

## Chillu and Semi-vowel examples

Cibu lodged some examples supposedly showing a contrastive distribution, and additionally claims that all his examples are words. In reality, these contrived examples are not words and cannot be found either in Malayalam or Sanskrit dictionaries. They are merely unnaturally created expressions.

Not only that, the only word similar to one of these examples to be found in the “Sabdatharaavali” , the authoritative Malayalam dictionary, is പിന്നിലാവ് and its presentation in the dictionary is completely against the principle of such arguments. More specifically, the only given meaning of the rendering പിന്നിലാവ് is “the diminishing or waning moon” , which corresponds to the rendering and meaning of the example പിൻനിലാവു cited in the argument .

Cibu also makes the following general statement regarding the examples :

“General patterns of these examples are (both the forms of character capable of forming chillu) + (semi-vowels) and (ന in chillu or pure form) + ന. Above examples are just few from vast number possible with these pattern rules.”

Given that all the examples he provides are not only non-existent in all dictionaries but also impossible according to Malayalam word formation rules, the statement that “[these] examples are just few from vast number possible [...]” and that therefore there are a huge number of such examples, is a misleading trick intended to misrepresent issues. This can be understood by looking in the pages of Sabdatharaavali, or any other authoritative Malayalam dictionary. Look for the context of മുൻ, വൻ, പിൻ, തൻ, etc. followed by ന in such dictionaries: it is very difficult to identify words with those prefixes that retain the chillu, because Malayalam word formation norms does not allow such constructions.

At the same time, in Sabdhatharaavali, we can witness words:

1. മുനിർണ്ണയം /munnirṇayam/ (മുൻ + നിർണ്ണയം)
2. മുനിലാവ് /munnilāvṛ/ (മുൻ + നിലാവ്)
3. മുനില /munnila/ (മുൻ + നില)
4. മുനാൾ /munnāl/ (മുൻ + നാൾ, മു + നാൾ)
5. പൊന്നിരം /ponniram/ (പൊൻ + നിരം)
6. വന്നദി /vannadi/ (വൻ + നദി)
7. വന്നരി /vannari/ (വൻ + നരി)

The fact is that even though the said examples are untrue, one can use ZWJ to achieve the ന്ന rendering. This is fully correct, since here the differences are between presentation variants. There is no problem during input or retrieval.

Regarding the example മുൻവിക്ഷോഭം and മന്വിക്ഷോഭം, we do not know how to respond to this. It is highly irresponsible to present such examples, which is impossible to generate in any Indic language, not to mention Malayalam.

With these imaginary expressions, one cannot build up any linguistic principle for a given language.

In analysing the arguments mentioned by him, we were careful in sorting out six aspects:

1. those arguments have not been able to substantially establish the problems for which the chillu encoding is the solution
2. they arguments have not been able to present in detail the consequences of not encoding chillus
3. they have neither been able to argue against the original reasoning of not including chillus in Unicode, nor against the reasoning presented by Rachana towards the same
4. finally, they have not provided any overwhelming advantages for the encoding of chillus
5. No practical problems have been mentioned regarding the usage of ZWJ/ZWNJ, whether it can be used as an effective solution for Malayalam, and the essence of why Unicode originally used the joiners and Rachana's reiteration of the same.
6. Overall, chillu being equivalent to halant form in Devanagari, neither do the chillu proposers know, nor have they investigated, how it was settled in Devanagari without any problem.