rank, we can go on to compute the minimum expenditure on mansabdārs' cavalry by treating the total 'sawār'-rank as barāwūrdi; and to compute the maximum by assuming, that the payment against the entire sawār-rank was made according to the dāghi rates for Turki horses.

As noted earlier, there is no list of Akbar's mansabdārs specifying sawār ranks. It is, therefore, not possible to determine the actual number of sawār-ranks, with a firm degree of precision. An attempt at rough estimation can, however, still be made.

The sawār-rank begins to be mentioned in the Akbarnāma from the 41st R.Y., though only occasionally. It is in the account of the closing years of Akbar's reign contained in the
In Iqbalnama that sawar-mansabs begin to be recorded almost regularly. By assembling the recorded pair of zât and sawar ranks for the last years of Akbar's reign, we can work out the average ratio between the number of zât and sawâr-ranks on the basis of a fairly large sample.

Taking into account only those mansabdârs (47 in number) for whom both the zât and sawar-ranks are recorded in the Iqbalnama from the 47th to 50th R.Y., the total of sawar numbers awarded amounts to 59.15% of the zât ranks. This ratio of sawar to zât rank is corroborated by the information available for the early years of Jahangir. During the 2nd and 3rd years of his reign the ratio of sawar to zât rank worked out from all the references to ranks given in the Tuzuk-i Jahângiri comes respectively to 100:64.42 and 100:57.95. It should then be reasonable to take 'sawar' rank as amounting to 60% of the zât-mansabs for the year 1595 as well.

Given this ratio, the total number of mansabs against which cavalry was required in 1595-6 should have

1. I have calculated from data willed from Tuzuk-i Jahângiri, ed. S. Ahmad, Aligarh, 1864, pp.41-73.
been 1,88,070, being 6/10 of the total of mansab (3,13,450) indicated by Abul Fazl's list and statistics corrected by information from Nizamuddin Ahmad. Now this included both cavalry which had been inspected and branded and paid for at dagh rates, and cavalry that was due to be maintained, but not yet brought to the brand, and paid for at barawardi rates. It may be assumed then that while the maximum size of cavalry that Akbar's mansabdars would have maintained was 1,88,070, in actual fact, it should have been much smaller. This fits pretty well with what we know of the size of the Mughal army in Shahjahan's time (1646-47). According to Lahori's estimate based explicitly upon an application of the Rule of One fourth to the total of mansabs held at that time, the total number of cavalry was 185,000. Since the Empire had expanded somewhat by this time, the proximity of the actual size of Mughal cavalry, to the maximum size under Akbar seems quite reasonable. This, then is a fairly good confirmation of our supposition that the ratio between the mansab and the equivalent of sawar-rank in 1595-6, was 10 : 6.

To apply the barawardi-rates for calculating the

---

pay-claim (talab), we should in addition know the total sawar
ranks of the Rajputs, since they were assigned lower barawardi-
rates. From the list of the Ain supplemented by the Tabaqat,
we can see that the total number of mansabs of the Rajputs on
the list was 29,650, while the total mansabs of all recipients
listed, was 2,41,250.¹ That is the share of the Rajputs in
the zat ranks held by holders of 200 and above was 12.29%.
Assuming that this was approximately the percentage in 'sawar'
ranks as well and giving the total sawar rank as 1,88,070
(60% of 3,13,450; the total of mansabs, based on the Ain's
figures), the total 'sawar-mansabs' of the Rajputs may be
estimated at 23,114.

Proceeding from these figures, the estimation of the
minimum and maximum expenditure on the cavalry of the mansab-
dars is a matter of simple arithmetic. Multiplying the total
sawar ranks for non-Rajputs, viz., 1,64,956 by the barawardi
rate of 9,600 dama per annum and the sawar-ranks of Rajputs,
viz., 23,114 by 7,920 dama, and adding the two products we
get the floor for the total pay sanctioned for the mansabdars'
cavalry, viz., 1,76,66,43,811 dama per year. This would be
42.76% of the total dama calculated from the Ain.

¹. It should be noted that Hindus other than Rajputs are
not included among the Rajputs by us.
The maximum limit can be obtained by multiplying the total estimated savar-rank (6,88,070) by the hypothetical daghí-rate of 15,360 dámā per unit of savar rank per year. This yields a total of 2,88,87,55,200 dámā or 69.93% of the total jame of the Empire.

Though the two figures set the minimum and maximum limits on expenditure against 'savār'-rank salaries, they are of little help in getting an estimate of the actual level that lay in between. This can be estimated only if we can determine the portion of the total savar-rank on which only barāwurdí payments had been made, whereby we might make separate calculations for the total barāwurdí and daghí payments. For this we have no direct evidence whatsoever. But it seems certain that the proportion of savar-rank on which daghí payments were made could not have been very high. The mansabdārs did not always maintain as many horses and men as were required under their 'savār' rank. A despatch by Abul Fazl from the Deccan suggests that even bringing one-half of the required number to the brand was not usual.¹ We can then hardly assume that daghí payments accounted for more than a

¹. Rustaqat-i Abul Fazl, litho., p.45. This collection of letters, however, contains some material that seems to have been interpolated later.
third of the 'sawār' ranks. Moreover, even when the full number was brought to the brand (dāgh), the additional payment on dāghi-rates was not always made. This is the burden of Bayazid Biyat's complaints. Finally, if six years elapsed after the last muster (renewal of the dāgh was due every three years), a deduction of 10% was made on sawār-rank payments, and this continued until the horses and men were presented for the dāgh and muster afresh. If a promotion was granted and three years passed after the last brand (dāgh), no payment (even on barāwūrdi rates) was made for the additional sawār-rank, pending the actual presentation of men and horses for the brand.

It should, therefore, be an acceptable assumption that the 'sawār' ranks against which dāghi rates were paid, did not exceed one-third of the mānpabe on which only barāwūrdi payments had been made. We may therefore, reasonably proceed on the hypothesis that 'sawār' ranks were divided in a 1:2 ratio, into those (a) against which only barāwūrdi and (a) against which dāghi payments had also been made. On this

3. Ibid., I, p.192.
basis, the total expenditure on the sawār-rank payments can be estimated at 2,14,06,43,040 dāms, that is, at 52.78% of the total effective jama' of the Empire in 1595-96.

We may now recall our estimate for the payments against the 'zāt' ranks, viz., 82,74,55,200 dāms. The total payments against the mansabs (both 'zāt' and 'sawār' ranks) would give our assumption of 1:1 ratio between barāwrdī and dāghi payments, can be estimated at 339.95 crores. One can, therefore, suggest that 82.34% of the effective jama' in 1595-96 was alienated in payments to the mansabdārs.

IV

We have just suggested that the total income of all the mansabdārs accounted for 81% of the total jama'. Putting it differently, we may say that 81% of the entire net revenue resources of the Empire was approximated by just 1,671 persons. This concentration of revenue resources becomes still more pronounced, when we analyse the pattern of distribution among the various ranks of the mansabdārs. The table below gives the total expenditure (against the zat and against the sawār ranks) on different ranks as percentages of the total expenditure on mansabs salaries. The mode of calculation of
the expenditure against the savar-ranks is the same as has been followed above in calculating the entire expenditure on the total mansabs (i.e. assuming a ratio between the barawuri and dāshi payments).

| Mansabs        | No. of mansabdāra | Salary as % of jama'
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From 10,000 to 5,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>, , , , 2,500</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>, , , , 500</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>52.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>, , , , 100</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>71.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>, , , , 10</td>
<td>1,671</td>
<td>82.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus within the various classes of mansabdāra there was again a very high degree of concentration. The top 12 controlled 18.52% of the total jama', and no less than 52.12% of the total net income of the Empire was required to meet the pay claims of 122 mansabdāra holding the rank of 500 and above: The remaining 1,549 mansabdāra controlled only 30% of the revenues.

These figures give us a measure of the immense concentration of revenue resources in the hands of a very small number of persons constituting the core of the ruling class under Akbar.
This concentration of wealth (and power) seems to have continued under Akbar’s successors. For Jahangir’s reign we do not have the necessary data; but from Shahjahan’s reign we have lists of mansabdārs at the end of the 10th and 20th R.Y. in Lahori,¹ and at the end of the 30th R.Y. in Waris.² These lists give the ranks of all the mansabdārs holding the zat mansab of 500 and above. The pay-schedules prevalent under Shahjahan have also survived.³ Lahori gives the estimated income of the Empire for the year 1646–47.⁴ On the basis of these data, Qaisar has worked out the distribution of revenue resources for the year 1646–47.⁵ According to his calculations, 445 mansabdārs holding the zat rank of 500 and above, claimed 61.5% of the total jama‘. We have seen that under Akbar the top 487 mansabdārs controlled 71.4% of the revenue, implying almost the same degree of concentration. However, the higher strata under Akbar seem to have taken a much larger share than under Shahjahan. The top 25 mansabdārs under Shahjahan controlled 24.3% of the jama‘; but under Akbar the pay-claim of the top 25 accounted for as much as 42% of the jama‘.

3. Selected Documents of Shahjahan’s Reign, pp.79-84.