

<http://www.soas.ac.uk/events/event56771.html>

Shah Mahmoud Hanifi

NOTE: This document has been modified since submitting it for distribution on 31 May. It will continue to be modified until the conference itself on 10 June when a final PDF will be prepared and printed for presentation and subsequent notation and amendment on the route toward publication.

THE COMBINED HISTORY OF PASHTO PRINTING AND RESISTANCE TO PRINT

I. Introduction

Great thanks to Ben, Magnus, Jane, & SOAS.

Depending on the deployment of power point slides, or not, combinations of the following prefatory comments will be used to get the presentation started:

Jirgas and the Tent of Printing. In jirga spirit I want to speak with you, not to you, about the history of Pashto printing. I will spring from some of Professor Barth's pioneering work about Pashtuns and Swat but then move to address issues raised in recently written work by Nile Greene probably most directly, but at least in limited ways also Magnus Marsen and Ben Hopkins, as well as David Edwards and Charles Lindholm, Christine Noelle, Richard Tapper, Nancy Lindisfarne, Mukulika Banerjee, Sana Haroon, Bob Nichols, Hugh Beattie.... indeed it seems all participants here have had something to say somewhere along the line that has a bearing on the history, language and identity of the Pashtuns. Metaphorically, then, Pashto Printing is a big nomadic tent that I hope we can all meaningfully share for a few moments!

Maps, Identity and Printing. It is unclear precisely how the ubiquitous ethnic map of Afghanistan took shape, but language is at its root. Combine the critique of the ethnic map (can't capture movement, minorities, historically changing relations) with a sort of warm up about the historical geography of Pashto. In terms of mapping languages and their boundaries, I would to posit the idea of Pashto being bounded by Kabul, Qandahar, Peshawar and Quetta. Leaving aside the challenges of conceptualizing "urban Pashtunness," what is most useful for us at present is that these four cities compare well to the four contact situations Barth describes for Pathan communities in *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*. The brief outline of the historical geography of the Pashto language provided below will highlight how printing in Pashto led to a significant displacement and rearrangement of identities tied to that language.

Metonymy in Light of Varied Language Relations. Also by way of introduction I would like to draw attention to the Afghan-Pashtun-Pathan metonymy and how Barth's analysis of ethnicity can account for how these groups could in fact be the same people. But for historical and other analytical reasons I think we need to pay attention to some of the distinctions between those categories. One way to do this is to examine how the three categories arise in distinct historical contexts and how

each category relates differently to the Pashto language and its printing, as well as to other languages in time and space.

II. Historicizing Forms of Language and Reviewing Fredrik Barth on Pashto

It is possible to conceptually separate multiple dimensions of language that collectively articulate it. We can immediately identify four forms of linguistic practice: speaking, writing and printing, and publishing. Writing, printing and publishing are connected but separable dimensions of language and communicative practices, and in general terms I would like to draw attention to the historical boundaries between the speaking, writing, printing, and publishing of Pashto language texts. I will focus on the linguistic boundaries and interactions between Pashto and other languages entailed in approximately 500 years of Pashto writing. The exercise will provide a general historical overview of Pashto's textual history.

Shining analytical light on the historical and what might be loosely termed structural boundaries involved in the history of Pashto language production will illuminate how the practices that allow for the printing and publishing of Pashto texts are subject to political and technological constraints. A combined sense of the possibilities and limits of Pashto printing and publishing generates my title, and attention to the history of Pashto language production, practices and boundaries of various sorts will structure the narrative. The focus will be on the production side of Pashto writing and printing; the consumption of those texts through reading, oral transmission and state dissemination await separate treatment. The motive for offering this brief history of Pashto's textuality and textual boundaries is to extend Professor Barth's discussion of Pashtun identity.

With that in mind I would like to briefly draw attention to the place of the Pashto language in two of Professor Barth's books. In the Introduction to *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries* (EGB) on page 11 a shared field of communication is referenced as one of four ethnic group characteristics and of course here language is primary. On page 119 of EGB in the chapter on "Pathan Identity and its Maintenance" Pathan custom is viewed as articulated through language but, and this is critical, language alone is not sufficient to actualized Pathan identity. In the same chapter on page 128 we learn Pashto is the lingua franca in the stratified society of Swat and that merely speaking (*Pashto wayel*) but not doing Pashto (*Pashto kawul*) devalues the motivation to claim Pashtunness and may lead to a 'sloughing off' of Pashtun identity. Finally on page 140 we have a number of observations about the use of Pashto in domestic and public situations in Swat Kohistan. In the crudest of schematizations Professor Barth's analysis of Pashtun identity in EGB explores four cross-boundary ethnic contact situations that contextualize divergent public expression of three core components of Pashtun identity, namely seclusion (*pardah*), decision by councils (*jirga*) and hospitality (*melmastia*) that are contextualized by ecological, demographic, class, and other variables.

In *The Last Wali of Swat* (LWS) on page 51 readers find the Wali's father needed a scribe who asks to "go and learn to write a bit of Persian" in Thanna because the "official language of correspondence was then Persian," only later shifting to Urdu. On the same page we learn the Wali's father "introduced Pashto" (unclear how; orally or textually at court? --SMH) and that the Wali "continued using it" but that all correspondence with the British and Pakistani Governments was in English. The same page also indicates the most trusted messenger of the Wali's father was a converted Sikh who adopted near fluent Pashto. Finally on page 101 of LWS there is the tantalizing statement that the political agents in Swat all spoke Pashto up to the level of Governor and that those officials were "all made to learn it" first before being sent there. The LWS draws attention to strategic value of spoken Pashto, the power of Persian language literacy, and the role of the colonial language examination system.

Using the history of Pashto printing in what follows I will elaborate on some of the general issues Professor Barth touched upon in EGB and LWS.

III. Pre-Mughal History: Islam, Persian Writing and the Shadowy Origins of a Pashto Speech Community

It is of course hard to even guess about when Pashto first emerged as a spoken language, particularly the ingredients and innovations entailed by those first utterances. It is an only slightly less precarious exercise to accurately chart how spoken Pashto evolved in its own right and in relation to the world around it. One rough guide to Pashto's origin and development is a chart of languages, and here I will reference the chart in *Encyclopaedia Iranica* to draw attention, still in rough schematic terms, to the large number of languages that Pashto is structurally related to and currently surrounded by.

The genealogical organization of the language family tree has Pashto representing something on the order of a single complex "leaf" of the eastern Iranian "stem" of the Indo-Aryan "branch" of the Indo-European language "tree." This chart results from a comparison of grammars, vocabularies, and a wide variety of other linguistic evidence. The idea and methodology behind this genealogical approach to the history of languages and linguistic interaction was in large measure developed by Sir William Jones whom will be addressed below.

The history of writing in the area we now know as Afghanistan is also a vexing subject. If we begin the conversation with Alexander the Great we are left with more questions than answers about the bureaucracies he and his armies encountered and bequeathed. Some of the earliest texts written in an Indic language, namely birch bark scrolls etched in the Gandhari language using the Kharosthi script, appeared roughly three or four centuries after Alexander in approximately the first century A.D.

The Ghaznavid era historically anchored for around 1000 A.D. marks the appearance of Islamic state structures. The bureaucracies and chanceries associated with the Ghaznavid and other Islamic polities that proliferated during the medieval period (broadly from the Buyids to Babur) routinely used both Arabic and Persian, a pair of languages then also twinned in the writings of cosmopolitan intellectuals such as al-Biruni who helps us appreciate the growing importance of writing throughout the medieval Islamic state system.

The high profile of Turkish populations and languages in the emerging Islamic ecumene is increasingly apparent during the medieval period, most notably for our purposes in the context of the Delhi Sultanate. The integration of populations of Turkish slaves in the Delhi Sultanate 'naturally' complicated what appears as mere Arabic-Persian hybridity with a number of additional linguistic elements from Central Asia.

In the Delhi Sultanate we stand on comfortable historical ground imagining spoken Pashto, no matter how developed on its own evolutionary terms, being audible in commercial, political and military settings throughout Himalayan foothills and Ganges plains where a synthetic Indo-Persian Islamic state was being formed and reformatted through a series of migrations between South and Central Asia.

By the time of Babur's passage from Turkistan to Hindustan through the Hindu Kush it is clear that spoken Pashto existed over a wide area between roughly Herat and Calcutta. This expanse was composed of various dynamic zones of linguistic interaction. On the historical cusp of its textualization spoken Pashto existed in a dynamic linguistic environment where Persian, Arabic, Chaghatai and other Turkish languages and dialects, as well as multiple local (as far as local can be determined in a world where movement was ordinary) Indian languages and dialects were present in spoken and written form.

IV. The Mughal Period Writing of Pashto and Early Pashto Lexicography

The claims of Abd al-Hai Habibi about the *Pata Khazana* and the numerous references to oral reckonings of the non-extant writings of Shaikh Mali notwithstanding, it is clear Pashto was first written during the Mughal period.

The formative era of Pashto's textualization involved considerable lexicographical and philological production. For heuristic purposes we can posit that dictionaries and grammars represent language boundaries. Because all cultural boundaries are permeable, in addition to restricting connections boundaries also serve as bridges that enable or as Professor Barth might say 'canalize' relationships. Dictionaries therefore represent boundaries and bridges between languages and grammars represent boundaries and bridges between vernacular and classical expressions of language.

The production of dictionaries and grammars reveals some of the power structures behind printing, which invariably leads down the analytical path to states, especially the schools, bureaucracies, and armies that define them. The contested dimension of all power involves resistance to it. Printing certainly represents power but the articulation of printing power in textual form reveals variety and competition between texts and their authors and sponsors and between spoken and written forms of language/s. In the Mughal period and arguably through to today we can see “insurgent” Pashto competing against “hegemonic” Persian for textual space.

Vladimir Kushev is arguably the most insightful guide to understanding the context in which Pashto was first textualized. Kushev’s work illuminates the boundaries and relationships between Pashto and other languages during the period when it can be said with historical certainty that Pashto was first written. State interests and patronage are clearly key ingredients in the means of Pashto manuscript production under the Mughals, particularly toward the end of the Mughal imperium when British colonial rule was taking shape in South Asia.

Kushev can be seen as picking up on Barth’s attention to the various boundaries surrounding Pashtuns, but whereas Barth focuses on congeries of values, strategies, and resources Kushev is interested in the history of linguistic connections between Pashto and other languages. Kushev notes the geographical spread of Pashto allowed for multiple linguistic contacts but little linguistic unity for the language. His examination of poetry, prose and chronicle writing samples from the earliest periods of Pashto textualization between the sixteenth and eighteenth century reveals a large variety of loanwords in Pashto from Persian, Turkish, and Indian languages.

While loan words obviously result from linguistic contact, it important to appreciate that linguistic contact is predicated on inequalities in political and market relations and that those inequalities contextualize the social spaces of language interaction and textual production. Kushev posits that half of Pashto’s written vocabulary during this period comes from Arabic and Persian loanwords. Leaving aside the important and complicated relationship between the Arabic and Persian languages, the influence of Persian has been determinant in number of respects for Pashto from its first phase of textualization in the 1500s and 1600s through its arguably formative period in the 1770s and 1800s.

Persian was not just a language of administration for the states that surrounded but could not encapsulate the Pashto language and its speakers. It was also a normative model for poetry and a second mother tongue for many Pashtuns. Early Pashto writers devoted a large portion of their labor to translating Persian poetry, folktales, legends, and religious narratives. All Pashto poets also wrote separately in Persian and many wrote bi-lingual diwans or compendiums of poetry. In addition to poetics where the Persian style of meter and rhyme set the standard for emulation, medieval science, art and especially religion and theology were the largest sources of content for the majority of Persian and through Persian Arabic loanwords that

appeared in early Pashto writing. The first Pashto texts regularly used synonyms from Arabic and Persian poetry, often in alternating Pashto, Persian, and Arabic lines and verses.

Kushev views the Persian elements as a significant “substratum” of Pashto literature while also drawing attention to the lack of reciprocity and asymmetry in the relationship between the two languages. Unlike Pashto with its somewhat congenital incorporation of multiple layers of Persian vocabulary and narrative styles, Kushev notes (via Reshtiya) modern Persian in Afghanistan or Dari grafted a few handfuls Pashto words into its lexicon.

Pashto’s intimate relationship to, perhaps even dependency on Persian is well evidenced in the texts produced during its formative period and subsequent maturation phase. The formative era of Pashto writing is composed of two texts, each of which was heavily inflected by the Persian language and literary style. The first text to contain Pashto was the *Khair al-Bayan* that was written in approximately 1585 by Bayazid Ansari, who hails from Kaniguram in what is now South Waziristan. Ansari’s mother tongue wasOrmuri and the text in question includes Pashto, Persian, and Punjabi translations of numerous Arabic quotes from the Quran. The Quranic passages are accompanied with Persian translations as well as Pashto and Hindustani interpretations. The Pashto sentences themselves carry Persian and Arabic citations and references. The document is of critical importance because it is the first to contain as many as 13 new letters and/or graphemes (diacritics and other modifications and innovations such as for the multiple final yeys) in the Pashto language.

The *Makhzan al-Islam* was written by Akhund Darweza in close collaboration with his son Abd al-Karim in approximately 1615. It directly treated the Pashto writing system and offered suggestions for its improvement. This work is on the whole based on translations of Persian and Arabic religious works. All of its chapter titles and section headings and some of its introductions are in Persian. Akhund Darweza and authors of the few other state-sponsored works like it that included Pashto, also wrote in Persian, the language housing the greatest part of Pashto’s collective textual production.

Khushhal Khan Khattak’s (1613-1689) writings were produced in the middle and late 1600s. His oeuvre represents a bridge between the first two aforementioned Pashto texts and a proliferation of Pashto writings in the eighteenth and nineteenth century. In literary terms Khushhal could not escape Persian influences and a larger Persianate textual heritage in terms of both vocabulary and style. To be sure Khushhal enriched the Pashto language and its script through his writings, primarily by standardizing its eastern dialect and in so doing he enhanced its inherent vocabulary and restricted loanwords. Consciously limiting loan words did not do away with them altogether, however, and Khushhal did in fact choose to use loanwords from Hindi, Punjabi, Kashmiri, and Hindko throughout his corpus. The

loan words used by Khushhal were subject to transformation, orthographically and morphologically when incorporated into Pashto.

Kushev finds that Indian loanwords, unlike their more numerous Persian counterparts that remain somewhat more in tact, are incorporated more “organically” in Pashto. Kushev notes that most authors of Pashto language texts, notwithstanding the commonality of a second mother tongue of Persian, were bi- and often tri-lingual in Indian languages including the range of elite and popular dialects falling under the Sanskrit-Persian-Khari Boli-Hindustani-Hindi-Urdu continuum, as well as Hindko, Kashmiri and Punjabi, at least. When Indian words enter Pashto they are incorporated or ingested with transformations in final vowels and suffixes for the critical distinguishing Pashto feature of gendering, primarily. The Indian loan words are folded into the structure of Pashto with some verb stems (-edil and -awal, for example) being incorporated to such an extent that they become polysemantic. The intimacy between Pashto and Indian languages characterizing the formative period of Pashto textual production results from multiple centuries of sustained contact between Pashto-speakers and their neighbors to the east.

What is glossed rather unproblematically as “Hindustani” provides the richest set of loan words for the early Pashto. Kushev provides a rough set of categories for the Hindustani loan words that entered Pashto during its formative period. The categories and proportionalities are:

I.) abstract substances, qualities, senses, feelings and others (41 words); II.) qualitative adjectives, adverbs (43 words); III.) action and state expressed by verbs and verbal nouns (31 words); IV.) the terminology concerning ethnography and social relations (57 words), half of which (29 words) denote occupations, professions and the social status of persons in Indian and Pashtun societies; V.) words having similar subject meanings and denoting goods and objects relating to the economy, household management, clothes, habitation, and settlements (55 words); VI.) the words for animals (or their behavior), and parts of the human body (39 words); VII.) there are 35 words for different kinds of food, edible plants and 15 more for other plants, including medicinal and poisonous; VIII.) 18 Indian loan words are numerals, measures of time and weight, including names of 5 Indian months, 2 week-days and 4 numerals meaning big quantities; IX.) smaller groupings include nature and its phenomena, military terms, ornaments, fabrics and garments, relationship terms (kinship and affinity), creeds (especially dervishism and yoga), spiritual culture (poetry), cosmetics and perfumery, and specific words for negative properties of persons and occupations.

Just as the Mughal state indirectly then directly generated the first two Pashto language texts, the Durrani and British polities are responsible for the second generation of Pashto language writings. This period, designated above as a formative period of maturation, lasted roughly from the late 1700s through the

early 1800s. During this phase there was a noticeable surge in the production of Pashto language texts. These texts also depend on Persian, but now also more liberally incorporate elements from other languages.

While poetry and religion are the most voluminous subject matters treated in this material, a significant strand of perhaps twenty percent of Pashto language writing was strongly lexicographical (dealing with dictionaries and grammar) and increasingly philological (dealing with the history of languages, their origins, spread and contemporary relationships). Kushev notes an early nineteenth-century change in Pashto lexicography. Judging from the grammatical categories and formal paradigms these texts employ, a different structure and methodology takes shape in the Pashto dictionaries, grammatical essays and commentaries that now exhibit a greater familiarity with Iranian and Indian lexicography and European philological writings.

Three Pashto manuscripts from the late eighteenth century deserve notice in this regard. The first is *Marifat al-Afghani* written by Mulla Pir Muhammad Kakar in approximately 1773. This item is a teaching and conversation manual that was prepared for Ahmad Shah Durrani's son Sulayman. Kakar's work is a textbook and study guide, not a formal grammar per se. However, the *Amadnama-ye Afghani* that was produced in Rampur during the reign of the Durrani monarch Shah Zaman sometime between 1793-1801 is a formal grammar and a dictionary. The *Kitab-e Khiyalat-e Zamani dar Lughat-e Zaban-e Afghani* although incomplete was also produced at the turn of the century and intended as a combined grammar and dictionary. The authors of the *Amadnama* and *Kitab-e Khiyalat* are not named but appear to come from the eastern margins of the Pashto-speaking world. It is important to note these titles of Pashto texts are all in Persian and Arabic

The complexity and sophistication of Pashto lexicography increased during the early nineteenth century. The expanding British presence stimulated but did not cause this growth. It is clear that colonial patronage for new works and the quest to collect and codify older manuscripts amplified an already active intellectual and commercial market for local language materials in India.

Perhaps the most important Pashto language text is the *Riyaz al-Mahabbat* that was composed by Nawwab Mahabbatallah Khan Shahbaz-e Jang in roughly 1806-1807. A son of the famous Rohilla Chieftain Hafiz Rahmat Khan, Mahabbat was taken captive by the British after his father's death and the defeat and surrender of the Rohilkand polity to the British East India Company (BEIC). It was while in British custody and through the patronage of John Ulric Collins and George Hilario Barlow that Mahabbat was commissioned to write a Persian-Pashto dictionary. It is interesting to note that while under British supervision Mahabbat was repeatedly chastised for speaking Pashto with his brothers when they visited him, apparently for want of a suitable British translator or interpreter to surveil and bureaucratically ingest this language.

Mahabbat wrote in Hindustani most voluminously, and he produced diwans in that language as well as in Persian and Pashto. The *Riyaz al-Mahabbat* has two parts, the first being an extensive discussion of verbs and their various forms, and the second a Pashto-Persian dictionary (is it unclear if the dictionary is the same one commissioned by Collins and Barlow). Mahabbat appears to be the first person to describe Pashto sounds using examples from other languages, and the *Riyaz* appears as the first “scientific” lexical-grammatical study of the eastern dialect of Pashto. Bernhard Dorn who in 1847 composed and printed the first Pashto grammar to appear in Europe (St. Petersburg; see below) used the *Riyaz al-Mahabbat*.

The *Ajaib al-Lughat*, a four-language dictionary for Pashto, Persian, Arabic, and Hindustani was composed in 1813 by Ilahyar Khan. Ilahyar was also a son of Hafiz Rahmat Khan and therefore a brother of Mahabbat. Ilahyar notes that he used 26 Persian dictionaries published between 1220 and 1736 in compiling his impressive work that was subsequently used by Henry George Raverty (see below). An interesting feature of the *Ajaib* is that it identified three dialects of Pashto based upon the geographic range of distribution of sets of isoglossed phonemes. Roughly fifty years later Raverty identified eastern and western dialects of Pashto based upon a detailed consideration of the phonology and morphology of various semantic units within the language.

A summary history of Pashto dialectology that was inaugurated by Ilahyar’s *Ajaib* in the early 1800s is in order at this point. The latitudinal division of eastern and western Pashto Raverty produced in the mid-nineteenth century gave way to a longitudinal north-south Pashto dialectology by the end of the British colonial period in the mid-twentieth century. For example, *The Pathans* (1958) authored by a capstone colonial official on the North-West Frontier of British India, Olaf Caroe, distinguished ‘hard and soft’ dialects of Pashto based on a single isoglossed kh/sh phoneme. This ‘mere’ bifurcation reveals a dominant intellectual trend towards simplification of complex linguistic boundaries within the history of British colonial knowledge formations. In the 1980s a philological move was made from within the American academy “back” toward multiplicity with an identification of four dialects in Pashto. However, this most recent view merely distinguishes phonetic ‘sub-varieties’ of the still dominant and singular late-colonial focus on the phonetic variation of a single Pashto morpheme.

With that brief but necessary excursus behind us, we can return to the maturation period of Pashto lexicography in the early nineteenth century. Two anonymous texts, the *Farhang-e Irditdai* from c. 1810 and the *Afridinama* from c. 1815, directly result from British influence. The former item was commissioned by Archibald Seton and the latter work is a five language dictionary including Pashto, Persian, Hindustani, Kashmiri, and English.

In South Asia during the early nineteenth century period when the Mughal empire was evaporating and British rule was congealing written Pashto was still firmly grounded in what might be seen as a Persianate template that was becoming

increasingly receptive to Indian languages and British political influences. During this period Pashto lexicographical and philological texts appear as the combined product of local multilingual elites and British state sponsors. It is noteworthy that during this lively period of textual production there is no Pashto-Pashto lexicography. The absence of a self-referencing dimension to this literature draws attention to the market for Pashto language texts along and beyond the linguistic and geographical boundaries of Pashto speakers. At least in that restricted sense this material represents a cross-cultural exchange and boundary crossing. In textual practice early lexicography situates the Pashto language and therefore Pashtun ethnicity in some measure against multiple other speech communities, ethnic groups, and centers of power.

V. British Colonial Knowledge Formation and the Printing of Pashto: Sir William Jones and Henry George Raverty

Attention to the career and influence of Sir William Jones (1746-1794) helps to explain the appearance of the English language and the influence of European linguistic science in early Pashto lexicography. Sir William Jones is responsible for establishing the Asiatic Society of Bengal and its journal *Asiatic Researches* that combined to form the institutional framework that is responsible for generating the first printed specimen of the Pashto language. He is also responsible for the intellectual framework known as comparative philology that structured in important ways the British colonial engagement of the Pashto language, what types of Pashto texts would be printed, and how they would be circulated in new ways.

In the late 1780s Jones used his high profile position to advance an imaginative argument that distinct languages such as Greek, Latin, Sanskrit and Persian shared the same origin in a hypothetical proto-Indo-European language. Jones' language family tree model provided a master genealogy that revolutionized thinking about possible common ancestries of widely distinct contemporary civilizations. Before arriving in India Jones had learned Arabic well and mastered Persian, in addition to Hebrew, Turkish, Greek and Latin, not to mention his command of a handful of European languages. In India he began the intensive study of Sanskrit and other Indian languages and Jones' unique work and influential position contributed to what Tom Trautmann has called an "Indomania" or a new India-focused Orientalism of the 'far East' world of Hinduism. This new Orientalism departed from the older terrain of Orientalism grounded in the 'near East' where the Arabic and Persian languages preponderated and Islam reigned.

Among the many textual artifacts Jones and his team collected was a set of materials that included a sample of the Pashto language and a Persian abridgement of a Pashto text that conveyed a "very wild description" of Afghan descent from the Jews, particularly their being among the 'Lost Israeli Tribes.' Details of the Lost Tribes and the events surrounding the Great Flood or Deluge were among the most important geographic and chronological markers used to interrogate and interrelate languages and cultures within the global connections and philological theories Jones

was fashioning around the Indo-European idea. The Pashto language specimen is noticeable for the disdain it exhibits towards both Hindu and Muslim clerics as well as cities, particularly Peshawar that is associated with fire graves. Jones' weighty conclusions reflected familiarity with a Pashto dictionary of the sort describe above and the key for his theorizing about the Afghans as a Lost Israeli tribe was the "manifest resemblance" he detected between the Pashto and Chaldaic languages.

Through *Asiatic Researches* which carried the stamp of the prestigious new Asiatic Society, and through it the Bengal and English Governments, Jones proclaimed: "the account of the Afghans may lead to a very interesting discovery...and I strongly recommend an inquiry into the literature and history of the Afghans." There could be no more consequential intellectual and political endorsement for the study of the Pashto language. Pashto was then coming to be institutionally comprehended through the work of Jones and his colleagues as a language spoken by Afghans who form a community equated with Pathans, who hail from the Peshawar province of Kabul otherwise known as Roh, and who write in Persian.

Via the Chaldaic connection Pashto, Afghans, and Pathans became important links in a new Orientalist chain of reasoning connecting Asian and European peoples and by extension the geographies and histories of Judaism, Christianity, Islam, and Hinduism. No matter whether Jones was hoping to bring the Lost Tribes back into World Time or give World Time back to the Lost Tribes, these were indeed heady conceptual burdens for Afghans *cum* Pathans and their Pashto to bear!

The high profile and magnitude of Jones' claims about Pashto and Afghans and the resources it set in motion prompted hundreds if not thousands of colonial officials and researchers across approximately five generations to study Pashto and consider the Lost Tribe Hypothesis. Henry George Raverty (1825-1906) can be safely referred to as the foremost colonial authority on the Pashto language. The volume and merits of Raverty's Pashto oeuvre clearly distinguish him from the thousands of other officials who engaged the language and its speakers during the colonial period.

The prefatory and introductory remarks to Raverty's Pashto *Grammar* (1855) and *Dictionary* (1860) contain extensive commentary on the Jewish Descent Theory. These passages alone draw attention to the great ranges of Raverty's linguistic, historic and geographic knowledge that are conveyed much more fully and sometimes in extremely complicated and opaque ways in his writings, perhaps especially his *Notes On Afghanistan and Baluchistan* (1888).

Raverty's greatest contribution to the philological debates inaugurated by Sir William Jones is methodological. In the Introduction to his *Grammar* Raverty comments on Jones' position by discussing how traces of 'original languages' can never be extinguished and how the most relevant migrations for the philological analysis of the Pashto language have generally come from the west, all of which serves to buttress the Jewish Descent Theory.

Perhaps most significantly Raverty argues that full knowledge of surrounding languages is required before a sound comparison of any aspect of one single language can be made to that language's 'relatives.' Raverty continued to combine big ideas and small details in pursuit of Pashto philology after the publication of his *Grammar*. In the Introduction to his *Dictionary* Raverty addresses conceptual distinctions between languages, idioms, and dialects as those categories apply to contemporary and historic communities of Pashto speakers, as well as the details of casing, gender, pluralization, pronouns, tenses, and vowelings in Pashto.

In his published work Raverty addressed the "practical side" of the methodology coin as well as the "intellectual." Throughout the Introductions and Prefaces to his *Grammar* and *Dictionary* Raverty provides unique and important information on, for example, the practices of local women scribes who pen Pashto texts in their fathers' name, the background and credentials of his tutors and translators or *munshis*, the special fabrication of Pashto type for printing his work via 'Gutenberg's blessing,' and the attempt to use special indicators such as capitalization, underlining and red ink to enhance the meaning value for certain words.

In these pages Raverty mentions the seventeen years he spent studying nine Oriental languages, and provides concrete information about the financial incentives and rewards he received for his language studies (Rs. 1000 from the Governor in Council, Bombay for passing the Presidency Exam as Interpreter for Urdu, Persian, Marathi, and Gujarati), while also lamenting that the debt he incurred in doing so "never brought advantage or advancement." Raverty also comments on the ignorance of Pashto language examiners, offers only slightly veiled references to a competitor who 'beat him to the punch' in receiving official endorsement for work on the Pashto language without having to undergo scrutiny by 'competent judges,' and refers to the practice of subscription-based intellectual exercise on the Pashto language.

Unpublished archival sources reveal that Raverty's career involved a suspension without pay from his official duties on charges of bribery and corruption, and a series of petitions and appeals about the dismissal that appear to have culminated in his reinstatement to official colonial service in British India. It is striking that Raverty experienced this tumult during the approximate five years between the publication of his monumental *Grammar* and *Dictionary* of the Pashto language, in 1855 and 1860 respectively. These difficult experiences Raverty endured draw attention to a number of issues related to the marketing of Pashto and other vernacular language material in colonial India.

The large-scale printing of Pashto language texts for market consumption began with William Carey and the Baptist Missionary Press of Serampore that issued a Pashto language Bible in 1818. For both ideological and practical reasons a close working relationship developed between Jones' Asiatic Society and the Baptist Missionary Press that were and remain in very close proximity (the sites are a few

blocks apart). However, it is clear from various published versions of the first volumes of *Asiatic Researches* that the printing of Pashto began earlier than 1818 and that Pashto printing was not fully monopolized by the Serampore Baptists. Raverty's comments about new Pashto types being specially cut for printing and publishing his *Grammar* and *Dictionary* speak to an evolving set of production technologies. His published comments also address the expense and debt generated during the production of his Pashto language materials, and the trials and tribulations of marketing his work.

All of that published information is confirmed and elaborated upon in archival sources that reveal the considerable expense and intense competition surrounding the printing and marketing of Pashto language materials, both at the provincial and all-India level. Raverty's work incorporates forty separate Pashto characters, each of which is identified in relation to multiple other characters and sounds in multiple other languages such as the perhaps obvious Chaldaic, Hebrew, Aramaic, Sumerian, Armenian, and Georgian, but also apparently less clearly relevant languages such as Phoenician, Manchu, Tibetan, and Albanian.

In other words, Raverty's commitment to Jones' philology made his work intellectually unique and valuable, but also very challenging and expensive to produce. In the end, Raverty's detailed consideration and treatment of the Pashto language in its own right and in relation to other languages was not easily or very well marketed, which gave rise to a series of incidents and communications that structure the archival narrative of his fiscal complaints and legal troubles.

On the consumption side of his writings, Raverty's work on the Pashto language was certainly partially geared to academics and "Orientalists," but the major audience for his Pashto material was military. Indeed Raverty explicitly markets his writing to the military establishment. And it is the colonial military establishment that draws Raverty's wrath for its lack of appreciation and incorporation of his Pashto language work. The language exam system for colonial officers evolved considerably in the nineteenth century, as did the place of the Pashto language in that growing exam bureaucracy. Raverty's experiences indicate that competition was fierce for the considerable sums to be made for Pashto language materials that were successfully marketed within the context of official examinations. Raverty's work does not appear to have ever been featured in the official exam system. Instead, works authored by Vaughn before him, and subsequently Hughes and Plowden, and later Roos-Keepel and Khan, at least, were officially adopted or informally sanctioned as study and teaching aids for the colonial handling of Pashto.

Henry Walter Bellew (1834-1892) was a contemporary of Raverty's who was also vying to create space within military exam bureaucracy for his version of the Pashto language and instructional materials for it. Bellew indicates the exams in colloquial Pashto were first held in January 1863 and carried a Rs. 500 reward if successfully completed. In 1865 that exam was "assimilated mutandis mutadis to standard Hindustani," and Bellew's *Grammar* is explicitly structured with that exam format in

mind. Bellew demonstrates nowhere near the level of detailed command of Pashto or other languages as Raverty did, and also unlike Raverty Bellew viewed Pashto as a dialect of Sanskrit.

Bellew wrote his Pashto *Grammar* “somewhat on the model of Forbes’ Hindustani Grammar” and based it upon the assumption its user would already be familiar with Hindustani, the standardization of which, as well as its bifurcation into Hindi and Urdu are important parts of the history of Pashto that cannot be told here. The Hindustani modeling made Bellew’s Pashto *Grammar* much more familiar and intelligible to colonial officialdom than Raverty’s occasionally eccentric writings. Bellew’s use of only 20 characters for the Pashto language gave his work a substantially simplified and more manageable feel than Raverty’s. Bellew and Raverty were contemporaries in the colonial engagement of Pashto, but in terms of intellectual depth as it relates to successful marketing of ideas they were worlds apart.

Raverty’s *Dictionary* was printed in London in 1860 but his *Grammar* was printed in Calcutta by J. Thomas in 1855. Pashto printing continued in British India with Christian and Islamic Pashto language texts and Pashto lexicographical texts appearing in 1859 through the Peshawar Church Mission, in 1865 in Delhi, in 1877 in Amritsar, in 1883 in Abbottabad, and in 1884 in Dera Ghazi Khan, at least.

VI. The Printing and Publishing of Pashto Beyond British Colonialism: Missionaries, Militaries, and Universities from Serampore to Monterrey

We must briefly situate the printing of Pashto in Afghanistan before turning to the same concern in the global arena and US national context. And just as in the Mughal empire, in the Afghan state arena the printing of Pashto is fully nested within Persianate parameters. Expressions of Pashto printing appear so proportionally infrequently in Afghanistan as to conclude they are quite exceptional and subject to special scrutiny and resistance from dominant elements in the state bureaucracy and among political elites.

Pashto writing appears in the early Durrani empire in the form of Ahmad Shah’s (r. 1747-1772) diwan, which is perhaps its most celebrated for its couplet about how the mountain peaks of Pashtunkhwa make him forget the Delhi throne. Those two eighteenth century manuscript lines seemed to have had little adherence in nineteenth century texts but were regularly reprinted in twentieth century materials.

Lithographic printing technology was found in Kabul during the rule of Sher Ali (r. 1863-1866, 1868-1879) when the periodical *Shams al-Nahar* was printed between 1873 and 1877. That lithographic machinery was either expanded upon or replaced by Abd al Rahman but an apparently exponentially increased capacity was achieved by the importation of machinery and technical expertise from Delhi in the late 1880s. Of the thousands of documents printed during the reign of Abd al-Rahman,

the only evident Pashto language text is from 1886 and it contains the minutes of the meeting between Abd al-Rahman and Lord Dufferin held in Rawalpini held the previous year.

During the reign of Habibullah (r. 1901-1919) typographic and zincographic equipment was imported to support primarily Mahmud Tarzi's *Seraj al-Akhbar* (1911-1918) newspaper. A Pashto poem appeared in *Seraj al-Akhbar* in 1917. Also in 1917 a Pashto language textbook authored by Salih Muhammad was printed at the Mashin Khana in Kabul, and another Pashto language text authored by Muhammad Abd al-Wasi Qandahari was printed in Kabul in 1923. Amanullah (r. 1919-1929) printed a set of government edicts in Pashto in Kabul in 1927. Examples of publishing in the public sphere are the short-lived weekly combined Persian and Pashto *Tulu-e Afghani* that took shape around the same Salih Muhammad, and a Pashto language text produced by a literary society, the *Majlis-e Talif Pashto* in 1935. It is important to emphasize the two Pashto printings emanating from the public sphere were produced in Qandahar. We must also reckon with the fact that Muhammad Gul Khan Mohmand was able to print a Pashto language textbook in Balkh in 1938. Nevertheless, despite these public and private ventures, the Afghan state exerted most influence over Pashto printing in the 1930s, primarily through the government-sponsored literary and culture society, the *Pashto Tolena*.

From the 1940s through the 1970s, basically during the reign of Zahir Shah (r. 1933-1973), the trend toward government monopoly of printing through the *Pashto Tolena* and other minor organs of the state continued. In the 1980s and 1990s the historically heavily subsidized Afghan state lost its print monopoly to a lavishly subsidized Afghan diaspora through which Pashto printing proliferated via various non-governmental agencies in Peshawar especially but also elsewhere. Today in Afghanistan there are scores of Pashto language printers operating due largely to the re-concentration of diaspora-generated international funding in Kabul. A key agency whose funding triggers a great deal of Pashto printing is USAID and its well-known allies such as the University of Nebraska at Omaha that today operates the conspicuously well endowed Education Press that uses at least 25 printing presses in Kabul to service the Government of Afghanistan and American interests.

Stepping now back outside the trails used to track the printing of Pashto in the context of Afghanistan and the Afghan state, we will do well to recall that some of first efforts to print the language were made in Serampore (Calcutta/Kolkata) by William Carey and William Ward who organized the Baptist Mission Press that printed the New Testament in Pashto 1818, then other Christian works in 1820 and 1832. The Bible (broadly) and missionary literature designed to convert Pashto speakers continued to be printed in India and Europe throughout the nineteenth century. If we take note of the role of missionary Christianity in the US military and the use of the internet by electronic evangelicals it is clear printing and publishing the Pashto Bible remains a large and profitable global business today.

Pashto lexicographical work was printed with some regularity in London in the second half of the nineteenth century. This was in no small measure driven by Raverty's continued work on the Pashto and Persian languages after retiring from the British Army and returning to England in 1864. Pashto printing occurred in an isolated instance in France in the late 1880s. The second center of Pashto lexicography in Europe was in St. Petersburg where Bernhard Dorn (1805-1881) was stationed in various positions beginning in the 1830s. In the twentieth century St. Petersburg continued to be a primary locus for the study of the Pashto language under the direction of such personalities as N. Dvyorankov, D. A. Shafeev, and the aforementioned V. V. Kushev, to name a few of the many scholars who produced lexicographical and/or grammatical works on Pashto under Russian and Soviet state patronage.

In Europe during the twentieth century other notable authors of Pashto language material include in the first instance Georg Morgenstierne (1892-1978) who wrote on Pashto and surrounding languages for approximately fifty years beginning in the 1920s. In Poland Judwiga Pstrusinksa's work on Pashto from the 1970s and 1980s is noticeable. Of course at SOAS D. N. Mackenzie (1926-2001) and Christopher Shackle are the most notable linguists associated with Pashto, although neither would claim that language as his primary object of research.

The study of Pashto in Pakistan predates that state to the establishment of Islamiyya College in 1913. The politics Pashto and the position of its speakers in the North-West of British India before, during and after Partition has received considerably scholarly attention from Mukulika Banerjee, Sana Haroon, Hugh Beattie and others in attendance here today. In terms of intellectual engagement of the Pashto language in Pakistan proper, the clear center is the Pashto Academy that was established in 1955 at the University of Peshawar, founded five years earlier. The Pashto Academy and other units such as the Area Study Centre for Central Asia and the History Department at the University of Peshawar also contain considerable human and print resources on the history of the Pashto language and its local printing in the NWFP/Pakhtunkhwa (yes, labels do matter!), at least. A similar richness of personnel and textual resources the history of Pashto and its printing, however differently constituted, can be found Kabul University and in Kabul. The same can be said for the availability of relevant human and material resources for this subject in Qandahar and Quetta.

Before turning to the history of Pashto in the USA it is important to note there is no apparent textual or programmatic residue for Pashto in Iran, India, Australia, the Gulf or the Arab World more broadly. Perhaps audience members can correct and update me in this regard.

In the US academy the study of Pashto dates to the Cold War period of the 1950s and 1960s when Pashto language resources were most concentrated at the University of Michigan where Herbert Penzel and Oscar Louis Chavarirra-Aguilar produced a valuable set of Pashto grammatical studies. Under the guidance of

Penzel and Chavarirra-Aguilar the University of Michigan also granted two Master's Degrees in Pashto Linguistics to students from Afghanistan, namely Rahim Elham and Habibullah Tegey. The University of Texas awarded Masters and Doctoral Degrees to M. Alam Miran whose graduate work and subsequent scholarship has dealt with the challenges of Persian speakers when learning Pashto, and the question of bilingual education and the function of national languages in Afghanistan.

Although both the University of Wisconsin-Madison and Indiana University, at least, have capitalized on the intellectual, economic, and political environment of the post-9/11 world to start fresh Pashto language programs, at the University of Pennsylvania Wilma Heston published linguistic analyses of Pashto and Benedicte Grima Santry taught the language since the 1980s. The Pashto program at the University of Pennsylvania continues to thrive under the current administrative leadership of James Caron whose 2009 PhD from Penn marks a significant contribution to the study of the public and state politics surrounding the Pashto language in Afghanistan between the 1920s and 1950s. Bob Nichols work on Peshawar and Pashtuns should not go unnoticed here.

In general terms in the context of the American Academy before 2001 the study of Pashto and indeed Afghanistan more generally remained on the scholarly margins between the three area study fields of Middle Eastern and Iranian Studies, Soviet and Central Asian Studies, and South Asian Studies, and particularly peripheral to established Middle Eastern and South Asian language teaching repertoires. Similar to how British colonialism dealt with Pashto in the context of Persian and Hindustani through institutions like Asiatic Society of Bengal and the military exam system, the American Imperial apparatus has concentrated considerable resources and strategic stake in militarizing study of Pashto.

Within the United States Military the teaching of Pashto is most highly visible and concentrated at the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) in Monterey, California, where it falls under the Emerging Languages Taskforce rubric. Its mission statement has changed over the last few years, but in practice the DLIFLC has provided Pashto language expertise to the Provincial Reconstruction Teams that were deployed in late 2001 and the Human Terrain System that began operating in 2006. {{The HTS definitely deserves a separate extended consideration}}

The volume of personnel and nature of the texts produced at DLIFLC is hard to measure and made purposefully so (employees are sworn to secrecy, websites locked, libraries and syllabi closed to the non-military public-at-large), but in 2006 there appeared to be 134 students and 34 faculty. The outsourcing dimension with private companies hiring contracted expertise for oral translation services primarily is large and the military market in the US for Pashto is growing. As was the case during British colonialism, under the American imperial sway the study and printing of Pashto has been noticeably militarized.

VII. Conclusion: Navigating Boundaries Between Written Persian and Spoken Pashto and Re-Learning Afghanistan

General Summary. The basic idea behind this paper has been to historicize the linguistic component of ethnic identity. Languages are constitutive features of ethnic groups, but for Pashtuns we must remember language itself is not enough to fully embody the identity. The values of Pashtunwali also inform what it is to be a Pashtun. Professor Barth helps us appreciate that Pashtuns by no means monopolize the values of hospitality (*melmastia*), revenge (*badal*), honor (*nang*), female seclusion (*pardah*) and male communion (*hujra*), in fact different groups of Pashtuns express those values or practice them in varying ways in both time and space in relation to other groups that hold similar values. The question of course driving Barth's analysis is the boundary itself, as informed by demography, ecology etc.

Language articulates ethnic identity, but language can be spoken, written and/or printed. This essay has considered primarily written and printed Pashto, and the relationship between Pashto and other languages, such as Persian, English and even HTML including the internet's exponentially increased dissemination capacity. The "problem" of the multiple yeys [some say five, others seven] in Pashto that has troubled writers and printers of the language from their separate inceptions continues through writing, printing and even computing today. The origins and solutions to Pashto's yey problem involves intellectual activity, academic and technical divisions of labor, state involvement and the enduring power and allure of Persian, at least.

The printed dimension of language draws attention to the state where bureaucracies, armies, and schools generate texts and those texts influence the social life of the nation where writings such as newspapers and textbooks help generate and maintain feelings of nationalism. So by extension my implicit treatment of ethnicity via language forms and interaction brings the larger issues of nationality and state formation into analytical play. The so-called smaller issue of Pashtun tribalism that informs ethnicity will have to be left aside, except for brief reference here to the marriage patterns of Durrani state elites and the resulting printed genealogies that are so widely reproduced and circulated in Persian and English language texts, at least, but conspicuously less so in Pashto documents.

Metonymy and Uneven Borders. Professor Barth teaches us that ethnic boundaries persist despite flows across them, thus explaining how the Afghan, Pashtun, Pathan metonymy may be logical and valid in intellectual and political practice. However I would like to interrogate that metonymy through an invented dialogue.

Question #1: how does the Pashto language relate to each of the three Afghan, Pashtun and Pathan categories? Answer: Very differently!

Question #2 are the Afghan, Pashtun and Pathan categories interchangeable?

Answer: No, at least insofar as there appear to be no self identified Pathans in tenth- or for that matter twentieth-century Afghanistan and certainly there is a difference between Pashtunistan and Afghanistan (don't forget the partial rejection of the returning champion Afghan cricketers).

Question #3: can a person or group be all three equally evenly at once?

Answer: Perhaps in exceptional cases, but not normatively.

Posing those rhetorical questions highlights how important it is to be clear about the glaring unevenness of Pashto and Pashtuns across the Durand line: vastly different demographics, climates and ecologies, connections to states (schools, armies, courts, hospitals etc.). Just look at the highly unequal relationship between the two state currencies! If ethnicity is defined in part in terms of state structure then we are not talking about one ethnic group here, are we? Regarding the possible bifurcation of Pashtun ethnicity we may also do well to consider the very real issue of Durrani-Ghilzay antimony that is predicated on unequal access to Afghan state resources.

Mapping, Representation, and Critiquing the Dual Mantras. Another route to the exit is to return to the all-too-common ethnic map, the fault lines of which are clear. Perhaps a three dimensional version could capture the differently shared languages across the boundaries of all the linguistic communities/ethnic groups, not to mention the states so routinely inscribed? I do not know if it is possible to represent the inequality and asymmetry in language relationships, or the distinctions between oral and literate command of a language. Maps like printing itself are in many ways a distortion of reality as much as a representation of it.

The problems of mapping lead us to the big question of representation, and after all print is a kind of representation. The basic question of how Pashtuns have been represented through print in some ways forms the substance of this paper. In the context of Afghanistan and the Afghan state, at least, the history of Pashto printing stands at odds with the Pashtun Domination Thesis of Afghanistan. The Pashtun Domination Thesis is tautological in that it has Pashtuns alone to the mysterious exclusion of any other Afghans simultaneously making and breaking the Afghan state. From the perspective of the international community the Pashtun Domination Thesis is normatively paired with the Failed State Rubric to account for the alleged intractability of Afghanistan. One conceptual antidote to the tautological and circular reasoning about the Afghan state is to ask how anything that is failed can dominate anything else. The Pashtun Domination Thesis and the Failed State Rubric for understanding Afghanistan are imperial projections that have remained astonishingly immune from academic and political critique, especially from Afghan intellectuals and global activists.

It is useful to return to the idea of contemporary Pashto being bounded by a quadrilateral of cities, namely Kabul, Qandahar, Peshawar, Quetta. In each urban

location Pashto relates to differently to varied sets of languages. Qandahar may be the center of spoken Pashto both today and historically, but is has never been the center of Pashto printing! That print entails the displacement of identity is the point to be emphasized (return to satellite map assuming power point).

Questions, Postulates and Caveats. Is it possible that Pashto is proportionally less printed than the languages with which it interacts because of the state locus of its major neighbor and competitor languages such as Persian and Urdu today? In historical terms could it be that Pashto has been both textually “enabled” by states and “restrained” in orality as an act of resistance to those states by Pashtun society? If so, would that be tantamount to the strategic adoption of print resistance, similar to the notion of nomadization as a strategy? The power of the spoken word should not be lost in a consideration of printing, and indeed that dialectic is another way of describing the simultaneity of printing and print resistance. The hegemony of the state produces Pashto printing that also responds to popular orality that ultimately may be an expression of subaltern resistance to the Persianate states, be it Afghan, Mughal, or Pakistani.

It is methodologically premature to deduce a general rule about Pashto printing, but if we must generalize it can be said that it has occurred episodically and unevenly and on the margins of the states that have to engage the language for their own survival. Behind that general rule the most consistent theme is the sequestration of Pashto in military institutions associated with those “Pashto-fied” states. A pattern emerges that Pashto seems to have been rather speedily militarily co-opted in print by states in an ironic perhaps desperate but certainly thus far failed attempt to quell oral Pashto resistance, insurgency and dissent to those literate states.

I recognize that Pashto has been printed outside of state contexts, but I would counter that the public expression of Pashto has been and will remain primarily oral barring an unforeseeable global conjuncture. In Afghanistan, very separately and differently than in Pakistan it must be reiterated, we have ongoing synergy and dynamism along the boundary between Dari, the language of the state and its bureaucracy, and Pashto, the “language of the people.” A key border post along the boundary of that historic frontier is found in the relationship between printed Persian and spoken Pashto. Here we have only been able to draw attention to historic contact points and production sites of printed Pashto and by so doing identify boundaries and power relations between Pashto and other languages and between printed and spoken versions of the language itself.