

could be checked by an adequate number of measurements taken among 'Dard' tribes further south-east, such as those of Astōr and Gurēz, whose difference in appearance from the 'Dard' speaking Chitrālis appeared to me striking. In any case it is clear that, as far as Chitrāl is concerned, the Hindukush can neither in a linguistic nor in an ethnic sense be considered to form a true watershed.

The composite racial character of the present Chitrāl population is reflected also in the languages spoken in the territory. In the main valley of Chitrāl from below Mastūj to Drōsh as well as in the large side-valleys northward, collectively known as Kāshkār-Bālā, the bulk of the people, whether they belong to the autochthon stock of cultivators or to the ruling classes, speak Khōwār. The term is derived from *Khō*, the name by which the cultivators designate both themselves and their country. Khōwār or Chitrālī, as it is also called, forms a separate group among the languages which Sir George Grierson calls 'Modern Pāisācī', and to which it was the custom to apply the historical term 'Dard', without regard for its more limited modern use. Occupying an intermediate, and somewhat independent, position between the Kāfir and Eastern groups, Khōwār 'often shows striking points of agreement with the Ghalchah languages'.⁸

Languages
spoken in
Chitrāl.

This relation to the Eastern Irānian language group in the north and north-east deserves special attention in view of the ethnic links already referred to. Whatever the explanation of this linguistic connexion may be, it is a significant fact that in the Lutkhō Valley of Chitrāl a Ghalchah dialect is actually spoken by a large and apparently old settlement from Munjān.⁹ In view of what has been said above as to the former extension of Kāfiristān into the Kūnar Valley, it can scarcely cause surprise to find the Kalāshā Kāfir dialect spoken by numerous settlements in side-valleys immediately to the south-west of the Chitrāl capital and also in the main valley below it (Figs. 8-10). Further down in the portion of the Kūnar Valley, which extends to the debouchure of the Bashgol River and which has long been counted as a part of Chitrāl, the language spoken is Gabar-bati or Naristi, another Kāfir dialect. Even the Shīnā or proper Dard group of Sir George Grierson's 'Modern Pāisācī' languages is represented by 'Dangarik' colonies found between Ashret and Drōsh along the left bank of the Chitrāl river.¹⁰ In addition, the presence in Khōwār, as in other 'Modern Pāisācī' languages, of non-Aryan words traceable to the Burushaskī language surviving in Hunza-Nagar supplies, in all probability, evidence for the earlier occupation of these valleys 'by the ancestors of the present speakers of Burushaskī whom they [the Khō, Dards, &c.] expelled or absorbed'.¹¹

In spite of such a great racial and linguistic mixture Chitrāl, as far back as historical records go, appears always as an organized political unit under the rule of a recognized dynasty. This fact is all the more striking when it is compared with the agglomeration of amorphous tribal communities which even our own generation has found adjoining Chitrāl from the west, south, and south-east. Yet the natural obstacles raised to peaceful intercourse and co-ordination by the barriers of high mountains and difficult gorges were quite as great in Chitrāl, if not greater, than in the surrounding valleys held by these far more primitive communities. It is, I believe, necessary to recognize in the political consolidation of Chitrāl the result of a more developed civilization which itself was

Political
organization
of Chitrāl.

⁸ See Grierson, *Pisāca Languages*, p. 6. It is true that 'the name Dard is not acknowledged by any section of the tribes to whom it has been so sweepingly applied' (Biddulph, *Hindoo Koosh*, p. 156). Yet, as the classical references and many passages in Sanskrit literature show, it must have once been widely used as a general designation for people in the Upper Indus region. Its ancient application was, no doubt, very vague. But this does not seem to me in itself to con-

stitute a valid reason against the scientific employment of a term which has the great advantage of being significant, short, and historical in origin.

⁹ See above, p. 26.

¹⁰ Cf. for these various settlements Biddulph, *Hindoo Koosh*, p. 64.

¹¹ See Grierson, *Pisāca Languages*, p. 4.