

Dear Sirs,

I have come across a L2 document submitted by Mr. Everson. (L2/12-039 2012-01-30)
It is about two characters that are to be added to the Grantham proposal of GoI

I found those submitted characters for addition are incorrect. I guess its origin should be from wrong signals of his remote sensing devices or his collections from friends and colleagues who handles the subject are ingenuous and inept.

But where he was misled or erred should be by his naive knowledge on language as Tamil and his failure to note the nature of sentence formation (syntax) of the contents in focus. Everyone is aware of that the syntax (sentence format) identifies a language in which the contents are written. When phrases of exotic languages as French (for example suo moto, sine die, **ad valorem** etc) intermixed into English contents used inside sentences in English does not make the language of the content to Latin or else as the case may be..

Let us see the actual point in lime light turned on by me.
(kindly refer the image at the bottom)

(1) The Example/evidence # 1 thro 6 form part of the individual page's header/a sub-heading for a following verse. It is printed in the Language Tamil. Even standard 1 student in Tamil will read this single sentence as

பெரியவாச்சான் பிள்ளை (a) யருளிச்செய்த (b) தனி ழுரை கம்* (c)

The word referred as (a)above, is name of a person (an author). All the letters are of Tamil language and the name of person (a proper noun)too has etymological origins in Tamil language

The word referred as (b) above, is "யருளிச்செய்த" a verb (in past tense)denoting "authored" (created) All the letters are in Tamil script and the language too is Tamil.

The word referred as (c) above is "தனி ழுரை கம் " a compounded (Tamil)word of two individual words as தனி+ ழுரை கம் " The first part "தனி" is a adjective for the next trailing part " ழுரை கம் " (verse)

In the first word there are two letters 'த' and 'னி' both are written in Tamil letters in Tamil language while the phonetics here does not convey any semantics in Sanskrit.

"தனி" means "separated / isolated" in Tamil language. Here the meaning of the

compounded word is "what is conveyed in the verse (ழுரை கம் the next part) is not part of a serial but the start and finish of the taken subject ends in this single verse itself.

Mr. Everson point this 'னி' as a characters in Grantham script. It is an incorrect inference and expression out of complete ignorance on Tamil letters and its semantics

The other 4 examples (2 thro5) are all duplicates.

The sixth one though it is almost same only the second part of the compound word was written in different format. (ழுரை) Here there is one more word as இந்த க்ரந்தம் meaning this verse. Here 'இந்த' in Tamil script and language

Because Mr. Everson is pointing only the Tamil letter 'னி' (combination of Tamil NNNA + vowel sign for I) as Grantham characters by his erroneous view though the whole series of 3 words (a,b & c as above) form part of a sentence that are written only in Tamil language written with Tamil letters. Hence his proposal has to be rejected on technical incompetency i.e. erroneously identifying letter of one language and claiming it as letter of another language.

(2) On the letter 'ழ' /LLLA/

(Kindly refer the bottom most figure in the image attached marked (7))


Grantham merely being an alternate and fully fledged glyptic set to Devanagari as for as Sanskrit is concerned, even a entry level student in that language will know that the letter 'ழ' /LLLA/ is not in its canonical set of letters under pedagogy.

But on date that particular letter 'ழ' /LLLA/ already inducted as a newly coined letter along with its own new rhythmic glyph to Unicode's Devanagari character set with a special comment as "for use along 'Dravidian' languages" (for representing proper nouns of people and places based on request from GoI). Still most of regular University faculties or pedagogically connected people were not aware of why a newly created letter is found in the Unicode list under Devanagari if at all they care to see and analyze it as language character and its logics behind coding schemes of the letters found in their PCs

By the set of images submitted as the evidence by Mr. Everson he is trying to demonstrate that by proximity (in a print media) that letter 'ழ' /LLLA / being found along train of Grantham characters it should be part of Grantham. That logic is not maintainable because the very letter 'ழ' /LLLA/ was never form part of that language Sanskrit for last 2 millennium+ years or ever since it was devised. If anyone claim the letter 'ழ' /LLLA/ as one of Sanskrit letter he must be a person of complete ignorance on that language.

Because someone placed a glyph 'ழ' /LLLA/ next to Grantham letters it should be part of Grantham is a argument stem from naive/inept/ingenuous person or with hidden cunningness to achieve something by bringing in a kind of illusion. He should be using the idea that evidence of one instance is enough to demonstrate to Unicode. But Unicode cannot be fooled by lone evidences of texts written with typos, texts of fancy mongers who try to write in individual funny ways to his/her whims and fancies or exhibitions of their new and virgin innovation. Only those characters and letters stems from well matured contents a legal ref can be applied. Canonically can born only after reaching criticality that is after standardized use and acceptance and reached a pedagogical status.

Another point to note is that the lone single word shown was commented as a name of a female deity (a proper noun) Hence the word need not be of Sanskrit also. By virtue of usage of the letter 'ழ' /LLLA/ it can be from Tamil. From my

knowledge the word  (if at all that is the word) may mean a female who wore beautiful armaments. At the same time I doubt very much about the shown piece of **windowed text** as part of reasonably errorless sentence (or part of verse) at all because they seems to be randomly assembled rather thrown Grantham characters without any semantic rationality of words of that language and does not form any meaningful word or sentence or form part of evidence full text at all. There are single and double dandas and numerical characters between double dandas and a single letter next to single danda all in a single line. There are single letters shown/thrown below a line of characters may be of vertically stacked consonant conjuncts.

On the whole it seems to be a child/madman's scribbling and not a part of text with sane writing in Sanskrit which is worth considering as a reliable evidence.

BTW

Some more for UTC's consideration as a part of my point on Unification:-

In this example of Mr. Everson's submission I would prefer it to show as an example of manipravalam mode of writing. This Manipravalam is a kind of writing mode used in South India where in words of Sanskrit written in Grantham intermixed into Tamil expressions. Though it is no more organic these days just like Grantham script but the archived volume and users of such historical, religious contents found in Tamil nadu are huge and voluminous and command considerable demographic gravity. Hence this reason abets my request for unification with Devanagari simply because Tamil is already in BMP along with Devanagari. I hope I have opened in this instance one more trump card justifying and strengthening unification theory of Grantham and Devanagari as Grantham and Tamil scripts will get located in different planes as per the present proposal of GoI

பெரியவாந்ரதாங்கிள்ளை யருவிச்செய்த
 1 தனி ழோகம்.

தனி ழோகம் - ததேதாடி ழுசு. ௩
 2

தனி ழோகம் - வனஷ நாடா யணம்.
 3

தனி ழோகம் - வரா ழாடி. ௪
 4

தனி ழோகம் - ழிதே தகி நலி.
 5

பாரதாதி
 தனி ழோகம்.
 6 இந்த க்ரந்தம்.

7

