

Cambridge University Press

0521404770 - The Delhi Sultanate: A Political and Military History

Peter Jackson

Excerpt

[More information](#)

---

## **PART I**

### **The thirteenth century**

## CHAPTER 1

### The background

#### Caliphs, amirs and sultans

The ghosts of two great Muslim conquerors haunted the rulers of the Delhi Sultanate. One was Maḥmūd of Ghazna (d. 421/1030), whose campaigns had extended Islamic rule into the western Panjāb. The other was the Ghurid Sultan Mu‘izz al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Sām, whose more recent victories over a number of Hindu states had entrenched Muslim power in the north Gangetic plain, and whose murder in 602/1206 had first propelled Muslim India on its own separate path, distinct from that taken by the lands west of the Indus. Maḥmūd and Mu‘izz al-Dīn, each in his way, typified the warlords who had been carving out principalities for themselves within the Islamic world since the ninth century. The universal Caliphate of the ‘Abbasids had steadily disintegrated, leaving them with only the titular headship of the orthodox (Sunni) Muslim community. Some provinces had been lost to the heterodox Shī‘īs. For almost three centuries (296–567/909–1171) the ‘Abbasids were challenged by the Fatimid *Imāms* representing the Ismā‘īlī Shī‘ī sect. From Egypt and Syria, these counter-caliphs deployed a network of agents and propagandists whose activities extended even as far east as Sind, the region of the middle and lower Indus valley, reduced by the caliphal general Muḥammad b. Qāsim al-Thaqafi as early as 92/711. From 344/965 the Fatimid Imam’s name was mentioned in the prayers at Multān, and by the end of the century at Maṣūra.<sup>1</sup> But in the majority of caliphal territories power passed into the hands of semi-independent, hereditary governors. Such rulers, who initially bore no title higher than *amīr* (literally ‘commander’), usually went through the formality of obtaining a patent of authority (*manshūr*), a robe (*khil‘at*) and a sonorous

<sup>1</sup> For a good introduction to the first centuries of Muslim rule in Sind, see Yohanan Friedmann, ‘A contribution to the early history of Islam in India’, in M. Rosen-Ayalon (ed.), *Studies in memory of Gaston Wiet* (Jerusalem, 1977), 309–33; Derryl N. MacLean, *Religion and society in Arab Sind* (Leiden, 1989). On Ismā‘īlī activity, see S. M. Stern, ‘Ismā‘īlī propaganda and Fatimid rule in Sind’, *IC* 23 (1949), 298–307; ‘Abbās al-Hamdānī, *The beginnings of the Ismā‘īlī da‘wa in northern India* (Cairo, 1956).

## 4 The thirteenth century

title (*laqab*) from the ‘Abbasid Caliph, in return for inserting his name in the public Friday sermon (*khuṭba*) and on the coinage (*sikka*) and, more notionally, remitting an annual tribute.

To bolster their dubious legitimacy, the provincial amirs had to act (or pose) as champions of Sunnī Islam and its caliph against both the infidel and the heretic. These functions were exercised most successfully by rulers of Turkish origin. Most of the regional dynasts imitated the ‘Abbasid Caliphs, and buttressed their own power, by maintaining regiments of Turkish slave guards (Arabic sing. *ghulām*, *mamlūk*; Persian *banda*) from the pagan steppelands of Central Asia. Ghulam status, it must be emphasized, bore none of the degrading connotations associated with other kinds of slavery. The Turkish peoples enjoyed a particularly high reputation for martial skill and religious orthodoxy, and ghulams were highly prized by their masters, receiving both instruction in the Islamic faith and a rigorous military training.<sup>2</sup> Nor was such confidence misplaced: as we shall see, the forging and preservation of an independent Muslim power in India were to be in large measure the work of Turkish slave commanders and their own ghulams.

Maḥmūd’s dynasty, the Ghaznavids or Yaminids (352–582/962–1186), was of Turkish stock; its effective founder, Maḥmūd’s father Sebüktegin, had been a Turkish slave commander. At its greatest extent, the Ghaznavid empire embraced an area from Rayy and Iṣfahān in Persia as far as Hānsī in the eastern Panjāb. Maḥmūd himself, who conducted no less than seventeen expeditions against pagan Indian rulers and who also rooted out the Ismā‘īlīs from the cities of Multān and Maṣūra, was rewarded by the ‘Abbasid Caliph for his services to Sunnī Islam with the *laqab* of *Yamīn al-Dawla* (‘Right Hand of the State’).<sup>3</sup>

Turks did not enter the civilized lands of Islam only through the slave traffic, however. They also came in as free men, in the large-scale migrations or invasions of recently converted nomadic tribal groups from Central Asia; and one such clan, the Seljūks, who originated among the Ghuzz (Oghuz) confederacy north of the Aral Sea, created in the second half of the eleventh

<sup>2</sup> C. E. Bosworth, ‘Barbarian incursions: the coming of the Turks into the Islamic world’, in D. S. Richards (ed.), *Islamic civilisation 950–1150* (Oxford, 1973), 1–16 (especially 4–10), and repr. in Bosworth, *The medieval history of Iran, Afghanistan and Central Asia* (London, 1977). D. Ayalon, ‘The European-Asiatic steppe: a major reservoir of power for the Islamic world’, in *Trudy XXV mezhdunarodnogo kongressy vostokovedov, Moskva 1960* (Moscow, 1963, 5 vols.), II, 47–52; *idem*, ‘Preliminary remarks on the *Mamlūk* military institution in Islam’, in V. J. Parry and M. E. Yapp (eds.), *War, technology and society in the Middle East* (Oxford and London, 1975), 44–58; both repr. in Ayalon, *The Mamlūk military society* (London, 1979).

<sup>3</sup> C. E. Bosworth, ‘The imperial policy of the early Ghaznavids’, *IS* 1 (1962), part 3, 49–82, repr. in his *Medieval history*. For a brief survey of the dynasty, see B. Spuler, ‘Ghaznavids’, *Enc. Isl.*<sup>2</sup>. The standard works are Bosworth, *The Ghaznavids. Their empire in Afghanistan and eastern Iran 994:1040*, 2nd edn (Beirut, 1973); *idem*, *The later Ghaznavids, splendour and decay: the dynasty in Afghanistan and northern India 1040–1186* (Edinburgh, 1977).

century an empire that comprised the whole of Persia, Iraq and Syria. In 344/1055 the Seljūk leader entered Baghdad and took the caliph under his protection, receiving in return the new and exalted style of *Sulṭān*. The Seljūks had already defeated the Ghaznawid amir, Maḥmūd's son Mas'ūd I (431/1040); and his successors, who assumed the title of sultan as a counterblast to Seljūk pretensions, were gradually driven from their lands in eastern Persia. In 511/1117 the Ghaznawid Bahrām Shāh was enthroned with the assistance of the great Seljūk Sultan Sanjar, who dominated the eastern Iranian world from his base in Khrāsān. The Ghaznawids thereby became tributary to the Seljūks; even so, it was not the Seljūks who would destroy them.

Mu'izz al-Dīn's family, the Shansabanids, originated among the petty princes (*mulūk*; sing. *malik*) of Ghūr, the mountainous region east of Herat.<sup>4</sup> Reduced to tributary status first by Maḥmūd of Ghazna and later by the Seljūks, they found their opportunity at a time of renewed upheavals in the Iranian world. In the 1120s, by one of the same processes in the eastern Asiatic steppe that would bring conquering Mongol armies westwards in the thirteenth century, the Qara-Khitai (or -Khitai), a semi-nomadic people of probably Mongolian stock and under the leadership of a Buddhist ruling dynasty, moved into Turkestan and Transoxiana (*Mā warā' al-Nahr*) and established their hegemony over the Muslim rulers there. Sanjar was defeated in 536/1141, and in the middle of the century, under pressure from fresh waves of Ghuzz tribesmen dislodged from their homelands by the Qara-Khitai, his empire collapsed. The Ghuzz also wrested Ghazna from Bahrām Shāh's son and successor, Khusraw Shāh, and obliged him to fall back on Lahore (*Lāhawr*), the administrative centre of his Indian territories. The Shansabanids, who had for some years been embroiled in a feud with the Ghaznawids, were the ultimate beneficiaries of these developments. Already, in c. 544/1150, the Shansabanid prince 'Alā' al-Dīn Ḥusayn had temporarily expelled Bahrām Shāh from Ghazna and sacked the city, thereby winning the undying sobriquet of *Jahānsūz* ('World-Burner'); and he took for himself the title of sultan and the ceremonial parasol (*chatr*) affected by the Seljūk sovereigns. It was Ḥusayn's nephew, Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Sām (558–599/1163–1203), who expelled the Ghuzz from Ghazna in 569/1173–4 and installed there his younger brother Mu'izz al-Dīn (formerly Shihāb al-Dīn) Muḥammad.

Under Ghiyāth al-Dīn and Mu'izz al-Dīn, who throughout cooperated more or less harmoniously, the Shansabanids – or Ghurids, as we may now call them, since they had reduced to subordinate status the other maliks of

<sup>4</sup> A. Maricq and G. Wiet, *Le minaret de Djām. La découverte de la capitale des sultans Ghorides (XII<sup>e</sup>-XIII<sup>e</sup> siècles)* (Paris, 1959): 31–44 contain a historical survey of the dynasty down to c. 1200; more generally, see C. E. Bosworth, 'Ghūrids', *Enc. Isl.*<sup>2</sup>; A. D. H. Bivar, 'Ghūr', *ibid.* For what follows, see also Bosworth, *Later Ghaznavids*, 111–22; *idem*, 'The political and dynastic history of the Iranian world (A.D. 1000–1217)', in J. A. Boyle (ed.), *The Cambridge history of Iran, V. The Saljuq and Mongol periods* (Cambridge, 1968), 157–66, 185–92.

## 6 The thirteenth century

the region – emerged as one of the great powers of the eastern Islamic world. Their principal seat was the fortress of Fīrūzkūh, identified by André Maricq in 1957 with ruins at Jām on the middle Hari Rūd, some 200 km. east of Herat; Ghiyāth al-Dīn's authority was recognized by branches of the dynasty which ruled at Bāmiyān, Mādīn and Jurwās. His chief rivals were the rulers of Khwārazm on the lower Oxus (Amū-daryā), who belonged to a dynasty founded by a Turkish ghulam and who like the Ghurids were erstwhile subordinates of the Seljūk Sultan. But the Khwārazmshāhs suffered from two disadvantages that did not afflict the Ghurids. One was the overlordship of the heathen Qara-Khitān to their rear (although their military support could on occasions prove welcome); the other was the hostility of the 'Abbasid Caliph al-Nāṣir li-Dīni'llāh (575–622/1180–1225). Encouraged by the caliph, from whom he obtained the title *Qasīm Amīr al-Mu'minīn* ('Partner of the Commander of the Faithful'), Ghiyāth al-Dīn engaged in a duel for Khurāsān with the Khwārazmshāhs, in which, prior to his death in 599/1203, the Ghurids definitely had the better of it. Mu'izz al-Dīn, who like Ghiyāth al-Dīn bore the title of sultan, ably seconded his brother's efforts; but he also looked eastwards.

### Early Muslim India

For the first few centuries after Muḥammad b. Qāsim's conquest of Sind, the frontier in India between the Islamic world – the *Dār al-Islām* ('Abode of Islam') – and pagan territory – the war-zone or *Dār al-Ḥarb* – had remained relatively static. The early Muslim governors of Sind engaged in holy war (*jihād*) against their Hindu neighbours, despatching periodic expeditions as far afield as Kashmir or Mālwa.<sup>5</sup> But until the first decades of the tenth century, Muslim expansion eastwards was effectively barred by the powerful Gurjara-Pratihāra dynasty, which dominated northern India from its capital at Kanauj (Qinnawj) on the Ganges. Maḥmūd of Ghazna undoubtedly benefited from the eclipse of this empire and the division of its territories among a number of warring successor-states. Many of his victories in India achieved nothing more than the acquisition of unheard-of quantities of plunder: Hindu cities were sacked, notably the great seaport of Sōmnāth in Gujarāt (416/1025–6), their temples looted and golden idols piously smashed to pieces and carried off to Ghazna to replenish Maḥmūd's treasury. But for all their swashbuckling character, one result of the Ghaznawid amir's activities was the acquisition for Islam of a new foothold in the western Panjāb.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>5</sup> For a convenient list of campaigns, see J. F. Richards, 'The Islamic frontier in the east: expansion into South Asia', *South Asia* 4 (1974), 94–8; and on early Muslim India more generally, André Wink, *Al-Hind: the making of the Indo-Islamic world, I. Early medieval India and the expansion of Islam, 7th-11th centuries* (Leiden, 1990), esp. chap. 4.

<sup>6</sup> M. Nāzīm, *The life and times of Sulṭān Maḥmūd of Ghazna* (Cambridge, 1931), chapter 8.

Following their expulsion from eastern Persia, the Ghaznavids were increasingly confined to their lands in present-day Afghanistan, Makrān and Sind and to their conquests in India. Within the subcontinent they forfeited some of Maḥmūd's gains. Hānsī, for example, was wrested from them by a coalition of Hindu princes in 435/1043; and Multān again passed into the hands of the Ismā'īlīs.<sup>7</sup> But the dynasty was by no means moribund. The reigns of Ibrāhīm (451–492/1059–99) and of his son Mas'ūd III (492–508/1099–1115) were characterized by the continuing prosecution of the traditional mission in India. It is in 1090 that we first encounter, in an inscription of the Gāhaḍavāla king of Kanauj, the mysterious *Turushka-danda*, a tax designed either to finance the struggle against the Muslims or to meet their demands for tribute. According to the chronicler Jūzjānī, Mas'ūd III's military chamberlain (*ḥājib*) Toghategin mounted a raid which penetrated beyond the Ganges and further east than any Muslim incursion since the time of Maḥmūd. The dynasty did not abandon military exploits even in an era of decline. Bahrām Shāh is said to have conducted holy wars (*ghazūhā*) in India, and his grandson Khusraw Malik appears to have fought against Hindu powers not long before the truncated Ghaznavid Sultanate was finally overwhelmed by the Ghurids.<sup>8</sup>

### The Ghurid conquests

We possess a number of sources for the Ghurid campaigns of conquest and for the emergence of an autonomous Muslim power in northern India. The *Ṭabaqāt-i Nāsirī* of Minhāj al-Dīn b. Sirāj al-Dīn Jūzjānī, completed in Delhi in 658/1260, is a general history of the Islamic world in twenty-three sections (*ṭabaqāt*), of which sections 19 and 20 deal with the Ghurids and their immediate successors in India. A precious source for the mid-thirteenth-century Delhi Sultanate, it is of less value for events in India prior to 623/1226 when the author was still resident in Ghūr.<sup>9</sup> Of the earlier works composed in India, Ḥasan-i Nizāmī's florid and verbose *Tāj al-Ma'āthir*, begun in 602/1205–6 but completed after 626/1229, is the nearest thing we have to a narrative of events. This work, which opens with Mu'izz al-Dīn's great victory at Tarā'in in 588/1192, may have drawn upon the victory despatches (*fath-nāmas*) of Mu'izz al-Dīn's slave general Aybeg. For

<sup>7</sup> J. Burton-Page, 'Hānsī', *Enc. Isl.*<sup>2</sup>; Bosworth, *Later Ghaznavids*, 32–3. *AH*, 252–4.

<sup>8</sup> Toghategin: *TN*, I, 240 (tr. 107). Bahrām Shāh: *ibid.*, I, 241 (tr. 110). Khusraw Malik: *AH*, 272; partial tr. I. M. Shafī, 'Fresh light on the Ghaznavids', *IC* 12 (1938), 218. *Turushka-danda*: Bosworth, *Later Ghaznavids*, 67; but for a discussion of the possible meanings, Lallanji Gopal, *The economic life of northern India, c. A. D. 700–1200*, 2nd edn (Delhi, 1989), 48–52. See also Bosworth's comments, *Later Ghaznavids*, 61–7, 84–6, 125–6, on Ghaznavid vigour, together with the evidence accumulated in A. B. M. Habibullah, *The foundation of Muslim rule in India*, 2nd edn (Allahabad, 1961), 57–60.

<sup>9</sup> On the author, see K. A. Nizami, *On history and historians of medieval India* (New Delhi, 1983), 71–93.

## 8 The thirteenth century

all its defects, it can claim to be the first chronicle written in the Delhi Sultanate.<sup>10</sup> A fairly skeletal outline from 588/1192 down to the events of 602/1206, following Mu'izz al-Dīn's murder, is to be gleaned from the prologue to Fakhr-i Mudabbir's *Shajara* (or *Bahr*) *al-Ansāb*, composed at Lahore shortly afterwards; although it does supply dates for certain events that are not given elsewhere. Regrettably, Fakhr-i Mudabbir's later work, *Ādāb al-Harb wa'l-Shajā'a*, a military and administrative treatise presented to the first Delhi Sultan, Iltutmish, in c. 630/1232, does not include among its numerous anecdotes any pertaining to more recent decades.<sup>11</sup> Similarly, only a small proportion of the material relating to India in the *Jawāmi' al-Hikāyāt*, a large collection of historical anecdotes compiled by 'Awfi in Delhi (c. 628/1230–1), dates from the post-Ghaznawid era.<sup>12</sup> It is fortunate that events on this distant frontier made a powerful impression in Islam's heartlands. We should be much less well informed about the Ghurid campaigns were it not for the *al-Kāmil fi'l-Ta'rikh*, a general history by Ibn al-Athīr (d. 630/1232), who wrote in the Iraqi city of al-Mawṣil (Mosul); though where he obtained most of his information was as great a mystery to at least one contemporary as it is to us.<sup>13</sup>

Once installed at Ghazna, Mu'izz al-Dīn was not slow to appropriate the Ghaznawids' role as the standard-bearer of orthodox Islam in the subcontinent. As Maḥmūd had done, he made war on the Ismā'īlīs, who had re-established themselves in Multān, and captured the city (571/1175–6); the evidence suggests that although the Sūmra princes at Daybul in the Indus delta, whom he attacked in 578/1182–3, were of Indian stock, they too may have been Ismā'īlī sympathizers. Certainly he is praised for his warfare against the Shī'īs.<sup>14</sup> But the annexation of the remaining Ghaznawid territories was undoubtedly his principal goal. A series of campaigns from 577/1181–2 onwards secured first tribute from Khusraw Malik and then, in

<sup>10</sup> A critical edition is very much to be desired. Unless otherwise stated, references are to IOL Persian ms. 15 (Éthé, no. 210). The standard version ends in 614/1217, although in the last century Sir Henry Elliot utilized a copy (since lost) that went down to 626/1229: abstract translated in ED, II, 240–2. For a useful summary of the main recension, see S. H. Askari, 'Taj-ul-Maasir of Hasan Nizami', *PUJ* 18 (1963), no. 3, 49–127; on the author, Nizami, *On history and historians*, 55–70.

<sup>11</sup> M. S. Khan, 'The life and works of Fakhr-i Mudabbir', *IC* 51 (1977), 127–40. E. Denison Ross, 'The genealogies of Fakhr-ud-dīn Mubārak Shāh', in T. W. Arnold and R. A. Nicholson (eds.), *Ājab-Nāma: a volume of oriental studies presented to Edward G. Browne* (Cambridge, 1922), 392–413.

<sup>12</sup> On the author's life, see M. Nizāmu'd-dīn, *Introduction to the Jawāmi' u'l-hikāyāt*, GMS, ns, VIII (London, 1929), 3–20.

<sup>13</sup> D.S. Richards, 'Ibn al-Athīr and the later parts of the *Kāmil*: a study of aims and methods', in D.O. Morgan (ed.), *Medieval historical writing in the Christian and Islamic worlds* (London, 1982), 84–5.

<sup>14</sup> SA, 19–20. Habibullah, *Foundation*, 36–7. S.H. Hodivala, *Studies in Indo-Muslim history* (Bombay, 1939–57, 2 vols.), I, 141. For Daybul, see S. Qudratullah Fatimi, 'The twin ports of Daybul', in Hamida Khuhro (ed.), *Sind through the centuries* (Oxford and Karachi, 1981), 97–105; Wink, *Al-Hind*, I, 181–3.

582/1186, the capitulation of Lahore. Khusraw Malik was sent to Ghiyāth al-Dīn and later put to death in captivity.

Confronting the Ghurid ruler now were a number of major Hindu powers, for which the designation 'Rājput' (not encountered in the Muslim sources before the sixteenth century) is a well-established anachronism.<sup>15</sup> Chief among them was the Chāhamāna (Chawhān) kingdom of Śākambhari (Sambhar), which dominated present-day Rajasthan from its capital at Ajmēr; it included much of the territory between the Sutlej and the Yamuna, and under Prthvīrāja III (the 'Rāi Pithūrā' of Muslim writers) claimed paramountcy throughout India north of the Vindhya mountains. Junior branches of the dynasty ruled at Nadōl and at Jālōr, and Delhi (Dillī, Dihlī), under its Tomara princes, had been tributary to the Chawhāns since the middle of the twelfth century. Chawhān supremacy was of relatively recent date, however, having been won in the teeth of strenuous opposition from the Chaulukyas, who reigned over Gujarāt from their capital at Anhilwāra (Nahrwāla; now Patan) and still nurtured designs on southern Rajasthan. To the east, the Chawhān state bordered on the Gāhaḍavāla kingdom of Kanauj (Qinnawj; the ancient Kānyakubja), which dominated much of the modern province of Uttar Pradesh, and the Chandella kingdom of Jeḷākabhukti (modern Bundelkhand), centred on Kālinjar. In the 1180s the Chandellas were under pressure from both the Gāhaḍavālas and the Chawhāns, and forfeited some of their western territories to Prthvīrāja III. The Gāhaḍavāla kingdom, on the other hand, was also busily expanding into Bihār, where it contested the débris of the defunct Pāla empire with the Sena dynasty of western Bengal.<sup>16</sup> In all these states, there existed a quasi-feudal hierarchy in which the kings (*rājas*, called *rāīs* by the Muslim invaders) received military service, in return for grants of land, from subordinate chieftains, called *rānakas* (or sometimes *thak-kuras*), who in turn conferred estates on their own cavalry commanders, the *rāutas* (from Skr. *rājaputras*) or *nāyakas*; these two lower levels are the *rānas* and *rāwats* respectively of the Muslim sources.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>15</sup> For this term, see B. D. Chattopadhyaya, 'Origin of the Rajputs: the political, economic and social processes in early medieval Rajasthan', *IHR* 3 (1976), 59–82, repr. in his *The making of early medieval India* (Oxford and Delhi, 1994), 57–88.

<sup>16</sup> See generally H. C. Ray, *The dynastic history of northern India* (Calcutta, 1931–5, 2 vols.), chaps. 6 (Senas), 8 (Gāhaḍavālas), 11 (Chandellas), 15 (Chaulukyas) and 16 (Chāhamānas); also Dasharatha Sharma, *Early Chauhān dynasties*, 2nd edn (Delhi, 1975); R. C. Majumdar, *Chaulukyas of Gujarat* (Bombay, 1956); Roma Niyogi, *The history of the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty* (Calcutta, 1959); A. Banerji, 'Eastern expansion of the Gāhaḍavāla kingdom', *JAS*, 4th series, 5 (1963), 105–11; N. S. Bose, *History of the Chandellas* (Calcutta, 1956); and R. K. Dikshit, *The Chandellas of Jeḷākabhukti* (New Delhi, 1977).

<sup>17</sup> R. S. Sharma, *Indian feudalism: c. 300–1200* (Calcutta, 1965), especially chap. 5. Pushpa Prasad (ed.), *Sanskrit inscriptions of Delhi Sultanate 1191–1526* (Delhi, 1992), 56–7 (no. II:5), 58–71 (no. II:6), 78–9 (no. II:9), 80–9 (no. II:11). For examples from Muslim sources, see *SA*, 33 (with RATGAN in error for RANGAN); *Tāj*, fols. 137a, 150a; and *inter alia* the 'celebrated *rāwats*' of *TN*, II, 65 (tr. 828).



## 10 The thirteenth century

Significant gains at the expense of these Hindu powers were deferred until after Mu'izz al-Dīn's annexation of the Ghaznawid territories, which brought him control of the more northerly routes via Peshawar (Parshāwar) and the Khyber Pass. Indeed, his earliest incursion into the Dār al-Ḥarb had ended in disaster. An attack in 574/1178–9 on the Chaulukya kingdom by way of lower Sind resulted in a heavy defeat for the Ghurid Sultan near Mount Ābū. Subsequently, at a date which is variously given as 583/1187–8 or 587/1191, he invaded the eastern Panjāb and established a garrison at Tabarhindh. But he was routed at Tarā'in by a large Hindu force under Prthvirāja and his subordinate, Govindarāja of Delhi, and obliged to retire to Ghazna; Tabarhindh was recovered by the Hindus.<sup>18</sup> When Mu'izz al-Dīn returned in 588/1192, however, and again offered battle near Tarā'in, he won a crushing victory, in which Prthvirāja was captured and Govindarāja killed. The victory at Tarā'in seems to have constituted a turning-point in two respects. Firstly, the Hindu chiefs of the eastern Panjāb undertook to pay tribute to Mu'izz al-Dīn.<sup>19</sup> And in the second place, it is from this moment that we can date the establishment of a permanent Muslim force in the region, at Indraprastha (Indrapat), near Delhi.<sup>20</sup> But direct Muslim rule was not imposed on a uniform basis. While the great Chawhān fortress of Ranthanbōr was occupied, Ajmēr was left in the possession of Prthvirāja, now Mu'izz al-Dīn's client; and following his execution for some act of duplicity shortly afterwards, it was conferred on his son. Similarly, Delhi was granted to Govindarāja's successor as a tributary prince.<sup>21</sup> This pattern was to be followed many times in other regions conquered by the Muslims.

Mu'izz al-Dīn continued to move down from Ghazna into India for each cold season and to take charge of the war against the infidel. In 590/1194 it was the turn of the Gāhaḍavālas, whose king Jāyachandra (the 'Jaychand' of Muslim authors) was defeated and slain by Mu'izz al-Dīn in the vicinity of Chandawār (Chandawal, near Etāwa); the Ghurid army looted his treasury at Āsī (Asni) and occupied Banāras (now Varanasi). In 592/1196 the sultan headed an expedition which secured the fortress of Thangīr (Tahangarh, fifteen miles south of the later city of Bhayāna) from the

<sup>18</sup> Habibullah, *Foundation*, 60–1. *TN*, I, 398–400 (tr. 457–64, 466), where this engagement is dated in the year preceding the second battle of Tarā'in. *IA*, XI, 113–14/172–3, 371–2/561–2, describes the campaign twice (cf. XI, 115/174): in the second account, he dates the episode in the latter half of 583 (ended 1 March 1188), and this is confirmed at XII, 59/91.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, XI, 115/174, *wa-iltazamū lahu bi'l-amwāl. Tāj*, fol. 50b, for the chieftains of the Delhi region specifically.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, fol. 51a.

<sup>21</sup> Habibullah, *Foundation*, 61–2. On the coinage believed at one time to reflect Prthvirāja's client status, see now P. N. Singh, 'The so-called joint issue of Muḥammad bin Sam and Prithviraja III: a reappraisal', *JNSI* 50 (1988), 120–3; John S. Deyell, *Living without silver: the monetary history of early medieval North India* (Oxford and Delhi, 1990), 267–9. That Delhi was thus subjected in two stages may help to explain the conflicting dates given for its capture in the sources, on which see Muḥammad Aziz Aḥmad, *Political history and institutions of the early Turkish empire of Delhi (1206–1290 A.D.)* (Lahore, 1949), 129 n.1.

Chandellas, and allowed the rai of Gwāliyōr to buy him off with tribute. But otherwise Mu'izz al-Dīn appears to have played a relatively limited role in the extension of Muslim power. After the death of his brother Ghiyāth al-Dīn (599/1203), his energies were largely absorbed by developments in Khurāsān, where the Khwārazmshāh 'Alā' al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Tekish sought to recover territories previously lost to the Ghurids. In 601/1204 Mu'izz al-Dīn invaded Khwārazm itself, only to suffer a decisive defeat by the shah's Qara-Khitān overlords at Andkhūd (now Andkhoy).<sup>22</sup> In these circumstances, the Ghurid Sultan seems to have relied in India increasingly on his Turkish slave lieutenants.

The Ghūrīs were a people of the hills. Traditionally they fought on foot, and Jūzjānī has left us a description of their characteristic method of warfare, which involved the use by each soldier of a protective screen called a *kārwa*, made of raw bullock-hide and filled with a dense wadding of cotton.<sup>23</sup> It is true that we also encounter mounted Ghūrī warriors, like the 1200 horsemen from Tūlak who briefly garrisoned Tabarhindh following Mu'izz al-Dīn's first invasion of the eastern Panjāb;<sup>24</sup> but they were probably in short supply, and the sultans' expansionist designs required access to larger numbers of cavalry. As the empire expanded to the west, they supplemented their forces with warriors from various parts of Khurāsān: Khurāsānīs are found under Mu'izz al-Dīn's banner, for instance, in the final thrust against the Ghaznawids and in his assault on Prthvīrāja, and later among the troops who entered Lahore with Aybeg in 602/1206.<sup>25</sup> In addition, Ghuzz warriors appear in the army of Ghazna in the period following Mu'izz al-Dīn's death, and the Ghurid sultans, like their Ghaznawid precursors, recruited tribal cavalry from among the Khalaj, a nomadic people in the *garmīsīr* ('hot') regions of Bust and Zamīndāwar, who may have been of Turkish stock but would in time become assimilated to the neighbouring Afghans.<sup>26</sup> Only late authors mention the Afghans proper, who were as yet confined to the Sulaymān range (consequently known at this time as *kūh-i Afghān*, 'the Afghan mountains') and who had accompanied Ghaznawid campaigns, as serving at Tarā'in.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>22</sup> W. Barthold, *Turkestan down to the Mongol invasion*, 3rd edn by C. E. Bosworth, GMS, ns, V (London, 1968), 349–51. Bosworth, 'Political and dynastic history', 164–5.

<sup>23</sup> *TN*, I, 343 (tr. 352–3). The *kārwa* is also listed in *AH*, 423, among the equipment required to conduct a siege.

<sup>24</sup> *TN*, I, 399 (tr. 458); and for an earlier reference to mounted Ghūrīs, see I, 355–6 (tr. 372–3).

<sup>25</sup> *IA*, XI, 110/168, 113/172. *SA*, 33.

<sup>26</sup> Ghuzz: *IA*, XII, 144/219. On the ethnicity of the Khalaj, see V. Minorsky, 'The Turkish dialect of the Khalaj', *BSOS* 10 (1940), 426–32, repr. in his *The Turks, Iran and the Caucasus in the middle ages* (London, 1978); C. E. Bosworth, 'Khaladj, i. History', *Enc. Isl.*<sup>2</sup>; C. E. Bosworth and Sir Gerard Clauson, 'Al-Xwārazmī on the peoples of Central Asia', *JRAS* (1965), 6, 8–9, repr. in Bosworth, *Medieval history*. But for a different view, cf. Irfan Habib, 'Formation of the Sultanate ruling class of the thirteenth century', in Habib (ed.), *Medieval India I. Researches in the history of India 1200–1750* (Oxford and Delhi, 1992), 2–3 and n.12.

<sup>27</sup> G. Morgenstierne, 'Afghān', *Enc. Isl.*<sup>2</sup>. For Afghan warriors under the Ghaznawids, see