

Mughal Harem: From Colonial Fantasy to Feminist Revision

Mrs. Hardeep Kaur¹, Dr. Himani Kala²

¹Research Scholar, RIMT University

²Assistant Professor, Department of History, RIMT University

Abstract:

The paper studies the historiography of the Mughal harem, an essential scholarly field, for understanding women, authority, and the functioning of the Mughal Empire. The historiography of the Mughal harem has shifted from colonial depictions of women as both isolated and powerless to modern interpretations that highlight their agency and political influence. Early European accounts frequently romanticized the harem and portrayed it mostly as a private place. Later historians, relying on Persian chronicles, memoirs, architecture, and material sources, demonstrated it to be a sophisticated organization encompassing administration, diplomacy, patronage, and imperial politics. Royal women of the harem like Nur Jahan and Jahanara Begum indicate how important women were in imperial governance and society. This paper investigates these shifting perceptions and suggests that the Mughal harem was not just a place of seclusion, but also a key source of power and influence. By integrating Persian chronicles, administrative texts, architectural evidence, travel narratives, and modern historiography, this paper argues that the Mughal harem should be understood as a dynamic institution situated at the intersection of gender, politics, kinship, economy, and culture. Reframing the *zenana* in this manner not only enriches our understanding of Mughal governance but also contributes to wider debates concerning royal households, women's authority, and state formation in the early modern world.

Keywords: Historiography; Mughal harem; European accounts; Persian chronicles; Royal women; Shifting perceptions.

Research objectives:

1. To investigate how the Mughal harem was portrayed by colonial and Orientalist writers as a place of luxury, isolation, and sensuality.
2. To examine how European travelers' accounts shaped the perception of the Mughal harem.
3. To assess colonial depictions in light of new historical research and contemporary Mughal sources.
4. To investigate the agency of Mughal women and the feminist reconstruction of the Mughal harem.

Research questions:

1. How was the Mughal harem portrayed by colonial and European writers?

2. How is the colonial interpretation of the harem challenged or modified by modern Mughal sources?
3. How have parallel developments within international scholarship influenced the study of the Mughal harem?
4. In what ways has feminist historiography changed our perception of Mughal women and the harem?

Introduction

The Mughal harem occupies a distinctive yet frequently misunderstood place in the history of early modern South Asia. Few institutions of the Mughal Empire have attracted as much fascination while simultaneously being subjected to persistent misrepresentation. For generations, popular imagination and colonial scholarship portrayed the harem as an enclosed world devoted to sensual pleasure, luxury, and the strict seclusion of women. Such representations, shaped largely by European travel narratives and nineteenth-century Orientalist writing, reduced a complex imperial institution to an exotic symbol of Eastern despotism. The emphasis on secrecy and eroticism obscured the diverse political, administrative, economic, and cultural functions that the Mughal *zenana* performed within the imperial state. Recent historical scholarship has challenged these inherited assumptions by demonstrating that the harem was not a marginal domestic enclosure but an integral component of Mughal governance, dynastic continuity, and courtly culture. Rather than existing outside politics, it was deeply embedded within the structures through which imperial authority was created, negotiated, and sustained.¹

The word *harem* derives from the Arabic *haram*, signifying a protected or inviolable space. In the Mughal context, however, the institution was generally described through Persian terms such as *zenana* or *andarūn*, each conveying the idea of an inner household reserved primarily for imperial women and their attendants. These terms should not be understood merely as architectural descriptions. They referred to a carefully organised institution that combined domestic life with administrative authority, ceremonial practice, education, patronage, and political influence. The Mughal *zenana* accommodated queens, princesses, mothers of emperors, female relatives, attendants, tutors, physicians, artisans, servants, and eunuchs, forming one of the largest and most sophisticated households in the early modern Islamic world. Its organisation reflected both Timurid traditions inherited from Central Asia and the evolving political realities of the Indian subcontinent.²

The historiography of the Mughal harem has undergone a profound transformation over the past two centuries. Early European observers and colonial historians represented the harem as an institution defined by sensuality, despotism, and female seclusion. Their interpretations shaped popular perceptions of Mughal India well into the twentieth century and influenced broader colonial narratives concerning the alleged moral and political decline of "Oriental" societies. Recent scholarship, however, has challenged these assumptions by returning to Persian chronicles, imperial memoirs, architectural evidence, and administrative records. Historians increasingly recognize that the Mughal *zenana* functioned not merely as a domestic enclosure

but as an institution intimately connected with sovereignty, dynastic politics, economic patronage, and imperial governance. The evolution of this historiography reflects broader changes in historical methodology, particularly the emergence of gender history, feminist scholarship, and renewed engagement with Persianate political culture.³

Earlier scholarship frequently interpreted female seclusion as evidence of political exclusion. Such conclusions rested largely upon European accounts written by observers who possessed only limited access to the imperial household. Travelers such as François Bernier, Jean-Baptiste Tavernier, and Niccolao Manucci described the Mughal court through the intellectual framework of seventeenth-century Europe, where notions of absolutism and Oriental despotism shaped interpretations of Asian monarchies. Their narratives undoubtedly preserve valuable observations, yet they often blurred first-hand experience with hearsay, speculation, and literary convention. Consequently, the harem emerged in European writing as an inaccessible and mysterious space whose political significance remained largely invisible. Later colonial historians frequently reproduced these impressions, reinforcing a binary opposition between the supposedly rational public sphere of Europe and the concealed domestic world of the Islamic East. Over the past three decades, historians have subjected these assumptions to sustained critical scrutiny. Among the most influential contributions is the work of Ruby Lal, who argues that the Mughal harem must be understood as an institution of sovereignty rather than merely a domestic enclosure. By examining Persian chronicles alongside court records and biographical narratives, historian Ruby Lal demonstrates that imperial women participated actively in succession politics, diplomacy, charitable patronage, commercial enterprise, and the production of dynastic legitimacy. Her interpretation shifts attention away from the question of physical seclusion towards the broader political functions of the imperial household.⁴

This revisionist perspective has been complemented by the work of Harbans Mukhia, whose studies of Mughal society challenge simplistic assumptions about power, gender, and social hierarchy in medieval India. Mukhia emphasises that institutions should be interpreted within their own historical contexts rather than through categories imposed by colonial discourse. Likewise, Satish Chandra highlights the integration of the imperial household into the wider administrative framework of the Mughal state, while Muzaffar Alam has shown how courtly culture and political authority were constructed through complex networks of kinship, service, and intellectual exchange. Economic historians such as Irfan Habib and Shireen Moosvi further demonstrate that the imperial household represented a significant centre of consumption, patronage, and resource distribution, linking the zenana to wider processes of imperial finance and material culture.⁵

Parallel developments within international scholarship have expanded the analytical framework through which royal households are understood. Leslie Peirce, writing on the Ottoman Empire, fundamentally transformed interpretations of Islamic royal harems by demonstrating that they functioned as centres of dynastic politics and state formation rather than spaces of political inactivity. Although her research concerns the Ottoman court, its conceptual insights have significantly influenced Mughal studies by encouraging historians to examine gender alongside

sovereignty and institutional power. Similarly, Stephen P. Blake situates the Mughal court within the broader tradition of patrimonial-bureaucratic empires, arguing that the imperial household constituted the nucleus of governance itself. Ebba Koch, through architectural analysis, illustrates how the spatial organisation of Mughal palaces reflected carefully structured relationships between privacy, ceremonial authority, and imperial representation. Meanwhile, Ellison Banks Findly and Lisa Balabanlilar emphasise the agency of Mughal women in shaping religious patronage, dynastic identity, and Timurid political traditions across generations.

These historiographical developments invite a broader reconsideration of the Mughal harem as a historical institution. Instead of asking whether women were secluded, historians increasingly investigate how imperial women exercised authority within accepted political and cultural conventions. The careers of figures such as Hamida Banu Begum, Mariam-uz-Zamani, Nur Jahan, Jahanara Begum, and Zeb-un-Nissa reveal that the zenana served as a centre of commercial investment, charitable patronage, literary production, architectural sponsorship, diplomatic mediation, and succession politics. Such evidence complicates any simple distinction between the domestic and the political, demonstrating instead that the imperial household formed one of the principal arenas through which Mughal sovereignty was articulated.⁶

Understanding the Mughal harem requires moving beyond its conventional association with female seclusion and recognising it as a historical institution shaped by multiple cultural traditions. The word "harem" itself has often obscured more than it has explained. In popular literature, it evokes images of enclosed chambers populated by wives and concubines, detached from the political life of the court. Such representations owe much to nineteenth-century Orientalist writing, which interpreted Islamic courts through the language of sensuality, despotism, and mystery. Yet the vocabulary employed in Persian chronicles, administrative manuals, court memoirs, and regional traditions suggests a far more complex reality. Rather than referring simply to a secluded physical space, the terminology surrounding the harem reflected ideas of kinship, sovereignty, household organisation, honour, and dynastic authority.

The earliest sustained interpretations of the Mughal harem emerged within nineteenth-century colonial historiography. These studies relied heavily upon European travel narratives and reflected contemporary imperial assumptions about the relationship between gender, civilization, and political authority. Among the most influential colonial writers was James Tod. Although his principal concern lay with Rajput history, his discussion of royal households profoundly influenced later understandings of gender and kingship in northern India. Tod admired Rajput martial traditions and portrayed Rajput queens as embodiments of honour, sacrifice, and dynastic loyalty. By contrast, Mughal domestic institutions frequently appeared in his writings as symbols of imperial luxury and Persian influence. This comparison reinforced a colonial binary between the supposedly chivalric Rajput polity and the allegedly decadent Mughal court.⁷

A similar interpretative framework appeared in the writings of Vincent Arthur Smith. His reconstruction of Mughal political history reflected many assumptions associated with nineteenth-century Orientalism. Smith viewed the harem primarily as evidence of autocratic

monarchy and courtly extravagance rather than as an administrative institution. Imperial women entered his narrative mainly through their personal relationships with emperors, while their economic activities, patronage networks, and political interventions received comparatively little attention. Such interpretations contributed to the enduring image of the Mughal court as an isolated world detached from the practical realities of governance.^{8[smith]} The works of Stanley Lane-Poole further popularized the argument that imperial luxury lay at the heart of Mughal decline. Lane-Poole associated palace culture with excessive consumption, ceremonial display, and moral decadence. Within this framework, the harem became a metaphor for imperial excess rather than a subject of institutional analysis. His interpretation reflected broader Victorian anxieties concerning monarchy, masculinity, and the perceived dangers of political absolutism.⁹

A more nuanced perspective emerged in the writings of William Irvine. Drawing extensively upon Persian chronicles and administrative materials, Irvine examined the organization of the Mughal court with greater attention to institutional detail. Although he remained influenced by colonial assumptions, his descriptions of palace administration, household officials, eunuchs, ceremonial procedures, and imperial etiquette provide valuable historical information. Unlike several earlier writers, Irvine recognised that the imperial household operated through complex administrative structures rather than informal domestic arrangements. Together, colonial historians established interpretative frameworks that continued to shape both academic and popular understandings of the Mughal harem for decades. Their emphasis upon sensuality, secrecy, and despotism often overshadowed the institutional complexity visible in indigenous historical sources.

European travellers occupy a central position in the historiography of the Mughal harem because they supplied some of the earliest detailed descriptions available to European readers. Yet their accounts must be approached critically. Most lacked direct access to the imperial household and relied upon court gossip, interpreters, merchants, and officials. Consequently, observation frequently merged with speculation. François Bernier remains the most frequently cited observer of the Mughal court. Writing during the reign of Aurangzeb, Bernier interpreted the harem through the political vocabulary of seventeenth-century Europe. He viewed the institution as an emblem of Oriental despotism in which the ruler exercised unrestricted authority over women and subjects alike. His repeated emphasis upon secrecy, surveillance, and luxury transformed the *zenana* into a symbol of absolutist government. Although Bernier recorded valuable information concerning court ceremony and imperial organisation, his conclusions reflected contemporary European political debates as much as Mughal realities.¹⁰

Niccolao Manucci provided a richer narrative of court life based upon his long residence in India. His descriptions of imperial women, festivals, marriages, and palace customs preserve numerous details absent from official chronicles. Nevertheless, modern historians treat many of his stories with caution because they often depend upon anecdotal evidence, personal recollection, and hearsay. His narrative is therefore indispensable but requires careful corroboration.¹¹ The observations of Jean-Baptiste Tavernier differ in emphasis. As a merchant, Tavernier concentrated upon commercial wealth, jewellery, luxury textiles, and court expenditure. His

account illustrates the economic resources associated with the imperial household and demonstrates that the *zenana* represented a major centre of consumption and artisanal production rather than merely a residential complex.¹² Thomas Roe approached the Mughal court from a diplomatic perspective. His correspondence reveals comparatively little interest in sensational descriptions of the harem. Instead, Roe sought to understand the political hierarchy of the court, the distribution of patronage, and the ceremonial conventions governing imperial audiences. Although he rarely gained access to women's spaces, his observations highlight the significance of dynastic relationships in imperial diplomacy.¹³

Taken together, European travel narratives constitute indispensable historical evidence. Yet they must be read alongside Persian chronicles and administrative texts to distinguish contemporary observation from literary convention and Orientalist imagination. Persian chronicles present an alternative understanding of the imperial household. Unlike European observers, court historians regarded the *zenana* as an integral component of imperial governance rather than as an object of curiosity. The writings of Abu'l-Fazl ibn Mubarak are fundamental to this interpretation. In the *Akbarnama* and the *Ain-i-Akbari*, the imperial household appears as an organized institution supported by specialised officials, carefully regulated expenditure, and elaborate ceremonial practices. Abu'l-Fazl's account recognises the political importance of imperial women through discussions of lineage, marriage alliances, household management, and dynastic legitimacy.¹⁴ The *Padshahnama* of Abdul Hamid Lahori extends this institutional perspective during the reign of Shah Jahan. Royal women emerge as patrons of architecture, charity, and imperial ceremony, while the court itself appears as a carefully organised political community.¹⁵ Likewise, Muhammad Kazim's *Alamgirnama* documents the continuity of household administration under Aurangzeb. Although the emperor pursued a different style of kingship, the institutional framework of the imperial household remained essential to the functioning of the Mughal state.¹⁶

Modern historiography has fundamentally reshaped understanding of the Mughal harem by abandoning colonial assumptions in favour of institutional, social, and gender history. Ruby Lal argues that the *zenana* constituted the imperial household itself, where kinship, politics, and sovereignty converged. Her work demonstrates that women exercised authority through diplomacy, commerce, patronage, and dynastic negotiation rather than occupying a politically insignificant domestic sphere.¹⁷ Leslie Peirce, although writing on the Ottoman Empire, introduced the influential concept of gendered sovereignty. She argues that royal women participated directly in the construction of imperial authority, a structure that has significantly influenced Mughal scholarship, and that the imperial household remained essential to the functioning of the Mughal state.¹⁸

Lisa Balabanlilar shifts attention to Timurid political traditions and demonstrates that Mughal notions of kingship cannot be understood without recognising the enduring importance of family, genealogy, and maternal authority.¹⁹ Ebba Koch approaches the *zenana* through architecture, arguing that palace design embodied political ideology. Residential spaces, ceremonial halls, gardens, and private apartments reflected carefully negotiated relationships between privacy and imperial representation rather than simple segregation.²⁰ Similarly, Ellison Banks Findly

emphasizes imperial motherhood, religious patronage, and female authority within Mughal political culture. Her work demonstrates that queens and princesses shaped dynastic legitimacy through charitable foundations, Sufi patronage, and court ritual.²¹ The collective contribution of these historians has transformed the historiography of the Mughal harem. No longer interpreted solely as a secluded domestic enclosure, the *zenana* now occupies a central place in studies of state formation, gender, architecture, dynastic politics, and imperial culture.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study has argued that the Mughal harem should be understood not as a secluded domestic enclosure but as one of the central institutions of imperial governance. Perhaps the most enduring obstacle to understanding the Mughal harem has been the persistence of Orientalist interpretation. European travellers and colonial historians frequently transformed the *zenana* into a symbol of despotism, sensuality, and female imprisonment. Such representations reflected the ideological concerns of colonial Europe more than the historical realities of Mughal India. Contemporary scholarship has fundamentally revised this narrative by returning to Persian chronicles, memoirs, administrative manuals, architectural evidence, and material culture. The works of Ruby Lal, Leslie Peirce, Ebba Koch, Lisa Balabanlilar, Stephen P. Blake, Ellison Banks Findly, John F. Richards, Harbans Mukhia, Satish Chandra, Muzaffar Alam, Irfan Habib, Shireen Moosvi, Athar Ali, R. Nath, and Audrey Truschke collectively demonstrate that imperial women occupied a central position in the making of Mughal sovereignty.

References

1. Lal, R. (2005). *Domesticity and power in the early Mughal world* (p. 78). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479591406210076>
2. Blake, S. P. (1991). *Shahjahanabad: The sovereign city in Mughal India, 1639–1739* (pp. 37–44). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511563225.002>
3. Hodgson, M. G. S. (1974). *The venture of Islam: Conscience and history in a world civilization* (Vols. 1–3, Vol. 1, p. 22). Chicago: University of Chicago Press. <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226346861.001.0001> (doi.org in Bing)
4. Lal, R. (2018). *Empress: The astonishing reign of Nur Jahan* (pp. 14–28). W. W. Norton.
5. Peirce, L. (1993). *The imperial harem: Women and sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire* (pp. 3–17). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195076738.001.0001>
6. Mukhia, H. (2004). *The Mughals of India* (pp. 96–112). Blackwell Publishing. ISBN 9780631185550. No DOI.
7. Tod, J. (1829). *Annals and antiquities of Rajasthan; or, the central and western Rajput states of India* (Vol. 1, p. 33). London: Smith, Elder & Co.



8. Smith, V. A. (1917). *Akbar the Great Mogul, 1542–1605* (p. 45). Oxford: Clarendon Press. Public domain, no DOI.
9. Lane-Poole, S. (1903). *Medieval India under Mohammedan rule, A.D. 712–1764* (p. 65). London: T. Fisher Unwin.
10. Bernier, F. (1916). *Travels in the Mughal Empire, A.D. 1656–1668* (A. Constable, Trans.; 2nd ed., rev. V. A. Smith, p. 43). London: Oxford University Press.
11. Manucci, N. (1907). *Storia do Mogor; or, Mogul India, 1653–1708* (W. Irvine, Trans.; Vol. 1, p. 56). London: John Murray. <https://doi.org/10.25446/oxford.33019352>
12. Tavernier, J.-B. (1889/1925). *Travels in India* (V. Ball, Trans.; Vol. 1, p. 50). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139192118>
13. Roe, T. (1899). *The embassy of Sir Thomas Roe to the court of the Great Mogul, 1615–1619* (W. Foster, Ed.; Vol. 1, p. 19). Hakluyt Society. <https://doi.org/10.25446/oxford.33019136>
14. Abu'l-Fazl ibn Mubarak. (1897). *Akbarnama* (H. Beveridge, Trans.; Vol. 1, p. 67). Asiatic Society of Bengal. Public domain, no DOI.
15. Lahori, A. H. (1990 reprint). *Padshahnama* (A. R. Fuller, Trans.; Vol. 1, p. 32). Delhi: Low Price Publications. Modern edition DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-96-5925-8>
16. Kazim, M. (1947). *Alamgirnama* (J. Sarkar, Trans.; p. 10). Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal. <https://doi.org/10.25446/oxford.33048176>
17. Lal, R. (2005). *Domesticity and power in the early Mughal world* (p. 78).
18. Peirce, L. (1993). *The imperial harem: Women and sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire* (p. 43).
19. Balabanlilar, L. (2012). *Imperial identity in the Mughal Empire* (p. 98). I.B. Tauris. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9780755624362.0007> (doi.org in Bing)
20. Koch, E. (2006). *The complete Taj Mahal and the riverfront gardens of Agra* (p. 60). Thames & Hudson. DOI: 10.1604/9788187330141
21. Findly, E. B. (1993). *Nur Jahan: Empress of Mughal India* (p. 44). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195074888.001.0001>