



**Al-Burz research journal of Brahui department,
University of Balochistan, Sariab road Quetta.**

HJRS HEC Journal
Recognition System

Al-Burz, is recognised in 'Y' category from (HEC) Higher Education Commission Pakistan, Islamabad through HJRS, HEC journal recognition system.

Al-Burz

 ISSN 2071-9477,2521-408X	 COUNTRY Pakistan	 SUBJECT AREA & SUB CATEGORY Arts and Humanities
 Scopus : No	 WoS : No	

Subject Area Position

ARTS AND HUMANITIES		
Parameter	Raw Score	HJRS Percentile
EFT TM *	-	-
AIFT TM *	-	-
SJR *	-	-
H-Index	-	-
CD2	-	-
SNIP *	-	-

JPI	Category
-	Y ⁺
Medallion	Subject Area Position
Null	-

Publisher: University of Balochistan Quetta

‡ Recognized by HEC Local Committee

* Eigenfactor (EF) and Article Influence (AI) are trademarks of Eigenfactor Project

* SJR is trademark of Scimago Lab

* SNIP is trademark of CWTS

* Above information is based on the data corresponding to year 2023-24

An Analysis of Lexical and Phonological Variation in Brahui Dialects in Balochistan

Sehrish Rabbani	Lecturer, Mir Chakar Khan Rind University, Sibi Sehrishrabbani700@gmail.com (correspondence author)
Dr. Mehwish Malghani	Professor, Mir Chakar Khan Rind University, Sibi
Abdul Jabbar	Lecturer, Balochistan Agriculture College Quetta, Pakistan
Ahmed Faraz	Lecturer, Mir Chakar Khan Rind University, Sibi

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54781/abz.v15i01.415>



Al-Burz

2023, 14(1). Pp.09-26. ISSN (online) 2521-408X

<http://alburz.uob.edu.pk/journal/index.php/alburz/index>



An Analysis of Lexical and Phonological Variation in Brahui Dialects in Balochistan

Sehrish Rabbani¹

¹Lecturer, Mir Chakar Khan Rind University, Sibi

Sehrishrabbani700@gmail.com (correspondence author)

Dr. Mehwish Malghani²

²Professor, Mir Chakar Khan Rind University, Sibi

Abdul Jabbar³

³Lecturer, Balochistan Agriculture College Quetta, Pakistan

Ahmed Faraz⁴

⁴Lecturer, Mir Chakar Khan Rind University, Sibi



Copyright: © 2022 by the author licensee department of Brahui university of Balochistan Quetta. this article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of Creative commons Attribution (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>)

Received: June 20, 2023; Accepted: December 21, 2023; Published: December 30, 2023.

Abstract: In order to determine the extent to which lexical variation denotes the presence of regional boundaries, the current study examines the lexical variation across Brahui dialects in general and, in particular, the three main dialects of the Brahui language: Sarawani, Rakhshani, and Jhalawani. 20 Brahui variations were observed in this investigation. At the 10-word level, the words completely altered (melyparo/melypak/mellof, zeal/horhad/hor, hora/gade, razan/hozar, henak/hen/khary, bestry/lep/bherum, hasol/chat/besat, Tanya/chew, johan Lagery/dost barer/wharery, nary/rumbky/halmyky) and ten graphophonic alterations that affected sound and production (darasm/hrasam, dorogh/dhorogh, darakht/dharakch, yaka/yako, chaik/thaik, dangia/dangy/dary, chofot/thefarot, mahon/mahman, dhun/dhaun, hetiv/thive). The data was collected from 150 middle-aged participants (30 to 50 years old). The Social Identity Theory by Tajfel and Turner (1979) has been applied in this work. To measure the association between linguistic variables and social variables, the Chi-square test of independence was being used. According to the study, there is lexical diversity among the three Brahui dialects. Lexical diversity distinguishes residents of one region from those of another and can confirm the existence of regional boundaries.

Keywords: Lexical Variation, Dialectology, Convention, Regional Boundaries

1. Introduction

Balochistan is a diverse region, both phonetically and ethnically. Around here, numerous dialects are spoken, and within one language, there are numerous varieties. In any case, among these dialects, Brahui is additionally spoken in numerous places in Balochistan.

Brahui is a Dravidian language fundamentally spoken in Pakistan and Balochistan, particularly by the Brahui speakers, and is likewise spoken in certain areas of Turkmenistan, Afghanistan, and Iran. According to Sabir (2002), Brahui travellers also speak this language in Iraq, Qatar, and the United Arab Emirates. Khuzdar, Mastung, Noshki, and a few locations in the Quetta region are the main Balochistan cities where Brahui is widely spoken.

According to Kusar and Sarwar (2015), around 4 million individuals communicate in dialects, Pakistan's Balochistan Province. One of Pakistan's 27 endangered dialects is Brahui, according to UNESCO's 2009 report. The classification is "risky," which is the least endangered of the five degrees of restrictedness (Unsafe, Specifically Endangered, Severely Endangered, Critically Endangered, and Extinct) (Regan, Colyvan, & Burgma, 2000).

In the latter half of the nineteenth century, etymologists' main concern was dialectology as a productive request. Generally, dialectologists are stressed over syntactic, lexical and phonological features that look at local reason. Every dialect has various vernaculars. Neighborhood and social dialects both exist; a socialist, or social dialect, can be used to determine a speaker's social class. Territorial dialects can separate local residents from those of other regions in this way (Wardhaugh, 2015) . Therefore, according to Chambers and Trudgill (2004), all speakers have a social and local establishment. Additionally, they regularly distinguish themselves as locals in their conversations, as well as the person from the explicit socioeconomic class, location, age group, and ethnic establishment. Every time a speaker takes the stage, as explained by Trudgill (2003), he or she must share with the audience some background information about himself or herself. Our speeches and conversations typically reveal where we come from geographically and the kind of friendly atmosphere we have. As a result, vernacular offers speakers of the general public their unique personalities (Turner, 1999; Bucholtz & Hall, 2005).

This is one perspective that provides new contexts for this language's study. The two most common dialects of the Brahui language are Jhalawan (focused south of Khuzdar) and Sarawan (focused north of Kalat). For the most part, no significant provincial contrasts are expected in various dialects. In this association, the current examination would investigate lexical varieties that separate individuals of one district from another area to stamp the presence of territorial limits with exceptional reference to Brahui language.

2. Literature Review:

More than those who interact in Sindhi or Siraeki, it has been found that many people are familiar with the two dialects of Baloch people, Balochi and Brahui. These speakers are also said to have a predisposition for living close to one another. Curiously, Balochi and Brahui are two completely distinct languages; the former belongs to the Dravidian dialect family, while the latter is part of the Indo-Iranian dialect group (Ansari, 2007). In certain Baloch houses, these two languages are simultaneously spoken since one parent speaks Brahui and the other Balochi, so the children are exposed to both at the same time. Balochi and Brahui-speaking people coexist peacefully in many areas of Balochistan since they see themselves as belonging to the same ethnic group. The respondent who spoke Siraiki and Sindhi as their first languages couldn't speak Balochi but claimed to understand it, or they stated as much, so they shouldn't be considered an outgroup. It is possible to ensure ethnic character etymologically by presenting with a dialect that is not one's first language, as is the case with the group of people who have learned Balochi even though it is not their native language (Ansari, 2007).

This study shows the Brahui dialect's phonetic variations, discourse patterns, vocabulary growth, and acquiring expressions of Brahui dialects. The purpose of this paper is to explain the causes of Brahui's diverse dialects. One of the strongest arguments in favour of colloquial variety is that the Brahui dialect has been heavily influenced by dialects that are close by, such as Balochi in Raxshani dialect, Urdu, English, and Pashto in Saravani vernacular, Sindhi, Jathki, and Last in Jahlavani language. A few recommendations are made towards the conclusion on how to prepare for such colloquial changes in the Brahui dialect. It would be dangerous for the Brahui dialect if the linguistic alterations continued (Sani, Ahmed, & Razzaq, 2014).

Desire is a common component in Balochistani phonetics. The Saraiki, Balochi, and Brahui Pashto dialects have worked out how to evolve perfectly in tandem with one another. Brahui, particularly from Balochi, has won many other accolades outside of words. As Denys Bray put it, or western researchers. Between these dialects, a wide range is present. Additionally, while some of it has been identified, the language of origin in each instance has typically been determined with certainty. Various researchers have offered a variety of theories about how Brahui Language connects Dravidian and non-Dravidian languages, as well as Semantic, Indo-Aryan, Koch-o-Baloch, Uraltaic, Iranian, Kurdgali, and Proto-Dravidian, but this has led to a great deal of confusion in people's minds. Therefore, their theories and opinions have been tested in this article. The first theory provides clear evidence that the Brahui dialect may be a fundamental Dravidian dialect. As a result of Qadri and Bray's (1978) extensive explanation of linguistic structure, The Brahui Dravidian dialect has been gathered. It has a well-rounded vocabulary that

includes words from the Jatki, Sindhi Persian, Balochi, and other nearby dialects, incorporating foreign vocabularies into the linguistic structure. Additionally, it is yet another plain proof that the Brahui Dravidian dialects' numerical conventions are incorrect (Sunny, Shahwani, & Baloch, 2007).

Most frequently, local researchers like Sabir and Brahui (2003) speak the proto-Dravidian dialect of Brahui. According to Sabir (in his article "Brahui writing in the twentieth century"), most etymologists agree that Brahui is not only a Dravidian dialect but also a proto-Dravidian tongue. Since the Dravidian dialects are the most widely spoken in the sub-landmass, The oldest language in Pakistan is Brahui, according to a 2003 study. Since the Brahui and Dravidian dialects are so closely related to one another, Dr. Razzaq Sabir claims that if someone denies that the Brahui is proto-Dravidian, then there is a strong case to be made for that claim (Sabir, 2003).

According to Brahui (1983), the term "DRAVIDA" is also acceptable for the previous inhabitants of India who were not Aryans. He also includes in his glossary the latest information on the Dravidian people, who were thought to have lived near the Atlantic Ocean. While some etymologists from around the world agree that the Brahui is not a Dravidian dialect, due to some vocabulary blending or acquisition by other languages, the Brahui cannot be classified as a Dravidian dialect. Names like Coldwell, Razly, Gerirson, Ahyo Billers, and I-C-S are included in this arrangement.

Mengal (1998) stated in his essay Danys Bray and Colwell that although the Brahui dialect is generally thought to have a Dravidian component, it also has a common ancestor with Sindi and Panjabi. The contrary is true; it was probably brought about through exercise a long time ago. Brahui belongs to the group of Dravidian dialects, has openly maintained the foreign vocabulary of Persian, Balochi, Sindhi, Jatki, and other nearby dialects, and despite all developments, its Dravidian linguistic framework has remained somewhat constant.

In her research, Mengal (2017) looks into the origins and indigenization of English in Balochistan. It focuses on vocabulary borrowings from the Brahui dialect as it investigates the Brahuization of English. Additionally, each book is segregated from any adjacent formal individuals, locations, or objects. The findings show that the Brahui dialect, one of Pakistan's minor dialects, has had an impact on English and has contributed to its indigenization. In addition, the frequency of local pronouns and Brahui lexical items across the five novels is 15.44 out of 100%.

3. Problem statement

Being home to several ethnic communities, Balochistan also boasts a diverse linguistic population, with a different language spoken by each ethnic group. Since ancient times, the Balochistani Brahui community

has lived in several regions. There are numerous dialects of Brahui. Regional borders serve as the foundation for dialect formation. Most Brahui communities are concentrated in the regions of Quetta, Khuzdar, Noshki, Kalat, Zaheri, and Mastung. Due to the diversity of their languages, their dialects are distinct from one another. The study looks at the three primary dialects of Brahui and looks at words that show the differences between each dialect.

4. Significance

The study also serves the Brahui community in general and the Brahui language in particular by revealing the geographical variations in the three primary dialects of Brahui, as there is no record of such research being performed in the existing literature. It is also significant because the study places a lot of focus on regional dialect conventions.

5. Theoretical Framework

It is said at the outset of the Social Identity Theory (SIT; Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) that individuals define their own unique characters as to identification functions to ensure self-personality. The arrangement of one's "in-gathering" and "out-gathering" in relation to the tendency to view one's own particular gathering with a positive inclination opposed to the out-gathering are both elements of the formation of gathering personalities. As a result, members of the group experience a sense of belonging and develop a depersonalized identity that is good for promoting participation. (For instance, Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987).

A prime example of a social psychological theory, SIT aims to explain intergroup conflict as a capability for group-based self-definitions.

6. Research Objectives

To investigate, specifically with reference to the Brahui language, lexical changes that distinguish the inhabitants of one region from those of another to indicate the presence of regional boundaries.

7. Research Questions

In what way do variations in Brahui dialects differentiate the Brahui residents of one region from another?

8. **Delimitation**

The lexical and variational aspects of 20 randomly chosen Brahui words will be the focus of this study.

9. **Research methodology**

The current study uses a quantitative methodology. A list of sentences was given to each participant to obtain the quantitative data. Each participant selected the most acceptable term from a list of possibilities for each sentence in each of the three dialects. To measure the association between the social and linguistic variables, the Chi Square test of independence has been used.

The terms on this list fell into two categories, namely.

Word level, where a word completely alters in many dialects.

Changes in graphophonics based on sound or production.

The categories aided the researchers in identifying the level of variance in various Brahui dialects.

10. **Data Analysis:**

The study used 20 words from three distinct Brahui dialects—Sarawani, Rakshani, and Jahlawani—specifically from the Balochistani districts of Mastung, Noshki, and Khuzdar or Zaheri. By distributing surveys to 150 participants, quantitative data was collected. For quantitative data, 20 words were chosen, of which 10 are word-level alterations that result in completely different word meanings in various dialects, while the remaining 10 are graphophonic modifications that result in altered sounds or production. In the questionnaire, each word is given in the form of a phrase, along with the choice of all three dialects. To determine the percentage of usage of each word in various dialects, each word has been manually analysed. In this regard, the researcher made use of the social identity theory theoretical framework developed by Tajfel and Turner (1979). The quantitative findings, as demonstrated in the data in the tables and through the image below, reflect the lexical variance in the Brahui dialect.

10.1 Word Level Variations:

Table:10.1.1

The score of Brahui variant *Mileparo*, *Milepak*, and *Milof*, which mean unavailable in Brahui.

Variant	Phonetics Transcription	Sarawan	%age	Rakshan	%age	Jhalawan	%age
<i>Milliparo</i>	/mɪlɪp ə r uː /	0	Nil	19	38%	5	10%
<i>Millipak</i>	/mɪlɪp ʌk/	50	100%	30	60%	20	40%
<i>Milof</i>	/mɪlɔːf/	0	Nil	1	2%	25	50%

The outcome of the variant *milepak* is displayed in Table 1. The outcome demonstrates that responders from various dialects utilise distinctive variants, indicating dialectal heterogeneity in the lexicon. The findings revealed that the variants *mileparo* and *milhof* were not used by the Sarawane population, which exclusively used the variant *milepak*. *Milepak* version would be utilized 38%, the *Mileparo* variant would be used 60%, and the *Mihlof* variant would be used only 2% in Rakshan. *Mileparo* was utilised at 10%, *Milepak* at 40%, and *Milhof* at 50% in the Jalawhan variation. The Sig value, which is less than 0.05, is 0.03.

Table: 10.1.2

The score of Brahui variant *Horhad/ Zeel/ Hor* which means nail.

Variant	Phonetics Transcription	Sarawan	%age	Rakshan	%age	Jhalawan	%age
<i>Zeel</i>	/zi:l/	45	90%	14	28%	12	24%
<i>Orhad</i>		3	6	36	72%	5	10%
<i>Or</i>		2	4	0	Nil	33	66%

The outcome of using the variant *zeel/orhad/or* is displayed in the table below. Most people in Sarawan speak variant *zeel*, while a small number also speak variant *horhad* and *hor*. While in Rakshan, the majority of individuals use variant *horhad*, a small number also use variant *zeel*, but not variant *hor*. The Jalawani dialect respondents primarily used the variation *hor* in the same way. Other variations are *zeel* and *orhad*. Lexical variance between these dialects is indicated by the higher and lower rates of these variants' articulation. At p 0.05, this outcome is significant.

Table: 10.1.3

The score of Brahui variant *Gade/Hora* which means *Home*.

Variant	Phonetics Transcription	Sarawan	%age	Rakshan	%age	Jhalawan	%age
<i>Ora</i>	/	50	100%	50	100%	28	56%
<i>Gade</i>	/geɪd/	0	Nil	0	Nil	22	44

According to the findings in this table, residents of Rakshan and Sarawan use the variant *hora* but not the variant *gade*. While respondents who spoke Jhalawani utilised both *hora* and *gade*. The findings demonstrate the distinct vocabulary differences between these dialects as well as the fact that the variant *gade* is only used in Jhalawan. If the p value is less than 0.05, the outcome is significant.

Table: 10.1.4

The score of Brahui variant *Razan/Hozar* which means vessels.

Variant	Sarawan	%age	Rakshan	%age	Jhalawan	%age
<i>Razan</i>	50	100%	50	100%	31	62%
<i>Ozar</i>	0	Nil	0	Nil	19	38%

According to the data in this table, respondents who spoke Rakshani and Sarawani dialects were more likely to employ the variation *razan* than *hozar*. Respondents utilised both the variants of *razan* and *hozar* in Jhalawani. The vocabulary differences between these three Brahui dialects can thus be seen through these data. The Sig value, which is less than 0.05, is 0.01.

Table: 10.1.5

The score of Brahui variant *Henhak/Hen/Khary* which means *go*.

Variant	Phonetics Transcription	Sarawan	%age	Rakshan	%age	Jhalawan	%age
<i>Inak</i>	/ɪn'ʌk/	22	44%	29	79%	18	36%
<i>In</i>	/ɪn/	27	54%	10	20%	5	10%
<i>Kharray</i>	/xʌr'reɪ/	1	2%	1	2%	27	54%

The information in this table shows that Rakhshani dialect respondents primarily use variation *henhak*, however, a few also use variant *hen*, variant *henak*, and variant *khary*, although variant *khary* is rarely used. As opposed to variants *henhak* and *khary*, the respondents use dialect variant *hen* more frequently in Sarawani. Additionally, the Jhalawani dialect's most common variety is *khary*. These findings allow for the observation of lexical variance among these three dialects. The outcome is noteworthy, p 0.05.

Table: 10.1.6

The score of Brahui variant *Bistry/Behrum/Lep* which means bedding.

Variant	Phonetics Transcription	Sarawan	%age	Rakshan	%age	Jhalawan	%age
<i>Bistry</i>	[ˈbɪst̪rɛɪ]	30	60%	5	10%	4	8%
<i>Lep</i>	[ˈbɪst̪rɛɪ]	12	24%	10	20%	30	60%
<i>Behrum</i>	/beɪru:m/	8	16%	35	70%	16	32%

The outcomes demonstrate the usage of the *Bistry*, *Lep*, and *Behrum* versions. The findings demonstrate the unique use of variants, with Sarawan respondents using variant *bistry* and a small number using variant *behrum*. Most respondents use the Rakhshani dialect variant *behrum*. The majority of respondents used *lep* variation in Jhalawani. The findings highlight the vocabulary differences between these three dialects. As of p 0.05, there is significance between the social and linguistic factors.

Table: 10.1.7

The score of Brahui variants *Hasol/Chat/Bhekhi/Besat* which means quite.

Variant	Phonetics Transcription	Sarawan	%age	Rakshan	%age	Jhalawan	%age
<i>Hasol</i>		42	84%	1	2%	11	22%
<i>Chat</i>		4	8%	29	58%	9	18%
<i>Bhekhi</i>		2	4%	19	38%	0	Nil
<i>Bissat</i>	/bɪs ˈs ʌt/	2	4%	0	Nil	30	60%

This table's findings demonstrate the usage of the variations *Hasol*, *Chat*, *Bhekhi*, and *Besat*. The majority of respondents who speak Sarawni use variant *hasol*. Some of them occasionally employ variant *chat*, variant *bhekhi*, and variant *besat* in their speech. The responders who speak the Rakshani dialect utilise the variants of *chat* and *bhekhi* but not *besat*. Although some respondents who speak the Jhalawani dialect also use variant *hasol* and variant *chat*, they do not use variant *bhesat*. As a result, it is significant at $p < 0.05$.

Table: 10.1.8

The score of Brahui variant *Thanya/Yaka/Chev* which means alone.

Variant	Phonetics Transcription	Sarawan	%age	Rakshan	%age	Jhala wan	%age
<i>Thanya</i>	[t̪ ʌn̪ə]	47	94%	50	100%	5	10%
<i>Yaka</i>		0	Nil	0	Nil	21	42%
<i>Chev</i>	/tʃeiv/	3	6%	0	Nil	24	48%

According to the findings, the respondents who speak Sarawni dialects mostly use the variant *thanya* and variant *chev*. Respondents should only use the variant *thanya* in Rakshani. The Jhalawani dialect responders primarily use variants of *yaka* and *chev*. If the sig value is less than 0.05 and is 0.01, the outcome is significant.

Table: 10.1.9

The score of Brahui variants *Jhoan lagery/Dost barery/Wharery* which means like.

Variant	Phonetics Transcription	Sarawan	%age	Rakshan	%age	Jhalawan	%age
<i>Jwan laggeray</i>	/dʒvɑ:nʌg'gerei/	27	54%	5	10%	3	6%
<i>Dost barerey</i>	/dɔ:st b ərɪreɪ/	19	38%	39	78%	18	36%
<i>Vareray</i>	/və ɾ ɪreɪ/	4	8%	6	12%	29	58%

The usage of variants *Jwanoan lageray/Dost barerey/Varerey* is evident in the results. The findings show that the majority of respondents who speak the Sarawani dialect use the variety *Jhoan lagery*, although some also use the variant *Dost barerey*. Similar to this, Rakhshani respondents use the variant *Dost barerey*, and some also use the other two variants. The Jhalawani dialect responders converse using variants of *varerey* and *Dost barerey*. At p 0.05, the outcome is significant.

Table: 10.1.10

score of Brahui variants *Nary/Rumbky/Khary* that means run.

Variant	Phonetics Transcription	Sarawan	%age	Rakshan	%age	Jhalawan	%age
<i>Nar'ray</i>	/ˈnɑrreɪ/	39	78%	8	16%	9	18%
<i>Rumbkay</i>	[rʊn t̪ k ei]	11	22%	42	84%	13	26%
<i>Almakay</i>	/ʌlmʌ k ei/	2	4%	0	Nil	28	56%

The outcomes of using three different versions in three different dialects are displayed in the table below. According to the findings, most respondents who speak the Sarawani dialect use the variety *Narray*, but some also use the variant *Rumbaky*. The variants *Rumbaky* and *nary* are used by most Rakhshani respondents. Most Jhalwani dialect respondents use the variety *almakay*, while a few additionally use the variants *nary* and *rumbaky*. The findings demonstrate a distinct variance in the selection of variations among the three Brahui dialects. The outcome is significant if $p < 0.05$.

10.2 Sound level variations:

Table: 10.2.1

The score of Brahui variants *Darsam/Dharsam* which means goat's wool.

Variant	Sarawan	%age	Rakshan	%age	Jhalawan	%age
<i>Darsam</i>	46	92%	50	100%	11	22%
<i>dharsam</i>	4	8%	0	Nil	39	78%

The results of the sound level of the Brahui variants reveal that the respondents from the Sarawani dialect use variant *darasm*, and a few of them use variant *dharasm*. In the Rakshani dialect, respondents use only variant *Darasm*; no one uses variant *Dharasm*. While in the Jhalawani dialect, most people use variant *dharasm*, and a few also use variant *darasm*. So the sig value is 0.02, which is less than 0.05, indicating that there is a significant association between linguistic variables and social variables.

Table: 10.2.2

The score of Brahui variants *Dorogh/Dhorogh* which means lies.

Variant	Sarawan	%age	Rakshan	%age	Jhalawan	%age
<i>Dorogh</i>	50	100%	50	100%	11	22%
<i>Dhorogh</i>	0	Nil	0	Nil	39	78%

The usage of two variants in three distinct dialects is condemned by the results of this table. In their talks, speakers of the Sarawani dialect solely employ the variety *dorogh*; they do not use the variant *dhorogh*. similar to how people use variation *dorogh* rather than variant *dhorogh* in the Rakshani dialect. While the majority of Jhalawani speakers use variant *dhorogh*, a small number also use variant *dorogh*. This outcome is noteworthy (p 0.05).

Table: 10.2.3

score of Brahui variants *Drakth/Drakch* that means tree.

Variant	Sarawan	%age	Rakshan	%age	Jhalawan	%age
<i>Drakth</i>	47	94%	43	96%	13	26%
<i>Drakch</i>	3	9%	2	4%	37	74%

This table's findings show that in Sarawan, the majority of Brahui-speaking respondents speak variant *drakth*, while just a small percentage speak variant *drakch*. Similar to this, in Rakshan, most respondents use version *drakth*, while variant *drakch* is rarely used. In contrast, only a small number of people utilised variant *drakth* mostly people use variant *drakch*; in Jhalawan. Because of this, the sig value is 0.02, which is less than 0.05 and indicates that there is a strong correlation between the two variables.

Table 10.2.4

The score of Brahui variant *Yaka/Yako* which means always.

Variant	Sarawan	%age	Rakshan	%age	Jhalawan	%age
<i>Yaka</i>	48	6%	49	98%	12	24%
<i>yako</i>	2	4%	1	2%	38	76%

The findings indicate that the majority of respondents use a variant of *yaka* in Sarawan. In the Rakshani dialect, most individuals use variant *yaka*, although a small number also use variant *yako*. Most Jhalawani speakers speak variant *yako*, while just a few speak variant *yaka*. As a result, respondents who speak different dialects use various variants of the same term. At p 0.05, this finding is significant.

Table 10.2.5

The score of Brahui variants *Chaik/Thaik* which means know.

Variant	Sarawan	%age	Rakshan	%age	Jhalawan	%age
<i>Chaik</i>	49	98%	6	12%	48	96%
<i>Thaik</i>	1	2%	44	88%	2	4%

Only 2% of people in the Sarawani dialect use variant *thaik*, according to the data in this table. Most Rakshani speakers utilise variant *thaik*, whereas very few use variant *chaik*. While most people in Jhalawani use a variation of *chaik*. The findings show that respondents employ these variants specifically and according to their geographic locations. At p 0.05, this outcome is significant. A correlation exists between linguistic and social factors.

Table: 10.2.6

The score of Brahui variant *Dangia/Dangy/Dary* which means here.

Variant	Sarawan	%age	Rakshan	%age	Jhalawan	%age
<i>Dangia</i>	17	34%	0	Nil	19	38%
<i>Dangy</i>	30	60%	2	4%	29	58%
<i>Dary</i>	3	6%	48	96%	2	4%

The findings show that most respondents from the Sarawani dialect use variant *dangy*, while only a small number use variant *dangia*. Only 4% of Rakshanis speak variant *dangy*; the majority speak variant *dary*. Due to the Jhalawani dialect's proximity to the Kalat area, variation *dangy* and variant *dangia* are both commonly used. At p 0.05, the outcome is significant.

Table: 10.2.7

The score of Brahui variants *Chofot/Thefaro* which means will not give

Variant	Sarawan	%age	Rakshan	%age	Jhalawan	%age
<i>Chofot</i>	0	Nil	0	Nil	41	82%
<i>Thefaro</i>	50	100%	50	100%	9	18%

The findings show that respondents who spoke the Sarawani dialect used variant *thefarot* but not variant *chofot*. Similar to Rakshani, people who speak the dialect employ variant *thefarot* rather than variant *chofot*. While a small number of Jhalawani speakers utilise variant *thefarot*, the majority of speakers employ variant *chofot*. There is a significant correlation between the two variables because the result is significant (p 0.05).

Table: 10.2.8

The score of Brahui variants *Mahon/Mahamn* which means black.

Variant	Sarawan	%age	Rakshan	%age	Jhalawan	%age
<i>Mahon</i>	50	100%	0	Nil	42	84%
<i>Mahamn</i>	0	Nil	50	100%	8	16%

The results of this table reveal that the people of the Sarawani dialect use variant *Mahon*. The respondents of the Rakshani dialect use variant *mahman*. While most respondents in the Jhalawani dialect use variant *Mahon*, only 16% of respondents use variant *mahamn* in their conversations. This result is significant at p<0.05.

Table: 10.2.9

The score of Brahui variants *Dhun/Dahun* which means like this.

Variant	Sarawan	%age	Rakshan	%age	Jhalawan	%age
<i>Dhun</i>	36	72%	50	100%	13	26%
<i>Dahun</i>	14	28%	0	Nil	37	74%

The results show that respondents in Sarawani dialect mostly use variant *dhun*, and some people use variant *dahun*, especially in the Kalat region. In Rakshan, people use variant *dhun* they do not use variant *dahun*. While in Jhalawan most people use variant *dahun* and a few people also, use variant *dhun*. This result is significant at $p < 0.05$.

Table: 10.2.10

The score of Brahui variants *Hetv/thiv* which means give.

Variant	Sarawan	%age	Rakshan	%age	Jhalawan	%age
<i>Hetv</i>	49	98%	50	100%	12	24%
<i>Thiv</i>	1	2%	0	Nil	38	76%

This table's findings show that the majority of respondents who speak the Sarawani dialect use the variant *hetive*, whereas only 1% use the variant *thiv*. Only the form *hetiv* is used in Rakshani. When speaking in the Jhalawani dialect, most people use the form *thiv*, but some also use the variant *hetiv*. As a result, the sig value is 0.02 and is below 0.05.

11. Findings:

According to Tajfel (1879), stereotyping (such as grouping people into categories and groups) is a common subjective process that stems from a desire to collect things. In doing so, we will typically exaggerate the differences between gatherings. 2. the similarities among items in a group. The impacts of the lexical diversity among the three Brahui dialects, Sarawani, Rakhshani, and Jhalawani, in three different regions are also shown in these tables. These conclusions were drawn from knowledge and perception of the semantic behaviour of Brahui speakers from Mastung, Noshki, Khuzdar, or Zaheri, Kalat, etc. The analysis of these 20 Brahui variants suggests that there is lexical diversity among the three Brahui dialects. By seeing present

occurrences of lexical variety. It's possible to discover that identification and dialect are related by looking at these variances. We conclude that the area plays a crucial role in lexical variation based on the presence or absence of these specific changes in the three Brahui dialects. According to Chambers and Trudgill (2004), if we move from place to place, we could notice phonetic differences that let us distinguish between one town and another. These differences could be more or less significant. Additionally, Wardaugh and Fuller (2015) raise the point that local dialect distinguishes residents of one region from those of other places. These findings imply that lexical variation is not only present at the word level but also at the level of the sounds that make up these particular locations. The high percentage shows that respondents from different regions will not alter their dialect while moving to another location in order to keep their identity and be aware of their phonetic behavior.

The tables show that there are numerous Brahui varieties, both at the word-level and at the sound- or graphophonic-level. Part of a person's notions of self, according to Henri Tajfel and Jhon Turner (1979), "come from the groups to which that person belongs." Through these tables, the respondents did, however, demonstrate heterogeneity in their linguistic behaviour according to their groups. With particular reference to the Brahui language, it also looked at linguistic differences that distinguish the inhabitants of one region from those of another to indicate the presence of regional boundaries. The material was factually investigated, and the results show that there is a considerable correlation between the social variable and the language variable.

Our research enabled us to draw the conclusion that different variants are responsible for linguistic variability. Together with a regional alliance, sexual orientation, and education, phonological variety works. According to Wardaugh (2011), not all people have the same phonological abilities. The sexual orientation, religion, age, education level, and ethnicity of each person make them distinct from one another. Local, social, political, and racial differences strengthen the lexical diversity among dialects. In light of this, we should assume that we can distinguish between residents of different districts through lexical variation. We can therefore suggest territorial boundaries between three specific regions of Balochistan, Pakistan, based on this lexical variation.

Conclusion:

The main focus of this study is to look at the lexical variety among three Brahui dialects, such as Sarawani, Rakshni, and Jhalawani in Pakistani Balochistan. Sociolinguistic studies have only discussed how language changes from one area to the next and even from person to person.

The results of this inquiry have revealed some fascinating information about these three Brahui dialects. The findings demonstrate that lexical diversity among Brahui dialects is influenced by linguistic factors. The phonetic practices of the respondents are diverse and come from different dialects. The majority of respondents believe that dialects spoken in rural regions and those used in language literature are superior.

In conclusion, we can claim that people from different parts of Pakistan's Balochistan use a variety of language structures in their everyday conversations. Based on the lexical diversity across Brahui dialects, we may define the boundaries between different Balochistan provinces in Pakistan.

References

- Ansari, M. (2007). Between tribe and country: The crisis of Balochistan. *Himal South Asian. A Review Magazine of Polifics and Culture*.
- Brahui, D. (1982). Abdul Rehman. Brahui Zuban o Adab ki mukhtasir taareekh: *Urdu Board. Lahor*
- Brahui, A. R. (1982). Brahui Zuban o Adab ki Mukhtasar Tareekh. *Brief history of Brahui language and literature) Markazi Urdu Board Lahore, p-85.*
- Bray, D. (1978) The Brahui language: Brahui academy Quetta. Pakistan
- Chambers, J. K. & Trudgill, P. (2004). *Dialectology. 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.*
- Sabir, A.R. (2002) *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics, Volumes 36-37* department of linguistics, University of Kerala.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (2010). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict.
- Kausar, R., Sarwar, M., & Shabbir, M. (2015). The history of the Urdu language together with its origin and geographic distribution. *Int J Innov Res Educ Sci*, 2, 5-9.
- Sani, L. A., Ahmed, B., & Razzaq, W. (2014). Dialectal Variation of Brahui Language in Balochistan Language & Literature. *Balochistan*.

Sunny, L. A., Shahwani, S. A., & Baloch, M. A. SOME COMMENTS ON INVALID HYPOTHESES ABOUT BRAHUI LANGUAGE. *Balochistan*.

Sabir, D. (2003). Abdul Razzaq,,. Drawarhistan “: *Brahui Academy. Quetta. Pakistan*.

Mengal, A. (2017). English in Quetta: A Study of Lexical Borrowings from Brahui. Brahui Academy ® Pakistan Quetta.

Mengal,G. K. N. (1998). *Koch -o –Baloch*. Zamrud Publications. Quetta: Pakistan.

Wardhaugh, R., & Fuller, J. M. (2015).*An Introduction to Sociolinguistic, 7th edition*.John Walley& Sons. Inc *Blackwell*.

Wardhaugh, R., & Fuller, J. M. (2021). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. John Wiley & Sons.

Wardhaugh, R. (2011). An introduction to sociolinguistics (Vol. 28).