

Ethnicity of the Pushtūns / Pakhūns

FAZAL SHER AND ABDUR RAHMAN

The Pushtūns or Pakhtūns occupy vast tracts of land in Pakistān and Afghānistān but their ethnic origin still lies in obscurity this has given rise to pseculatio, very often wild, based merely on emotions rather than reason. The most prominent among the speculators was the highly venerated the Maulānā, ‘Abd al-Qādir, former director of the Pushto Academy, University of Peshāwar, who set forth his views in 1967 in the preface to the Urdu translation of Sir Olaf Caroe’s book, *The Pathans*. It is a lengthy preface spreading over 44 pages, in which the Maulānā, besides telling us how this world came into existence, throws ample light on what, in his view, was the origin of the Pushtūns and their language, Pushto. The oldest part of the world where human race and civilized life appeared first of all, the Maulānā informs us, was Central Asia. In the remotest past, he says, when much of the present world was still under water, Central Asia had all the elements – earth, water, sunshine – the combined effect of which created an environment congenial for the development of human life. God therefore selected this tract of land for the birth of human beings (Banī Ādam). It was in this cradle, he further remarks, that the earliest humans received their training in art and culture and then spread around in the world in search of livelihood which mainly comprised hunting. Some of the hunting groups, the Maulānā says, wandered too far away to be able to return to the homeland and settled in distant lands losing all contacts with the original stock. There they developed their languages in obedience to the climatic conditions of those lands. Those who came back to Bākhtar (Bactria), an important place in Central Asia, and stayed on spoke Pushto which was the mother tongue and spoken all over central Asia. The people who spoke this language consequently came to be known as Pushtūns whose pivotal role in the determination and development of early stages of human life must be recognized. Pushto is the mother tongue, the Maulānā goes on to say, and all other languages in the world are its grand daughters. This relationship is not confined

merely to the languages of the Indo-European Semitic or Avestan families, the Dravidian, Mongolian and Shina also stemmed from the same source. The Maulānā concludes: the most ancient tribe, the bedrock for developing every day human life, is supposed to be Bakhd, Pakht or Pushtūn and the land where this tribe was born and dwelt was called Balkh, Balhika or Pushtūnkhwā. Balkh is the motherland of all nations of the world and Pushtūns are the progenitors of all mankind. Being themselves the primary source, they should not be tied to the tail of any other race.

The Maulānā was in fact responding to some Afghān writers who under the influence of Hitlerian propaganda had proposed an Āryan origin for the Pushtūns. Apparently, the Maulānā wished everything good for the Pushtūns, and in it we sympathize with him, but cannot endorse his views regarding the origin of the universe, Pushtūns and Pashto. Wishful thinking cannot be considered serious history.

But this advice of the Maulānā was not heeded to by Roshan Khān (1980: 50) who tied the Pushtūns to the tail of the Hebrews. The Pakhtūns are descendants of those Bani Israel, says he, who were banished from their homeland in Syria and the neighbouring regions by the Assyrians and Babylonians one after the other and who settled not only in the territories touching on Babylonia but also amongst the Āryans in the vast stretch of land comprising Irān, Khurāsān and the valley of the river Indus. There they first followed the Laws of Moses, and then turned over to Christianity, but when invitation of Ḥazrat Muḥammad (PBUH) reached them, they at once accepted Islam.

Roshan Khān (1977: 333-55) was not the first to suggest Hebraic origin for the Pakhtūns; he was preceded by a whole series of Pakhtūn writers harping on the same tune. The most outstanding of these was Ni‘amat Ullāh Harwī, whose *Makhzan-i Afghāni* (1978) became the main source for subsequent writers to draw upon. Ni‘amat Ullāh’s material regarding genealogies was issued later in many and various forms, including a work of the late eighteenth century entitled *Khulāsāt al-Ansāb* (Genealogical Abstract) composed by the Nawāb Ḥafiz Raḥmat Khān Rohila.

The Akhund Darweza, Raḥmān Bābā, and Khushhāl Khān Khattak also tow the same line.

When European scholarship was still in its infancy regarding the Pakhtūns, some European scholars also put their weight in the same scale. The first amongst these was Sir William Jones, the pioneer of oriental studies, who suggested that the Afghāns were the descendants of the “lost ten tribes” of Israel who escaped from captivity and took refuge in the country of Arsarath (see Elphinstone 1992: 207, note. This place in his view is Hazārajāt, the Ghor of the Afghān historians. Elphinstone (1992: 205) entertained the same view. ‘As regards the Ghor immigrants it is known (says he) that ten of the twelve tribes remained in the east after their brethrens’ return to Judea; and the supposition that the Afghāns are their descendants explains easily and naturally both the disappearance of the one people, and the origin of the other. Alexander Burnes (1834: 162-63) argues the same case but from a different angle. The Afghāns, he says, entertain strange prejudices against the Jewish nation, a point which should at least show that they had no desire to claim, without a just cause, a descent from them. Since, he asks, some of the tribes of Israel came to the East, why should we not admit that the Afghāns are their descendants, converted to Islam. Even H. G. Raverty, (1856: 19, fn.) who is considered by Sir Olaf Caroe as “a mastr of Pathan lore” pleads in favour of the Bani Israel theory. “Is not possible”, he asks, “that those Jews who could make their escape might have fled eastward, preferring a wandering life in a mountainous country with independence to the grinding tyranny of Cyrus’ successors and their satraps? In fact there was no other direction in which they could have fled...”

The Bani Israel theory has been repudiated by Sir Olf Caroe (1958: 10) and more recently by Pareshān Khattak (2005: 25-33) in very strange terms. Disapproving of the Maulānā’s views on the creation of human life on this earth, Pareshān (Op.cit. : 18) nevertheless agrees with him that “the Pakhtūns are just Pakhtūns – a separate race by themselves – not to be tied with the tail of any other

race, they are neither Āryans nor Semitic”. Sir Olaf Caroe’s remarks (1958: 5) that Bani Israel theory is a curious accretion to Biblical history needs elaboration.

Bani Israel: European Version

The scriptural tradition of the Hebrew people or, as they call themselves, the Bani Israel (Children of Israel), begins with the patriarch Abraham. Around 1500 BC he migrated into Palestine with his flocks from “Ur of the Chaldees” which appears to have been a northern colony of Ur and not the original Sumerian city, setting up altars to his God Yahweh, and digging wells. Is son Isaac and his grandson Jacob continued his work. In their new homeland they made alliances with the local Canaanites and grew prosperous and powerful. Joseph, one of the sons of Jacob, was sold into Egypt where he later became vizier of the Pharaoh from which office he was able to befriend his brothers and father when they migrated there to escape a famine in Canaan. But they were all enslaved by a subsequent Pharaoh. From this servitude they were rescued by Moses who led them back into Canaan after they had spent forty years in the wilderness of Sināi. Moses welded them into a powerful fighting force capable of conquering the country but he did not live long and was succeeded by Joshua (Eastern 1970: 123).

The early Israelites were ruled by judges who were also religious leaders. In the course of the wars with the Philistines, who for many years kept most of the Hebrews in subjection, it was realized that a king would best serve as a rallying point for the whole people. The Prophet and judge Samuel therefore chose a certain Saul, also called Tālūt, of the tribe of Benjamin as king and anointed him as the chosen of Yahweh. But Saul failed in his religious duties and was abandoned by Samuel in favour of a Youngman named David, of the tribe of Judah. When Saul was killed in battle against the Philistines, David was proclaimed king.

David made Jerusalem his capital and founded a strong unified kingdom. This Israelite kingdom lasted through the reigns of David and his son Solomon. But when Solomon tried to live like an oriental despot and engaged in extensive building

projects, the northern tribes of Israel, perhaps unable to bear the burden, revolted at the time of the accession of Solomon's son Rehoboam. Thereafter there were two kingdoms: the north, which took the name Ephraim or Israel and the south, which was composed of only two tribes – the Judah and Benjamin. The northern kingdom was more prosperous its first king was Jeroboam, the son of Nebat. To the disadvantage of Israel/Ephraim, it was closer to the conquering powers of the age. The nearest powerful neighbour was Assyria.

Of the Assyrian emperors the first to invade Israel was Tiglath – Pileser who forcibly seized northern parts of the Hebrew kingdom and carried the captives to Assyria, thus commencing the captivity which had been so long as often threatened. Tiglath – Pileser died in 727 BC and was succeeded by Shalmaneser who besieged Samaria, capital of the northern kingdom, in 724 BC, and by the end of 722 BC smashed the defences and entered the city. Hoshea, king of Israel, had already fallen into his hands. What followed was the usual massacre and pillage. Twenty seven thousand and two hundred of the inhabitants were made prisoners and carried into captivity by the conquerors. Samaria was spared, not razed to the ground, and continued to function as a provincial capital under Assyrian governors. But the kingdom founded by Jeroboam was brought to an end after an existence of about two centuries and a half (Rawlinson 188: 177).

By 711 BC, the next Assyrian monarch, Sargon, realized that Judah, the Southern Hebrew state, together with other nations, was conspiring against him. He could take no firm action to tackle this problem, but his son, Sennacherib who succeeded him in 705 BC, swept over the land ravaging the territory and gathering spoils and captives. In his own account of the invasion, he says, that he carried off “200, 150” persons, a number which appears to be exaggerated. Finding no way out Hezekiah, king of Judah sent his nobles and tribute to Assyria and accepted a feudatory status.

Shortly afterwards however Hezekiah sent his ambassadors carrying rich presents to Egypt and requested Pharaoh's help against the Assyrians. As intelligence

regarding this new development reached Nineveh, the Assyrian capital, Sennacherib decided to deal with the Egyptians first, before taking on Jerusalem. At the head of all his forces he marched into Palestine for the second time and reached Libnah, a city at no great distance from Jerusalem, the possession of which, he thought, would strengthen his position. But this time luck did not smile on him, and Libnah turned out to be an inauspicious place for him. Some kind of a natural calamity befell his force so that he had to hasten back after the loss of a major portion of his army.

The next great calamity befell the Jewish people in the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, the most powerful amongst the Chaldeans who ruled Babylon after the fall of the Assyrian empire. As Chaldeans locked horns with Assyrians for supremacy in the Euphrates –Tigris valley, the Egyptians under the Pharaoh, Neco, found opportunity to extend their influence as far north as Syria in the territories considered by Babylon as its own. Nebuchadnezzar therefore moved quickly and engaged the enemy at Carchemish on the middle Euphrates. The Egyptian army suffered a crushing defeat and fled precipitately. Nebuchadnezzar could not punish Neco as he desired, for, his father died at Babylon and he had to return to the capital city. Meanwhile Judah under king Jehoiakin revolted in 602 BC. About the year 598 BC, Nebuchadnezzar marched at the head of a large army into Syria and besieged Tyre and Jerusalem simultaneously. Jerusalem very soon succumbed. Jehoiakin fell into Nebuchadnezzar's hands who put him to death and, placing Jehoiachin on the throne, returned home. But suspecting the new Hebrew King of treachery, he sent some of his generals and then himself followed in full force. As the siege of Jerusalem was pressed hard, Jehoiachin, his mother along with princes of Judah and Jerusalem went out to the king and placed themselves at his disposal the army entered the city and plundered the Temple and the royal palace. A multitude of captives were seized and carried off. The vacant throne of Judah was handed over to Mattania (also known as Zedek-jah). For a while things went very well. In the ninth year of his reign (589 BC) the Jewish king concluded a secret treaty with Hophra, the Egyptian Pharaoh and openly revolted.

The forces of Nebuchadnezzar were immediately put in motion and Jerusalem invested. The city was reduced and plundered. King Zedek-jah was seized and blinded while his attendants and sons were put to death. The precise number of captives is not mentioned. Not very long after this tragedy the Babylonians were defeated and replaced by the Achaemenian emperor Cyrus in about 550 BC. He allowed the Jews to return to Jerusalem and also helped them in the reconstruction of their Temple.

Palestine remained in Persian hands until its conquest by Alexander, the Great, after whose death it was taken over by Seleucus, one of his generals. A descendant of Seleucus tried to impose Hellenization in the country but he faced stiff opposition from the more orthodox Jews who, under the family of Maccabees, asserted their independence. Thereafter it was ruled by client kings of the Roman emperors who converted it into an imperial province in AD 6. But, when it revolted again during the rule of the Roman emperor Titus in AD 70, Jerusalem was captured by the Roman forces causing great destructions and its inhabitants dispersed. There was no Jewish nation again until the middle of the 20th century.

Bani Israel: Muslim Version

The history of the Bani Israel recorded by Muslim chroniclers is full of complications, particularly in the field of proper names which have been greatly vitiated by generations of ignorant scribes, but, in general, it is in accord with that known from the scriptures. The salient features such as the struggle launched by the Bani Israel for supremacy in Palestine, the sack of Samaria and deportation of captives during the Assyrian period, the natural calamity that befell the forces of Sekhārib (Sennacherib), Bakht Nasar's (Nibuchadnezzar's) invasion of Jerusalem and carrying off captives to Babylon, their release by the Achaemenian emperor Cyrus, Alexander's invasion, the destruction of Jerusalem and dispersal of population for the third time (in this case by the Romans) are all mentioned, but instead of highlighting the actual facts of history, these are buried in fables and

narrated amidst confusion regarding the difference between the Assyrians and the Chaldeans as two separate and successive dynasties, for, the kings belonging to these dynasties are all indiscriminately lumped together under the blanket term “Bābel Shāh” (King of Babylon), which is not incorrect, for, both the Assyrians and Chaldeans ruled Babylon during periods of their ascendancy, but it does not tell the difference between the two dynasties.

The chroniclers referred to above include Ma‘ūdi (346 H/957), Ibn al-Athīr (died AD 1233), Ibn al-Kathīr (701-774 H/130-1372-73), Qazwīni (730 H/1329) and Mīrkhwand (died AD 1498). These writers, who have left behind voluminous works, depended primarily upon the Qurān for information with regard to the Hebrew nation, but, knowing fully well that the Qurān was not a book of history, they also drew upon what they called Israeliyāt (i.e. Israel Studies). Information of the Qurān was considered as the word of God and therefore superior to any other source (Ibn Kathīr 1987: 326, 369, 374).

The Qurān however does not mention the names of individual Israelite rulers of the post-Solomon period and gives only a gist of some major events affecting the Jewish people. It reads:

And we gave (clear) warning to the Children of Israel in the Book (revealed to Moses), that twice would they do mischief on the earth and be elated with mighty arrogance (And twice would they be punished)!

When the first of the warnings came to pass, we sent against you our servants given to terrible warfare: they entered the very inmost parts of your homes; and it was a warning (completely) fulfilled. Then did we grant you the return as against them: we gave you increase and sons, and made you the more numerous in man-power.

If ye did well, ye did well for yourselves; If ye did evil, (Ye did it) against your selves. So when the second of the warnings came to pass (We permitted your enemies) to disfigure your faces, and to enter your Temple, as they had

entered before, and to visit with destruction all that fell into their power (Yusuf, A. 1937: II, xvii, Vs. 4-7).

Without differentiating the northern from the Southern state, the above verses clearly mention that the Hebrews were twice invaded and overpowered by foreign forces who plundered their cities and caused great damage, and that in between these invasions was a period of respite in which the Jews grew rich and powerful. Who precisely these invaders were and where from did they come were the kind of questions for which answers to be worked out.

Muslim chroniclers did try to find answers. But their source of information – *Israeliyāt* (Israeliology) as they called it – does not appear to have been well developed at that time. The result is that some of the significant features of the story are missed out. For instance they refer to the general uprising of the ten northern tribes in the reign of Rehoboam (son and successor of Solomon) but seem to have been unaware of the establishment of two independent Hebrew states. Curiously, Jeroboam, who founded the northern state, is mentioned as the successor of Rehoboam, ruler of the Judah (or the Southern State). Similarly utter confusion prevails regarding the chronological positions of Sennacherib (written *Sanhārīb*), an Assyrian emperor, and Nebuchadnezzar (written *Bakht Naṣar*), a Chaldean emperor. Ibn al-Athīr (1979: I, 256) says that both the above mentioned emperors were among the six survivors of the army of Sennacherib when it was struck down by a natural and completely destroyed. Mas'ūdi (1985: I-II, 77) mentions *Ful'īfas* as the Kabul Shah who invaded the Israelites and omits the name of Sennacherib altogether. Ibn al-Kathīr (1987: I-II, 381) says that it was *Bakht Nasar* (Nebuchadnezzar) who advised *Sakhārīb*, the king of Babylon, to taken on the Bani Israel. But, surprisingly, the list of the names of the Kings of Bani Israel of the post-Solomon period and the reign length of each ruler is almost the same as given by Rawlison. The name of Shalmaneser, who invaded the northern capital, Samaria, and took numerous captives besides rich booty and carried them off to Assyria in 721 BC is not mentioned by any of our chroniclers. However, all of them mention that *Bakht Nasar*

invaded Jerusalem (586 BC) for the second time and took a multitude of captives. An interesting detail with regard to the captives recorded by Ibn al-Kathīr (pp.382-83) shows that they were taken from all the twelve tribes of Bani Israel (ten are mentioned by name and the remaining two are covered by the phrase “the other families”). He given the precise number of captives taken from each tribe but does not say that the tribes were carried off in too. In view of this the much hyped theory that ten of the twelve tribes were completely lost loses its credibility.

These, the so-called “lost ten tribes” are considered by some writers to be the progenitors of the Pakhtūns or Pushtūns. But no trace of the Hebrew language, which they must have brought with them in the area of the *pusht* (back) of the Koh-I Sulemān – the Pashtūn homeland – has so far come to light. The huge chunk of humanity represented by the ten tribes who once formed the entire population of the northern state (viz., Israel) should have left clearly identifiable impact on the newly acquired lands, and, moreover, if the Pushtūns are their real off-spring, their language should have persisted till now, this however does not appear to be the case.

In the absence of any documentary testimony on the subject, we are left only with Pushto which is no doubt as old as the Pushūns themselves, and, if properly understood, may throw some useful light on their origin. The words Pushto, Pushtūn / Pukhtūn are evidently derived from the Persian word *pusht* meaning ‘back’. It is the same as the English word ‘post’ (as in post-mortem). It is also the name of the vast mountainous area marked out by different ranges and offshoots of the Koh-i Sulemān between Ghazni and Qandahār. In elevation therefore it stands much higher than the neighbouring lands. Apparently the name owes its origin to the Persian speaking Tāzjiks of the Kābul valley who styled the inhabitants of this area Pushtūn, meaning “those who live at the back”, with no ethnic or tribal connotations. It is obvious that this purely geographical term had nothing to do with ethnicity, for, all those who lived at the “back” were Pushtūns irrespective of their ethnic origin. These people also came to be known as Afghān (probably meaning “highlander” (see Dani 1969: 61) – a term which became popular with Persian writers in the medieval period. It is

certainly not a Pushto word, and, if the meaning given to it is correct, it is obvious that it owes its origin to the mountainous character of the *pusht*.

In the lands to the south and east of Indus the term Pushtāna/Pakhtāna (plural form of Pushtūn / Pakhtūn) is rendered as Pathān. The reason is not far to seek. In the dialects spoken in these lands sh(shīn) followed by t(te) turns into the (ṭhe). This change may also be seen in the territorial designation Poṭholār (correctly Pushthār) meaning “land at the back” (of a mountain). It can be seen that sh (shīn) and t (te) in Pushthāra are merged into the transforming Pushthār into Pathohāre. This term is used for the piedmont districts of Rāwalpindi Chakwāl and Jehlam. Literally, the terms Poṭhohāri and Pushtūn have the same meaning: “one who lives at the back”, or declivity of a mountain.

All those who have spoken with authority on this subject believe that Pushto is probably a Saka dialect from the north. The earliest of these is Justin, a Roman historian, whose exact date is not known but his work appears to be a collection of the most interesting passages of Trogus’ voluminous history datable to the first century BC. Hence the statements made by Justin may be referred to that age (Majumdar 1960: 188). Describing the language of the Parthians (who shared a common cultural heritage with the Sakas in their original homeland to the north of the Jaxartes river), he says, that it is half way between Median and Scythian, and a mix-up of both. This “mix-up” – a rough east Iranian tongue – might have been the precursor of Pushto and various other languages of the Pamīr region.

Grierson who carried out an extensive survey of Indian languages in the last century, in the article on Pushto holds it to be conclusively proved that this language belongs to the eastern group of the Iranian family represented by Avesta and its Zend commentaries. Zoroaster, the founder of the Zoroastrian religion in which Avesta and Zend are considered to be holy scriptures, spread his teachings from Sogdiana and the eastern parts of the Iranian world. This, according to Grierson, is the undoubted ancestry of Pushto.

Morgenstirne (1955), who has delved deeper into the subject likewise remarks that Pushto is probably a Saka dialect from the north. In origin and structure, he affirms, it is an Iranian language, though it has borrowed freely from the Indo-Aryan group. According to Caroe (1985: 66), a regular change to be observed in relating cognates in the Persian and Pushto is to be seen in the Persian d (dāl) which becomes the Pushto l (lām). A few common words will serve to illustrate this point: `

Persian	<u>pidar</u> ,	father	Pushto	<u>pilār</u>
“	<u>dīdan</u> ,	to see	“	<u>lidal</u>
“	<u>dāram</u>	I have	“	<u>laram</u>
“	<u>dāh</u> ,	ten	“	<u>las</u>
“	<u>dukhtar</u> ,	daughter	“	<u>lur</u>
“	<u>dast</u> ,	hand	“	<u>lās</u>
“	<u>diwaneh</u> ,	mad	“	<u>liwanay</u>

Persian origin of Pushto prayer names will be seen in the following examples:

Arabic	Persian	Pushto
Fajr, morning prayer	Namāz-i Sahr	Sahr Munz
Zuhr, noon prayer	Namāz-i Pishīn	Māspikhīn
‘Asr, afternoon prayer	Namāz-i Dīgar	Māzigar
Maghrib, evening prayer	Namāz-i Shām	Mākhām
‘Ishā, night prayer	Namāz-i Khuftan	Māskhutan

Wrapping up the whole discussion it may be seen that Sāmāria and Jerusalem were both sacked, twice in each case, in the course of four successive invasions carried out first by the Assyrian and then by the Chaldean emperors of Nineveh and Babylon respectively. In addition to these four, the Roman invasions in the first century AD equally caused great destruction and also put an end to the Hebrew state. The victors took numerous captives and carried them off to distant lands. As to the precise number of captives there are conflicting and often exaggerated accounts.

There is also mention of complete deportation of the Hebrew race (all the twelve tribes) from Palestine. But Ibn Kathīr's statement shows that Nebuchadnezzar (Bakht Nasar), took captives from all the twelve tribes when they were in Palestine. This, despite prophet Esdras' statement on the contrary, shows that the much hyped theory purporting "ten lost tribes" is not all that credible. If this is so the perception that Afghans are the lost ten tribes of Israel cannot stand the test of reason.

The study of Pushto has indicated the direction in which to look for the original home of the Pushtūns. It is generally agreed that Pushto falls in the group of languages spoken in eastern Iran which, in the first millennium BC was dominated by Scythian (or Saka) nomads who are known to have penetrated deeper in Iranian territories where they established their colonies. One such example is Sakastān (later Seistān, present Sīstān). From this case the more enterprising among them, pushed on into Baluchistan, lower Sind and Western India where they created small kingdoms for themselves. Some of these nomads would seem to have found been reused the grazing fields on the pusht of the nearby the

The study of Pushto has indicated the direction in which to look for the original home of the Pushtūns. It is generally agreed that Pushto falls in the group of languages spoken in eastern Iran which, in the first millennium BC was dominated by Scythian (or Saka) nomads who are known to have penetrated deeper into the Iranian territories where they established their colonies; one such example is Sakastān (later Seistān, present Sīstān). From this base, the more enterprising among them pushed on into Baluchistān, lower Sind and western India where they ruled for centuries. Some of these nomads, lured by the lush green meadows and pasture lands found on the pushto of the Koh-i Sulemān, decided to stay there for the benefit of their cattle, the backbone of their economy. Here, sheltered behind the lefty walls of the mountains they continued to grow in number over the centuries and when the pusht became too small to accommodate them all, they initiated the process of spilling over into the neighbouring lands. The Saka tribes who made the pusht their home came to be known as Pushtūn and their language as Pushto. Others of their

kind, such as Budnis, Dāwars and possibly Dilazāks, who could not find a niche on the pushto settled in other parts of Afghānistān retained their old tribal designations.

In the fifth century BC the Budnis were in the Caspian region (Herodotus 1973: 278); the Geloni (present Gīlāni or Jīlāni), although Greek by origin, lived among them and spoke half Greek and half Scythian. The Budnis are next mentioned by the Akhund, Darweza (1960: 107-10), who says that they occupied vast tracts of lands in and around Nangarhār. Their territories must have extended to some parts of the Peshāwar valley, for, a branch of the Kabul river, the one nearest to Peshāwar city, is still known as Budni (wrongly interpreted by some as “old”). They were pushed out of Nangarhār by Sultān Bahrām of Pīch, and are known to have fled eastwards. The Gakhars and Kathars are probably some of the Budni clans who crossed the Indus and settled in the Sind-Sagar Doab.

The Dawars, now in Pakistān, have left behind their name in Afghānistān where an important province is still known as Zamīn Dāwar (actually Dāwar). The Dilazaks occupied a vast territory stretching from Bajaur to the Indus. Having been driven out by the Yusufzais from these territories, they likewise crossed the Indus and settled in Hazara from where they were later scattered by Mughal forces during the reign of the emperor Nūr ad-Dīn Jahāngīr.

Bibliography

- Burners, A. (1834) *Travels into Bokhara*, John Murray.
- Caroe, S. O. (1958) *The Pathāns*, Oxford Uni. Press, Karachi.
- Easten, S. C. (1970) *The Heritage of the Past*, New York.
- Elphinstone, M. (1992) *The Kingdom of Caubul*, Vol. 1, Karachi.
- Herodotus (1973) *The Histories*, Penguin Classics, trans. by A. de Sélincourt, Great Britian.
- Ibn al-Athīr. (1979) *Al-Kāmil fī at-Tārīkh*, Vol.1, Beirut.
- Ibn al-Kathīr (1987) *Tārīkh Ibn-i Kathīr*, Vol.1, Urdu trans., Karachi.
- Khattak, P. (2005) *Pashtūn Kawn*, Pushto Academy, Peshawar.
- Majumdar, R. C. (1960) *The Classical Accounts of India*, Calcutta.
- Al-Mas‘ūdi, A. (1985) *Tārīkh al-Mas‘ūdi*, Urdu trans. Karachi.
- Ni ‘amat Ullah. (1978) *Makhzan-i Afghāni*, Urdu trans., Lahore.
- Raverty, H. C. (1856) *Pushto Grammar*, London; Peshawar, repr. 1981.
- Rawlinson, G. (1889) *The Lives and Times of Kings of Israel and Judah*, London.
- Roshan, K. (ed.) (1977) *Tawārīkh Ḥāfiz, Raḥmat Khāni*, Urdu trans., Pushto Academy, Peshawar.
- Yusuf, A. (1937) *The Quran*, English trans.

