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4.1 Introduction

Languages are constituted of a large number of lexical items when compared to other features. Each lexical item of a language is used in a variety of ways in linguistic and extra-linguistic contexts. When all such variety of uses of lexical items or groups of lexical items are identified and described, lexical usages get established. These lexical usages can be studied from the point of view of general linguistics as well as sociolinguistics.

From the linguistic point of view, lexical usages are identified and established when the functions of lexical items in larger constructions and texts are identified. In other words, the lexical usages are studied in relation to the larger constructions in which they occur. Also when the form of lexical items, their meanings, functions, etc. are studied in textual contexts, the variations in the use of lexical items could be noticed. Lexical usages are established through the application of the principles of general linguistics. From the
point of view of sociolinguistics, lexical usages get established when the lexical items (form and meaning) are correlated with sociocultural parameters, speech contexts, etc.

Study of the varieties of lexical usages in different social contexts has been attempted even in the early years of language research, and before the development of sociolinguistics as a separate discipline. All such studies which try to establish the relationship between language, society, culture and human mind have considered the importance of lexical items for the establishment of such relationships.

Speakers of a language, use a number of stylistically varying vocabulary items according to their needs with reference to the rapid change in the social system, etc. Vocabulary selection and sequencing them depend upon the social context of language use. When one learns a language, he/she learns the appropriate choice of a particular lexical item from among a set of items to suit to the speech situation, social context, role-relationship between the speaker and hearer, etc. The individual also learns aspects such as where, why and how to use the vocabulary or construction in particular and language variety in general. So, social factors, socio-cultural factors
and speech contextual factors shed influence over the variation in the selection and sequencing of vocabulary items. This ultimately leads to variation in the use of lexical items and patterns within a society.

4.1.1 Review of Earlier Works

In the following pages a review of earlier works is given with a view to have an idea about the work done in this area in the past.

4.1.1.1 Herman Paul

Herman Paul (1980, quoted in Uriel Weinreich et al, 1986: 104-107) has observed that language structure is associated with speaker and hearer. The psychic organisms in human beings control and influence the variation in language use (vocabulary, etc.). Idiolects are the property of community and language variation means idiolectal variation. This was the conception Herman Paul had. By saying so, it appears that Paul could not identify the operational hypothesis relating
language and social factors such as age, sex, etc. which modern sociolinguistics use, while explaining the variation found in language use.

4.1.1.2 Meillet

Antonie Meillet (1905) has hinted that change in the structure of a society brings change in the language as well. And all such changes may be slow or fast.

4.1.1.3 Malinowsky

Malinowsky (1923: 309-312) has pointed out through his study on primitive languages that language is related to culture. He was of the opinion that metaphorical and other use of lexical items in primitive cultures have to be studied by bringing in the relevant context, and only in context words receive meaning. In his "Trobriand Islander's Language Study", (1923) he points out the use of the word 'Bearwood', which means in their language the 'canoe' which comes behind'. Thus, to know the use of the lexical items of primitive languages, one has to observe the speech context and relate it with the
lexical items, because the primitive languages, unlike the developed modern languages have no prepared thesaurus or dictionary for consulting the use or meaning of words. Psychological theories are necessary to explain the use of language and vocabulary. Taboo usages are associated with the psychological attitude and intention of the speakers. Malinowsky has pointed out that variation in language, vocabulary and culture are related to geographical, socio-economic conditions, and hence linguistic research should give importance to the relationship found between spoken language and cultural context.

4.1.1.4 Saussure

Saussure (1930) has exposed that language is under the control of society, and every individual speech is heterogeneous but one could assume the existence of a homogeneous language for a society. Speakers of a language according to Saussure, have a common 'langue' and variant 'parole'. He brings out the notion of vocabulary under the cover term 'sign' to which he associates signification, value and content. He has also pointed out the existence of homogeneous mental language
for the speakers of a society and heterogeneous physical speech for the individual of the context.

4.1.1.5 Bloomfield

Bloomfield (1933: 42-46) asserts that language is the collective property of the speakers of a community. In speech communities, language is exchanged among its speakers. He has brought out the notions like speech community, dialectal variation, styles of speech, etc. which paved the way for the detailed study of dialectal variation and sociolinguistic variation in language and vocabulary.

4.1.1.6 Bloch and Trager

Bloch and Trager (1942: 39-40) have identified the existence of idiolects or speech habits of individuals and the various stylistic variations found in the idiolect. They have established the variation found in the lexical usages leading to idiolectal variation.

4.1.1.7 Harris and Hockett

In America many linguists have pointed out the use of
4.1.1.8 Martinet

Martinet (1962: 522) points out that research on language and vocabulary change should be associated with the history of social needs of the people of a social set up. Brooke (1963: 36 - 37) is of the opinion that dialectal variation which is evidenced by vocabulary variation could be explained also through studies made over literature, folklore, history, geography, etc. which are related to society.

4.1.1.9 Chomsky

Chomsky (1965) has brought out the conception that the
variation in language use is part of 'performance'. It could be studied only after a study of the knowledge of language in the mind of an ideal native speaker is made. That is, linguistic performance and language use refer to the contextual actualisation of linguistic competence. So, he proposes the study of the linguistic knowledge of the ideal speaker hearer or the study of linguistic competence.

Several criticisms were levelled against Chomsky's proposition. The main critics were sociolinguists. Some scholars have discarded the conception of ideal speaker hearer situation, while some others have pointed out that Chomsky's notion of competence is restricted in its scope. Several later day studies also try to establish 'bilingual competence', 'productive competence', 'receptive competence', 'communicative competence', etc.

4.1.1.10 Weinreich

Weinreich (1953: 4 - 5) has brought out the idea that the function of languages and vocabulary items which are in contact and bilingual situation could be explained with the help of the
principles drawn from linguistics and other branches of science. Sociolinguists, ethonographers and geographers who are concerned with the description of society can be of good help in conducting language research with reference to various societies where there is language contact situation.

History of sociolinguistic research on language and vocabulary shows that linguists gradually adopted principles and procedures drawn from linguistics, sociology, psychology, anthropology, etc., for explaining language and vocabulary variation, and the correlation of language use in social contexts under the influence of different social parameters.

4.2 Sociolinguists' study of lexical usages

Sociolinguists like Dell Hymes, John Gumperz, Labov, Ferguson, Fishman, Trudgill and several others have contributed a lot to the sociolinguistic dimension of language research. All these researchers are concerned with language variation in general.

4.2.1 Hymes

Hymes (1972) has pointed out that language and vocabulary
use are conditioned by factors such as ethnicity, culture, society and broader context of ethnography of communication. Following Hymes, Gumperz (1968: 25) has pointed out that language is a verbal repertoire.

4.2.2 Labov

Labov (1966: 8-9) is of the opinion that variation in language (vocabulary) could be explained with the help of social parameters like age, sex, education, occupation, race, etc. The way in which pronunciation habits differ in a social group which are established through the statistical sampling and which leads to variation in vocabulary use, etc., serve as an index to judge the nature of variation. Taking the use of post-vocalic /r-/ in the vocabulary in an English dialect, Labov explains the correlation of language and social parameters.

4.2.3 Trudgill

Trudgill (1974: 33 - 34) terms the study of variation in the lexical and language use in the society as social dialectology. He explains that language and vocabulary variations
manifest themselves through their use in a society. Language variation according to Fishman (1971 : 5) can be explained with the help of principles drawn from the sociological theories. Language variation in structure and function according to Hymes and Gumperz, could be correlated with the ethnographic parameters including ethnography of speaking. So, in general sociolinguists talk about different socio-cultural correlating factors which are associated with language variation.

Vocabulary is an index reflecting socio-cultural entities and activities. Vocabulary change could be taken as a measure and index reflecting the changing pattern of the society. Language change, language development, social pressures continue to exist, and thereby the dynamics of language and society gets established. That some aspects of language change are explained through social factors is a stand acceptable to all sociolinguists.

4.3 Language Variation

Language variation has been studied by several scholars in different languages. This section deals with those studies conducted in Indian Languages with special reference to Tamil.
4.3.1 Language variation: Indian Studies

Studies on lexical variation which go for the establishment of language variation have been conducted in the Indian context. A study based on the correlation of language and society over the Indian language data was made by Jules Bloch (1910). Variation found in the use of language by Brahmins and non-Brahmins has been studied by Ramasamy Iyer (1932: 59-73).

Gumperz's (1958: 668-82) study of language use in multilingual context taking a typical multilingual north Indian village provides impetus for the study of language in reference to social situation in India. Following Gumperz's study, several sociolinguistic descriptions with reference to the Indian context have been made. Notable works among them are the following: Hindi by Levins, Marathi by Apte (1962: 5-25) and South Worth (1971), Gujarathi by Pandit (1963), Kannada by William Bright (1960) and McCormack (1960, 1968) and Tamil by Bright and Ramanujam (1962, 1968) and Shanmugam Pillai (1965). In the Indian scene, social variables like caste hierarchy, friendship network, class division, educational level difference, etc. are identified as factors governing language vocabulary variation (Susan S. Bean 1974: 278).
Variation in Tamil language is normally correlated with factors such as region, community, etc. by some scholars. In the Tamil situation even a single community which lives in different areas of the country manifest variation with reference to the use of Tamil. There are a number of social, regional and temporal markers which are of common use along with other idiosyncratic features of variation in the speech behaviour of the Tamils.

On the basis of region, dialects are classified under five groups in the mainland Tamilnadu and one in Sri Lanka. They are: Northern dialect of Tamil, Eastern dialect of Tamil, Western dialect of Tamil, Southern dialect of Tamil and Jaffna dialect of Tamil. These six dialects have characteristic (differentiating) features related to vocabulary, etc. which enable one to draw isoglosses (Zvelebil, 1964 and Karunakaran 1975). Ancient Tamil grammatical treatise Tolkappiyam also points out the existence of twelve major regional dialects in ancient Tamil land of which Malayalam appears to be a Tamil dialect variety (Tol.Col. Sutra, 400). Some of the lexical examples appear to be different in phonetic structure and
meaning in all the six regional varieties of Tamil.

The following are some of the examples which show variation in the lexical use due to geographical location (Karunakaran, 1975).

4.3.2.1 Lexical items used in the Northern dialect of Tamil

1. tunnu 'eat'
2. kayte 'donkey'
3. nayna: 'father/friend'
4. va:ttiya:ru 'friend'
5. be:ja:ru 'difficult'
6. ķaba:yi 'cheat' etc.

4.3.2.2 Lexical usages found in the Eastern dialect area

1. imma:m 'this much'
2. emplatu 'eighty'
3. a:yi 'mother'
4.3.2.3 Lexical usages in the Western dialect area

1. apleye / aple 'then'
2. ayyan 'father'
3. aṣya: 'mother'
4. unku 'eat'
5. paya 'son'
6. pulle 'daughter'
7. poñku 'cook'

etc.

4.3.2.4 Lexical Usages in the Southern dialect area

1. i:rañka:yaŋ 'onion'
2. poluca:ya 'evening'
3. ciyya:n  'grand father'
4. ca:kku  'gunny bag'
5. ni:li  'cruel woman'
6. nu:la:mpate  'cobweb'
7. velakkama:ru  'broomstick'

etc.

(Kamatchinathan, 1969)

4.3.2.5 Lexical usages in the Nanjilnadu Tamil dialect area

1. iru  'sit'
2. a:cce  'day'
3. pakaram  'a substitute'
4. terru  'mistake'
5. gamuttu  'kick'
6. ca:ntu  'chaff'
7. me:ni  'a measure' etc.

(Agesthialingom, 1967)
4.3.2.5 Lexical usages in the Jaffna Tamil dialect

1. eppan  'a little'
2. appu  'father'
3. alakkali  'destroy'
4. pe:  'fool'
5. tinnakku:ta:  'not possible to eat'
6. katavam  'a large basket'
7. kantukutti  'calf'
8. kaide  'rowdyism'
9. ko:coi  'train'
10. ma:mi inra  'aunty's'
11. veruli  'shyness'
12. vavutti  'teacher'
13. vantil  'cart'

(Yesudasan, 1979)
4.4 Lexical variants due to language contact

Sociolinguists talk about language contact situation and bilingual situation and linguistic convergence when languages come into contact with one another. Due to political and social pressures these kinds of situations appear in the Tamil context also. Tamil sociolinguists who worked on language contact situation have identified such variation in the lexical usages of the people using languages which are involved in contact situation.

Due to language contact situation, the usages found in Sanskrit and Perso-Arabic languages appear in Tamil in the form of loan translation, loan blend, loan words and created usages, etc.

4.4.1 Sanskrit usages in Tamil

1. aːtseːpam 'objection'
2. caːtciyam 'witness'
3. nirvaːkam 'administration'
4. visvaːsam 'faith'
5. duspirayoːkam 'misuse' etc.
4.4.2 Perso-Arabic words in Tamil

1. a:sami 'person'
2. a:jar 'presence'
3. pina:mi 'proxy'
4. dasta:ve:ju 'record'
5. makasu:1 'produce'
6. napar 'person'
7. va:pas 'withdrawal'

etc.

4.4.3 Loan words from English

1. kam𝑖san 'commission'
2. kampani 'company'
3. re:diyo: 'radio'
4. dippo: 'depot'

etc.
4.4.4 Telugu loans in Tamil

1. anḍa: 'a metal vessel'
2. uluval(ũ) 'horse gram'
3. pommalaṭṭam 'toy play'
4. nayna: 'father'
5. ya:tra: 'journey'
6. bintika 'a metal vessel'
7. pisukku 'piece'
8. bi:gam 'lock'
9. bu:va: 'food'
10. bomme 'toy'
11. ḍabbu 'money'

etc.

(Karunakaran, 1980)

4.4.5 Malayalam loan words in Tamil

1. aːcce 'day'
2. paramaːṭṭam 'behaviour'
3. to:kku  'gun'
4. cammanti  'chutney'
5. ca:tu  'chaff'
6. ca:ttam  'running'

etc.

( Karunakaran, 1980)

4.4.6 Loan Translation

1. ulmatippi:tu  'internal assessment'
2. potuceeyala:lar  'general secretary'
3. titi:r alaippu  'sudden call'

etc.

4.4.7 Loan Blend

4.4.7.1 English based loan blends

1. avuṭṭa:kku  'make (someone) out
2. aːdar po:tu  'order'(v)
3. kero:cey 'ghero' (v)

4. saspeñdu paṇṇu 'suspend' (v) etc.

4.4.7.2 Sanskrit based loan blends

1. apinayam piṭṭi 'act'

2. go:ṭṭan po:ṭṭu 'shout' (v)

4.4.8 New usages based on loans

1. pe:ruṇṭu 'bus'

2. koṭṭa:tcittalaivar 'revenue divisional officer'

3. ve:ṭṭpan:lar 'candidate' (as in election)

4. va:kkālar 'voter'

etc.

Tamil as a majority language also has influenced the enrichment of vocabulary items of minority languages in Tamilnadu such as Kuruba, Saurashtri, Kannada, Telugu,
Malayalam, etc. Since we are concerned with lexical usages in Tamil, we have not taken into account the other features.

Perso-Arabic loan words and their use have influenced speakers of Tamil to such an extent that it can cast the development of religion based varieties in Tamil. For instance, the Muslim variety of Tamil is characterised by certain lexical usages. Perso-Arabic words have a role in the formation of Muslim variety of Tamil.

4.5 Lexical usages in the Muslim dialect of Tamil

1. amma:ji 'mother'
2. uddiyo:kam 'government job'
3. ci:me 'foreign country'
4. ra:skiyam 'political trend'
5. ve:rruvanka 'others'
6. sulpam 'easy'
7. gu:isal 'hut'

etc.

( Karunakaran, 1980: 59 )
4.6 Sociolinguistic variation : Tamil studies

Just as geographical factors contribute to the variation in the use of lexical items in Tamil, caste is also an important variable which controls vocabulary variation in India and South Asia (Bean 1974). Pattanayak (1974) opines that caste based dialect is an myth with reference to its existence. But many scholars feel the existence of caste based dialect and say that caste does control linguistic variation either in isolation or along with others [Karunakaran (1975), Neethivanan (1975), William Bright (1975) and Annamalai (1975)].

Interest on the classification of Tamil language variety on the basis of social factors led Jules Bloch (1910) to arrive at the conclusion that Tamil has three spoken dialects, namely,

1. Brahmin dialect

2. Non-Brahmin dialect

and 3. Harijan dialect.

This view was accepted by other scholars like Ramanujan, Zvelebil and Bright. There are a number of variations among the non-brahmin Tamil dialects.
Shanmugam Pillai (1972) observes that the speech of the younger generation in Tamilnadu is closer to the so-called standard spoken Tamil and they gradually lose the identity of their own caste variety. However, there are no statistical evidences to the effect of this.

Some of the examples of lexical variants which are associated with caste variation in Tamil situation are given below:

4.6.1 Caste Variations

Some of the lexical usages which are identified as those controlled by the variable caste are as follows:

4.6.1.1 Brahmin variety: Lexical Usages

1. attimpe:r 'brother-in-law'
2. attanka: 'maternal aunt's daughter'
3. akam 'house'
4. ammañci 'uncle's son'
5. avai: 'they' (hum)
Lexical Usages

6. attukka:rar  'husband'
7. a:mpaṭaya:  'wife'
8. to:ppana:r  'father'
9. tu:ttam    'holy water'
10. manni     'sister-in-law'
11. maruma:n  'son-in-law'
12. ma:ttup pon  'daughter-in-law'
13. jalam    'water for washing'
     etc.

( Karunakaran, 1975: 137)

4.6.1.2 Non-brahmin variety: Lexical Usages

1. atta:cci  'paternal aunt's daughter'
2. atta:n    'paternal aunt's son'
3. anni      'elder brother's wife'
4. aviya/avuka  'they'
5. avańka  'they'
6. avarkal  'they'
7. ayya:  'father'
8. uṭṭukka:ri  'wife'
9. uṭṭukka:rar  'husband'
10. paṇam  'money'
11. ponta:tti  'wife'
12. tanni  'water'
13. maccă:n  'younger brother-in-law'
14. niṅka  'you (Hon)'
15. vi:tu  'house'
16. vai  'scold'
17. saṃsa:ram  'wife'

etc.

( Karunakaran, 1975: 138)
4.5.1.2.1 Group - I

Chettiyar vocabulary in Shettinadu area of Tamilnadu

1. iñji 'stingy fellow'
2. ańta:cu 'more or less'
3. alpanatti 'pin'
4. äracu 'male child'
5. oluku 'square pillow'
6. keţumpu 'spoil'
7. kama:mcu 'office'
8. ku:tare 'low character'
9. so:ma:tti 'help'

etc.

(Lakshmanan, 1981: 49)

4.6.2 Age as a variable

Many sociolinguists have pointed out age as a factor that governs the variation in the vocabulary use in a language.
The vocabulary use of the younger generation differs consider-
ably from that of the old generation in Tamil also. But
limited number of examples only could be identified. Moreover,
the study of child speech if conducted in various geographical
areas based on social dimension will prove the existence of age
variety in vocabulary use. Some Tamil examples are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech of elders</th>
<th>Speech of youngsters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. torappukkucci</td>
<td>ca:vi 'key'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. cokka:</td>
<td>caṭṭai 'shirt'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

( Sivashanmugam, 1988 )

Elders when they speak with small children also use variant
forms of lexical usages. These usages also can be associated
with age variable.

Normal Vocabulary use : Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common use</th>
<th>Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. pa:l</td>
<td>pa:cci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'milk'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ciruni:r</td>
<td>ucca:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'urine'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Education is a variable that controls the variation in vocabulary. In the speech behaviour of the educated speakers of Tamil, especially among the younger generation, a tendency to avoid the usage of lexical items that are marked for social or regional parameters like caste, region, etc. is observed. As a result of this phenomenon, among the youngsters the choice of lexical items is restricted to the common core only and they hardly use the deviant forms. Educated speakers of Tamil who hail from different regions of Tamilnadu with different social background identify the regional and social variations in their own speech behaviour when they speak with others (because of the raise of eye-brows by the hearers) due to communicability and intelligibility problems attached to those words. The speakers, consequently, tend to avoid the deviant lexical choices and use only those items which are found in the
common core of the educated Tamil speakers even though they do not have a clear cut idea about the common-core of Tamil language. The acculturation which takes place in schools and other educational institutions play a crucial role in bringing about this type of phenomenon. Some of the lexical items which occur in the common core of all the educated speakers of Tamil are presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educated</th>
<th>Uneducated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ippo</td>
<td>ippale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. evvalavu</td>
<td>emma:m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. appo</td>
<td>appale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. pille</td>
<td>pulle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. tinnu</td>
<td>tunnu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. tiruvila:</td>
<td>tirusa:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. came</td>
<td>co:ra:kku/po:nu:ku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. kalute</td>
<td>kayte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. kuti</td>
<td>ca:tu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. naːl  aːcce  'day'
11. noːy  tiːnam  'sick'
12. venkaːyam  iraṅkaːyam  'onion'
13. varavu  varavaːci/ varumpuṭi  'income'  etc.

4.6.4 Sex as a Variable

Linguistic variations are attested due to differences in the sex of the speaker. In Tamil several studies have been conducted to establish the role of sex as a social parameter in controlling linguistic variation. Ramasubbiah (1966) has identified the differences in the male and female Tamil speakers of Lower Perak area in Malaysia. Some of the examples of male-female differences are presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variation - Sex as a variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. irumpuccaṭṭi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. arccane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Yesudasan (1977:3:2) has identified some differences in the male-female speeches of fisher folks in Kanyakumari district of Tamilnadu. Some of the variations in the phonemic and morphemic levels of the fisherfolks of Kanyakumari in which male-female differences exhibited are presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ekku</td>
<td>enakku</td>
<td>'to me'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. to:ya</td>
<td>to:sa</td>
<td>'a food item'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. cenju</td>
<td>cenji</td>
<td>'having done'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. kayappu</td>
<td>kasappu</td>
<td>'bitter'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ka:rru</td>
<td>ka:ttu</td>
<td>'wind'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. varama:n'tan</td>
<td>varama:t'tan</td>
<td>'will not come-he'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

etc.
4.6.5 Occupation as a variable

So far we discussed such factors as caste, region, sex and education contributing for linguistic variation. This section deals with the variations controlled by the occupation of the speakers. The occupation of an individual does play a role in the lexical choice and triggers variation in speech. Moreover, the occupational vocabularies also manifest variation in Tamil situation according to the region in which the lexical items are in use. Many studies have been undertaken to identify the variations contributed by profession or occupation of an individual and to describe the variations in the occupational terms on the basis of the regional difference. Many scholars have attempted to list the occupational vocabulary of Tamil. Some examples of the occupational vocabulary are given below:

4.6.5.1 Agricultural vocabulary items

1. acampu 'weed'
2. pu:tte 'chaff'
3. ko:tte 'straw in the form of basket to keep the seeds'
4. puːnji 0 0 'elevated boundary of a small land'
5. maŋji 0
6. cuttukkavale "a water lifting device''
7. kiṭṭi 'trap for rats'
8. ruḍukke 'outer shell of cotton'
9. kumpuṭṭam 'a mark to show the person who makes the harvest'
10. tatti 'small paddy field'

(Murugesan, 1936)

4.6.5.2 Toddy tapper's occupational vocabulary

1. aːmaram 'male palmyra'
2. aːmpuːlukku 'male flower'
3. perani 'palmyra leaves backside of the leaf's branch'
4. payni 'palmyra juice'
5. talenaːru 'loop worn on legs'
6. cillatте 'sieve like material growing in palm tree'
7. katvole 'side leaves'
8. kolanji 'dried palmyra leaf'
9. karukkumaram 'palmyra which has not started blossoming'
10. matta aruva: 'a sickle'
11. mutuku 'back side of the tree'

etc.

(Maheswaran, 1981)

4.6.5.3 Weavers Vocabulary items

1. irattu 'twin thread'
2. atimane 'the base of weaving loom'
3. accu 'a frame with square wheel'
4. urulai 'rotating device'
5. u:kkai 'tip of the shuttle'
6. kaṭṭil  'pedal stand'
7. kanni  'a word referring to the length of the woof'
8. kutirai  'supporting stand'
9. kulai  'unstarched place in the woof'
10. madi  'one piece containing, two or four items'
11. ladi  'a quantity of yarn'

etc.

(Karthikeyan, 1985)

4.7 Standard and non-standard usages

Tamil language exhibits a stable diglossic situation where different vocabulary items are used in different modes of language use such as the spoken and written media. Studies that have appeared reveal the differences in the usages of lexical items in the two media Shanmugam Pillai, (1965), Srinivasa Varma (1980), Karunakaran (1976), Deivasundaram (1981), Irulappan(1980)
Arockianathan have studied the diglossic situation. Some lexical examples reflecting high and low varieties of Tamil are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High/Literary</th>
<th>Low/colloquial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>inru</td>
<td>innekki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to-day'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>umil</td>
<td>tuppu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'spit'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uyare:</td>
<td>osakke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'on the top'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uyarvu</td>
<td>osatti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'high grade'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>piraku</td>
<td>poravu/porakki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'afterwards'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maruna:lu</td>
<td>makkya:na:lu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'next day'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above illustrations, it is evident that Tamil vocabulary usages differ considerably from region to region, from one social situation to another, etc. Several parameters have been taken and in accordance with them the variation in the lexical usages have been presented. In the next chapter, lexical usages found in domains such as science and technology, administration, education, medicine, etc. are taken into
consideration in order to show the ways and means of standardizing them. However, the principles and procedures of standardization which are generally applied over the common and general vocabulary and which were discussed by various linguists involved in standardization can be used for the standardization of the vocabulary items.