Chapter - I

Introduction

Language is a socio-cultural phenomenon and it is closely tied with the social structure of the society. Language is not simply a means of conveying information, but it is also a very important means of establishing and maintaining relations with other people (see Trudgill, 1974b, p.13). It implies the fact that language is necessarily a form of social behavior. Children raised in isolation do not use language. Language is used by human beings in a social, context for communicating their needs, ideas and emotions to one another (see Labov, 1972, p.183).

The close interaction of language and society is an accepted phenomenon and it is the proper subject-matter of 'language use' which in turn is the proper subject-matter of sociolinguistics. Social interaction is a reciprocal process involving communication, and most of the human communication requires the use of language in some form or other. It is often noticed and felt that social contact, environment, etc. reflected in language use can have an affect on the structure of the language concerned. As society is reflected in language, a social change can produce a corresponding linguistic change. It is alsonoticed that no two human beings use language in exactly the same way and some of them use language in ways obviously very difficult from those of the others. The fundamental fact about language is its obvious diversity (Do Silva, 1975). There are two ways in which both language and society may be changed: one is the way of internal development and the other by the way of external force.
I. 1. Dialect

A Regionally or Socially distinctive variety of language, identified by a particular set of Words and Grammatical Structures. Spoken dialects are usually also associated with a distinctive Pronunciation, or Accent. Any language with a reasonably large number of speakers will develop dialects especially if there are geographical barriers separating groups of people from each other, or if there divisions of social class. One dialect may predominate as the official or standard form of the language, and this is the variety which may come to be written down.

I. 2. Dialect Definition

Dialect Regional variety of a Language, with differences in vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation.

Language spoken by class or Profession a form of a language spoken by members of a Particular social class or Profession.

A Particular variety of a language spoken by the people in some geographical area (a regional dialect) or in a Particular social group (a social dialect or socialist) British usage regards dialect as differing only in vocabulary and grammar, while differences in pronunciation are treated under the separate heading of accent; American usage regards differences in accent as part of the differences in dialect.

In both its traditional and modern sense dialectology has to do with the origins and distribute of dialects. The term ‘Dialect’ has generally been used to refer to a subordinate variety of a language, such as English, which has many dialects. A regional dialect is a language variety associated with a place.
I. 3. Differences between Dialect

Some linguist make a further distinction between accent and dialect. An accent consists of a way of pronouncing a variety (see Accent). A Dialect, however, language simultaneously on at least three level of organization: pronunciation, grammar or syntax, and vocabulary. Thus, educated speakers of American English and British English can be regarded as using dialects of the same language because differences of these three kinds exist between them. In practice, however, speakers of the two verities share a common grammar and differ from each other more in terms of vocabulary and pronunciation. Some examples of these differences are illustrated in Table.

I. 4. Occupational dialect

The term ‘Dialect’ represents any speech variant spoken or written old or new, standard or sub-standard, social or geographical, prestigious or downtrodden. According to dialectologists speech variant show three distance dimensions. i) Regional, ii) Temporal, iii) Social. Social dialect is the study of speech varieties used by the various speech groups and those variations and common corefounded among them. Regional dialect refer to regional differences within a language. Temporal dialect deals with the particular time or the dialect and its changes in that period these three dimensions or correlated with three imparted factors i)

I. 5. Definition of Occupational Technical Terms

A technical term is a specialized vocabulary item created for the representation scientific and technical concepts related to the scientific objects, process, quality, etc. It is an efficient and explicit capsule form of technical concepts. Sometimes the technical domain in such a way to make the word refer to the scientifically delimited conceptions. A technical term
may be a word or phrase with reference to the grammatical categories like noun or verb.

A Technical term generally replace long phrases, or even complicated discourse, and its meaning is fixed by an agreement or definition, which in science receives explicit formulation and strict adherence. The word occurs as an independent unit. If remove the unit ‘able’ from ‘unacceptable’, the remaining part ‘unaccepted’ does not occur and is not a correct form. Such notion of segmentability is also used to identify words.

I. 5.1. Occupational technical term

Occupational term is a specialized vocabulary item created for the representation of particular occupation like Agricultural, Waving, pottery, Carpentry, Fisherman, Arch structure, Goldsmith, Blacksmith and Copular terms in Tamil. The occupational terms for example, many lexical items relating to the agriculture vocabulary are in function in a technical sense. Such types of lexical items are called occupational vocabulary.

For example in Agriculture, profession a word like mo:li refers to the handle part of a plough. The same word has no existence in common Tamil usage. Instead the handle part of a thing is always called kaipiTi.

But in agricultural parlance ‘the handle part’ of a body is called mo:li. This can be called agricultural vocabulary.

Special professional vocabulary is used in various professions like the age old carpentry, pottery, weaving, goldsmith, blacksmith, brick work as well as the modern
I . 6. Tamil as a Dravidian Language

Tamil is one of the major Dravidian Languages of India. Tolkappiyam is an ancient grammar work, written in 3rd BC. Tamil is mainly spoken in Tamilnadu and also in other parts of the world. It is an official language in foreign countries like Malaysia, Singapore, Mauritius and Srilanka. Presently it has the status of Classical Language, which is a living one. It has various historical periods and the present period is termed as Modern period.

I . 7. Social Dialectology

1.7.1 Study of Social Dialects

Moving from country to country, region to region, social class to social class, we find changes occurring in language use. Changes which occur in language use could be conditioned by several social-parameters, contexts, styles, etc. In a broader sense, it could be stated that because of the existing regional and social differences, many varieties of a language found in use (distinguished by the complexity of the features in pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary). The varieties are called ‘dialects’ (see McDavid, 1966). The terms ‘Dialectology’ and ‘linguistic geography’ within the linguistic science are used purely in the objective sense to denote the study of regional varieties of a language. However, dialect can easily count to represent other factors than the geographic one.

Despite the fact that sociolinguistics has only recently been granted recognitions a field scientific inquiry, awareness of the correlation between linguistic diversity and social status can be well documented as for back as our first available records of social interaction. It is said that for the most part, linguistic description of social variation from the 1930s through the 50s in the United States of America was derived from the field of dialectology (see Welfram & Fosold, 1974, pp.26-28).
American dialectologists recognized the fact that social differences has to be considered even though the primary goal of linguistic geography was the correlation of the settlement history of the regional varieties of English. Hans Kurath (1941) and Fries (1952) concentrated a great deal on the classification of their informants on the basis of different social indices. Their social classification were mostly dependent on the field workers' judgments so that no real objective model for measuring the social status was utilized.

Despite some of the reservations regarding the linguistic atlas (of New England), that we might have in retrospect, it made available a tremendous of materials, which made possible other studies on linguistic (dialect) geography. However, in the earlier studies, especially in the making of the linguistics atlas, the correlation of the social and the linguistic differences were only of secondary concern and in the later studies, more direct attention was paid to the importance of the social factors in accounting for the existing linguistic diversity. In the view of McDavid (1948), dialectologist for the most part, however, still seems to appeal to the social parameters only when the data proved too complicated to be explained by merely a geographical statement of the settlement history.

In the past, many linguistic attempted to describe the speech behavior found in the urban and rural areas without recourse to any of the proper methodology of sociology, because they had chosen to ignore the fact that most, if not all speech communities are more or less socially and linguistically hetero-generous. Social dialectology, whether it is urban, semi-urban or rural has to take into account on principle, the application of sociological techniques, social research findings, etc. to elicit and analyze the linguistic data. These techniques and procedure recognize the existing
linguistic diversity caused by the social state (based in the hierarchical system) found in the speech community concerned.

Although sociolinguistic derive much of their approach from structural linguistics, they break sharply from the linguistic trend i.e. the approach which treats language as completely uniform and homogenous in their structures. The present day sociolinguistic description includes the very nature and extent of the correlations made between linguistic usages and social parameters. It also includes a common system through which the social stratification of speech could be well explained. The method of investigating social dialects and accents measuring the social class, caste, status, etc. of the informants and correlating them with the linguistic data was now proved very useful (see Labov, 1966; Trudgill, 1974).

I .7. 2. The value of Sociological Rural Dialectology

When we think of sociological rural dialectology, we are confronted with the following questions for which suitable answers have to be found: 1) What is the value of sociological rural dialectology? 2) What are its aims and objectives? and so on. One of the significant and most obvious results of this type of dialectological study is the accumulation of a new set of linguistic data, the analysis and the conclusions made out of it. (Labov (1966) has pointed out very clearly that the interpretation of the term ‘sociolinguistics’ to explain the interrelationship between language and society is an ‘unfortunate notion, foreshadowing a long series of purely descriptive studies with little bearing on the central theoretical problems of linguistics of sociology.

Trudgill (1974a) in his Norwich English study feels that Labov’s criticism of the ‘purely descriptive study’ appears to be somewhat over-severe. In this context, it is also felt that purely descriptive studies of rural speech behavior have long been regarded as legitimate and worthwhile
pursuits. Even though some of the earlier studies of this kind have not contributed much directly to the solving of problems of linguistic theory, they have indeed added to the linguistics’ knowledge about language and also provided data which have subsequently been turned to solving various linguistic problems.

So far much attention has not been paid to the study of social rural dialectology based on a systematic sociolinguistic frame work in providing descriptions of the speech behavior taking into consideration the linguistic characteristics as well as those social characteristics, applicable and found appropriate to the society concerned. Most of the work carried out in India on these guidelines has not thrown much light on the social significance (values) of speech forms explained in a more systematic and explicit way.

Many dialectologists have legitimately been concerned about recording ‘older dialectal forms’ before they are lost. Due to this tendency found in the elicitation of data, these dialectologists neglected to a certain extent current speech forma (usage) which could have helped them a lot to identify and describe all the usages and their differences as reflected in the speech behavior of various social groups. Rural dialectology also neglected in the past the study of linguistic heterogeneity. Hence the necessity to study dialect differences found in the speech behavior of various social groups living in a particular rural area.

The work that is presented in this study is an investigation of language use within the social context of the rural community in which it is spoken. It is a study on linguistic behavior which concentrates on the differences reflected in the language use of various social groups stratified on the basis of certain social parameters. The data for the present analysis is drawn from fairly large, heterogeneous and to a certain extent dynamic social communities who live in a Tamilnadu village. Various social factors
have taken into consideration in the process of data elicitation. The analysis of the data (using sociolinguistic techniques) helps us to find out the exact nature and the degree of differentiation found in the rural speech in a more elaborate and systematic way.

The present research work which makes use of both the sociological and the dialectological techniques and hypotheses is the first attempt that has been made to describe the speech behavior of the rural area in question viz., Nagapattinam District. As stated above, though it is possible to approach a study of this type in two or more ways, the present approach explored here is mainly concerned with those problems which are of interest to linguists and linguistics.

In the following sections we shall first of all describe the nature of the rural dialect surveys in general and that of the sociolinguistic surveys in particulars. Having described the nature of the sociolinguistic surveys, we shall then attempt to illustrate in more detail the nature of the linguistic diversity reflected in the speech behavior. This will bring out the dialect differences and their social stratification.

1.8. Nature of social surveys

The term social survey is defined as a fact finding study dealing with the nature and problems concerning the society. The purpose of any such survey is simply to provide someone with information. The purpose is always straightforward either in the social surveys or in other surveys. Many inquiries made aim to explain rather than describe. Their function may be theoretical – to test some hypothesis suggested by sociological theories or severely practical to assist the influence of various factors which could be manipulated by public action upon some phenomenon. But whichever the case be, the purpose is to explain the relationship found among the variables. Generally, in social surveys four major types of
subject-matter are discussed. They are: i) the demographic characteristics of a set of people, ii) their social environment iii) their social activities and iv) their attitudes, opinions, etc. To a social scientist a survey may equally have a purely deceptive purpose as a way of studying social conditions, relationship and behavior.

1.8.1 Nature of Linguistic Surveys

1.8.1.1 In the past

A general review of some of the surveys carried out in the past starting from 1931, is presented below in order to compare the same with the recent surveys in the concerned fields of inquiry. This will, in a way, show the type of development that has taken place from time to time, not only in the methodology followed in the survey techniques but also in the framework and procedure adopted in data processing, method of analysis and presentation of the linguistic material. Several important surveys carried out in the United States of America, United Kingdom, etc. are considered to be the major surveys which have contributed many insights into the concerned field of study in the past.

Hans Kurath Began his survey in 1931 to study the word geography of the Eastern United States of America. It is said that social classes are less clearly defined in America than in Europe. Even in the old reports on the Atlantic and in the Plantation country of the South, we find many such sharp cleavages as in England or one the European continent and have no such clearly defined social dialects as English Peasants’ speech on the one hand and received. Standard English on the other. What we do find is the gradation from cultivated speech thorough common speech to speech. Cultivated speech is widely spread in urbanized areas, folk speech in secluded areas and the common speech in the greater part of the farm country.
Later Kurath with a team of investigators did an elaborate survey of New England and prepared several volumes of Linguistic Atlas to show the lexical and other variations regionally. Kurath with the collaboration of McDavid started to work on a survey to study the ‘Pronunciation of English in the Atlantic State’ in 1941. Some of the techniques and other features of the survey are worth mentioning here. In this survey apart from those general techniques and methods, we find the following also. That is, the description of that chief regional type of cultivated speech in the Eastern United States is based upon field records of 157 speakers selected from 136 different communities. All these records were made in the homes of the informants by trained observers. The speakers classified as cultured are representatives of a group comprising the social and cultural elite, and the upper middle class. They differ considerably among themselves with regard to social position and the kind of social contacts they enjoy in their communities. The informants were in the age group of 45 to 65. Despite all the diversity among the speakers, they all belong to a social class distinct from the lower class and the folk.

In 1946, another important survey was conducted by Atwood to study ‘the verb forms’ in the Eastern United States and the same was published in 1953. Though this survey was confined to those variations found in the verb inflection, it brought to light some of the sharp distinctions found along the social lines. This survey was aimed to find out the differences between the cultivated speech and popular speech. The informants were selected on the basis of the degree of education viz. i) poor education, ii) fair education and iii) superior education. They were also further sub-classified into: i) Old or old fashioned and ii) middle aged or young, modern people.

During the same period Harold Arton started his work ‘Survey of English Dialects’ and the findings of this survey were published in 1962
with the same title. From these surveys, we are able to assess the nature of
the linguistic (dialect) surveys carried out in the above mentioned
attempts. The informants selected for these surveys were normally elderly
speakers of 60 years of age of above belonging to the same social class in
rural communities and in particular farmers. In these surveys the
informants were never asked to translate any word, phrase or sentence into
his vernacular.

The field area was determined according to their geographical
position, isolative and unreflectively to each other, as well as with respect
to the number of inhabitants. Account was taken about natural features
and their possible influence on local dialectal boundaries, and preference
was given to agricultural communities that had a fairly stable population
of about 500 inhabitants for a century or so. But the social history of the
localities concerned was not studied before hand. The informants were
very rarely below the age of sixty and they were mostly men. The field
recordings were mostly composite and made on specially prepared
question sheets usually in duplicate by means of carbon paper. In the
modern linguistic surveys more advanced techniques are being employed.

1.8.2 Recent Surveys

During the last few years several large-scale countrywide surveys
have been undertaken in many parts of the world by teams of linguists,
psychologists and other social scientists. In these surveys structural and
historical analysis of local languages as well as dialects are supplemented
by sociological survey information on language use and attitudes to local
languages and tests of mutual intelligibility and multilingual competence
(Ferguson, 1971). Haugen’s (1966) detailed study shows how minor
differences in grammar and pronunciation which do not affect mutual
intelligibility have nevertheless caused major political problems over the
last century in Norway. The Linguistic Survey of Scotland was the first to
take account of the fact that wherever education is widespread local
languages always co-exist with the standard languages of the schools and
public affairs (McIntosh, 1961).

In the United States of America, Labov’s work ‘Social Stratification
of English in New York City’ now a classic in sociolinguistic descriptions
brought to light for the first time the significance of sociological techniques
in the study of linguistic variation. Labov begins his study by isolating a
limited number of locally current phonological and grammatical features,
these which are most common and frequent in the day-to-day usage, most
subject to interpersonal and stylistic variation which carry the greatest
amount of social information. This study has provided the impetus for a
new tradition of social dialectology. In the urban United States, much of it
focused on the speech of low income minority groups. The study of Black
English (Wolfram, 1969) and Puerto Rican Speech (Wolfram, 1973) have
also focused in the speech of minority groups. These studies of social
dialectology employ tape recorded questionnaire data with statistically
representative population samples and seek to relate the distribution of
linguistic variables to the socio-legists, measures of such factors as class,
educational achievement, sex, status, etc.

These studies were followed by several other studies like the study
of Norwich English (Trudgill, 1974a), the study of Social Dialects in
American English (Woldram and Fasold, 1974) and others.

The study of social dialects is a major area of interest for
sociolinguists not only in the United States of America and United
Kingdom but also in India and other South Asian countries. In 1910, Jules
Bloch published the first over detailed study of the social dialects of Tamil.
For nearly half a century, this area of linguistic research did not gain any
explorative and informative studies and in this period Bloch’s contribution stood virtually the solitary one (Bean, 1974). But in the mean time there was a glimpse of work by L.V. Ramaswami Ayyer in 1952, who pointed out some differences between ‘Brahmin’ and ‘Flk’ Tulu.

In 1958, Gumperz’s study of Hindi dialects spoken in North Indian village revolutions those old concept related to social dialectology by introducing new ways of analyzing variation and by correlating linguistic variables with social parameters. Those studies carried out during this period (in the late 50s and early 60s) to describe the dialects of Indian languages, to a certain extent, focused on the sodally correlated speech variations.

Studies carried out to analyze the dialects of Hindi (Cumperz, 1958; Lavine, 1959); Kannada (Bright, 1960; Nitemath, 1961; McCormack, 1960); Marathi (Apte, 1962); Marathi and Gujarathi (Pandit, 1963); Tamil (Andronov, 1962; Bright and Ramanujam, 1962; Pillai, 1958, 1965, Subramoniam, 1958, Zevelebil 1963, 1964); Telugu (Krishnamurti, 1963), Tulu (Bhat, 1965; Bright and Ramanujam, 1984) and so on during this period considered at least some of the social parameters to analyse the existing speech variations.

Individual studies which concentrated on the socially correlated linguistic variation have indeed shown considerable interest in explaining variations found in the various levels of linguistic structure. For instance, Gumperz (1958) and Laving (1959) have used the phonological data; Ramasubbiah (1966) Pandit (1963) and Pillai (1965) have used lexical data; Apte (1968), Bright (1960), Hiremath (1961), McCormack (1960), Ramanujam (1964), Pillai (1960) and Gnanasundaram (1979) have used a combination of phonological, grammatical and lexical data present the socially correlated linguistic variations.
In the study of variations, attention has been paid not only to the study of linguistic features but also to a certain extent for the study of sociolinguistic correlations based on sociological factors like particular caste groups, friendship networks, etc. For instance, Pillai (1965) in his study of Kinship terms in Tamil has found that each of the thirteen castes in the villages under study had a corpus of kinship terms showing at least some distinct lexical variations (which the calls ‘caste isoglosses’) from each of the other castes. Gumperz (1958) and Laving (1959) have reported the differences found in the speech behaviour of different caste groups.

Starting from 1910, several scholars have worked on the dialects of Indian languages to describe those differences found in the speech behavior of major caste groups in the ritual hierarchy. Sloch (1910) in his pioneering study on social dialects in Tamil, reported a distinction between the Brahmin, Non-Brahmin and Untouchable speech behavior. Several studies of dialect variations that came up after Bloch’s study were based on his classification of the society into Brahmin and Non- Brahmin. Ramaswami Ayyer (1932) has reported differences between ‘Brahmin Tulu’ and ‘Folk Tulu’ in phonology, morphology and lexicon. Bright (1960) has made a study of Knnada dialects which brought to light a number of linguistic differences found in the speech behavior of the Brahmin and the Non-Brahmin groups. McCormack (1960) who studied Kannada dialects of Dharwar region (Karnataka) has reported the distinctive qualities of the speech variety of the untouchables.

He has also described the phonological and morphological distinctions among the Kannada speech patterns of the Brahmin, Lingayat and Untouchable social groups. McCormack’s another investigation (1968) brings out those morphological and semantic differences which exits in the speech behavior of the Brahmin and the Non-Brahmin Kannada speakers of Dharwar. He has discovered through this study the significance of
occupation as a correlate of linguistic variation. Apte (1962) has analyzed dialect differences reflected in the speech variety used by the Brahmins and other dialects of Bombay Marathi. He has also found education to be a significant corollary of phonological and morphological differences as well as similarities. Pandit (1963) found more significant caste or class correlated speech differences in Marathi and Gujarathi, especially in his investigation of lexical ‘Sanskritic borrowings.’ One of the conclusion that his study has drawn is that the degree of education has correlation with speech variation. Bright and Ramanujam (1964) have compared the nature of phonological and morphological differences found between the Brahmin and the Non-Brahmin speech varieties in Tamil and Tulu. Ramanujam (1968) has discussed the patterned phonological, grammatical and lexical differences which occur in the speech varieties of Tamil spoken by the Tenkalai Iyengar and Mudaliyar groups.

Bean, S. Susan (1974) in her conclusion remarks over the study the linguistic variation and the caste system in South Asia that ‘The relationship between linguistic variation and social stratification in South Asia has been discussed with attention to two problems viz., i) the general pattern of the social location of isoglosses and ii) the processes which inhabit the diffusion of linguistic innovation scores these social boundaries. Different levels of linguistic structure may reflect different social boundaries in their isoglosses. Different social dialects may exhibit distinct patterns of change. Different level of linguistic structure may have different rates and patterns of diffusion and change. There is some indication that lexical differences may most closely reflect individual castes since each caste is somewhat exclusive in social, ritual and culinary practices. Lexical borrowings may most clearly reflect education rather than caste party because of access to sources from which borrowings are made.
The literature on linguistic variation in South Asia provided evidence of five social locations of isogloss bundles viz. i) individual castes, ii) segments of the caste hierarchy, iii) education, iv) friendship networks and v) class. Of these caste status is the dominant variable; education, friendship and class each significantly dependent on it.

Pattanayak (1975) put forward his hypothesis on caste dialects according to which caste difference in dialects may be a marginally determinant variable only at the rural sub-caste level. Further he states: “scholars who investigated language variation in Indian have taken caste dialect for granted as apriori assumption. It is my contention that the term ‘caste dialect’ is a contribution of the social scientists working in the area and is the result of certain kinds of abstraction. The term ‘caste dialect’ implies that a caste group is a homogenous communication group, and the variety of speech so designated is both a structural and cultural isolate The burden of argument of this presentation is that the notion ‘caste dialect’ is unscientific and unnecessary. Caste may be one of the context along with rural; urban, educated: uneducated, peer group, old generation, male: female, etc. but certainly as an approach to, and category in dialectology it has much less validity that what has been attributed to it by scholars.”

Pattanayak’s hypothesis has been reviewed in the light of the earlier studies and also from the point of view of recent developments in the yield of social dialectology by Tiwari (1975), Gopinathan Nair (1975), Karunakaran (1975), William Bright (1975), Someseekharan Nair (1975), Roy (1975), Joshi (1975), Neethivanan (1975), Upadhayaya (1975) and Annamalai (1975) where they have made certain suggestions regarding the necessity for conducting an empirical study and a through ‘Sociolinguistic Survey’ of the various Tamil speaking areas in order to establish certain ‘sociolinguistic correlations’ and to describe language use. For instance Tiwari (1975) feels that ‘it is a fact that the con consciousness of caste is an
empirically verified and verifiable pen-Indian phenomenon. It would be certainly unscientific to treat the variable of caste as super-ordinate to, rather than co-ordinate with other variables.” Added to this, Gopinathan Nair (1975) also opines that ‘the studies so far held on Indian dialects, especially on the social dialects reveal that among the social variables viz. caste, caste groups, occupation, education, economic status, etc. Caste is one of the dominant variables or perhaps the most significant variables and plays an important role in the social stratification of the Indian society’. Karunakaran (1975) reviews that “there is a difference between the social dialects of the western countries and that of Indian linguistic area. The caste system prevalent in the Indian sub-continent illustrates the most rigid and detailed form of stratification in a large heterogeneous society. It would be quite useful and interesting to make a systematic socio-linguistic survey of Tamil dialects before making any categorical statement regarding caste dialects of regional dialects’.

I.9. Study of Linguistic Variation

The fundamental fact about speech is its obvious variation. In the recent years an approach to linguistic research has been developed with an emphasis upon the language is use within the speech community, aiming at a linguistic theory adequate to account for the data concerned. This new trend of research is based on the fact that there is a clear and systematic covariance between linguistic variation and social variation i.e., speech behaviour and social structure. Both language and society are heterogeneous in nature and hence the interrelationship between speech and the social behaviour is really a complex one. Even in the midat of this complexity, sociolinguistic researchers claim the patterned covariations that exist between speech behaviour and social structure.
In sociolinguistic analysis, systematic covariation between speech behaviour and social structure, does not necessarily mean that there is a one-to-one correspondence between them, and the features, both linguistic and social, need not necessarily be equally shared. It is also possible that different levels of linguistic structure may reflect different social boundaries in their isoglosses. Sometimes different social dialects may exhibit distinct patterns of change (Bright & Ramanujam, 1964) and different levels of linguistic structure may have different rates and patterns of diffusion as well as change. As a result of this complexity, linguistic variation may lead to sharp (Sh), find (F), gradient (Gr) or Straight (St) Stratification types.

I .10. The Present Study

The present study is on attempt to draw a detailed description of the Phonology and Morphology of the modern spoken Tamil has a number of varieties. The study of Nagapattinam dialect very important from the Point of view of occupational Vocabulary and social structure of the speakers of language. They can be classified on the basis of region, social class and professional varieties. The present work namely, the technical vocabulary of occupational terms in Nagapattinam Tamil comes under the category, professional vocabulary. From the dialectologist’s point of view occupational speech can be designed as caste com-professional dialect. However here an attempt is made to study only the technical terms used by them, in connection with them profession namely Agricultural, Carpenttory, pottery, Weaving, Fisherman dialect, Archistucture and Cobular. However here an attempt is made to descriptive study of this work. In general forms within the pattern of the major regional dialects. From the sociological point of view occupational terms belong to the lower middle income group. Numerically they are minority Hindus. The data for the present analysis has been collected from the Agricultural, Carpenttory,
pottery, Weaving, Fisherman dialect, Archistucture and Cobular terms in Tamil. They are living in Nagapattinam District, Tamil Nadu.

The present study includes Five chapters viz. 1) Introduction 2) Area Specialisation 3) Analysing the Data 4) The Special features in Nagapattina District, 5) Comparative Study, 6) Conclusion.

The common system constructed for Nagapattinam Tamil speech describes the various phonological and morphological features in a more elaborate way. Common system is the basis for explaining all those variations found in the speech behaviour of different social groups stratified on the basis of the social parameters concerned. The phonological, grammatical and lexical variations on the basis of the social stratification made. Phonological variables discussed in the section on grammatical variables, only morphological variables and their variations are discussed.