

Further Response to Tulu Academy Documents

Vaishnavi Murthy Yerkadithaya

Vinodh Rajan

This document will address the questions raised by script ad-hoc committee (SAH) with regards to the recent documents submitted by the Tulu Academy (particularly, L2/21-89, L2/21-213, L2/21-188).

Our previous responses to the Tulu academy has already been recorded under L2/21-092 and L2/21-220. Here, we re-iterate the relevant points only if necessary.

It is our understanding that in a traditional sense, the terms *Tulu* and *Tigalari* refer to the same script. However, the Tulu academy has also been calling it's script as "Tulu", which probably is the cause for such confusion. According the Tulu academy's own document L2/21-213, the behavior of the academy's script has been modelled to imitate Kannada and the glyph forms aligned towards modern Malayalam to make the script more accessible. In our opinion, the script is better referred to as "Revived Tulu Script", "Reformed Tulu Script" or even "Modern Tulu Script".

1. The translated copy of Tuli Lipi Parichaya includes images of stone inscriptions (figures 1-24), though many are not very clear. Does the proposal by Murthy/Rajan cover the epigraphical texts shown here? (Their proposal L2/21-210 has one stone inscription, figure 2.)

As such, our proposal covers all traditional forms of the script that include manuscripts and epigraphs. The encoding model is designed to support the complex conjunct behavior as seen in historical sources (including various variant forms).

It must be said that the script as devised by the Tulu academy does not display the traditional style in its normalized form or does the encoding take any consideration of it. One would have to resort to a traditional font (and, possibly, extensive use of joiners similar to Malayalam) to display the traditional forms.

Consider the transcription of the following inscription using the normalized version of the script in our proposal (1) and also the academy's script (2)



ಗಂ ಁಗ್ಗಾ ಳು ಲಂ ಗ ಗುಂ ಸ ಡ ಲ ಡು ಳ ಣ ಳ ಳ ಗುಂ ಡ (1)

ಗಂಁಗ್ಗಾಳುಲಂಗಗುಂಸಡಲಡುಣಲಣಗುಂಡ (2)

2. According to the Academy, horizontal conjuncts would not be accepted by the native users. Are Murthy/Rajan agreeable to a joiner character used only for historic use?

We would end up in a situation similar to Burmese or Malayalam, which will include encoding variant characters, using joiners or variation selectors and the constant need for a proper font to display the text in a style that's appropriate.

Apart from the horizontal joiner, one probably also would need to encode a repha and several chillu characters similar to Malayalam to properly display the traditional texts. As noticed in our proposal, the traditional Tulu-Tigalari shows a great variety in terms of conjunct behavior.

A cleaner solution would be to (if necessary) encode them separately for historical and modern usages.