



ligatures have been used as per the free will of the writer. Thus it should be (once more) evident that the virama ligatures of Grantha are *not* by nature prepausal.

The fact that Dr Reinhold Grünendahl in his book *South Indian Scripts in Sanskrit Manuscripts and Prints* (Wiesbaden, Germany; ISBN 3-447-04504-3) has labeled these virama ligatures as “prepausal” (as shown by Ganesan in L2/10-303) is only because of “their being *many times* seen in word-final position” as I wrote in L2/09-372 p 22. It is not possible to assert that these are *only* seen in word-final position (and hence should be considered prepausal) because of the existence of proof to the contrary as shown above.

Given the existence of this proof I am sure Dr Nachimuthu will agree that the adjective “prepausal” is not applicable to either these written forms or to any character intended to represent them in the Unicode Grantha encoding.

\*

That said, I must note that a separate character called LIGATING VIRAMA (with or without the adjective PREPAUSAL) is not at all necessary, as seen in the GoI recommendations document L2/10-409 from the Unicode Grantha meeting held at New Delhi on 2010-Sep-06 based on the consensus of all the scholars who attended the meeting – which includes colleagues of Dr Nachimuthu from the JNU Delhi namely Dr Girish Jha and Dr Santosh Kumar Shukla.

I have also separately submitted L2/10-404 based on this recommendation of the GoI meeting in which I have concluded that when different virama models for Grantha are compared, it is found that it is altogether better not to encode any separate LIGATING VIRAMA character. Thus even the question of an adjective PREPAUSAL does not arise. Even in the hypothetical consideration of a distinct LIGATING VIRAMA, no adjective such as PREPAUSAL is appropriate, considering the ground facts to the contrary as shown above.

-o-o-o-