Policy Journal of Social Science Review

HEC
HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION

Let's Start!

A Sociolinguistic Study of Od - The Language of Pakhiwass Settled in Rawalpidi Region

Shamail Ur Rehman[1*]
Faheemuddin Shaikh[2]
Rafaqat Hussain Shah[3*]
Fariha Saghir[4]

OJS
OPEN JOURNAL SYSTEMS

HJRS | HEC Journal Recognition System

A Sociolinguistic Study of Od - The Language of Pakhiwass Settled in Rawalpidi Region

Shamail Ur Rehman	Lecturer Visiting at Arid Agriculture University, Rawalpindi
Faheemuddin Shaikh	PhD Scholar at University of Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia
Rafaqat Hussain Shah	PhD Scholar at Minhaj University, Lahore. Corresponding Author: englingtutor1@gmail.com
Fariha Saghir	Lecturer English at PMAS Arid Agriculture University, Rawalpindi

Abstract

The current study seeks to explore cultural and linguistic practices of Od, one of the nomadic groups scattered in different geographical boundaries across Pakistan. Known as Pakhiwass or Changgarr, they live in periphery and stay away from the mainstream Punjabi communities in sub-human conditions due to their low socio-economic status. There are many significant cultural and linguistic dimensions associated with these groups which have not been academically mapped and explored so far. The present study is a sociolinguistic survey to understand their language use and preferences while dealing within as well as outside their ethnic groups. Using ethnographic research method, the data of the study has been collected from Od tribe, residing in the vicinity of Pirwadhi, Rawalpindi. Linguistically, Od language has its own vocabulary and shows syntactical and morphological differences from local languages. Sociolinguistic analysis shows that Od is as good a language as any other language. However, language has limited vocabulary and no use outside the community.

Key Words: Od, Sociolinguistics, Language documentation, Pakhiwass, Marginalization

INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

The present study is an effort to know about Od language, spoken by the community of eponymous name. Od community, along with others communities, is scattered and has endogamous populations of artisans, traders, and performers, competing successfully with permanently established communities and businesses. Their organizational structure and the

potential upward social mobility, occupational freedom enables them to fill gap in host community and exploit 'ghettoizing' opportunities. There are many speculations and myths about their culture and identity, including languages. In Urdu, they are known as *Khana Badush* that means their identity outside their own communities is not fixed and varies according to people and places. Every host community has given them some specific/derogatory name such as *Changarr, Pakhiwass* and Banjara. *Od* is one of the dormant and unsearched languages of the ethnic tribes, commonly known as *Pakhiwass.* These tribes, having linguistic, social and cultural background, speak different languages to mark their respective identities.

With massive industrialization and globalization, it is becoming difficult for local and marginalized communities such as Od to sustain themselves socially, culturally and linguistically. The present research fills the gap left by researchers by not fully studying the nomadic communities linguistically. Different linguistic and cultural surveys of Punjab (SIL, 2011) have given insights about local languages and cultures but provides no information on such lesser known, dormant and unclassified languages.

Wagha (2010) claims that Od belong to Indus River Valley Civilization and speak a coded language but most of historical researches and articles suggest that the Gypsies, Roma, or Sintis originated in the regions of Sindh and Rajasthan or present-day Southern Pakistan and Northwestern India. 'The Gypsies among Us' Hussain Bux (n.d) cited some linguistic examples to prove that Gypsies are the long 'lost cousins' of Roma. (p.3). Gibb (2000) observes that the people known as *Bazigar* have had a very significant influence on Punjabi music and dance as it is experienced in the current era. The term /bāzī-gar/ is a word of Persian derivation meaning "one who performs *bāzī*." *Bāzī*, which connotes "play," refers in this context to a kind of entertaining performance based on physical acts. The term *natt* likely derives from a Sanskrit root that connotes "drama" or "performance". (p.2). Sahil (2004) has studied the difference between the gypsies' culture and local cultures and exploitation of minor communities at the hands of dominant ones. Linguistic analysis showed close ties of vocabulary and grammar between various Roma languages, Hindi, Sindhi, Marwari, and Saraiki. Dozens of common objects are called by words that are identical or similar to those found in these latter languages (as cited in Bux, n.d). Grimes (2000) has cited Od as one of the minor languages of the Pakistan. This is also one of the unclassified languages mentioned in ethnologue. Romaine (2000) also asserts that where people have lost their traditional authority over their land or been forced from it, large scale transformations of the environment have occurred, accompanied by cultural and linguistic decimation. Sociolinguists (Milroy, 1982; Eckert, 1992) provide three models in order to understand the concept of community and these have been influential in sociolinguistic literature: These models are Speech community, Social network and Community of Practice. In recent researches, Sheeraz (2011), and Anjum (2016) have worked on such lesser known languages of Farsi (Hijras) and Mankiyali (Tarawara community) respectively while provided insight into speech community, identity and language shift, and linguistic choices made by such communities in socio-political domains.

Pakhiwass are living across Pakistan, mostly in Southern Punjab and Sindh. Like other minor communities of Pakistan, *Pakhiwass* community has got the same oral history of language-transformation and no written record available to them. Most of the members are illiterate and especially young members (mostly those who are born and bred side by side with local communities) are relatively shy to admit that they have their ancestor's language and they are not its fluent speakers. They also do this in order to identify themselves with *"outsiders"*[1]or *Pindiwal*. *Od* and other tribes (*Bathu*, *Baziger*, etc.) settle side by side as they move from place to place, live in split-family structure, and for security reasons make a coherent bonding to give indication of *Basti*. They often belong to different professions and linguistic background. *Od* are mostly linked with construction industry. *Bazigar,* belongs to snake charming and other related professions; *Sanghir* works in brick kilns in Rawalpindi. Their tents and *Jughis* are made with such skills and craftsmanship that these can withstand storms and heavy wind blows. The word *Pakhiwass* (*Jughi deweller*) is derived from two words: velvet/cloth as *Pakhi* and person living inside as *Wass*, hence the name*. During field work, certain observations appeared regarding their religious affiliations, and it was found that their religious rituals depend upon the demographic situations they are part of: in Punjab they follow Muslims religious practices while in Sindh they are inclined towards the Hindu religious practices.

To study the cultural diversity of Pakistan, it is important to focus these small groups as they are diverse and different from the dominant groups socially, culturally and linguistically. Languages of such groups, are used for in-group communication, reflect social complexity and diversity. The process that makes a language more complex and localized, and specific to a small group, also imparts it a distinctive identity. *Pakhiwass* have separate ethnic identity and belong to many tribes. Od has been marginalized as a separate ethnic group on the basis of many speculations about its life style, culture, and other traditions. The community and its language have not been studied before. Other dominant communities in Pakistan are considered more civilized and cultured with regard to their language and status when compared with such minor ethnic communities (Tariq Rahman, 2003). However, it seems important to explore the marginalized communities, their cultures and languages. An endangered language is not always considered as a minority language and not every minority language is necessarily endangered. On a same note, with time, a neglected minority language will become endangered and community may use other linguistic options for their survival. So, it seems that *Od* is an endangered language and needs to be considered for language development and preservation. The present study is an attempt to highlight the sociolinguistic features of *Od,* the particular language this community uses and the socio-cultural meaningfulness of that language, its importance for the community, their castes and endogamous practices.

METHODOLOGY

The population for the present study has been selected from Od community residing in Pirwadhi and Khayban Sir Syed areas of Rawalpindi, Punjab. During data collection, these locales

---

[1] a person other than their own community

were chosen as most of Od community members were residing in these areas to do their professional activities of construction and building road networks. Purposive sampling was done by selecting twenty participants, including 10 females, from each location to ascertain their linguistic affiliations and practices. Though it was difficult and challenging to enter their *Basti* as an outsider but rapport building was done with two key informants of Od community who were local Tehkidar (construction manager) and more vocal in local languages. Thorough them, it was possible to reach the key informant and insider of Od community. Non- participation observation of members were done while they were busy interacting with themselves during professional work, with relatives and visitors from other localities of the city. Interviews were also conducted to know more about social and linguistic usage of language in particular settings. Local people were also asked about their opinions, by using separate questionnaire, about nomadic cultural practices and languages that are used by such communities or Pahkiwass.

Other tools like daily diary, field notes and photos were also taken to collect data. All interviews and discussion were recorded and transcribed in English and Urdu. All efforts were centered on the main research question: what are social and linguistic features of Od language? In the absence of any linguistic data of Od language, it was appropriate to use the concept of speech community, Bells Seven criteria of language to establish it as a language and distinct from local languages of Punjabi and Urdu.

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

In the absence of any linguistic data, whether Od is a language or not, linguistic data collected during filed work was qualitatively analyzed, and contains a discussion on and description of different social and linguistic features of Od.

LINGUISTIC FEATURES OF OD AS COMPARED WITH OTHER LOCAL LANGUAGES

Analysis of the linguistic data, collected in the form of filed notes, makes it clear that *Od* is a distinct language, not similar to local languages, in lexical, syntax and other linguistic features. Apart from the local languages, *Od* language has no mutual intelligibility with other languages spoken by other tribes of *Pakhiwass* community in the area of Rawalpindi like *Bathu*, *Bazigar*. However, it has some similarity with Gujrati (confirmed by its members) and it is different from languages spoken in Sindh like Bagri (a survey by SIL, 2011).

Comparison at Morphological Level: *Od* has nouns (feminine, masculine, singular, plural), pronouns, verbs, adjectives, determiners in the following tables, a few nouns of *Od* have only singular form like Ne**r**e, a fork like wood which is used for hanging utensils outside *pakhis*.

TABLE 1. *OD* NOUNS

Noun (singular)	Noun (plural)	Masculine/Feminine	English	Punjabi
Teme	Temeain	F	Woman	Aurat
Gocha	Gochey	M	Man	Adme
Khat	Khatain	M	Bed	Charpye

Table 4.1 shows that *Od* and Punjabi languages are different lexically and phonemic construction is different too.

TABLE 2. NOUNS ONLY WITH SINGULAR FORM

Od	Gender	English	Punjabi
Kog	M	Crow	Kawwa
Ne**r**e	N	Nill	Nill
Latte	M	Cloth	Kap**r**e

Above mentioned nouns have only singular forms and some have no equivalence in local languages.

TABLE 3. PRONOUNS OF *OD* LANGUAGE

Od	English	Urdu
Manon	Me	Mujhey
manja/maja	Mine	Mera
Mache	my (female)	Mere
Macha	my (male)	Mera
Toun	You	Aap
Tadda	yours(male)	Tumhara
Tadde	yours(female)	Tumhare
Be	She	Vo
Becha	Her	us ke
Oja	He	Vo
Ocha	His	us ka
Hume	We	Hum
Humcha	Our	Humhara
Humche	Our	Humhare
Ha	It	Yeh
Icha	Its	is ka

Pronouns of *Od* language are totally different from Urdu and Punjabi languages, which are the languages in contact. It shows that *Od* is maintaining its uniqueness and still retaining its own symbolic and linguistic features.

TABLE 4. VERBS OF *OD* LANGUAGE

Od	English	Urdu
Jarehe la	(present) is going	Jaraha
Gele la	(past tense) went	
Gelle la(male)	(He) went	Geya
Gelle le(female)	(She) went	Geye
Gey-ah	Bring	Lao

The table 4.3 shows that *Od* verbs are morphologically different from the languages being spoken in the area. Verbs have their past and present forms which indicate the tense and make listeners clear what to do and when.

TABLE 5. *OD* ADJECTIVES

Od	English	Urdu	Punjabi
Arte	Low	Neyche	Jikka
Beura	Aged	Boura	Buddha
Hrta	Spoil	Kharab	kharab
Kobti	Beautiful	Khubsurat	sohnrin

Usually local counting system is preferred though *Od* language has its own counting system. Following numbers are used for limited counting because these people have never enough money to save and keep its record.

TABLE 6. NUMBER SYSTEM

Od (Numbers)	English	Urdu
Pando Cheete	Five rupees	Panch rupey
Baghro cheete	Ten rupees	Das rupey
Ekre Cheete/Kere	Thirty rupees	Tees rupey
Khed Ekre	Forty rupees	Chalees rupey
Kahd Vokrn	Fifty rupees	Pachas rupey
Vokrn	Hundred rupees	Sou rupey

Comparison at Syntactical Level: *Od* language syntactical structure is unlike English language, Punjabi and Urdu, the local languages spoken in Rawalpindi.

TABLE 7. *OD* STRUCTURE (IMPERATIVE SENTENCE)

Language	Sentences
Od	Sidhali manun doul dey
	^{2}D.O +^{3}ID.O+V
English	Give me tea
	V+ID .O+D .O
Urdu	Mujehe Chaey dey do
	ID.O + D.O+ V
Punjabi	Maun Cha dey dey
	ID.O +D.O+V

This table shows that *Od* language has different syntax structure unlike Punjabi and Urdu because both these languages have D.O and ID.O sequence and it is unlike English language which has D.O at terminal. If we try to compare verbs of both the languages, Urdu and Punjabi, with *Od* language, we say that these languages have, morphologically and phonologically, different verbs construction. This stage of data analysis suggests that *Od* is a different language as compared with said languages.

SOCIAL FEATURES OF OD LANGUAGE

***Od* Community and Language**: In locale of study, two surveys were conducted: one for in-group language use and functions and second was out-group linkages of local community with Od community. Results of both the surveys are briefly described below. Local people have no idea of who *Pakhiwass* are and what type of languages they speak; though few respondents highlight their socio-economic conditions and mentioned their different tribes.

During field research, I frequently visited one of the informant of od community, living with his family in Khyban-Sir Syed, Rawalpindi. While showing his social attachment with the city, he said

Extract 1

Hume od hain, humche boli Od he ka. Geyle nain jate ka. Humcha Ore ka he?. Ara Humcha jena marrn are he ka

➢   We Od are, our language Od is. Back not go. Our there what is? Here our death life here is

➢   We are Od, our language is Od. (We) don't go back. What is there for us? Our life and death is here (in Rawalpindi).

Lives of women, usually the house managers, are not even less painful. Womenfolk also work dawn to dusk with their male counterparts in construction industry, on roads and in brick kilns. When asked about their social duties, one of them responded;

---

^{2} Direct Object

^{3} Indirect Object

EXTRACT 2

Roz kama pa ja-mein sey. Main orhe kam kron. Sanje non grahan a-gela. Ha kam humcha khandani sey.

Gloss:

➢ Everyday work to go (I). I there work do. Evening in home come back. This work our family profession is.

➢ I go to work everyday. I do work there. I come back home in the evening. This work is our family profession.

A community survey is conducted to know the attitude of *Od* community towards the socio-cultural importance of their language and another survey is of local people in term of socio-cultural distance and awareness about Od community. The results of the data, obtained through given questionnaire, can be interpreted in term of Ethno- linguistic Vitality of the group in Subjective and Objective domains. In Subjective domains (home, jobs, workplaces, friends, etc) community shows inclination towards their own language and in Objective domains (future progress, education, interactions with contractors), it shows inclination for Punjabi language. Most of the members (84%) agreed that Od language is used at home and almost (58%) agreed that with outsider/non-members Punjabi language is used in communication. When asked whether Od language being spoken is same as that of their ancestor, 60% agreed but 40% were of doubt about the purity of the language and considered it part of a Punjabi language. When asked 'why do you move from one place to another', in response to this question, 58% attributed it to economic reasons and 42% opined that they are displace by local landlords for security reasons. However, local people are not aware of *Pakhiwass'* social and linguistic practices, as results of survey of local people (Punjabis) have shown. When asked about the identity of such communities, 48% considered them as nomads, 30% opined that they 'did not know' about them and 22% opined that they are outcast/jughiwal community. In response to question,' How many times have you visited such communities?' 80% denied any contact and 20% don't like visiting them for no reasons.

Furthermore, results suggest that socio-economic disparities between the communities in contact determine the status of their social interactions and linguistic preferences. Therefore, communities with functional linguistic repertoire remain decisive in shaping and reshaping the identity of their less socially acceptable counterpart. Despite its marginalization and minimum social applications, *Od* will be continuously spoken by its community members, because it is their emotional attachment with the language which is a symbol of their identity. Though, it is obvious, with massive mobilization and economic disparities, Od community language shift will be in progress towards Punjabi language for better economic opportunities and integration within local communities.

Bells' Seven Criteria of a Language: I have applied Bells' (1976) seven criteria of a language to further clarify the social aspects and status of Od as a language.

Standardization: Od, as a language of migrant/ nomadic people, is standardized in locale of study but might have been influenced by local languages where it has remain in contact position.

No media or literature use it: During filed work, it came to notice that language is used only in spoken discourse and no written books or published material available to community to pass it on to coming generations.

Vitality: Od has a vitality in subjective domains only, for in use and within community members.

Historicity: Od and other related tribes are mentioned in social and cultural literature and some linguists have traced their origin to Thar Desert and considered them as ancestor of Roma gypsies of Europe.

Autonomy: Od is a completely different language from the local languages spoken in locale of study. Od considers it a symbol of their identity and solidarity to mark themselves as a distinct group.

Reduction: Od has no reduction in its use. Od is unique in its lexical and morphological features and cannot be considered as a dialect of Punjabi or any other language spoken in its vicinity.

Mixture: Od is not a mixture of any other language but carries few words from local languages to fill the gap in communication where they find no equivalent in their own language. Nomadic lifestyle and migrations would impact the lexical items in times to come.

De facto norms: Every language has its expert users and poor users, so, same is the case with Od. Old members are its expert speakers and new generations are poor users because of influence of local environment and culture.

CONCLUSION

To conclude, Od language is a threatened language which needs to be preserved by documentations. Od language is the community's first language but outside the domestic sphere it has less functional utility and language has gone under attrition because of community mobility and interaction with host communities. Mostly, the tribes living in locale of study are no more (remaining) endogamous because of limited social and family domains and less choices available inside their own community. Economic disparity of community is visible in their language, caste system and the transcribed data suggests that they have very humble use of their language. It also depicts their low social mobility and lack of monetary resources. Taxonomy of nomadic groups needs be established by exploring their social structures and further divisions in sub-tribes such as Ghee-payale, Kunger, Moor, Leybare, Kinger, Uroch, Deendar. So, the economic conditions are the overt reasons for the community's lack of interest in maintaining their language. Their cultures and traditions should be introduced in the text books so that people get awareness about such communities. In Subjective domains (home, jobs, workplaces, friends, etc) community shows inclination towards their own language and in Objective domains (future progress, education, interactions with contractors), it shows inclination for Punjabi language. Government policies can play a decisive role for the betterment and participation of these nomads in mainstream society. Otherwise, speakers of these languages will adopt local languages which, too, have oral traditions with low utility in official and academic circles. Other spoken languages such as Bagri, Dhatki, Bathu should be explored in order to know more about inter-languages' dependence and cultural relationship.

REFERENCES

Aitchison, J. (1997). *The language web*. Cambridge: University Press.

Akram. A. & Yasmeen. R. (2011*). Attitudes towards English & Punjabi Language Learning in Faisalabad .Journal of Academic and applied studied.* 1(4). November 2011, pp. 9-32.Retrieved January 04, 2012 from http://www.academians.org/articles/november2.pdf

Atichison, J. (1996). *The seeds of speech*: *language origin and evolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Blackwell.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power.* Cambridge: Policy Press.

Burton, R .(1898). *The Jew, the Gypsy and El Islam* .Chicago & New York: Herbert S. Stone. Retrieved April 10, 2012 from www.vho.org/aaargh/fran/livres7/BURTONTheJew.pdf

Bux, H.(n.d.) *Origins Gypsies among Us*. Retrieved March 10, 2011 from http://www.academia.edu/3705304/origins_Gypsies_among_us

Ceyhan, S. (2003). *A Case Study of Gypsy/Roma Identity in Edirne.* Retrieved May 17, 2011 from https://etd.lib.metu.edu.tr/oai/index.php/record/view/26729

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.Chomsky, N. (1986). *Barriers*, *Linguistic Inquiry*. Monograph 13, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Cooper, R. (1989*). Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (1997). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Crystal, D. (2000). *Language Death.* Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (2002). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics (5th edition*). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Davies, B. L. (2005) .*Communities of practice: Legitimacy, Membership and Choice.* Retrieved March 8, 2012 from http://www.leeds.ac.uk/linguistics/WPL/WP2005/Davies.pdf

Downes, W. (1998). *Language and Society*: Cambridge University Press.

Duan, L. (2004). A Sociolinguistic Study of Language Use and Attitude among the Bai people in Jianchuan Country, China. Retrieved March 4, 2011 from ic.payap.ac.th/graduate/linguistics/theses/DuanLei_Thesis.pdf

Duan, L. (2004).*A Sociolinguistic study of language use and language attitude among Bai people in China.* Retrieved April 12, 2012 from http.ic.payap.ac.th/graduate/linguistics/theses/DuanLei_Thesis.pdf

Duranti, A. (1997). *Linguistics anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dwyer, M. (2011). *Tools and techniques for endangered-language assessment and revitalization.* In Vitality and Viability of Minority Languages. *October 23-24, 2009.* New York: Trace Foundation Lecture Series Proceedings. http://www.trace.org/events/events_lecture_proceedings.html

Eckert, P. et.al.. (1992*). Think practically and act locally*: Language and gender as community-based practice. Annual Review of Anthropology 21: 461-90 Ethnologue.2009. [See Lewis, M. Paul (ed.). 2009.]

Fishman, J.A. (1972) *Language and Nationalism: Two Integrative Essays* .Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Fishman, J.A. (1991). *Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages*. Bristol, Pa.: Multilingual Matters.

Giles, N. et.al. (1991). *Accommodation Theory: Communication, Context, and Consequence*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Pres

Goffman. (1959) .*Presentation of Self in Everyday Life.* Retrieved 14 April, 2012 from http://www.academia.edu/816227/6_Minority_languages_and_their_status

Grierson, George Abraham. 1903-28*. Linguistic survey of India*. Calcutta: Office of the Superitendent of Government Printing, India.

Grimes, J. (1995*) .Language survey reference guide.* Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Gupta, F. (1997). *"Why mother tongue education is not preferred*." Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development 18 (6): 496-506.

Hall, K.(1995). *Hijra/Hijrin: Language and gender identity.* Unpublished PhD Dissertation. University of California, Berkley

Holmes, et al. (1999*). The community of practice*: Theories and methodologies in the new language and gender research. Language in Society 28: 173-83.

http://www.academians.org/articles/november2.pdf

Hudson, A. (1980). *Sociolinguistics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hudson, A. (1996). *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Huguet, A. (2007). *Minority languages and curriculum*: The case of Spain. Language, Culture and Curriculum, 20(1) 70-86

Hussain, H. (2002). *Ethnography of communication: A study of Jangli Boli of village Kanianwali, 234 J.B, in Pakistan Punjab.* Islamabad: Quaid-i-Azam University MA thesis, Anthropology.

Jane, A. (2004). *An Anthropological glance at Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children and Child Abuse among a gypsy Community of Pindora* .Retrieved Feb, 2010 from www.sahil.org/.../Commercial%20Sexual%20Expolitation%20of%20Chil...

Lave & Wenger. (1991). *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation.* Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press

Lee, E. (2003). *"Language Shift and Revitalization in the Kristang Community, Portuguese Settlement, Malacca*." PhD thesis, Department of English, Language and Linguistics, University of Sheffield.

Lewis, P. (2009). *Ethnography: Language of the world (16th ed.)*. SIL International.

Mansoor, S. (1993). *Punjabi, Urdu, English in Pakistan: A Sociolinguistic Study.* Lahore: Vanguard.

Meyerhoff, M. (2006). *Introducing Sociolinguistics.* Oxford: Rutledge.

Milroy, L. (1980). *Language and Social Networks.* Blackwell Publishers Ltd. Oxford. United Kingdom

Milroy, L. (1987)*. Language and social networks*. Oxford: Blackwell

Nagar, I. (2008). *Language, gender and identity: The case of kotis in Lucknow, India*. Retrieved June 15, 2011 from http://rave.ohiolink.edu/etdc/view?acc_num=osu1222102359

Nettle. et al. (2000). *Vanishing Voices: the Extinction of the World's Languages.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Page, Le. (1985)*. Acts of Identity: Creole-Based Approaches to Language and Ethnicity*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge ... links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0094-3061 (198701)16%3A1%3C71%3AAOICAT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-X

Pinker, S. (1994) *The Language Instinct.* London: Penguin.

Pinker, S. (1994).*The Language Instinct: How the Mind Creates Language*. New York: Harpercollins

Pinker, S. (2008). *The Stuff of Thought: Language as a Window into Human Nature.* London: Penguin.

Rahman, T. (2002). *Language, Ideology and Power:* Language-Learning among the Muslims of Pakistan and North India. Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Razzaq, A. (2011). *Memoni – A New Language is Born* [Electronic Edition]. Memon Books.com. Retrieved January 10, 2012 from http://www.memonbooks.com/site1/books/memoni_language.pdf

Rehman, T. (2003). *Language Policy, Multilingualism, and Vitality in Pakistan*. Retrieved April 14, 2011 from http://www.oocities.org/paklanguage/tariq_rahman.pdf

Rehman, T. (2012). *Language Policy and the Weak Languages in Pakistan with reference to Inequality in learning outcomes* [Electronic Version]. Retrieved August 12, 2012 from http://safedafed.org/seminar/document/presentations/day1/session2/Dr_Tariq_Rahman_ Language_Policy_and_the_Weak_Languages_in_Pakistan.ppt

Romaine, S. (1995). *Bilingualism (2nd ed.)* Oxford: Blackwell

Romaine, S. (1994). *Language in Society: An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (2nd ed.) Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.

Romanie, S (2000*).Vanishing Voices: The Extinction of the World's Languages*. Oxford University Press.

Schreffler, G. (2010). *"Signs of Separation: dhol in Punjabi*

Schreffler, G. (2010). *The Bazigar (Goaar) People and their performing Arts* [Electronic Version]. Retrieved September 15, 2012 from http://www.global.ucsb.edu/punjab/journal/v18_1-2/articles/8_Bazigar_article.pdf

Sheeraz, M. (2010). *A sociolinguistic study of Farsi- The language of Hijras.* Department of English, International Islamic University, Islamabad.

SIL International. Online: http://www.sil.org/silewp/abstract.asp?ref=2006-002

Thind, K. (1996). *Panjāb dā Lok Virsā. Patiala*: Punjabi

Twain, M. (1897). *Following the Equator - A journey around the world*. American Publishing Co., Hartford

UNESCO. (2003). *Education in a multilingual world*. Paris: UNESCO

Wagha, W. (2010).*Threatened Languages of Indigenous Peoples in Pakistan – Reflection and Suggestions.* Department of Pakistani Languages and Literature, Allama Iqbal Open

University (AIOU), Islamabad. Retrieved September 12, 2011 from http://www.damaan.org.pk/thesis.pdf

Walker, C. (2000). *AnInterview with Suzzane Romanie*. Wild Duck Review Vol. VI No.1.