

Lexicography, Abstracts

R. Kothandaraman: Dialect Variants in Classical Tamil and Lexicography

The classical Tamil has a long recorded history from second century B.C. to 10th century A.D. During this period the linguistic system as also the literary system have under gone remarkable changes. The verbal constructions have changed distinctly from the underlying system to surface system. Similarly the nominal constructions also have undergone distinct changes. These changes both in verbal and nominal construction took place in a particular dialect first and then the changed item have been integrated in classical system. For instance consider the nouns *kurī* (Kur.72.5) 'small bird', *parī* (Kur.72.4) 'cotton', *paḷū* (Tol.Eḷuttu.261) 'ghost', and *kuḷū* 'group / community'. These nouns have the underlying representations traceable to *kuruvi*, *paruvi*, *paḷuvu*, and *kuḷvu* respectively. In classical Tamil the verbal constructions have been accepted very much in this respect. Consider the following data of which the earlier form is given first and the later version is given as derived form. The earlier version is specified with asterisk mark.

Verbal Construction

- 1(1) *aṭukum > aṭūum (Kali.27-15, Pati.75.1)
- (2) *aḷivi > aḷī (Nar.82.9)
- (3) *aḷukum > aḷūum (Kali.145.8)
- (4) *arivi > arī (Matu.376)
- (5) *iruvi > irī (Kur.660)
- (6) *uṭuvi > uṭī (Kur.167.2)
- (7) *uṇuviya > uṇī (Aiṇ.268.2)
- (8) *eḷuvi > eḷī (Kali.136.19)
- (9) *eḷuvu > eḷū (Pati.31.20)
- (10) *eḷuvuka > eḷūuka (Kali.102.4)
- (11) *eḷuvutal > eḷūutal (Eḷuttu.ḷam.6)
- (12) *eḷuvum > eḷūum (Kali.45.7)
- (13) *oruvi > orī (Malai.202)

Verbal Base

- aṭuku
aḷivu 'to destroy'
aḷuku 'to weep'
arivu 'to inform'
iruvu 'to cause to remain'
uṭuvu 'to dress, to wear'
uṇuku 'to eat'
eḷuvu 'to awake'
eḷuvu 'to awake'
eḷuvu 'to awake'
eḷuvu 'awake'
oruvu 'to awake'
oruvu 'to delete, to remove'

| | |
|--|---|
| (14) *oruvu > orūu (Pati.37.12) | oruvu 'to delete, to remove' |
| (15) *oruvum > orūum (Akam.71.2) | oruvu 'to delete, to remove' |
| (16) *katuvu > katūu (Akam.194.10) | katuvu 'to seize, grasp' |
| (17) *kaḷuvi > kaḷī (Kuri.16) | kaḷuvu 'to seize, grasp' |
| (18) *kolaviya > kolīya (Naṛ.15.1) | kolīvu 'to sift in a winnowing fan' |
| (19) *tarukuntu > tarūuntu (Puram.24.9) | taruku 'to give' |
| (20) *tarukum > tarūum (Ciru.118) | taruku 'to give' |
| (21) *taḷuvi > taḷī (Kuraḷ.913) | taḷuvu 'to adapt' |
| (22) *taḷuviṇa > taḷīyiṇa (Eḷuttu.Col.Cēṇā.17) | taḷuvu 'to adapt' |
| (23) *turuvi > turī (Kuraḷ.929) | turuvu 'to search' |
| (24) *peṛukiya > peṛīya (Akam.242.15) | peṛuku 'to obtain' |
| (25) *maruvi > marī (Pati.50.23) | maruvu 'to combine, join together' |
| (26) *vaḷuviṇum > vaḷīyiṇum (Eḷuttu.Col.Cēṇā.15) | vaḷuvu 'to earr, swerve from the right' |
| (27) *veruvum > verūum (Kuraḷ.599) | veruvu 'to be frightened' |

In classical Tamil there are two types of verbal bases of which the first one is primary verbal base, and the second one is the derived verbal base. The derived verbal base is derived from the primary verbal base. Consider the following

| Derived Verbal Base | Primary Verbal Base |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 2(1) aḷikku- (Akam.192.9) | aḷi- |
| (2) irakku- (Naṛ.125.6) | ira- |
| (3) irukku- (Kali.143.32) | iru- |
| (4) iḷakku- (Aiṅ.269.15) | iḷa- |
| (5) uyarkku- (Matu.131) | uyar- |
| (6) uraikku- (Kuru.310.7) | urai- |
| (7) uvakku- (Akam.144.11) | uva- |
| (8) uvakku- (Kuru.189.7) | uva- |
| (9) uḷakku- (Pari.11.53) | uḷa- |
| (10) uḷakku- (Akam155.5) | uḷa- |

The derived verbal bases in 2 and 4 above occur in future constructions of personal type. The derived verbal base in 1 was originally non past base which later develops into verbal base. The final *-ku* occurring in the derived verbal bases of type 1 is copied, shifted, and pasted after primary verbal base of type 2.

| | |
|---------------------------|-------|
| 3(1) aṇiku- (Akam.340.18) | aṇi- |
| (2) amaiku- (Aiñ.36.2) | amai- |
| (3) āрку- (Puram.230.16) | ār- |
| (4) iṇaiku- (Aiñ.306.3) | iṇai- |
| (5) uṇku- (Pati.58.7) | uṇ- |
| (6) uṇarku- (Akam.226.1) | uṇar- |
| (7) uyku- (Kurū.11.3) | uy- |
| (8) uṛaiku- (Kali.36.21) | uṛai- |
| (9) eṇku- (Puram.13.1) | eṇ- |
| (10) eṇku- (Nar.6.6) | eṇ- |
| 4(1) alaippu (Kurū.10) | alai |
| (2) aḷippu (Nar.177.7) | aḷi |
| (3) ārppu (Mul.8) | ār |
| (4) ārpp-iṇ (Kali.15.4) | ār |
| (5) icaippu (Matu.267) | icai |
| (6) icaipp-iṇ (Pati.27.7) | icai |
| (7) iṭippu (Kali.3.5) | iṭi |
| (8) iruppu (Pati.90.20) | iru |
| (9) irupp-iṇ (Malai.290) | iru |
| (10) iṛappu (Pari.12.73) | iṛa |

The derived verbal bases in 4 occurs in early Tamil only before the infinitive suffix *-a*, and conditional suffix *-in*

There are transitive verbal bases such as tāl̥ttu (<tāl̥-ttu) 'to lower', vīl̥ttu (<vīl̥-ttu) 'to make to fall', āl̥ttu (<āl̥-ttu) 'to make to sink', puraṭṭu (<puraḷ-ttu) 'to make upside down', kaḷarru (<kaḷal-ttu) 'to unfasten, loosen', kāṭṭu (<kāṇ-ttu) 'to show' etc. which are historically traceable to non past bases. As such they are originally derive from the following verbal constructions which finally are traceable to *ceyuntu type of non past impersonal finite constructions.

- 5(1) tāl̥ttu (<tāl̥-ttu < tāl̥uttu < *tāl̥untu)
- (2) vīl̥ttu (vīl̥-ttu < vīl̥uttu < *vīl̥untu)
- (3) āl̥ttu (āl̥-ttu < āl̥uttu < *āl̥untu)
- (4) puraṭṭu (puraḷ-ttu < puraḷuttu < *puraḷuntu)
- (5) payirru (payil-ttu < payiluttu < *payiluntu)
- (6) kaḷarru (kaḷal-ttu < kaḷaluttu < *kaḷaluntu)

(7) k̄āṭṭu (k̄āṇ-ttu < k̄āṇuttu < *k̄āṇuntu)

This analysis is applicable to the derived verbal bases in 1 and 3 which are ultimately traceable to non past impersonal finite construction of **ceyur̄iku* and **ceyumpu* types. Tholkappiyar observes that there are constructions of **ceyump* (<cey-ump) type which are in free variation with **ceyuntu* (<cey-untu) type. This provides the theoretical basis to propose **ceyur̄iku* and **ceyumpu* types from which non past bases develop first which finally develop in into verbal bases. The details of the development of derived verbal bases will be dealt with later.

Suganya Anandakichenin and Erin McCann: Working towards a Śrīvaiṣṇava Maṇipravāḷam Dictionary

The *Madras Tamil Lexicon* and the *Glossary of Historical Tamil Vaishnava Prose* (VG) are currently the two main reference dictionaries that a scholar can refer to when working on texts in Maṇipravāḷam. The former, though, is not of much help when it comes to Sanskrit words, which Maṇipravāḷam abounds with; the latter, while lifting the definitions from the TL for Tamil words, tries to deal with Sanskrit words but also compounds, most of which cannot be found as such even in Sanskrit dictionaries (ex: *dharma-bhūta-jñāna*).

The definitions found in the VG are not always complete or exact; and not all the words used in Maṇipravāḷam texts are to be found in it either: while the medieval Śrīvaiṣṇava commentaries and important sectarian works have been meticulously searched and used to collect words and expressions for the glossary, and to provide examples, some works have clearly been neglected. Thus, many terms that are found in hagiographic texts such as the *Guruparamparāprabhāvam* (13th c.?) or *sthala-purāṇas* such as the *Kōyil oḷuku* do not have an entry in the VG. Similarly, many a time, the examples that have been chosen to illustrate the definitions are not the best choice, in that they are not necessarily the oldest occurrence, or the most apt in clarifying the meaning of a particular word/expression as the sentence in which it appears does not provide adequate context. And most of all, the definitions and glosses are in Tamil, not in English.

This paper is an attempt on our part to list the challenges we have had to deal with while using these dictionaries for understanding and/or translating texts in Maṇipravāḷam and to brainstorm with the workshop participants about how to work towards producing a dictionary that is more complete and user-friendly, and which also caters to English-speakers.

K. Nachimuthu: The language of literary texts and historical dialectology. Lexicographic Perspectives

The analysis of classical literary language poses lot of problems at various levels, viz. fixing of the text, exegesis, the employment of analytical methods and compilation of referenc tools appropriate to the needs of the work. The Caṅkam corpus has been receiving all thes attentions by dedicated scholars over the years. Presently following the investigations and publication of critical editions by Eva Wilden and others they have aquired emphasis on the development of new methodologies and investigative strategies. It is felt that instead of treating the classical corpus as a homogenised one it has to be looked at from the point of view of individual poets their dialectal or stylistic features involving temporal and spatial dimensions. These enquiries require perspectives from textual criticism, exegetical and commentarial traditions and linguistic analysis including from dialectological angles. The presentation tries to focus on these aspects.

V. Gnanasundaram: The Tamil lexical corpus and Cognates in Dravidian languages

'A Dictionary in which words are traced back to their earliest appropriate forms and meanings is known as Etymological dictionary' (Philip Durkin 2016). The Dravidian Etymological dictionary (DED) (Burrow & Emenau, 1984/ 1998) has listed the words /lexical items as cognates (groups of etyma) as available then in the dravidian languages -inclusive of tribal languages- such as Tamil, Malayalam, Kota, Toda, Kannada(occasionally Badaga) , Kodaku, Tulu [south Dravidian], Telugu, Kolami, Gondi, Gadaba, Kui, Kuvi etc. [central Dravidian] , Kurukh, Malto, Brahui [North Dravidian]. In total there are 4,572 entries(DED 1984/ 1998: Indian Edition). The total number of Tamil entries in DED, in comparison with all the other languages are more in number. And also, in most of the entries, Tamil occupy the first place in DED which serves a purpose regarding the reconstruction of the earlier –Proto Dravidian forms, in many instances, of course with exceptions. The Tamil phonemic system, very well agrees with the earliest reconstructed Proto Dravidian reconstructed forms(PDr). Though DED does not contain reconstructed Proto Dravidian (PDr) Forms, a Table is given wherein the phonemes with asteric marks are given which represent the earlier phonemic forms, from which the equivalent phonemes are descended to other languages. It may be pointed out that words from many of the tribal languages find a significant place in DED. Also, it may be pointed out that many of the other tribal languages which have been studied later, by the scholars of Annamali University etc., may find a place in DED Revised Edition(DEDR). Tamil Lexicon (1924-39) played a significant role with respect to the presence of the Tamil entry as head word in DED. It is the experience of many, that many of the Dravidian tribal languages possess many of the Old Tamil features: grammatical as well as lexical. For example, the presence of present tense formative suffix--p- in strong verbs, as in Old Tamil (in Modern Tamil it is -k- : Shanmugam 2009:61), is found in some of the South Dravidian tribal languages such as Bettakurumba: (eg.) naṭa-p-a>naṭappa 'to walk' (the equivalent form in Modern Tamil is naṭakka 'to walk') (Jeyapal 1978) Eravalla: (eg.) keṭu-p-aṭ-a >keṭuppaṭa(n)ā 'Do I extinguish the fire' (Gnanasundaram 2012) etc. Following is a couplet of Tirukkuṛaḷ· a didactic literature in Tamil which reads as...

uvap-p-a-t-talaikūṭi ulḷap pirital

anaittē pulavar toḷil - which means, 'It is the part of the learned to give joy to those whom they met and on leaving, to make them think, " Oh, when shall we meet them again?"' (Drew & John Lazarus 1991), where in, the Old Tamil tense formative suffix – p-is in use (the equivalent word in Modern Tamil is uvakka) (Gnanasundaram & Rangan 2016). The difference in the Old Tamil usage between tā (when the goal is in first or second person) and koṭu (when the goal is in third person) (Tolkāppiyam- Col. 29 & 30) is very much found in some of the tribal languages like Muduva (Sakthivel 1976), Kadar (Suresh 1981) Eravalla (Gnanasundaram & Rangan 2016) etc. Further, there are many lexical items like poḷutu (<poḷutu) 'sun', kani 'auspicious time', nere 'chastity' (<niṛai Kuraḷ 57/ Tamil Lexicon :2287) (Maheswaran: to be published) etc., are found in the Dravidian tribal languages. In this context, it may be mentioned that a Compilation of a dictionary Viz. 'Comparative vocabulary of Tamil Tribal Dialects' has been attempted in the work entitled: Survey of Tamil Dialects spoken by the Tribal communities of Tamil Nadu and submitted to Central Institute of Classical Tamil, Chennai (Gnanasundaram, 2011). In the above work, the comparative vocabulary of eight tribal dialects are arranged with the Literary Tamil form, as the head word . The lexical items, prevalent in the tribal languages/dialects, which are studied newly like Eravalla (Gnanasundaram, 2012), Villiyān (Gnanasundaram & Rangan 2014:418-436) etc. which are not entered in to DED are also listed, so as to draw the attention.

REFERENCESS

1. Burrow , T. & Emeneau, M. B. 1984/ 1998: First Indian Edition. A Dravidian Etymological dictionary. Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd.
2. Drew, W.H. Rev. & John Lazarus. Tirukkuraḷ (English Translation). 1991. Madras: Asian Educational Services.
3. Gnanasundaram, V. 2011. Survey of Tamil dialects spoken by the Tribal communities of Tamil Nadu. Chennai: Central Institute of Classical Tamil (Project Report)

4. -----2012. A Study of Eravalla: Linguistic (Socio linguistic and Folkloristic aspects with Eravalla-Tamil vocabulary), Coimbatore: Bharathiar University.
5. Gnanasundaram, V. & Rangan, K. 2016. 'Study of Dravidian Tribal Languages: some aspects'. Journal of Tamil Studies (IITS) April 2016
6. Gnanasundaram, V. & Rangan, K (eds.) (Chief Editor G.N. Devy) 2015. Peoples Linguistic Survey of India (Vol. 27 Part 2). The Languages of Tamil Nadu. Basha & Orient Blak Swan
7. Jayapal, S. 1978. Descriptive grammar of Bettakurumba, Annamalai University(Ph.d Dissert.)
8. Maheswaran, C., Pulayan PLSI Vol 27- Part 1. Languages of Tamil Nadu (in Tamil) (In Press)
9. Philip Durkin (ed.) 2016. The Oxford Hand Book of Lexicography, Oxford.
10. Sakthivel, s. 1978. Muduva Dialect, Annamali University
11. Shanmugam, S.V. 2009. 'The Dravidian Family of Languages and Tamil' Journal Of Tamil Studies. No. 75. June 2009.
12. Suresh, J. 1981. A descriptive study of Kadar language of Anaimalai hills, Annamalai University(Phd. Dissert.)
13. Tolkāppiyam: collatikāram (with cenāvaraiyam commentary), 1959. Chennai: Saivasiddandha publishers

V. Murugan: The Treatment of the Cankam Corpus in the TamilLexicon

Introduction

The Tamil Lexicon is the first comprehensive bilingual dictionary compiled for an Indian language by a university. Its bilingual character, etymology, citation-based treatment of signification, its wealth of grammatical information and its inclusiveness in the treatment of language varieties make it the greatest and the most important work of scholarship in Tamil.

The treatment of the Cankam corpus

The inadequacies and failings of the Tamil Lexicon with respect to its

1 Bilingual character

2 Significations

3 Citations, and

4 Etymology

1 Bilingual character

Absence of balance between the senses in Tamil and English. While the Tamil component is a mere synonym, a one-word equivalent or a generalized statement of genus alone, the English equivalent is more inclusive and fuller in perspective focusing on the differentia as well. There is also the other extreme of wholesome Tamil definitions and shrunken English equivalents. Yet another deficiency is that a large number of conceptual terms have their definitions in Tamil. But in their English equivalents, the constituents of these definitions are given only in Roman transliteration forcing the users to look up these constituents appearing as headwords in different volumes.

2 Significations

In a large number of entries, the meaning in Tamil is just a synonym of the headword. In several entries, the meaning consists of just the genus and not the differentia. Impreciseness, vagueness or inaccuracy marks several definitions in

Tamil.

The Lexicon contains entries running into several hundreds in which the definitions are wrapped in Sanskrit terminology or in an erudite literary idiom, both of which are beyond the comprehension of the general user. There is also the Sanskritization of conceptions rooted in the Tamil mind.

3 Citations

The use of citations in the Lexicon suffers from a multiplicity of shortcomings, the most important among them being

(i) Historical principles of dictionary-making are reflected extremely feebly in the Lexicon.

(ii) In several instances, the interpretation of meaning from quotations is subjective, uncritical or based on one or the other of the traditional commentaries. Besides, the meanings are not adequately generalized from the quotations.

(iii) In certain cases, the citation does not accord with the meaning derived.

4 Etymology

The etymological information in the Lexicon is confined to three kinds of notes, viz. (i) certainly known (ii) probable, doubtful, comparable or untraceable, and (iii) cognates in other Dravidian languages.

The etymological conclusions are not always based on tested authorities.

Most of the words shown to be derived from Sanskrit are merely parallel forms in Tamil and Sanskrit.

Precise correlation of chronological data, and study of systematic sound changes according to established linguistic principles must be the basis for any study of lexical borrowing.

P. Mathaiyan: Commentaries to Caṅkam literature and their
lexical interpretation

G. Sathish: Textual variations and glosses in Patirrupattu

Abstract

(Dr.G.Sathish)

Textual variations and Glosses in PathiRRuppaththu

“The anthology of pathirrupattu consists a long poems that deal with purapporul (life non-domestic) and they are is ten tens. The heroes of these ten tens are the Chera kings and there are ten different poets who have sung these panageric poems” (Meenakshi Sundaram 1965:47). Pathirrupattu not only a literature work, but also an historical chronicle of Cheras of sangam period.

Aim of this paper to examine (1).the printed texts, (2)available manuscripts, (3) textual variations, (4) commentaries and (5) kinds of Glossaries of the pathirrupattu from the point of view of lexicography.

(i).Textual variations

I closely examined the second ten (11-20) songs and found out the textual variation or variation in reading (VR.) from printed text, palm leaf, paper script and old commentaries of Tolkappiyam.

To find out the types of textual variations and listed the gloss which was occurred only in pathirrupattu.

Types of variations

1.phonological variations

பைஞ்ஞிலம் (17.9) paiññilam

பஞ்ஞிலம் paññilam

2.morphological variations

புணர்க்குஞ் (11.4) புணர் காக்கும்

puṇarkkuñ puṇar kākkum

3.Syantactical variations

மணிநிற விருங்கழி நீர்/நீல் நிறம்பெயர்ந்து (11.9)
maṇinira viruṅkaḷi nīr/nīl niraṁpeyarntu

Thomas Lehmann: A note on the lexis of the Aiṅkuṛunūṛu

In this note on the lexical items in the anthology Aiṅkuṛunūṛu I will present about twenty word forms, which in the Cankam literature or in Tamil literature in general occur exclusively in the Aiṅkuṛunūṛu, and I will try to analyze these word forms as to whether they are lexemes or candidates for lexemes to be included in a dictionary of Cankam Literature.

Eva Wilden: Akanāṇūru paḷavurai glosses and their provenance

Today the old anonymous commentary (*paḷaiya urai*) on the bigger part of *Akanāṇūru Kaliriyāṇainirai* (KV-90) survives in a single palm-leaf manuscript (UVSL 297). This was the basis of Irākavaiyaṅkār's edition: at his time the ms. was in better condition and preserved the full text where now parts of many leaves are broken away. However, he felt free to alter the text both by normalising colloquial and regional forms and by simplifying the spelling of many Sanskrit words written in grantha. The current presentation means to look at two lists of glosses extracted from this commentary, namely one precious set of glosses for rare words, containing at present 67 items, and one partial list of Sanskrit glosses for Tamil words (totalling 21), many of them not rare. The two questions to be posed are: Where do the glosses in a Tamil literary commentary come from and how do they relate to traditional lexicography? How and to what extent did such glosses find entry into the modern dictionaries?

Indra Manuel: Cañkam complex verbs

T. Rajeswari: Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar's glosses on the flowers of Kuriṅcippāṭṭu

Flowers plucked by the heroine and her confidante.

According to the commentary of Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar, the total number of flowers is ninety nine in Kuriṅcippāṭṭu.

Some of the plants, creepers and climbers which existed during Caṅkam age are now not extant. The names of the flowers are also changed, The Nikaṇṭus and the later commentaries help us only to a certain limit to know the exact names of a very few plants.

The period of Kapilar is far earlier than that of Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar. Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar lived in 14th century CE. We do not know whether the names of the flowers which belong to those two periods were the same names or not.

In between the poet's period and that of the commentator, there might have been changes. Migration of plants from other regions, other states and even from other countries will have taken place in Tamil country. The same flower might have received a different name in different places. Hence it is better to identify the flowers according to the commentary of Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar. Here also problems arise.

1. Name of the flower mentioned twice

The flower “காந்தள்” is explained both as “செங்காந்தள்” and “தோன்றி”. The Tamil Lexicon gives two meanings for the term தோன்றி, i.e., red or white Malabar Glory Lily. As for the word “கோடல்”, it refers to the white species of Malabar lily (see வெண்காந்தள்). Hence “கோடல்” might be the white variety. The other two names may refer to the red variety (செங்காந்தள்).

The explanation given by Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar for the name “போங்கம்” is மஞ்சாடி. He also explains “திலகம்” as மஞ்சாடி. The difference between the two is not mentioned clearly.

2. Kapilar gives three kinds of water lilies, named *āmpal*, *kuvaḷai* and *neytal*. White *āmpal* and red *āmpal* are the two varieties. In the white variety, two kinds of flowers are seen: 1. the whole petals are in white colour, 2. few petals have red shade.

Kuvalai -Ceṅkaḷunīr - Since Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar explains குவளை as “செங்கழுநீர்”, it leads us to decide that the previously mentioned *āmpal* must be white *āmpal*. In this species the petals are red in colour. Some flowers are in blood red colour.

The phrase “மணிக்குலை கள்கமழ் நெய்தல்” Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar’s explanation is “நீலமணிபோலும் கொத்துக்களையுடைய கருங்குவளை”. So the flower must be in blue colour. It belongs to the *alli* - species. The sepals of the calyx are green in colour with black dots and short lines on the outer side. Mostly the number of petals is less than that of *āmpal*.

3. Jasminum species given by Kapilar

Kapilar refers to eight varieties of the Jasminum species in Kuṛiṅcippāṭṭu;

1. குளவி - காட்டுமல்லிப்பூ , 2. கல் இவர் முல்லை - கல்லிலே படர்ந்த முல்லைப்பூ
3. தளவம் - செம்முல்லைப்பூ , 4. மௌவல் - மௌவற் பூ , 5. கொகுடி - நறிய குளிர்ந்த கொகுடிப்பூ , 6. செம்மல் - சாதிப்பூ, 7. பித்திகம் - பிச்சிப்பூ, 8. இருள் நாறி - இருவாட்சிப்பூ

Among the above mentioned flowers, the names of the jasminum species முல்லை, மல்லி, காட்டுமல்லி, சாதிப்பூ, பித்திகம் (பிச்சிப்பூ), இருவாட்சி, சந்தனமுல்லை, பால்முல்லை, பச்சை முல்லை, இராம பாணம் /முல்லை are the names of some flowers known even today.

Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar gives the meaning which does not refer to any flower name for the following words: பஞ்சாயக்கோரை, பூளை, குருகிலை, கரந்தை and பாங்கர். He simply explains குருகிலை as முருக்கிலை.

P.L. Sami said Narantam is a sort of fragrant grass, not a flower.

Scholars have difference of opinion in identifying the flowers.

P. Kumar: Commentaries on Kuṟuntokai – Readings and Glosses

The aim of this study is to show how the glosses differ on the basis of the readings adopted by the editors or commentators of Kuṟuntokai, which is one of the Classical Tamil texts. The study is based on the commentaries of the three famous scholars viz. Cauripperumāḷ Araṅkaṇ (1915), U.Vē.Cāminātaiyar (1937), and Po.VE. Cōmacuntaraṅār (1955). They differ in many places on the fixing of the text and giving glosses. For choosing the readings they follow a set of procedures which are to be understood intuitively. For choosing the glosses they look for 1. parallels in other texts, 2. collocational usages, 3. earlier glosses given by other classical commentators like Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar, 4. meanings given in the lexicographical works like Nikaṅṅus 5. Dialect usages from regions and social groups. So we find that one and the same word has been explained variously by commentators in many places in Kuṟuntokai. For instance, *uvari* (Kuṟun. 391-1) is taken as noun by Cauripperumāḷ Araṅkaṇ and gives the meaning 'salt land'. But, it is treated as verbal participle by U.Vē.Cāminātaiyar and so the meaning 'having disliked' is given by him. These cases involve homonymy, polysemy and synonymy. Such things are examined and observations on their feasibility are made in this study.

T. Rajarethinam: The treatment of technical terms of Poruḷ

Ilakkaṇam in Nikaṇṭu-s

In the Tamil grammatical tradition on Akapporuḷ employs a lot of literary terms/registers which may be termed as literary technical terms. In Tolkāppiyam itself a number of such terms are found in the various areas of grammar and poetics. In the Poruḷatikāram part many of such terms are used and defined.

With regard to their treatment in Nikaṇṭus, these can be discussed in three levels:

Mutaṛporuḷ (the primary element of the akam poem), Karupporuḷ (the second constituent of the akam poem) and Uripporuḷ (theme proper to the five akam tiṇais). In Mutaṛporuḷ, terms related to the landscape and seasons are found. In Karupporuḷ, terms related to the things of the land and other things are found. In Uripporuḷ, literary terms related to Akam poetic structure (Tiṇai, Tuṛai...), divisions of Akam poetic sequential structure (Kaḷavu, Karpu..), Characters (Talaivaṇ, Talaivi...), Techniques (Iṛaicci, uḷḷuṛai, muṇṇam..) are found. Most of these terms are carried over in the latter akam grammars also as exemplified in Nambi Akapporuḷ. This carry over is discussed first with relation to Nampi Akapporuḷ (13 AD).

In the second level, it is investigated how for these terms are represented in the Nikaṇṭu tradition taking Tivākaram (8/9 AD) as the main corpus. It is found that terms related to the Mutaṛporuḷ and Karupporuḷ levels and their extensions are well represented while the third level – Uripporuḷ, is very meagerly represented. Since the terms of this level belong to the literary register forming a special technical vocabulary, in the general structure of Nikaṇṭu s, normally, these do not find a place. Moreover the concept of specialised dictionaries of technical terms on various subjects was not developed at that time. The definition of the words which gained the status of technical terms was included as one of the senses of the entry in many cases.

This paper will try to describe the above facts by giving illustrations.

M. Prabhakaran: The treatment of technical terms of Yāppu in
Nikaṇṭu Works

Victor D'Avella: Amarakoṣa and Tivākaram

Giovanni Ciotti: Tamil glosses on the Amarakoṣa and the
Tivākaram

G.Vijayavenugopal: Dictionary of Tamil Inscriptions – Data and presentation

Kinds of Dictionaries:

Dictionary of Tamil literature (from the point of view of meaning production)

Dictionary of Tamil language (from the point of view of language description-grammar)

Dictionary of Inscription; Mono-lingual/Bilingual

Selection from the data: general words getting specialized meaning

Three major domains – Political, religious and cultural

borrowings: tatbhava,tatsama, loan blend. loan translation,deviations

How to deal with mistakes/variations/dialectal usages

Variations

Importance of phrases, idioms

Dictionary entries – grammatical information, derivation, meaning, citation

How to deal with diachronic developments?

Y. Subbarayalu: DICTIONARY OF EPIGRAPHIC TERMS – PROSPECTS AND PROBLEMS

Most Tamil inscriptions can be dated within a century or so and therefore the epigraphical terms can be used fruitfully for a historical lexicon of Tamil. That was one of the avowed objectives of the Santi Sadhana project for preparation of A Greater Tamil Lexicon on historical principles. Unfortunately the project could not reach its final shape due to the lack of proper scholarly support.

For the time between the ninth and sixteenth centuries there are nearly fifteen thousand inscriptions in Tamil language, for which edited texts are available for study. The inscriptions being written in the documentary style prevailing at the time of their making, they use the current terminology reflecting the social, cultural and administrative practices of the day. The *meykkīrtti* texts which use a literary style are closer to the contemporary literary works and their terminology has to be treated with that of the literary works. The terms found in the business part of the inscriptions may look somewhat stereotyped as they are generally documents recording temple gifts and rituals. At the same time they have several interesting terms of current usage, which are useful for historical reconstruction.

In arriving at the correct meaning of the terms, the context alone helps in many cases. But if the occurrence of the term is not frequent, it is difficult to arrive at the correct meaning. Sometimes it is difficult to recognize even the correct form of the term from the few instances of its occurrence. There are a considerable number of terms of Sanskrit origin which are used in their original form or in Tamilised form. Their meaning may correspond to that of the original term. There are deviations too; some Sanskrit terms actually are found as translations of the indigenous ones. Therefore the context of their usage has to be checked carefully.

The existing works on epigraphical terms are only in the nature of glossaries, which are meant for the guidance of the scholars using inscriptions as a historical source. For preparing a proper dictionary, collaboration of lexicographers and epigraphist is necessary.

S. Saravanan: Kuṛuntokai/Narriṇai: Their inflection conjugation and Meaning

The aim of this study is to identify words in Uriyiyal of Tolkappiyam and their usage as verbal constructions in Kuṛuntokai/Narriṇai in Sangam Literature. There are about 120 rare words listed by Tolkappiyar in his work to define the meaning. But many of the words are now obsolete. The words are listed as base forms, derivative noun forms, verbal noun form, etc. in Uriyiyal. Out of 120 words, 60 words are found used in verbal constructions in the whole Sangam Literature and 43 words in Kuṛuntokai/Narriṇai alone. The conjugation and inflection of the verbs are dealt with here. As far as conjugation is concerned, the fourth conjugation verb is ñemirnta NR. 141:3 (which spread) also occurs in fifth conjugation as ñemiri Akam. 86:3 (having spread). Most of the verbs are used as intransitive verbs and as transitive verbs sporadically. A semantic analysis of these forms is also attempted at appropriate places.

Jean-Luc Chevillard: On the JUNCTURE between the early western missionary efforts at exploring Tamil and traditional Tamil lexicography: a preliminary exploration