Chapter XI

IMPERIAL HOUSEHOLD ESTABLISHMENT

One may expect that the Imperial household establishment should have accounted for a considerable portion of Imperial expenditure. The household encompassed in Abul Fazl's chapter 'Manzil-ābādī', consisted mainly of the harem, the kitchen and other departments such as store-houses of precious stones and gold ornaments etc., the wardrobe, library and many others. With the help of the data in the Aīn and some statistics offered by Pelsaert we may venture estimates of the annual expenses on these various items.

Harem:

In the Imperial household establishment, the harem not only constituted the largest department but also accounted for the heaviest expenditure. Abul Fazl says that the female-inmates of the imperial harem numbered over 5,000.¹ Cash stipends were paid to the ladies

¹ Aīn, I, p.40.
in the harem, under a special seal; no paper drafts (barat) were issued.¹ High-ranking ladies (mahin-bâno) received stipends ranging from Rs.27 to 1,610 per month. The other female inmates were placed in two grades: the monthly stipends of those in grade I ranged from Rs.20 to 51, and of those in grade II, from 2 to 40.²

Abûl Fa'îl does not give the number of those whom he styles 'high-ranking ladies' nor of those who were placed in either of the other two grades of other inmates. One may say that at least all the wives and near female relations of the Emperor should have belonged to the category of mahin-bâno. Monserrate gives the number of Akbar's wives as 300;³ but we do not know the number of other female relations (aunts, sisters, etc.) who too must have been counted among the ladies designated mahin-bâno in the Ain. However, to calculate the floor of expenditure, the number of high-ranking ladies may at a minimum be assumed to be 300. The range of their pay is too wide to

¹. Ain, I, p.41.
². Ibid., I, p.40. Blochmann's text and Add. 7652 give Rs. 2 to 40 but Add 6652 reads Rs.10 to 40; ten seems a possible error for 2 here. The division of female inmates of the harem (Mukhaddarat-i iqbal) was first put into effect in the 19th year. (Akbarnâma, III, p.105).
³. Monserrate, p.105.
give any workable average. We may, therefore, take Rs. 100 rather arbitrarily as the probable average pay per month per head. This assumed average is on the lower side, since it implies that most of the wives received less than Rs. 100 per month.

On this conservative basis the annual expenditure on cash stipends to the 3 high-ranking ladies can be set at (300 x 100 x 40 x 12 =) 1,44,00,000 đan.

With 300 thus accounted for, the other female-inmates should have numbered 4,700. The designation used for them parastaran-i huzur could cover anyone from a favoured concubine to an ordinary female servant or slave. We have no means of knowing for certain how many of these women were placed in Grade I and II. In Grade I we probably concubines and holders of offices in the harem. As such their number is not likely to have been less than 700, it being improbable that the ratio between them and the high-ranking ladies was much less than 1:2.5. The remaining 4,000 may then be taken to be female attendants and slaves, and to have formed Grade II.

1. Such female officials are mentioned in the Ḥūn, I, p. 40; some seem to have been designated urdu-began (p. 41).
Now, since the minimum monthly pay for Grade I is set at ₤.20 and maximum at ₤.51, an assumed average pay of ₤.30 may not be far from the truth. For Grade II, comprising the attendants and slaves, the average might well have been closer to the minimum (₤.2); and the assumption we may make, then, is that the female attendants received ₤.5 per month on an average — a salary about twice that of an unskilled workman, so that it may represent a reasonable average of salaries in the various scales in both grades ranging between the extremes of ₤.2 and ₤.51. On these assumptions, the annual expenditure in đême could be computed as follows:

Grade I : 700x30x40x12 = 1,00,80,000 đême
Grade II : 4,000x 5x40x12 = 96,00,000 đême

The total for Grade I & II = 1,96,80,000 đême

Adding this to the amount paid to the women of high ranks, the total expenditure on cash stipends in the harem should have amounted to 3,40,80,000 đême.

This amount does not include the pay or cost of maintenance of the eunuchs who served in the harem,¹ but

¹. ʾĂin, I, p.40.
whose actual number is unknown. Presumably their pay was higher than that of ordinary male slaves. To allow for this additional expenditure, and keeping in view the generally conservative assumptions we have made, we may put the annual amount spent on cash stipends and wages in the harem at the round figure of 3,50,00,000 dāms.

Food & Kitchen:

Abūl Fazl gives a fairly elaborate account of the imperial kitchen supplying us with about 30 recipes of dishes cooked for the imperial table.¹ Since he provides immediately afterwards a list of the average prices prevalent in the imperial camp,² it may be possible to make use of his data to estimate the imperial expenditure on food. But the first task, then, is to establish the total quantities cooked, or the number of persons fed from the imperial kitchen.

The Aīn says that all the female inmates of the harem were given rations (rāṭība),³ But it is not clear

---

2. Ibid., I, pp.60-6.
3. Ibid., I, p.53: "Whatever ration (rāṭība) is provided for the attendants of the bed-chamber (i.e. the harem), begins to be distributed from the morning and most often continues into night
t". 
whether they received cooked or uncooked food. From the large amount of fire-wood supplied to the Imperial household, viz., 1,50,000 *mans* (mod. equivalent 1,00,650 maunds)\(^1\) per year, one is tempted to conclude that food for all the over 5,000 inmates of the harem was prepared in the royal kitchen. This would then mean that the kitchen staff should have also been very large. Even given one cook or assistant to 10 persons fed, there should have been at least 500 persons employed in the kitchen to meet the needs of the 5000 inmates of the harem. But there is another possibility: Fire-wood too could have been rationed out to the harem inmates, along with the other ingredients of diet. In that case cooking might have been done at several kitchens within the harem, and female cooks might have been employed, who themselves are already included among the 5,000 female-inmates counted by Abul Fazl. This gets some support from the statements in the *Ain*, that when Akbar closed his periodic abstinence from meat, he did so by eating from meat dishes sent from his mother's establishment.\(^2\) The *Ain* also says that the cooking utensils in the imperial kitchen

---

received a tin-coating (qalī) every month, while those of the princes were tinned once in two months. Thus his mother and the princes, at the very least, had separate kitchens.

However, whether cooked in a single kitchen or at various places in the harem, food was supplied to at least 5,000 inmates per day. With the total quantity given by Abul Fazl, the fire wood consumption per head (counting 5000 persons fed) works out at 30 man per annum or 3.3 aer (2.070 kg.) a day. This seems rather high, particularly since the fire wood supplied to the Imperial kitchen must have been of superior quality. Even if we presume that some fire-wood was also used for heating in winter and for providing hot-water in the hammāma (baths) the amount daily consumed was high enough to suggest that the number of persons for whom food was cooked was considerably more than 5,000, and that our estimate of 5,000 is perhaps a conservative one.

If we can somehow determine the expenditure on diet per head, it may become possible to attempt a rough estimate of the amount spent on food materials. The ʿAin makes no direct statement in this respect and one can only

1. ʿAin, I, p. 55.
resort to some rather arbitrary calculations. Let us begin
by assuming that the consumption of food per head in terms
of weight was \(\frac{3}{4}\) Akbari ser \((0.99\) kg.) per day. This may
appear to be rather on the liberal side, but one is perhaps
entitled to assume a generous ration in the Imperial esta-
blishment.

With the help of the recipes given by Abūl Fazl, the value per ser (Akbarī) of various dishes (23 out of the total 30 for which complete details are provided) can be calculated on the basis of camp prices given in the \(\text{Āin}\). This will probably result in some overestimation, camp prices being retail prices\(^1\) while the supplies for the imperial establishment came from various places all over the country,\(^2\) and were therefore most probably equivalent to wholesale prices (after adding the cost of transport to primary costs).

The weights and prices of the various dishes described in the \(\text{Āin}\) are given in the following table. I have arranged these broadly in four groups, viz., rice preparations; wheat preparations; sweet dishes; and meat and vegetable preparations. As estimate of cost of cakes of bread (\(\text{chānpātī}\)) is added at the end.

\[\text{---}
\]

\(^1\) See Chapter XIV.

\(^2\) \(\text{Āin}\), I, p.53.
Recipe | Value in | Weight in | Value per mer
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dema</td>
<td>aer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice Preparations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oubuli</td>
<td>85.05</td>
<td>24.38</td>
<td>3.48 dema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinc Pulao</td>
<td>106.78</td>
<td>27.90</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wizobirven</td>
<td>99.39</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khushka</td>
<td>22.70</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khchefi</td>
<td>20.40</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snoba</td>
<td>85.56</td>
<td>17.48</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat Preparations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outeb</td>
<td>77.20</td>
<td>17.92</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harisa</td>
<td>74.62</td>
<td>17.56</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koschak</td>
<td>76.28</td>
<td>16.11</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halim</td>
<td>76.13</td>
<td>15.27</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet Dishes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zared biranj</td>
<td>103.92</td>
<td>20.40</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shic biranj</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halwa</td>
<td>86.75</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat &amp; Vegetable Dishes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des pivaza</td>
<td>75.95</td>
<td>14.58</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mafhoba</td>
<td>73.53</td>
<td>22.42</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarkh</td>
<td>66.70</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanch</td>
<td>73.70</td>
<td>11.75</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zabra</td>
<td>107.23</td>
<td>20.27</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinc shorba</td>
<td>75.86</td>
<td>15.92</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muthak gonland</td>
<td>76.11</td>
<td>13.05</td>
<td>5.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despukhat</td>
<td>92.36</td>
<td>15.65</td>
<td>5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caliva</td>
<td>77.82</td>
<td>13.26</td>
<td>5.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapati (bread)</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1 (15 in number)</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These costs do not include the cost of fire-wood consumed and the wages of the kitchen staff. Being costs of ingredients above, they would largely remain the same whether the entire food was cooked at the single imperial kitchen or cooked at different kitchens within the harem along with the main kitchen.

We may further assume a uniform composition for food for all inmates of the harem. There may be possible objection that the composition of food would not have been same for all of the harem inmates and the high ranking ladies might have enjoyed better food and served with a large variety of dishes, while the diet given to the attendants and slaves should be expected to be plainer. However, since we are using unweighted averages of all the possible recipes, the number of dishes would not affect our estimates markedly.

Assuming the following composition of the diet per head and multiplying these quantities with the average value per ser worked out by us for the four groups of dishes we get the following estimate for consumption per head per day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Value per ser</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wheat preparations</td>
<td>2 ser</td>
<td>1.15 qams</td>
<td>2.30 qams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rice</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meat &amp; veg.</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sweet dishes</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>chapati</strong> (bread)</td>
<td>1/2 (7½ in no.)</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.40 qams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The daily expenditure on food per head in the Imperial establishment thus works out at 4.40 dāms or more than double the total wage of an unskilled labourer.

Now to convert this into total expenditure per year on the female inmates only, one would need to multiply the estimated expenditure per head by the number of persons served and then by the number of days in a year,

\[ 4.4 \times 5000 \times 365 = 80,30,000 \text{ dāms} \]

We must remember too, that from the quantity of fire-wood consumed, the total number of persons fed by the imperial establishment would seem to have actually considerably exceeded 5,000. Furthermore, this amount does not include the expenditure on the royal table itself, which could not have been negligible.

According to Abul Fazl, 100 dishes were always kept in readiness, round the clock in the royal kitchen, since Akbar used to take food once a day without fixing any time for it.\(^1\) Monserrate tells us that 40 courses were served at each meal.\(^2\)

---

Out of the numerous dishes prepared by expert cooks recruited from within India as well as from Iran, Turkey, and other countries, Abul Fazl, describes recipes for 30 common dishes. In describing the recipes Abul Fazl seems to have taken 10 sera (6.2 kg.) as the standard minimum unit. In the absence of any better information, one may assume that at least all these 30 dishes were served at each meal and the total quantity of basic ingredients in all the dishes cooked was at the minimum 10 sera (6.2 kg.).

Proceeding on these assumptions, the cost of the food served at each meal at Akbar's 'table' works out at 1,645.22 damā (app. Rs.41). This certainly is an underestimation since instead of 40 dishes reported to be served at the royal table we can compute the costs only for 22 dishes. Moreover, the dishes served at the royal table could not, of course, have been only the ordinary ones described by Abul Fazl. Therefore, what we get here is a minimum. Since as noticed earlier, Akbar used to eat only once a day, the annual minimum expenditure works out at (1645.22×365=) 6,00,505 damā.

Even if we assume that the female cooks were counted among the 5,000 female-inmates of the harem, we have to allow for a staff of at least 100 cooks and other
related employees for the royal kitchen. The pay scale in
this department for a pīvāda varied from 100 to 400 dāma per
month. We should, therefore, allow, taking as the average
rate of 250 dāma per month, a sum of (250×100×12 =) 3,00,000
dāma per annum for the cooks and other servants. The supe-
rior officials should be excluded because they got their
pay on the rolls of the army (as ahadīs or mansabdāras).

In estimating the cost of fire-wood we can
perhaps use the prices given by Pelsaert. The latter says
that the price of fire-wood at Agra varied from 12 to 18 pice
per man of 60 lbs.\(^2\) i.e. 6.915 dāma per man of 55.321 lbs at
an average.\(^3\) Since the fire wood used in the Imperial kitchen
would have been of the higher quality, this average price
would be a little lower than the actual; on the other hand,
prices had increased between the time of the \(\text{Arin}\) and Pelsaert
(1620's). Supposing that one would have cancelled the other,
we can assume, therefore, that the total cost of fire-wood
was (6.915×1,50000 =) 10,37,250 dāma.

1. \(\text{Arin},\ I, p.60\)
2. \(\text{Jahangir's India}, p.48.\)
3. For \text{mewā Akbarī}, see Irfan Habib, \text{Agrarian System, p.368.}\
In this way the total Imperial expenditure on food per annum may be summarised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In female-inmates</td>
<td>80,30,000 dāms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In royal table</td>
<td>6,00,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In fire-wood</td>
<td>3,00,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In cooks' wages</td>
<td>10,37,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>99,67,755</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cost of utensils, polishing, etc., remains unknown. But such costs can perhaps be taken into account by rounding off the expenditure on the kitchen to 1,05,00,000 dāms.

Drinking-Water Supply:

The arrangements for drinking water were so elaborate that it required from Abūl Faṣl a separate chapter (Ain-i Akbār khāna) to describe them.¹ According to the information given in this chapter Akbar used to drink water brought from the river Ganga, irrespective of where he was, whether at the court or on march. Even the water used for cooking purposes contained some Ganga water. Special officials were appointed to arrange for the carriage of the water from the Ganga.

¹ Ain, I, pp.51-2.
Ice was used round the year; the cost of ice that was brought from "an average distance" is said to be 15 देमा per ser.¹ Water was also cooled by using saltpetre; and 2.5 sera of saltpetre was needed to cool only a ser of water, while the cost of saltpetre was 10 to 53 देमा per man.²

Since we have neither any estimates for the amount of ice consumed nor of the water cooled, it seems difficult to estimate expenses on this department. Nevertheless, we may at least fix some lower limit for the expenses. Even if we assume that only one man of ice was consumed in the Imperial household daily, the amount spent on ice alone would have amounted to (40×15×365 =) 2,19,000 देमा per year. Besides this the amount spent on cooling water, arranging the supply of water from the river Ganga, the wear and tear of the utensils and the salary of the employees in the department should add up to not an insignificant amount. One may, therefore, hazard the conjecture that at a minimum about 10,00,000 देमा would have been spent on the अब्दार खाना.

---

Fruits:

The prices of a variety of fruits are set out in detail in the *Āin*, but we have no figures for the quantities consumed. Moreover, at least a part of the fruit supply would have come from the imperial gardens and orchards. But orchards and gardens too would have required investment and recurring expenditure and so the fruits from them too would have represented a considerable amount of expenditure.

Abul Fazl treats betel-leaves among fruits. These too were procured not only from the market but were received in lieu of land-revenue. From the province of Allahabad some 12,00,000 leaves were collected in revenue. It is, therefore, difficult to attempt any computation of expenses on these items. In the absence of any estimate we may assume that the expenditure on fruits etc. was one-tenth of the expenditure on food, that is 10,50,000 *dāms* per year.

The total expenditure on the kitchen, *ābdār-khāna* and fruitery should therefore have added up to 1,25,50,000 *dāms* per year.

---

Hunting Animals & Pigeons:

In keeping with the time-honoured Mongol tradition, Akbar maintained a huge hunting department. According to Abul Fazl one thousand cheetahs or hunting leopards (yuz) were maintained in the Imperial parks.\(^1\) Out of these 50 were selected as \textit{khāsa},\(^2\) and were kept at the court. Two hundred servants were employed to look after these \textit{khāsa} animals.\(^3\)

Other leopards were allowed 2 or 3 attendants each; those who were carried on horses required two; others who were carried on oxen-drawn carriages required three. The servants were divided into two categories; the superior received 180 to 300 dāms per month, and the lower staff from 100 to 160 dāms. The meat allowed to a cheetah per day varied from 2.57 sars to 5 sars.\(^4\)

If we allow to the \textit{khāsa} leopards the maximum ration of meat and the highest wages to their attendants and further assume that the servants were evenly divided into two

---

1. \textit{Āin}, I, p.208; Firishta (I, p.272), however, records a tradition that it was Akbar's wish to have 1,000 leopards but whenever the number exceeded 900, some died and the number always remained below 1,000.


categories, viz., superior and lower, the amount spent on them works out as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Food} & : \frac{5}{40} \times 30 \times 50 \times 365 = 67,500 \\
\text{Servants} & : 100 \times 300 \times 12 + 100 \times 180 \times 12 = 5,520,000 \\
\text{Total} & : = 6,19,500 \text{ dāma}
\end{align*}
\]

Assuming that out of the remaining 950 cheetahs, half were provided with 2 servants each and the other half, 3 each, and further that to each cheetah one superior attendant was assigned, and allowing also the average wages to the servants and average ration of meat to the beasts, we may estimate the expenditure on the 950 animals as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Food} & : \frac{3,72}{40} \times 30 \times 365 \times 950 = 9,67,433 \text{ dāma} \\
\text{Servants} & : 950 \times 240 \times 12 + 2,375 \times 130 \times 12 = 64,41,000 , , \\
\text{Total} & : = 74,08,433 \text{ dāma}
\end{align*}
\]

The imperial expenditure on food and servants of both categories of cheetahs then should have been 80,27,933 dāma a year.

We have not considered the amount spent on carts ('arāba) and horses because the carts for cheetahs were perhaps counted among those 1,750 for which the expenditure has already
been estimated,¹ the horses might similarly have been accounted for among the 12,000 Imperial horses. Abûl Fazîl mentions expensive trapping for cheetahs, without mentioning their costs. The amount spent on these trappings would have been a part of total expenditure on trappings for Imperial animals. This amount is estimated separately in this chapter. However, we have to make some allowance for litters etc. The Imperial expenditure on cheetahs can thus be rounded off at 80,30,000 dāms a year.

Animals such as deer, dogs, panthers (giyāb-gosh) and hawks were also kept for hunting.² The Āin gives the number of deer at 12,000 out of which 101 were selected as khesa animals;³ but no data for their costs of maintenance are furnished. For the dogs, panthers and hawks the amount of food allowed and the wages of the servants (100 dāms a month for attendants of dogs and panthers⁴ are recorded. But the numbers of the animals are not specified. It is, therefore, not possible to compute the amount spent on them.

¹ See Chapter X.
² Āin, I, pp.208-12.
³ Ibid., I, pp.165, 167; Firishta, I, p.272, however gives the number of deer as 5,000.
⁴ Āin, I, pp.209-10.
Besides the hunting animals and hawks, a large number of pigeons too were reared and kept. Abul Fazl shows his inability to give the precise number of pigeons but he estimates them at over 20,000. Out of these 500 were kept as khāsa. These accompanied Imperial camp, being carried by bearers (kahār). All the servants attached to the pigeon house drew their salary on the roll of army. Their wages ranged from 80 dōms a month to as high as 1920 dōms.

Though the information provided in the Ain does not enable us to compute the expenditure on hunting animals other than cheetahs, it at least offers clues by giving the number of deer and pigeons and the wages of the animal attendants. These figures suggest that on these animals the expenditure could not have been less than 50,00,000 dōms a year. This estimate is arbitrary, but it could err only on the lower side.

In all, let us say, the expenditure on hunting animals, hawks and pigeons was around 1,30,00,000 dōms a year.

2. Ibid., I, p.218.
Other Departments:

There were a number of other departments such as wardrobe, library, encampment and stores of precious stones etc. on which the imperial administration must have incurred considerable expenditure. But though the Ain gives a fairly detailed description of these departments, the information it gives is inadequate for our purpose: Either it offers no statistics or the data offered by it are so scanty or incomplete that an attempt at quantification on their basis is not possible. We are, however, fortunate in possessing in Pelsaert (and, copying from him, de Laet)¹ a statement of the value of the different kinds of goods in the stores of the Imperial establishment at the time of Akbar's death (1605); and from this we can perhaps attempt an estimate of annual expenditure in these departments.

Pelsaert gives us to understand that his figures are drawn on the basis of information contained in the account books maintained by the Mughal administration. In his inventory of Akbar's possessions, Pelsaert records, along with the

stocks of specie, the value of cloth in the Imperial wardrobe (the Ā'in's tosha khāna), tents and articles of furniture in the Imperial stores (farrāsh-khāna), cannon, muskets, hand weapons and armour in the Imperial arsenal (qur khāna), books in the Imperial library, rich trappings for animals, etc. In addition to these he also furnishes us with the number of animals in the Imperial stables. Pelsaert's figures for horses and elephants etc. are largely corroborated by the Ā'in itself, as well as by the account left by Firishta. Moreover, the items for which the total values are given, are all accounted for in the Ā'in. For instance, Abul Fazl mentions the animal trappings and harnesses which were of gold and silver cloth studded with jewels, etc., used for the khāsa animals; their value is provided in Pelsaert's list. Similarly, all other items of goods listed in Pelsaert also appear in the Ā'in-i Akbari.

Abul Fażl says that all the cloth bought, woven to order and received in presents was preserved, and experienced men were appointed to enquire into the previous as well as the current prices of these. Thus there must have

1. Vide Chapter X.
2. Ā'in, I, pp.135-8, 142.
been a standing official valuation of all goods in the Imperial store houses; and Pelsaert's figures could very well have come from an official record of valuation, just as he says they do.

As printed in the translations of Pelsaert's chronicle and De Last's De Imperio Magni Mogolis, the figures contain some errors. Some misprints in Pelsaert can be corrected by referring to de Last. Other errors, common to both, can be corrected quite easily by reconciling the different items of value with subtotals and the grand total given by Pelsaert. It has been found that only three slight corrections are needed. The reconstructed figures as well as the originals printed in Pelsaert are given in the table below:

Table (next page)

These figures can provide us with the means of estimating the annual expenditure on various departments. We can, perhaps, best do so by venturing a few assumptions and then examine the results. It would, first of all, be a valid assumption that goods left by Akbar should have taken years to accumulate and the total value given by Pelsaert would comprise
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Accepted figures in Rs.</th>
<th>As printed in Felsaert's Chronicle</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A: Cash:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uhrsworth</td>
<td>97,580,000(\S)</td>
<td>97,580,000(\S)</td>
<td>commas misplaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rupees <strong>,</strong></td>
<td>100,000,000</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dams <strong>,</strong></td>
<td>766,666</td>
<td>766,666</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total of A</strong></td>
<td>198,346,666(\S)</td>
<td>19,834,666(\S)</td>
<td>last digit ('6') in the main number missing in transl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B: Precious Stones, etc., Wrought Silver, gold &amp; Porcelain etc.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precious stones</td>
<td>60,520,521</td>
<td>60,520,521</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver works</td>
<td>2,225,838</td>
<td>2,225,838</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold ornaments</td>
<td>19,006,745</td>
<td>19,006,745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold works</td>
<td>9,507,992</td>
<td>9,507,992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper works</td>
<td>51,225</td>
<td>51,225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>2,507,747</td>
<td>2,507,747</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total of B</strong></td>
<td>93,820,068</td>
<td>93,820,068</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C: Other items:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloth</td>
<td>15,509,979</td>
<td>015,509,979</td>
<td>First digit '0' to be omitted; de Last reads 503,252, the fig. for next item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woollen cloth</td>
<td>503,252</td>
<td>503,252</td>
<td>misplaced commas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tents etc.</td>
<td>9,925,545</td>
<td>99,25,545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>6,463,731</td>
<td>6,463,731</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artillery</td>
<td>8,575,971</td>
<td>8,575,971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons &amp; armour</td>
<td>7,555,525</td>
<td>7,555,525</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armour</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>50,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal harness</td>
<td>2,525,646</td>
<td>25,25 , 646</td>
<td>Last digit (5) missing; correct fig. in de Last.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total of C</strong></td>
<td>56,059,649</td>
<td>56,059,649</td>
<td>One superfluous '0'; correct fig. in de Last.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>348,226,383</td>
<td>348,226,383</td>
<td>Misplaced commas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the total of costs incurred annually upon their acquisition. Since the Empire constantly increased in extent, and the revenue-resources correspondingly increased, the scale of purchases should have become greater.

It will, thus be misleading to assume that a simple average worked out by dividing the values given by Pelsaert, by the number of years in the reign can represent the expenditure on acquisition, in the 40th R.Y.

We must, therefore, again make the same assumptions, as in the case of annual savings (Chapter VIII) that the costs incurred every year were in arithmetical progression and compute the expenditure in the 40th year accordingly. This can simply be done by dividing the value by 1225 and then multiplying the quotient by 40. This would, however, not include the amount spent to cover loss and wear and tear of the articles. At the same time, the value of presents received, appears here as a part of expenditure, while the costs of articles given as presents are not counted. It seems practically certain that the value of presents received exceeded those given away. This excess might be set off against the annual depreciation (through age, use and loss) of value of the stored articles.
We shall, however, bear another factor in mind while attempting to convert Pelsaert's values into annual expenditure. It appears from Abūl Fazl's account that the valuation of goods in the Imperial store houses was made on the basis of prices prevailing in the market. Only this can explain the appointment of experienced men to enquire into the previous and current prices. This implies that the 'value' does not represent the actual price at which the goods were bought or manufactured, in case it was a product from the Imperial kārkhanās, which most of the stored goods were. Another statement of Abūl Fazl establishes our point beyond dispute. He says that a carpet was woven at the cost of Rs. 1,802 (ba kharṣ raft); but it was valued at Rs. 2,715 (arj bar niḥād). In other words, the price was fixed at 50% above the cost. Such a high valuation is of course not a rule but an exception, since it was for this reason precisely that the particular product attracted Abūl Fazl's attention. But we may assure ourselves that generally speaking the values assigned to goods in the Imperial store houses were higher than the actual cost incurred on acquiring them. While we have no means of determining the scale of overestimation, we may, perhaps, fix it

2. Ibid., I, p.51.
at 25%. That is the actual amount spent on these goods was
20% less than their recorded value. We shall therefore scale-
down the values given by Pelsaert by 20% to get the actual
expenditure by the Imperial establishment.

Now, dividing the scaled-down value by 1225 and
then multiplying the result by 40 we may get a provisional
estimate of the approximate cost of acquisition in the 40th
regnal year (1595-96). The cost would, however, be in terms
of 1605 prices. Since we ourselves are concerned with the
year 1595-6, we have to assume that these were the same as in
1595. This assumption is not so vulnerable to objection as it
may look at first sight: The change in price-level was probably
not very great during the decade, 1596-1605; the rupee, in
terms of which Pelsaert has stated all the values, continued in
1605 to fetch 40 dams as it did in 1595.¹

It may be noted that the annual cost of acquisi-
tions worked out in this way would include the wages of workmen
and other employees as well as any other expenses on the
Imperial workshops (*kärkhanas*) where perhaps most of the arti-
cles stored in the Imperial store-houses were made. Thus no
separate calculation for expenses in workshops need be made.

¹. Irfan Habib, *Agrarian System*, p.381.
Based on our method of computation of cost for the year 1595-96, we may now offer some figures and comments on the annual Imperial expenditure on different heads.

Wardrobe:

According to Pelsaert the value of the cloth in the Imperial stores was Rs. 1,60,13,231 (woollen articles valued at Rs. 5,03,252 and other kinds at Rs. 1,55,09,279). Reducing the amount by 20% to get the cost price and after converting it into dāms, and proceeding by the method of calculation already described, we estimate the expenditure on cloth for 1595-96 at 1,67,32,193 dāms.

Even from the account given in the Āīn, one would expect a large amount of expenditure on the wardrobe (tosha khāna). In each season (faṣl) one thousand suits were made for the Emperor, from different types of cloth. Out of these 120 were kept in readiness all the time. Such a large number of dresses were perhaps needed because of the practice of conferring robes of honour (khilāt) on favoured persons. That the robes were given out of the khāsa dresses is evident from Abul Fazl statement that Akbar's clothes were found to fit every body whether tall or short.  

1. Āīn, I, pp.102-3.
2. Ibid., I, p.103.
There is little more specific information, in Abul Fazl's description to build up any kind of estimate of annual costs in this department. He says that in Lahore alone there were 1000 kārkḥānas making shawls. But since these probably includes kārkḥānas of nobles and even merchants, the figure cannot serve as the basis for an estimate of the Imperial expenditure on shawls. Abul Fazl does provide us with the prices for a variety of golden (zarrīn), silken (abreshmī) and cotton (resmānī) cloth. He mentions woollen cloth too as manufactured at the Imperial kārkḥānas but does not give the prices of woollen cloths. The costs of tailoring of some dresses too are given; but since the number of such dresses made is not recorded, one cannot estimate the expenses on the tosha-khāna. One may, however, suppose that the actual expenditure was even higher than that arrived at from the value given by Pelsaert, since perhaps the amount spent on the robes granted away exceeded the value of those received in offerings or presents.

Utensils & Other Articles:

Pelsaert gives the value of gold pots, dishes, cutlery, figurines, silver utensils as well as chandeliers,

1. Āīn, I, p.104.
2. Ibid., I, pp.105-11.
3. Ibid., I, p.104.
bedsteads, etc., copper ware and procelain crockery as
\$1,42,92,902; this should be scaled-down by 20% to give us
approximate cost-prises. Following the method of calculation
explained above, we get from this the figure of 1,49,34,520
dāma for expenses during the year 1595-96. We assumed that
the value of gifts received may be off-set by the loss by wear
and tear which ought to have been high in the case of procelain.

Animal Harnesses:

Abūl Fazl mentions rich trappings and pieces of
harnesses that were used to decorate the khāsa animals (ele-
phants, horses, camels, etc.) for ceremonial occasions and
these were in addition to the usual harness which was changed
periodically.¹ From Pelsart's statistics the amount spent in
1595-96 on the pieces of expensive harness can be calculated
at 26,39,043 dāma.

Books & Paintings:

Akbar had a remarkably rich library. Pelsart
says that there were 24,000 books, originals (authors' 'auto-
graphs'? as well as copies, the estimated value being \$6,46,373

¹. *Ain*, I, pp.135-8, 142.
The high cost (more than Rs. 250 per volume) seems justified because it is not only the high quality of hand-made paper and splendid calligraphy that made the books precious, but these were often illustrated profusely by miniatures painted by Akbar's painters. This can be seen from such MSS as have survived. One book the Qissä-i Hakim contained no less than 1,400 illustrations. The costs might well have included payments made to calligraphists, as well as to painters and even perhaps the translators of Sanskrit texts which Akbar patronised. A number of calligraphists and painters were on the Imperial rolls.

Proceeding with our assumptions namely reducing the value by 20% to obtain the total of actual costs, and then calculating on the basis of an expenditure increasing in arithmetical progression we can estimate the expenses on the library in 1595-96 at 67,53,940 dāms. This estimate may still be on the lower side since it does not probably include the amount spent on the library staff (the salary of the pīvādas appointed in the department varied 600 dāms to 1,200 dāms per

2. Ibid., I, pp.115-6; Badāūnī, II, pp.336, 366.
3. Ibid., I, p.118.
month and the payment made to the readers who read books aloud to the Emperor. It is interesting to note that the books were not only given out in presents but were even given in arma (payment in kind to army). On the other hand, books were also acquired as war-booty, as well as in offerings and presents and possibly in property acquired in escheat.

Tents & Furniture for Encampment:

According to Felsaert the value of the tents and other articles used in camps, as entered in the account books was 3,99,25,545. This in turn gives us expenditure of 1,03,71,182 dāms in 1595-6. Abdul Fazl’s detailed description of the layout and organisation of the camp in his chapter the Ain-i Farrāsh khan, accords with the high value assigned in Felsaert’s record to tents and furniture. The Ain says that one tent designated the bargah cost 3,1000; and there were 11 other kinds of tents some double storeyed as well as folding. The sayabans (hanging shades) of the tents were made of brocade and velvet, and embroidered with gold.

1. Ain, I, p.118.
2. Ibid., I, p.112.
5. Ibid., I, p.49.
Precious Stones and Ornaments:

Pelsaert gives the value of precious stones in the royal treasury at the death of Akbar, as Rs.6,05,20,521; of gold ornaments the value reported by him is Rs.1,90,06,745. These are very high values; yet the fact that they are not round, but exact, suggests their being totals of actual or detailed valuations of individual pieces. The estimation of the values of precious stones was a difficult task and necessarily involved much arbitrariness. But that the total value offered by Pelsaert is not excessive is supported by Abul Faţl’s statements in respect of individual stones and gems. He mentions rubies worth Rs.52,000 each and strings of pearls in which each pearl was valued at 30 muhra (Rs.270).

In trying to estimate the annual expenditure based on the total value of precious stones and ornaments in 1605, one has to keep in view the fact that quite a few of them were seized as booty, from the treasures of defeated chiefs and rulers. Since precious stones and gold ornaments

1. Tavernier’s Travels in India, tr. Ball and Crooke, New Delhi, 1977, vol. I, pp.112-13, vol. II, pp.72-5, where it is related that only the deposed Emperor Shâhjahan was able to estimate the value of a particular diamond correctly.

2. Ain, I, pp.11-12, compare Tavernier’s prices for a ruby (Rs.95,000) and a ‘large Topaz’ (Rs.181,000) in the Mughal treasury (Vol. II, pp.100, 102).

do not wear off, items reposing in the Mughal treasure in 1605, might have been in possession of the Mughal Imperial house for more than a generation; and there must have been a recognisable portion inherited from Humayun. It will therefore, perhaps be reasonable to assume that about one third of the total jewels in the Imperial treasure, at the close of Akbar's reign, might have been those acquired as a result of acquisitions of those in possession of defeated powers, or were inherited by Akbar. We have also to make an allowance for presents (or at rather the balance of presents, the value of presents received less that of gifts awarded), which should have been considerable, since precious stones were the most acceptable items of gifts (nazr/paishkash) made to the Emperor by the high nobles.¹ There were, in addition, the jewels, etc., acquired through escheat. We may, therefore, allow that at least 20% of the gems and ornaments in Akbar's vaults in 1605 had been acquired through gifts and confiscations. A further scaling down by 20% has to be made to allow for the excess of stated value above costs. Having a net estimated total of cost values of precious stones and jewels factually purchased by Akbar (1,35,72,65,357 dams), we can now apply the simple formula for calculating the variable annual expenditure. From

this formula one can set the total expenditure on precious stones and ornaments, in the 40th regnal year (1595-96) at 4,43,18,868 dāms.

It seems rather strange that the sum spent on acquiring gems and ornaments exceeded the expenditure on the arsenal or, for that matter, on the entire harem. But this was in keeping with the intense interest of the Mughal Emperors in collecting all kinds of jewels and ornaments; and such heavy expenditure on jewellery must be regarded as an economic fact of importance in its own right.

Building Construction:

According to Abūl Fazl large sums were spent on the construction of forts, sarāis, schools, religious houses (riyāżat kade), tanks, wells, etc. He records in great detail the wage-rates for those employed in the building department, the prices of building material and the estimates of costs of construction. Nevertheless, all these data offer no clue to the total expenditure on the building department.

We come across only some sporadic information about costs of

1. Āīn, I, p.167. The construction of sarāis is also mentioned in the Akbarnāma, II, pp.252-3.
construction of individual buildings. For example, according to an inscription on the Nagarnagar fort in Srinagar, 1,10,00,000 dāms were granted from the Imperial treasury for the construction of the fort, its building being completed in the 44th regnal year. Pelseraert says that it took Jahāngīr five years and 12,00,000 to complete the construction of the Allahabad fort, built by his father (i.e. 96,00,000 dāms per annum on an average).

Keeping these figures in view, one may estimate the average annual expenditure on the buildings at about one and a half crore dāms. For arriving at this figure we have, looking at the enormous building activity which occurred under Akbar, assumed that the construction of at least one large-scale fort of the kind as at Allahabad was in progress all the time; and the construction of buildings, renovations and maintenance, needed about half as much expenditure again.

1. Inscription on the gate way of the Nagarnagar fort (Personal inspection). The text of the inscription as read by Pir Ghulam Husain Khuyhami in his Tarikh-i Hasan, Jammu & Kashmir Government Publication, Srinagar, vol. I, p.387, read "one crore, nine lakhs". I assume the amount is in dāms, not tankas. Rupees would, of course, be out of question.

2. Pelseraert, A Dutch Chronicle, p.21, Finch (1608-11), however, says, "It hath been for forty years building, and is not yet finished; neither is like to bee in a long time". He adds that Akbar employed 20,000 persons for many years; 5000 were still at work there when he visited the place (Early Travels, p.177).

3. Aīn, I, p.170, gives the costs of cleaning of wells in winter as well as summer.
Cash-Grants and Alms:

The Emperor granted cash allowances paid out periodically (daily, monthly, yearly) to various beneficiaries from the Imperial Treasury. These were called ważā' (plural of ważīfā) and considered part of the suyūrghāl.¹ Now, the suyūrghāl consisted, in bulk, of the land grants called madad-i naḥāsh.² We have argued in Chapter VI that the figures in ḍāms that Abūl Fazl gives under the heading suyūrghāl in his Account of the Twelve Sūbas consists of the estimated revenue alienated through land-grants plus the total amount given in cash allowances. Abūl Fazl adds the total to the ḍāms to produce an enlarged ḍāms, styled naqādī; we have, therefore, deducted the suyūrghāl figures to restore the actual ḍāms. This, however, does not mean that the amount paid in cash allowances can be excluded from our estimates of expenditure out of the Imperial Treasury. These amounts had still to be paid by the Imperial Treasury itself replenished from the income accruing from sources covered by the actual ḍāms.

1. Aḥn, I, p.197.
2. Ibid.
Unluckily, there is no means of judging from the Ain the total amount that was claimed from the treasury in the form of such cash allowances. The land grants must undoubtedly have always formed an overwhelmingly large portion of the total suvürghal. I, therefore, take it that the amount of cash-allowances was probably 10% of the total suvürghal. Calculating on the basis of the entire suvürghal (excluding that of Berar) this would imply an expenditure of 1,00,79,647 dēms in cash allowances in 1595-96.

To this should be added an amount of, say, 25 lakhs to cover ad hoc cash-donations, alms and amounts spent at the time of the weighing ceremony (tuladān/wazn-i munaddas). If such alms needed a separate treasury, of which Abul Fazl speaks, the amount must have been considerable. Say at least about 25,00,000 dēms. To avoid any false impression of precision we may, therefore, round off the total amount spent on cash-grants (wazāfī) and alms of the latter kind at 1,25,00,000 dēms.

1. The only hint of a ratio between the total suvürghal and cash-grants seems to come from the Mīrāt-i Ahmādī (vol. I, p.26), which says that in Gujarat, 1,20,00,000 dēms; 50,000 bighas of ārazi; and 103 villages; and Rs.1,40,000 in cash from the treasury — were assigned in madad-i ma'ash and ināba. The actual ratio cannot be worked out since the amount of revenue alienated through 50,000 bighas of ārazi and 103 villages is not known. It is also possible that the total amount given in cash allowances might have increased under Aurangzeb as a result of the jizya, or poll tax on non-Muslims, whose yield was largely reserved for this purpose.

Miscellaneous:

There were two other departments belonging to the household establishments, viz., illumination (chirāgh afrozi) and the drum-house (naqqār khānā). The drums were used not only during military marches but also as a time-announcing device. Though the Ain describes these departments, it is not possible to work out the annual expenditure on the basis of the data provided for them.

There were other items too on which expenditure must have been incurred, such as perfumes and incense, and occasionally on building of boats. We have assumed that the annual expenses incurred on such miscellaneous items amounted to about 25,00,000 dāms.

We may now attempt to compute the entire expenditure on the Imperial household establishments, by summing-up the various estimates which we have worked out above:

1. Ain, I, p.46.
2. Ibid., I, pp.43-7.
3. Ibid., I, p.
4. Akbarnamā, III, p.716. In the 41st R.Y. R.16,338 were spent on building a boat, tonnage more than 15,000 mams.
Harem: 3,50,00,000
Kitchen, Abdār khāna etc.: 1,25,00,000
Wardrobe: 1,67,32,193
Material for encampment: 1,03,71,182
Utensils: 1,49,34,520
Trappings of animals: 26,39,043
Books and paintings: 67,53,940
Ornaments & gems: 4,43,18,668
Hunting animals: 1,30,00,000
Building construction: 1,50,00,000
Cash-allowances & alms: 1,25,00,000
Miscellaneous: 25,00,000
Total: 18,62,49,746

Putting it differently 4.592\% of the total jama' was spent on maintaining the Imperial Household Establishment as defined by us.

Our conception of the Imperial Household is, however, at variance with that of Abūl Fazl who has included animals and arsenal within it, while he has placed the hunting animals and cash-grants and alms under the 'Army'. According to Abūl Fazl the total expenditure on the household (buyūtāt) in the 39th R.Y. amounted to 30,91,86,795 dāms.\(^1\) Taking all

---

those items of expenditure that Abūl Faţl counts under the household, or ṣubḥat, our estimates total to 37,66,86,570 dāma¹ for the 40th R.Y. This is appreciably in excess of the amount given by Abūl Faţl, the difference amounting to 6,74,99,775 dāma. The difference could, however, partly be explained by the fact that, as Abūl Faţl says expressly, he does not count under the expenditure on the ṣubḥat, the pay of "most of the officials of the ṣubḥat", who were put on the rolls of the 'Army'.² The pay of such officials as held mansabs or were ḍhadīs is also included by us under the mansabdāre and the army establishment. But the large number of clerks, artisans and labourers, who were, as Abūl Faţl, explicitly says elsewhere, were on the rolls of the Army,³ appear under the Household establishment in our estimates.

We may recall that our estimate for the pay of foot-retainers on the rolls of the Army amounts to 6 crores of dāma. It is not unlikely that 'civil' or non-military lower staff (formally on 'Army' rolls) of the Imperial Establishment received an equal amount in wages and salaries, and this is

---

¹ It comprises the expenses incurred on animals (viz., 19,38,58,567 dāma; arsenal (2,20,80,257 dāma); and the entire expenditure on the household calculated by us less the costs on hunting animals (1,90,00,000 dāma) and expenditure on cash-grants and alms (1,25,00,000 dāma).

² A’in, I, p.9.

³ Ibid., p.190.
spread about concealed in our estimates for the expenses on various departments of the buvūtāt. If this was so, the difference between our estimate of expenditure and Abūl Fazl's figure for the expenses of the buvūtāt would be reduced to marginal proportions (a matter of 74,99,775 dāms). If our estimates had not been necessarily so often in the round and aspiring only to rough approximation, one could even have pleaded that such a difference could well occur between expenses of one year (the 39th, to which Abūl Fazl's figure for the buvūtāt expenditure refers) and those of the next (the 40th, our own standard year).

Final Statement of Imperial Expenditure:

Our estimates of expenditure on the three heads, viz., the salary bill of the nobles; Imperial military establishment; and the Imperial household, may now be summarized and the entire expenditure set against the total effective jāma' of the Empire to see what portion of the revenue-income has been accounted for. The figures (in dāms) as established or estimated by us for 1595-96 are set out below:
A. Effective jama' in 1595-96: 4,05,57,39,222 dama

B. Expenditure

1. Salary bill of the Mansabdars:

- gât salaries: 82,74,55,200
- sawâr payment: 2,14,06,43,040
- allowances for animals under the gât establishment: 37,14,20,856
- Total (1): 3,33,95,19,096

2. Imperial Military Establishment:

- ahâlî: 8,10,79,200
- piyadâgân: 6,00,00,000
- animals: 19,36,56,567
- arsenal and armour: 2,20,80,257
- Total (2): 35,70,16,024

3. Imperial Household:

- harem: 3,50,00,000
- kitchen and abdârkhânâ etc.: 1,25,00,000
- wardrobe: 1,67,00,000
- material for encampment: 1,03,71,182
- utensils: 1,49,34,520
- trappings of animals: 26,39,043
- books and paintings: 67,53,940
- ornaments and gems: 4,45,16,868
- building construction: 1,50,00,000
- hunting animals: 1,30,00,000
- cash-allowances and alms: 1,25,00,000
- miscellaneous: 25,00,000
- Total (3): 18,62,49,746

- Total of (1), (2) & (3): 3,88,27,84,866


- Total of (B): 4,05,57,39,222
We find that the costs incurred on the salary bill of the mansabdārs accounted for a very large part of the total effective jama', viz., 82.34%, while the amount that went to maintain the Imperial household was a mere 4.59% of the total income. The entire Imperial expenditure, comprising the costs incurred on the Imperial Military establishment as well as household establishment, comes to 54,32,65,770 ḍāns, or 13.39% of the jama'. We may recall that our minimum limit for the size of the khālisā, out of which the Imperial expenditure was met, was 22% of the total effective jama', that is 89,22,62,629 ḍāns. ¹

Our estimate of the Imperial expenditure are therefore, well within the income of the khālisā. Out of the remaining part of the income of the khālisā the salaries of the mansabdārs, who were naqdīs, must have been paid.

The expenses on all the three heads combined accounted for 3,83,77,96,470 ḍāns while the effective jama' of the Empire in 1595-96 was 4,05,57,39,222 ḍāns. In other words, after meeting all the salary claims and expenses as estimated by us, Akbar's administration should have been left with 17,29,54,356 ḍāns, to be transferred to the Imperial

¹. See Chapter VIII.
hoard or cash reserves.

We may now remind ourselves that the range for the amount so transferred in 1595-96, has been estimated by us on the basis of the total amount held in cash and bullion, in 1605, as 15,50,26,822 to 18,85,28,830 dams.¹ We now find that the savings for 1595-96 (17,29,54,356 dams), resulting from our item-wise estimates of expenditure are well within this range.

Here, then, one estimate made by us is corroborated by a series of other estimates, so that both are to some degree reinforced. A third source of corroboration, for at least the size of savings, comes from Shāhjahān’s court historian, Qazwīnī, whose history closed in 1638. He says that the Khāliṣa had been much reduced under Jahangir, but that Shahjahan (acc. 1628) enlarged it considerably so as to yield a cash income of 60,00,00,000 dams; at the same time he restricted the annual expenditure from the Imperial treasury to 8,1,00,00,000 or, in years when military campaigns were undertaken, to 8,1,20,00,000. This gives us a range of annual expenditure of 40,00,00,000 to 48,00,00,000 dams, and, therefore, that of savings of 12,00,00,000 to 20,00,00,000 dams a

¹. See Chapter VIII.
year. It will be seen that the scale of annual saving which Shâhjahân was apparently able to achieve roughly corresponds to the level of savings we have estimated for 1595-96.

Our several leads, therefore, tie up. This does not, of course, mean that all our detailed estimates are of uniform reliability; but it, perhaps, does entitle us to say that, subject to adjustments of the more conjectural figures, the broad pattern of Imperial expenditure we have established from the large amount of direct and indirect data in the Āin and other sources, may be accepted; and the implications this has for the structure of the Mughal-Indian economy may now be studied.

1. Qazwînî, Pâdshâhname MS, Add 20734, pp.444-5, Or 173, f.221a-b.