CHAPTER 7
THE SOCIOLOGICAL COMPONENT

7.0. Introduction

It has been the 'slogan' of many an anthropologist, Sociologist and Linguist that family is the basic unit of society. Accordingly many scholars in connection with kinship (which is located in family) studies isolated features attributed as sociological. In the discussion at the end of the previous chapter (Kinological component) it was made clear that kinship organisations in many of their aspects differ from larger social organisations. This chapter intends to provide an outline of the parallel features of family with the located concepts of kinship in it, and larger social organisations. Hence the sociological parameters (those labelled as such here) are discussed in this chapter within the frame work of kinship organisations as applicable to the terminology for the six communities.

1. A number of studies in this connection are given in the introduction (Ch.1). These scholars treat kinship structures and social structure synonymously though their studies are concerned with kinship organisations. Murdock (1960:21) (under the very title 'Social structure') clarifies the term sociological as applied to the determinants of kinship ordinarily refers not to invoking of universal principles, but to the attribution of classificatory terminology to the influence of particular social institutions viz., preferential marriage groups and local groups — family, clan, sib and moiety.
The present chapter thus concentrates on the following aspects of kinship as reflected in the respective kin terminologies, based fundamentally on the group interaction concept, largely dyadic or triadic in nature, binding the concerned persons on the basis of their roles and relations with each other, subject to power and status;

1. The repertoire of kinship terminology - the totality of terms used receptively or productively available in an individual's storehouse of language, in dyadic interaction (directly or indirectly) cutting even across the barriers of class, caste and species,

2. The sociological classification of kin terms,

3. The analogous situations of kinship organisations to the extent it operates in the society - the pseudo kinship organisations - the larger kinship organisations - the nonkin zones, their shorter duration of interaction and other features against the rigidity in kin organisations,

4. The parameters or variables in kinship organisations forming the guidelines in the formation of parallel parameters in the larger social organisations.

5. The effects of larger sociological processes - how terminology is affected and conditioned by ecological factors. The reverse impact of larger social organisations on the life and integrity of kinship and related terms, 'the dying terminologies and losing kinship ties'
7.1. The repertoire of kinship terms

The repertoire of kinship terms is the totality of kinship terms utilised by the members of a speech community in all contexts receptively or productively. This wide range includes all kin terms of a specific speech community.

7.2. Sociological classification of kinship terms

The terminology of kinship can be envisaged as grouped under various categories within the sociologically conditioned parameters, as prescribed by the larger social organisations. They are broadly divided into two. This two way division gives the totality of terms used on the synchronic level.

7.2.1. Intra kinship terms (Geneologically or kinologically classified terms)

These terms include the terms used in the kinship contexts proper, the terms used in the intra familial and interfamilial interactional contexts, the basic terms of kinship. These terms have been elaborately dealt within the kinological component. For the sociological values of these terms refer to sections to be followed later.

7.2.2. Extra kinship terms

Extra kinship terms are used outside the kin circle. Two types are found. 1) the extensional type; 2) the distinct--

2. Basic here includes kin allied terms also.
ctive types to denote caste/class/species distinction.

7.2.2.1. Extra kin terms: The extensional type

Extensional kin terms are used for non kins, a mere mapping of some of the genuine or basic terms for the sake of exhibiting pseudo parallelism in behaviour patterns as a marker of politeness and intimacy (for all generations) and ensure taboo avoidance behaviour.

7.2.2.2. Extra kin terms: the extensional types: The pseudo kin terms

The pseudo kin terms is a residual category that includes a number of very different institutions which have in common only the fact that they are linked to kinship by the people themselves. It is momentary, temporary or restricted to context or continued or permanent dictated by custom and volunteers extended to the kin of the primary participants or may be purely individualistic (Pitt Rivers, 1968: 407-11). The pseudo kin terms are characterised by the following features:

1. It has no descent line or origin,
2. No projection into the future
3. Involves no structural issues,
4. Does not depend on a network of rights and duties but upon claim and benevolence,

Factors giving rise to various types of pseudo kin organisations are:
1. Chronological age or position of nonkin individuals,
2. Customs by which a kinship status is given to the individual,
3. Institutions which in some way or other resemble kinship organisation in analogy with it yet possessing a distinct nature and accordingly a distinct structure.

Eg. monasteries, orphenages etc. ³

Pseudo kin terms have been arisen due to need oriented social relations (Sarkar, 1980) and political reasons in Bangla Desh (ibid.) and among Chinese in America (Li, 1980). The concept of pseudo kin system has been also served as a means for personal fulfilment of desires as can be seen from the account given by Parmar (1975). Pseudo marriage /taːli-ktu kalyaːnam/ has caused life long bondage among some of the castes in Kerala (Puthenkulam, 1977). Pseudo father is considered as a label of paternity among the Todas and also some other castes of Kerala (Rivers, 1906; Emeneau, 1967; Puthenkulam, 1977) in the case of polyandry.

In the general set up pseudo kin terms are mere expressions of attitudes, part of common currency of personal relations. In the general set up, pseudo kinship is an extension of the relations and terminology much lesser in measure of intensity of related aspects and is only a marker of politeness in reciprocal interaction, a way of laying barriers

for emotional feelings and behaviour norms and further is exceptionally devoid of procreational aspects. In this context it may be said that no community in this study uses the term for father for a pseudo kin. This is also the general trend in most of the communities in India, pointing towards the significant barrier of procreational aspect in kinship terms. Even a marginal difference in KG is found between /bappa/, /N bappa/ F/FyB which is obligatory in interaction.

7.2.2.3 Pseudo kin terms: Class kin terms:

In KG terms used for parents are not used for pseudo kins. In their place terms MB/MBW as a familiar address are used ensuring a tension-removed behaviour for the mother as well for the adults in cases where they are used. A caste cook is addressed by the term /ma:mu/ and /ma:yi/ according as the sex category by all members of the house in case they are younger than the cook. A priest irrespective of his age is addressed as /bat ma:ma:/ and his wife as /bat tan ma:yi/ by the members of the caste but /ma:mu/ or /ma:yi/ in isolation is not used. In reciprocation the priest addresses the member of the caste by the personal name or by suffixing the surname to the personal name. Excessive politeness from the priest is not expected. On the other hand the religious leader cannot be addressed by any of the kin terms but by the term /swa:miya:nu/ with affixing the proper honorific marker /-a:nu/. The pseudo term /ma:mu/ and /ma:yi/ have dual social value as a status marker or an
indicator of politeness. The variable/age/ and its variants which are solely used as address or vocative terms derived from the kin term have varying sociological values and have been discussed in (Lalitha Bai, 1977, Prabhoo, 1982)\(^4\). The term /vai\(\text{ge}:/\) is a polite vocative for caste female member of middle age group onwards somewhat of equal status of interacting persons, /vai\(\text{ge}:/\) the male vocative form used by the both male and female adult (of middle age.) not as a status marker but as a marker of politeness of moderate nature. The term /va\(i\text{vo}:/\) as a vocative is used for priest and rarely for a caste member who is placed in an economically high position. /va\(i\text{go}:/\) is used for the females by both sex of equal class. Sometimes familiarity and intimacy may neutralise class inequalities and even generation gaps where this term is used when addressing the mother, or an elder sister in NKG. Closely connected with the kin terms are pronouns in KG where a first and second person /tan\(\text{ni}:/, /tum\(\text{mi}:/\) is for Sp.P He\(\text{ds}\), priest and his wife and the religious leader. For others the singular second person and third person pronouns are the common currency terms in address and reference (Lalitha Bai, 1977). Familiarity leads to the utilisation of kin terms /vai\(\text{ge}:/, e\(\text{z}\) of similar age for the concerned non kins. However such terms are not very common among NKG. In SKG the tendency to this mode of use is slightly higher.

---

4. The present author.
MR uses terms as /da:da/ and /bhayi/ as a common currency of address as a marker of respect and politeness for group members. As they are a nomadic group and that too being a small group, more information was not collected in this respect.

Among UM similar case as in KG prevails where a caste cook is addressed by the term /ma:mu/, /xa:la/, /na:na/, /na:nj/ /bha:y/, /bha:n/, /ji:ji/ which is reciprocated by the cooks also in addressing the members of the house based on the age of the person. Unlike the KG term the female term of polite address is /xa:la/ and not /mumma:ni/. When UM servants refer to the native people as masters, they use the terms /amma/, /ce:cci/ /yejama:nan/ etc.

Nambudiris are specific in marking difference of classes and castes terminologically. A nambudiri with a married son is referred as /acchan/ by the caste members to indicate his specific status (Nambudiripad, 1982) where the others are referred to by a generic term as place name+/accan/ without obligatory aspiration. The basic term for father is also /acchan/. The nambudiri marriage is referred as /penkoda/ with reference to females and /ve:li/ with reference to males clearly indicating the class levels on the basis of sex category as a status marker which is reflected in other cultural elements also (Nambudiri, 1984, Nambudiripadu, 1982). A nambudiri woman refers to her husband as /avidutto:r/ with honorific third person pronoun. The eldest son is referred to as /mu:ssag/ mu:ttar ada(Nam-
The Koravas use the kin terms for nonkins who fall in the age category of the respective kin with selected terms. Thus the terms /amma/, /amma:van/, /appu:ppan/, /ammumma/, /mo:ne:/ /annan/, /akkan/ may designate the nonkins of the caste members who resemble the ages of the respective kins. The term for father is not used. As a solidarity marker caste names as /ammukkoRatti/, /cinnan k>avanan/ are used among the caste members. Among MM /umma/, /ittta:ttta/, /ikka:kka/, /ha:jiya:R/ etc. are used for caste members.

7.2.2.4. Extra kinship terms: The caste kin terms

Kin terms are distinguished for caste differences as a marker of status, higher or lower. Since KG belongs to the migrant community of the IA stock of language family and also the highest caste Brahmins, a two way caste distinction as status marker is found. KG refers to filials of any non-KG as /ce:do/ and /ce:du/ as the inferior form of the basic terms /cella/ and celli/. These terms are the extended terms they use for the Kudumbis - a working class of Konkani speakers who migrated with them in Kerala from Goa and neighbouring places. In turn the KK refer their own children as /ce:do/ and /cuduma/. The KG refer the husbands of Kudumbi woman as /go:vu/ and the wife of a Kudumbi as /me:IlO/. (This is extended for non-Brahmin castes). The Kudumbis address the KG as /kho:t/ and /kho:ttii:n/. The term /ajj/ used by the NKG is considered to be inferior.
by the SKG as it is the common term for the Kudumbis also, and they use a separate term /a:bu/ for PF. The filial terms used for non KG has lost its prestige value to a larger extent, thus constituting to the sociological archaic kin terms.

Since the MR are a nomadic group and also belong to the different language group, they use the terms as /ayya/ and /amma/ while they go out for begging (in non kin context).

MN has a distinct set of terms for caste distinction as they hold a high position in the caste hierarchy. The informant belongs to the highest strata next to the highest MN sect /lambra:kkal/.

A number of terms distinctive of caste differentiation is given by Nambudiri (1963 & 1964) which is more than a mere autobiography in its elaborate discussion on Nambudiri social life drawing ample examples from concerned linguistic data. An /a:sya/ cook addresses the Nambudiri of the house as /lambura:n/ and his wife as /karta:ramma/ and a female /a:sya/ cook is referred by the Nambudiri woman as /illatt + amma/. The Nambudiris refer the Tamil cook as /kutti:ppattar/ by personal names. Other castes are referred to by personal names neutralising age distinction. A Nambudiri child is referred to by the terms /unni/ and /kutti/ for S and D respectively where as the children of non Nambudiris are referred to as /kutti/ for both sex. A lower caste member refers to a Nambudiri maiden as /ku innovate: tto:la/ and refers to the Nambudiri marriage as /mane:riccil/.
A Nambudiri woman is referred as /ammattRa:na/ by a lower caste member (Nambudiripad, 1982).

The Korava place them in an intermediate position between the superior castes Nayars and Ezhavas of the locality, and the inferior castes Pulayas and Parayas. The Koravas address the Nayars as /mu:tte:de/ and /amma/ and the Nayars address them by personal names or terms like /mudukki/ 'old woman'. A lower caste member is addressed by the terms /mudukki/ or by personal names like /podiya/ or /martha/ in MK. The Pulayas and Parayas address the Koravas by the terms /anna/ or /akka/ etc.

7.2.2.5 Extra kinship terms: the distinctive types: the extra species terms

Kinship terms are distinguished for non-human by all communities. A few examples are dealt with in here. In KG the offsprings of animals are labelled as /pl:la/ with some exceptional cases. Eg.

/pla/ /paddi/ 'calf (m/f)'
/pett/ /hatti/ 'pup (m/f)'
/vasRa/ 'calf (m/f)'

The delivery of humans is distinguished from animals and plants. For humans /ba:lantilti: jalli/ 'delivered.'

/ga:y villi/ 'cow has given birth (to a calf)'
/ke:li villi/ 'plantain tree has borne fruit'
Parallel terms in the other five communities are given as follows:

- **MR** /keːla cə nattə/ "plantain sucker"
- **UM** /māus ka təi/ ""
- **MN, MK** /vaːla kkanna/ ""
- **MM** /baːya kkanna/ ""
- **KG** /səːi/ "sapling"
- **MR** /naːli jhəːd/ "coconut sapling"
- **UM** /naːrəl ka təi/ ""
- **MN, MK** /teːn̂nin təi/ ""

/vaːla kulaccu/ is the term in Malayalam for bearing fruit in plantain trees, but for animals there are no specific terms. 5

7.3.0. Sociological parameters in kinship terminology:

The term sociological parameters here refers to parameters generally used in sociology largely used in connection with society as a larger group. It can be seen from the following discussion that the parameters so called in larger social groups actually trace their origin to kinship organisations. The long standing statement that family is a cross section of the society is contended in the following discussions.

5. Pillai (1972) refers to some terms like /kuttiyiduga/ 'delivery of a cow'.
The following parameters broadly divide the sociological parameters under discussion within the set up of the kinship terminology of the six communities under study:

1. The parameters of style,
2. The parameters of context,
3. The parameters of stratification,
4. The parameters of interaction,
5. The parameters of power and status,
6. The parameters of code and,
7. The parameters of socialisation within the set up of the terminology of kinship.

7.3.1. The parameters of style and context

Every act of behaviour is a manifestation of culture envisaged as a mode of style which is community specific in its diversity (Berelson: 1967). The term 'style' in this context form the outer layer of sociological parameters with an adjacent layer of outer parameter context. The two concepts style and context can be interpreted in the broader and narrower sense. In the broader sense, a verbal behaviour is envisaged as an act of style. In the narrower sense it indicates the fluctuating verbal variants conditioned by defined parameters. Similarly context in the broader sense indicates the general setting of the behaviour. In the narrower sense it indicates the temporal contexts as formal or informal not necessarily
conditioned by temporal context (time) in the primitive sense, but may be conditioned by other contexts and dependent socio-psychological or other variables. Many of the parameters as can be seen are of a merging type though at times they may be marked with specific parametric features. Eg. UM/xalai ba/: 'MeZH'. This term indicates stratification, as transition, status, behaviour norm as a polite term, etc. specifically indicate respect due to status of the kin.

The parameters of style as applied to the terminology of kinship involves the various variants of the variables as kins and the related terms. The ethnological diversity in the evaluation and designation of terms which are language and community specific depicts the stylistic mode or behaviour of the concerned community. The terms as variants either as polite or informal forms bear in itself a mode of behaviour even in tonal pronunciation styles and pitch levels. For example the vocatives as informal variants have generally a high pitch whereas the formal varieties are coloured with politeness with a low pitch. Similarly the terms for filials are exceptionally coloured with affection and so on.

1.3.2. The parameters of context: formal/informal

The interaction of persons is always envisaged in connection with the temporal and place of interaction. Friedrich (1972) reports narrow distinction in Russian pronominal usage.
In kinship the roles and relations and genealogical distance contribute to the informal/formal contexts. The upward distance may be considered giving rise to the formal contexts with respect to ego and the downward distance from ego contributes to the informal context. The dimensions in kinship and larger social organisations are varied in number as per the size of the two groups and inner subdivisions. The selection of contextual parameters are innumerable in larger social organisations. In kinship on the other hand the number of selectional restrictions are few and static in nature.

Formality is a feature related largely with the tension bounded behaviour as can be seen from the consanguineal/affinal contrast contributing the informal/formal contexts.

7.3.3. Parameters of stratification: The grouping concept

The basic concept of society is based on grouping system. It makes atleast two people to make the smallest group, the upper limit being 20 who may be able to engage in direct personal relations at one time and where intimacy is predicted (Berelson, 1967:53). The concept of grouping system is based on some measure of values. Man as a social animal to keep himself in the social group for generations, in recognisable path, has evolved the concept of society on conscious values which is absent in the lower animal world (Inkeles, 1964:64). In this connection kinship forms the strongest unbroken group by
the cardinal line of descendents. Even in the cases of mass forces of distraction some measure of identity is kept intact.
(change of caste, religion etc.) and the kinship line is kept intact. This points towards the biological predominence of kinship. According to Vincent and Small (1961: 270), 'family- is the smallest permanent group ..... In society ..... a man and a woman for the personal nucleus of structure.....' Cooley 1961:227) attributes universality as the salient feature of family as the smallest group. Within the family set up the grouping can be categorised on the generic level on the sex category as matrilineal, patrilineal and bilineal. In the present set all the communities are patrilineal. The grouping system involves stratification of kins on some measures of values. Kins are grouped hierarchically on the basis of kinological parameters. Thus the parameters of grouping and stratification are different in kinship and larger social organisations. Thus grouping or stratification has the following hierarchical strata in kinship as follows:

1. The kin group:
   1. The lineage group,
   2. The parental group,
   3. The filial group,
   4. The spousal group/affinal group,
   5. The sib group,
   6. The consanguineal group,
   7. The parallel cousin group,
8. The cross cousin group,
9. The parallel parent group,
10. The cross parent group,
11. The parallel filial group,
12. The cross filial group,
13. The step kin group with the inclusive subgroups, and the like many extended groups of kinship such as the descent type groups, residential groups, inheritance mode groups, adopted kin groups, clan groups etc.
14. The orientational family group
15. The procreational family group. All these groups are discussed in the kinological component.

b. The class group,
c. The caste group,
d. The species group.

7.3.4. The parameters of interaction

The under current as may be said is of the functioning of society based on group system and interactional behaviour. Every person tends to act out a line in social encounters—a pattern of verbal and nonverbal acts expressive of many qualities as equality, subordination, superiority, friendliness and social distance (Goffman, 1955)\(^6\). Thus the elements of interaction are envisaged in the roles, relations and the interacting persons with face labels of status markers. Interaction phenomena distinguishes self from the others and one person

---

from the other giving rise to the different personalities by differentiating roles and relations. No system of social groups is adequate as the kinship system in the all role and relation and person inclusion in self in an individual's life time. The individual as a kin unlike in larger social organisations enjoys the values of subordination, solidarity, status and power in various stages of his life.

7.3.4.1. The elements of interaction: The element of relation

The actions and responses of participants in interactions can be equated with moves in games (Elias, 1970). He introduced the two person games and the multi-person games with the dominant and nondominant moves. In kinship the possible combinations of two way combinations of relations are as follows:

7.3.4.1.1. Non-intervening kin relations at opposite poles:

These combinations signify the two opposing cardinal relations, each or both of them may be considered as ego/kin without an insertion of another kin in the middle. Eg. H/W, F/S, F/D, M/S, M/D, B/Z.

The two relations as persons can be joined diagrammatically. Eg. F/S

\[ F \leftarrow \ldots \rightarrow S \]

7.3.4.1.2. Intervening kin relations

These relations form a triad, ego being the connecting link. The interactional ego can be referred only in relation to ego and further one of the combinations invite the segmentation of the direction or place. Eg. H, B

7.3.4.1.2.1. Wing diagrams of some of the nonprimary kins

The kin terms involving the non primary kins from different types of wings of relations depending on the number of links involved in the establishment of the particular kinship giving rise to the multiple relational system. The dotted connected lines indicate the covertly expressed kin relations of the transitional kins which are treated under the link component in the label of role shifting rules. The wing diagram (7.3.4.1.2.1.1.) will illustrate one such case. Eg. $\tilde{z}FZH$ (KG).

4 claims are involved: 1) FZH, 2) MBW, 3) F8W, 4) MZH.

7.3.4.1.2.1.1. Wing Diagram of $\tilde{z}FZH$
Each nod and line indicate a change in relation and role and hence the interacting persons as kins with some deviations and similarity of the cardinal kin from the newly established kinship. Smooth functioning of the kin interaction is based on these harmonious coordination of the various kins with defined power and status. The interactional profile is set up within the sockets of his role, relation, personality qualities which stand in dyadic position with the fellow members of the kin groups based on values and functions and attributed for the interacting persons. It is the interactional nature of behaviour which lays selectional restrictions on the choice of kin terms or social substitutes (Ervin-Tripp, 1972). Numerous studies have appeared on the selection of social substitutes, various types of address terms, part of the core always have been dealt with kin terms (Friedrich, 1972; Lalitha Bai, 1977; Accamma, 1977; Prabhoo, 1982).

7.3.4.3. Parameters of interactions: Planes of interactions: Dyadic interactions

In dyadic interactions only two persons are involved in the conceptual level, the speaker and the hearer. Kinship terms have been recognised as the outcome of the avoidance of the personal names of the kins due to their seniority (Lowie, 1964) biologically or sociologically. The kin terms used as vocatives in the dyadic interactions of the hearer kin are also repeated in the reference context when speaking about
them to a third person if the third person knows the referent kins. If otherwise a separate reference term existing in the community will be used.

7.3.4.4. Parameters of interaction: Nondyadic interactions:

Triadic interaction

Nondyadic interactions involve kins or persons other than the speaker and the hearer. Taken one non-dyadic referent at a time this interactional profile contributes the triad system. The third person may also present in the interacting set up which is considered as the ideal set up.

Eg.

KG /jɑːvə/ 'Haw'
MR /jaːvu/ 'Haw'
UM /jeːθəːni/ 'HeBw'
MN /eleːmburi/ 'HyB'
MK /seːsaːRE/ 'OZS'

The typical nondyadic kin terms are exclusively reference terms. The interactional profile is envisaged in the systematic coordinated functioning of roles, relations and setting with ego and the alter on opposite sides of the polar lines (Parsons & Shills, 1951)8 As a third person the referent also comes in the interactional profile (vide diagram: 7.3.4.5)

---

7.3.4.5. The interactional profile

As regards modes of interaction kin terms have been classified as address and reference (−address) terms (Murdock, 1960; Lalitha Bai, 1977). A three way distinction is made by Prabhoo (1982) with the exclusive inclusive nature of social substitutes. The following definitions are slightly modified from the earlier ones.

7.3.4.6.1. Address terms

A term of reference is one which is used in addressing a person by a speaker. Two types are found, 1) solely address terms and specifically directive in nature, 2) equally vocative and a reference term. In the first category second person pronouns are found. In the second category many of the social substitutes such as kin terms, occupational terms, personal names etc. are found.

7.3.4.6.2. Reference terms

A term of reference is one which is used in speaking about a third person in absentia or in presence of this third

---

person to the hearer, and is nondyadic in nature with reference to this referent individual.

7.3.4.6.3. Vocatives

A vocative term is one which is used in calling a person usually remote but may also be proximate generally imperative or commanding in nature, solely used in dyadic interaction. These are terms of the exclusive nature as per categorisation. The term is never repetitive consecutively (as immediate constituents in face to face interaction (of the second type address terms) or is not a reference term and does not inflect for cases but may take gender/honorific suffixes (Prabhoo, 1982) marked. Kin terms may be classified on the basis of mode of use.

1. Solely reference terms

Eg.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kin</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KG</td>
<td>/de:Ru/</td>
<td>'HyB'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>/di:Ra/</td>
<td>' '</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM</td>
<td>/de:vaR/</td>
<td>' '</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>/avidutta:ra/</td>
<td>'H'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MK</td>
<td>/ma:pla/</td>
<td>' '</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>/kattiyo:n/</td>
<td>' '</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. This is a sub category of reference terms not found in the kin category but are mainly part of second person pronouns. One example is found in MR /bhay1/ 'aZ (bhayn).
3) Solely vocatives: Along with kin terms these terms are used as vocatives. Some of the vocatives are derived from the kin terms or used generally in kin context more frequently either as informal vocatives or formal polite vocatives in the specific contexts. An account of the functional aspects of the vocatives in Malayalam and Konkani has been given in Prabhoo (1982). The decreasing functions of these vocatives either as formal/informal vocatives due to the influence of socialising processes such as education, splitting of families have also been discussed in 1982.

Exclusive vocatives in KG are basically two: 1) /are:/, 2) /ago:/. /are:/ is a familiar term of address or vocative even for elder sibs in NKG. The dialect variations are obtained by prelinking an affirmative single word sentence 'yes' as /vəre:/, /vəgo:/ as in NKG. This type of linking is available only for mother in SKG as /vəima:/ 'yes mother' as a vocative by some of the members. The term is restricted to be used for kins of ascending generation. The term /ago:/ is also a term of familiar address for female kins or any other caste member derived from the Dravidian /agge:/ is used for mother also in NKG. /vəgo:/ is a term of intimacy neutralising generation distinction. From these terms the polite variants /age:/, /vəlge/, /vəlge/ and /valgo:/ are derived. The functional aspects of these terms have been already dealt with in the previous sections. The relative measures of the interactional values are discussed in the succeeding section.
In MR. /age:/ and /ka:yge:/ are vocatives used for the H and W respectively. They address their husbands by the term /mha:rija:/ also. /are:/ and /ari:/ are also the inferior address terms in MR.

In UM the terms /age:/ and /are:/ and /ari:/ are used as solidarity or inferior address terms.

In MN similar terms which exist in MK as /eda:/, /edi:/ are not generally used and are avoided. A husband is never referred to as /ende ɡamburil/.

In MK the familiar terms as vocatives are /eda:/ and /edi:/ A wife can also be called as /ede:/ which is generally used among the peer group in southern Kerala. These are not derived from kin terms but are used in connection with the kins to larger measure.

The terms as vocatives used in MM are /eda:/ and /edi:/ for young kins or to indicate inferior status.

7.3.4.7. Parameters of interaction: Relative measure of polar interaction

Interaction is envisaged between speaker and hearer situated at the polar end points of the interactional line (Parsons & Shils 1951, Goffman 1955). The distinction in the measure of interaction is a dimension of the relative (higher or lower) status of the speaker and hearer. The unequal dimension has been termed as nonreciprocal and the equal dimension as reciprocal by Brown & Gilman (1971) whereas

Friedrich (1972) labels them as asymmetrical and symmetrical for the social substitutes. In the present context the parameters of symmetry are conditioned by status higher or lower which are discussed in detail in the category of power and status. In kinship terminology almost all the terms indicate asymmetrical interaction except for the affinal formal vocatives /valga/, /vaigal/, /vonn/, /informal, /vaigot/ (NKG). All other terms are asymmetrical. The four combinations of measure of relative measure of interaction are:

- symmetrical (+status and power equal)
- symmetrical (-status and power and equal solidarity marker) 
- asymmetrical (+status, higher status and power of speaker)
- asymmetrical (-status, lower a status of the speaker)

7.3.5. Parameters of status and power

Status in its simple sense is position in a particular pattern and role is the dynamic aspect of power (Linton, 1961: 174). Status and power in a broader sense can be treated as redundant features. In a narrower sense conceptually status is a precedent concept power. Mannel (1978:91) considers power as a process involving change, -change, shift and development and rather is a verbal concept. Thus status is relatively static in position and power is a functional or dynamic concept which measures the extent of status of the addressed individuals. The term status or power does not mean the positive concept as high status but may as well mean...
lower or equal status or power. Power has been treated as an analogous concept to energy as both are abstract entities (Olsen, 1968:172). Since power is a measure of status, the units of status are as well considered as the units of status also, due to their interdependent nature.

Brown & Gilman (1971:255) defines power in terms of relative ability of behavioural control of interacting persons. According to them power is a relationship between at least two persons and it is nonreciprocal in the sense that both cannot have the same area of behaviour. The many bases of power can be given as physical strength, wealth, age, sex, institutionalised role in the church, the state army or within the family and that parents are emperor figures. They explicate the Freudian view that the parental power and status image act as a stimulus in the mapping of the concept to the larger social organisations and thus the emperors are parent figures (Brown and Gilman 1971:256). It is evident that many of the sociologists recognise the family as the cross section of the society, but it has its root in the family. In kinship organisations, in the patrilineal families power and highest status is bestowed in the father, power can be ascribed or

11. Mennel (1978: 91)
or achieved later in the larger social organisations. But in kinship status and power are ascribed as per kin roles which are community specific and to a larger extent universal too. Within the family circle status and power are divided conceptually as follows: Parental authority to filial docility male authority to female in clan organisation, male authority as a father and husband to female subordinance are clear markers of sex wise status and relation wise status or relative age status (Vincent & Small, 1961: 275).

7.3.5.1. Status and power in group concept

In kinship status in groups can be envisaged in consanguineal and affinal groups. Affinal kin groups are marked with higher status. Hence the spouse’s kins of children are given due respect in verbal and nonverbal interaction especially during the marriage ceremonies and early years of alliance in KG. Of these the kins of daughter’s husbands are given higher status than the kins of the son’s wife.12 In MN as a marker of status and hence politeness terms for wife’s kins are not generally used. In MM the female kins of wife are duly respected. As markers of affinal status the vocatives for the affinals are /válga:/ and /válga:/ in NKG as reference terms /veyu/ and /vei1/ in KG, /samdh1/, /samdhin/ in UN.

12. Also pointed out by Frantzmann (1979).
7.3.5.2. Parameters of status: Levels of status

Wherever status is indicated, parallel concept of power is also indicated and hence the term of power is avoided hereafter unless otherwise stated. In kinship, status seems to be more appropriate terms than power in the discussion. In KG different levels of status are terminologically expressed.

7.3.5.2.1. Super status

This level grades above all in the status stratifications where any of the address terms as a polite marker or respect denotative marker for fellow members of the community is avoided. The general vocatives used in kin context or non-kin context in the community are not used in this connection. Eg. A religious leader is addressed (specifically not by a vocative) can be addressed as /swamiya:nuy/ only in KG.

7.3.5.2.2. High status

This status category includes the kins who are not to be addressed by the kin terms. Other syntactic constructions are used for these kins. Thus the husband, husband's parents, wife's parents, husband's elder brothers are not addressed by the kin terms. A married woman is not to utter the name of her husband indicating the specific status. Syntactic constructions like /alkilve:/, /məa:sr:/, /vəla:nə:/ etc. are used in this context especially by the females in KG. Husbands also do not use the name of their wives but
vocatives like /vɔi ɡoː/, /aikilvɛː/ are used. This indicates the inhibition and controlled behaviour in joint families, amidst the elders, existing and continued even now. The wives of husband's elder brothers are however addressed by other kin terms classificatory in nature merging with the natal kin term /akka/.

In MR the terms for spouses are /mhaːrja/ for husband and /kaːygeː/ for wife. Spousal kins of the other category mentioned above in KG are referred to by kin terms in MR.

In UM the terms /aŋgiː/ is used for wife and /apآ/ and /aŋgiː/ for husband. Other kins mentioned in KG are referred to by kin terms which are repetitive of consanguineal terms. This is apparently due to the merging of natal kins to affinal kins.

In MN husband is not addressed by any term, husband's parents are referred to by terms for ego's parents, husband's brothers and wife's relatives do not come in direct verbal interaction and many terms are not found as in other communities.

In MK husband is addressed by /ensʌː/ as status marker, Affinal relatives are addressed by the kin terms of merging type as /ammaːvən/, /ammaːvi/, /annan/ etc.

In MM the husband's father is not addressed by any term

13. /apآ/ is the contracted term of honorific singular /aːp/.
but mother is addressed as /umma/. Males do not use kin terms for wife's kins as vocatives especially for females.

7.3.5.2.3. High status: Intra category levels: 2.

Kins are distinguished terminologically based on the difference of biological seniority between the kins in question and not the transitional kin. In the communities under study the parameters of distinction differ each other. In KG the ascending and parallel generation eldest kin is always denoted by the basic kin term. The non eldest kins are denoted by prefixing the personal name. For the female kins in this case the kins are denoted by prefixing the natal or spousal personal name indicative of the category of the kin and also the dual name possessing nature of the GSB married women. Eg: /akka/, /N akka/. The status of a genealogically senior kin is extended to the spouse, who is junior to ego in age but kinologically senior in terminological reflection. Eg. eBW.

In MR, this distinction is not found. All the elder kins are denoted by the kin terms in isolation only. Utilisation of personal names even in prefixing is considered to be an insult to the concerned kins.

In UM a three level distinction is found in the differentiation of kins by their relative seniority. The eldest kin is denoted by suffixing the kin term /ba:/, and /ma:/ as a modifier to denote the status and seniority in the ascending
parallel and descending generation. In the descending generation the husband of daughter is denoted by the term /javãy ba:pu/ to indicate the respective high status of the concerned kins. Eg:

/ta:ya ba:/ 'FeB'
/phuphu ma:/ 'FeZ'
/bu:ma:/ 'eldest Z'
/de:da bha:y/ 'eldest B'
/de:da ma:mu/ 'mother’s eldest B'

In MN in the ascending generation personal names are not affixed, instead modifiers of generic types are used. As in KG for kins of the parallel generation, the eldest kin is denoted by basic kin term and others as well as the parallel kins - the sibs are denoted by the prefixation of personal names to the basic term.

Both in MK and MM as in MR personal names are not used with kin terms for senior kins. To denote relative seniority modifiers /mutta/, /alee/ of generic type as in MN are used.

7.3.5.2.4 High Status: Terminologically expressed caste status

It has been already pointed out that the KG and MN belong to the highest caste group as Brahmins and accordingly terminological distinctions are made. In MN even sect distinctions are made. An adhya addresses the asya simply by the caste name /namburi/ where as an /asya/ addresses the
It was not possible to elicit whether the MR distinguish terms for caste, but they do consider a sect /da:yitkar/ and the speakers of /va:grī bo:li/ as inferior castes. They distinguish two groups, the Brahmin /do:RkaR/ and the non-Brahmin /cava:n/ of the dichotomous division of their moving nomadic group. They also consider the clan /ba:ngo:t/ as a superior clan. However, terminological distinction, it appears, they do not consider.

They address the non Mharathi speakers as /amma/ and /ayya/.

The MK which belongs to an intermediate group of the locality in caste hierarchy, consider themselves superior to Pulayas and Parayas. The UM also consider their sect Hanafi as superior but a corresponding terminological distinction was not elicited.

7.3.5.2.5. The parameters of status: The intermediate status

Utilisation of personal names as found in KG and MN can be considered as denotative of intermediate status between the utilisation of basic kin terms and personal names especially in the address mode of use. In UM among the Hanafis the basic term is used to denote the intermediate status of seniority.

14. Since the informants left the place without prior notice, further minute details could not be collected.
7.2.5.2.6. Parameters of status: Intermediate caste status

The MK as already stated locate them as intermediate group superior caste and accordingly terms distinguished (vide 7.2.2.4.) for terminological distinction of caste difference.

7.3.5.2.7. Parameters of status: Intermediate status: Caste egalitarian attitudinal status

Egalitarian attitude 15 towards caste members of lower class as cooks may act as a stimulus in treating them as pseudo kins by the assignment of terms like /ma:mu/, /ma:y/, (KG), /ikka:kka/, /itta:ttla/ (MM), /xa:la/ (UM), /karta:ramma/ (MM).

In KG and UM terms are reciprocated mutually.

7.3.5.2.8. Parameters of status: Lower status

Kinologically lower status is indicated by the utilisation of personal names and vocatives as /ag0/, /are:/, /ari:/, /pori:/, /edi:/, /eda: /, /ede:/ are used in the six communities (these are already discussed). In UM the relative juniority and junior most status is denoted by an endearing adjective /-ja:n/, /ca:n- / either by suffixing or prefixing. While the senior most status of kins indicate respect and politeness, the junior most status is indicated by an endearing term even for kins of ascending generation.

15. Hill & Hill (1980: ) use this term in different context (language maintenance).
In MN distinct terms are used for the lower caste marker. MK receives the term /mugukki/ 'old woman' from the higher caste Nayars and Ezhavas and in turn gives them to Pulayas and Parayars. Avoidance of kin terms for lower castes and utilisation of inferior terms as /mugukki/ or the personal names neutralising age distinction, is a specific feature among the MK.

7.3.5.2.9. Parameters of status: Neutral status: Solidarity status

Brown & Gilman (1971: 257-61) consider solidarity as a symmetrical concept of interaction, which may include the power equals and also the powerless equals, which indicates reverence and formality in the first case and intimacy in the second case. It in fact involves a process of levelling status distinctions by the superiors coming down and the inferiors going up resulting in the equilibrium of power imbalance. Hence according to the authors it is an adjustment which may invite 'conflicts'. Solidarity however in the present context has more clear dimension. Solidarity in this discussion indicates neutralisation of status inequalities due to intimacy and friendship and typically is symmetrical in the first preference. In kinship the typical system hardly occurs. One instance
of a vocative /vəˈɡoʊ:/ in KG for the mother is somewhat a solidarity marker cutting even the levels of generation. It is not indicative of equal status but is a marker of intimacy which is an essential feature of solidarity dimension. Except for this term, solidarity is not expressed through verbal behaviour of kinship, though in nonverbal behaviour elder sibs, grandparents may adopt a solidarity behaviour frequently. In the siblingual group the behaviour is solidary to a larger extent nonverbally, but terminologically status is distinguished even for a year's difference in the traditional system.

7.2.5.2.10. Correlation of terminology of kinship and levels of status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Super status</td>
<td>-K, -VF, -PN, +HTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High status-1</td>
<td>-K/+K₁⁻, +K, VF,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High status-2</td>
<td>+K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High status-3</td>
<td>K+KM, +K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate status-1</td>
<td>+K, NK, +K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate caste status-2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate status-3</td>
<td>+K, -K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower status</td>
<td>N, NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral status</td>
<td>+K, -VIF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+K --- +kin terms = --- reciprocal
-K --- -kin terms VIF --- vocative informal
+K₁ --- basic kin term VF --- vocative formal
7.3.6. The parameters of code

The introduction of codes in the sociological evaluation was first effectively brought into picture by Berstein (1971/1974) in the study of class codes and control.

The origin of different types of codes is attributed towards different forms of social relations, and when values are attached to categories of terms or speech forms they are designated as specific codes. It is a means of verbal planning. A social role then can be considered as a complex of coding activity controlling both the creation and organisation of specific meanings and the conditions for their transmission and reception (Berstein, 1974:144-5). Kinship terms specifically indicate conscious verbal planning and the correlative behavioural restrictions. Two types of linguistic codes have been isolated by Berstein based on the rigid and elastic nature of the types as follows:

7.3.6.1. Restricted code

The dichotomous division of codes into restricted and
elaborated in their turn have two-faced features. The restricted code is a simplified code in structure, where more is understood than uttered, characteristic of functioning in relation to persons among the prison groups, the age group of adolescents, army and friends of long standing and is marker of solidarity. But the concept of restricted code differs in kinship with an opposite face. In kinship restricted code or avoidance or total absence of some terms indicate a restricted behaviour coloured with formality. Apart from some of the parameters giving rise to the restricted codes, the social parameters, like caste, class, species, kingroups, status, power all give rise to various types of restricted codes.

7.3.6.2 Elaborated Code

In elaborated code the selection of alternatives involves a wider range. The UM represents as elaborate code system with linguistically expressed different levels of terms of a single category. The MK and MM terms which contribute to the restricted code system due to the classificatory and simplified nature. (Of MM specifically requires the long standing acquainted group to understand the various semantic domains of terms in relations). The MN on the other hand represents the restricted code system with limited terms in correlation with the restricted interaction of opposite sex category. The KG have some of the restricted codes for the affi-
nals reflecting restricted behaviour, but also have a core of elaborated codes in verbally differentiated codes as kin terms. Elaborate codes when invites excessive styles as a lower caste member calling a Nambudiri maiden /kunnaːtɔːlɔ/ is semantically designated as a restricted code conditioned by the lower caste status of the speaker. Restricted codes may also indicate high status. Though the nature of the codes differ from Bernstein these act as a covert force in the socialisation process within the family circle - socialisation of integrative nature.

7.3.7. Kinship terms and socialisation process

The concept of codes in kinship presents a well developed terminological system in kinship and the corresponding behavioural pattern in the socialisation process of an individual. The concept of socialisation can be categorised as follows:

7.3.7.1. Generic socialisation

Generic socialisation is the general term applied to the process by which an individual acquires all the rules in verbal or nonverbal interaction of his society or group within an interval of time.

7.3.7.2. Basic socialisation

The process by which an individual acquires the basic rules as a member of group or family in verbal and nonverbal interaction is labelled as basic socialisation.
7.3.7.3. Extended socialisation

The process by which the individual extends his primary or basic knowledge of socialisation with further modifications somewhat in parallel direction is called extended socialisation.

7.3.7.4. Integrative socialisation

Integrative socialisation is the process by which a group of individuals representing different societies or communities converge towards some assigned group value of integration. That is all the different groups will be moving towards a common point of attraction. For example, in the present situation caste distinction is often overlooked, pseudo kin terms can be used cutting across caste and language barriers. This may be in line with general integrative trends motivated from other directions. The equating of affinal kins with those of the consanguineals is a recent trend observed as a case of socialisation within the family circle (Prabhoo, 1977) is of integrative nature. The reduction of terminology as a marker of educated and civilised group.

7.4.0. Current trends in kinship terminology

The traditional system of well knit kin ties and the related terminologies are withering away at the hands of the current macrosociological forces in India. Higher rate of educated people, separation from the ancestral house common
property and occupation; seeking job in the non-native places, modern machine equipments and the less dependency on elders, gradual decrease in family ritual participation etc. are thunder bolts to the language of kinship. The distinction of consanguineal/affinal terms is fast vanishing at least in reference. The terminological generational distinctions are also reduced in their strata. Siblingual age distinction is also not considered terminologically very seriously. These all reflect the broken contacts with secondary kin groups, socialisation within the family circle which is reverse reflection of refined ideas due to the general social uplift and the attainment of education. As an opposite phenomenon it reflects the simplification process due to the lesser importance given to kinship, or as a marker of solidarity. The kins of parents if younger than ego are addressed by personal names against the traditional rule in KG. In MN more terms are used for kins in the past. Moreover they are slowly giving up no cousin marriages and prefer cross cousin marriages. The rigid sex avoidance rule is made flexible and accordingly more terms are used as calling FZH by the term /amma:van/. In KG on the other hand the custom of cross cousin marriage is fast disappearing and accordingly the correlated terms are also slowly disappearing. Polygyny is considered as a shame among the educated Muslims and also among the Nambudiris, Monogyny is the current mode of marriage among the educated and civilised communities.
The works of Kodama (1962), Prindle (1973), Peng (1975), Lalitha Bai (1977: ), Praboo (1982), attributed the loss of terms towards splitting of the families (secondary). Ostor (1982) also reports sharp reduction of kin terminology in the Hungarian society where in rural areas the kins are differentiated for even four generations while in the urban areas the differentiation is found to be up to one generation only. All these point towards the universal trend of diminishing values of kinship. As counter phenomena, communities like MN who had a simplified terminological system traditionally, are expanding it.

7.5.0. The overall pattern of kinological and sociological selectors of kinship terminology for the six communities under study

The overall pattern of kinological selectors is the sum of selectors kinological proper and sociological as applied to kinship terminology. The overall pattern of the kinological and sociological selectors within the frame work of the terminology of kinship includes the 15 major selectors (briefed from the 21 features in the kinological component) with their dominant subselectors and the seven sociological selectors, with their subselectors. A number of studies have appeared in the selectional rule frame work beginning from Ervin Tripp (1972) on the social substitutes almost all of them being either personal pronouns or other types of address terms. Praboo (1982) has made a study on the functional
aspects of the vocative social substitute found in Konkani and Malayalam which is used with their variants largely in the kinship circle within the methodological frame work of selectional rules after Ervin Tripp (1972) and others. Indian studies on this model however not appeared by the illustration of flowchart. In this chapter the frame work is not exactly the same type as in Ervin Tripp and Prabhoo in the diagramatic representation but it represents a sort of branching figure or flow chart with major selectors indicated by the diamonds and the sub selectors by the circles. The conjoining of the two separate frames of selectors makes the entire frame work of the terminology of kinship involving the kinological and the sociological selectors.

7.6. Kinological and sociological selectors

The major class of selectors, their subselectors and their abbreviations or symbols in the diagram are given below.

7.6.1. Kinological selectors

1. Clan (cl) --- (+) uniclans, (-) absence of clan (x) biclan
2. Descent (des) --- (+) paternal
3. Inheritance (iather nal) --- (+) paternal, (-) male spousal (x) parental (male & female) (x) parental and spousal
4. Consanguinity (con) (+) consanguinity, (-) affinity
5. Adoption (ado) (+) adoption, (-) absence of adoption
6. Residence (res) ---- (+) patrilocal, (-) males spouse local
7. Relation (rel) ---- (1) Parental (2) filial (3) spousal 
                  (4) siblingual
8. Transition (tr) ---- (1) Parental (2) filial (3) spousal 
                       (4) siblingual
9. Marriage rules (mr) ---- (c) cross cousin marriage 
                      (u) uncle niece marriage 
                      (b) siblingual marriage 
                      (k) kin (e) ego
10. Sex (se) 
     a. kin (K) ---- (+) male kin (-) female kin 
                    (x) male or female kin 
     b. ego (e) ---- (+) male ego, (-) female ego 
                    (x) ego either sex category
11. generation (gen.) ---- (+) ascending, (-) descending 
                          (+) parallel 
                          (-) parallel 
                          (+) senior, (-) junior in relative age
12. Collaterality (col) ---- (+) collateral, (-) collineal 
                           (x) both
13. mode of use (mu) ---- (+) address, (-) reference 
                         (x) either of the mode of use
14. range of application (ra) ---- (+) denotative, 
                                       (-) classificatory
15. language structure (ls) ---- (+) elementary 
                                (-) derived

7.6.1.2. Sociological selectors

Of the seven sociological selectors, the last selector is actually a process as a joint functioning of the individual selectors (the previous six selectors) in viewing society as a dynamic phenomenon with developmental stages and hence is included in the selectors.
Kinological selectors of terminology within the framework of Ku, Ma, Um, Mn, M, and Mm

Overall pattern of the kinological and sociological selectors in Ku, Ma, Um, Mn, Mm, and Mm.

Sociological selectors of kin terms within the framework of Kaj, Mr, Um, Mn, M, and Mm.
1. Style (st.) —— (b) basic language form
   (-b) variants of the basic form in various situations

2. Context (con) —— (+) formal, (-) informal

3. Stratification (str) —— (kg) kingroup, (cl.g) class group,
   (cast.g) caste group, (Sp.g) species group

4. Interaction (int) —— (pl) planes, (mu) modes
   (pol) poles

5. Power & Status (p.s) —— (h) high, (im) intermediate,
   (lo) low, (neu) neutral

   High status (hs) —— (h) super status
   (h₁) high status-1
   (h₂) high status-2
   (h₃) high status-3

6. Code (cod) —— (ec) elaborated code,
   (rc) restricted code

7. Socialisation (soc) —— (bs) basic socialisation
   (es) extended socialisation
   (is) integrated socialisation

Vide the Selector frame showing the overall pattern of the
kinological and or sociological selectors within the set up
of the six communities under study. (Diagram 7.6.1.3)

7. Concluding remarks

The selectors isolated within the frame work of the
terminology of kinship for the six communities under study
validate how these social selectors which are also mirrored
in the larger social organisations reflects the societal elements or parameters and also that the family becomes the alma mater for the learning in the social behaviour. The extensions which are found in the larger social organisations with similarity and diversity are rooted in the concepts described in the selectors described in this chapter which have foundations in the family and has a significant role in rearing up the individual into a social animal. Thus the present chapter explicitly discloses the features contributing to the structure of the society in its minimal unit - the family in the units of kinship terms. The kinological selectors described in the previous chapter and the sociological selectors described in this chapter both within the set of the kinship and family structure together makes the whole of the kinship system described in terms of its language and validates the significance of language in the study of society.