

Exploring New Ways in Tamil Lexicography

Hamburg, 7–9 August 2023

7th August, Monday

morning

- 9.30–9.40 am Suganya Anandakichenin, Neela Bhaskar, & Eva Wilden: Welcome
9.40–10.00 am Eva Wilden & Charles Li: Tamilex, the Project

History of Lexicography 1 (chair: Neela Bhaskar)

- 10.00–10.40 am E. Annamalai: Change of Meaning as History
10.40–11.10 am coffee break
11.10–11.50 am Nachimuthu: The Old Tamil Commentaries in the Making of Tamil Dictionaries for Classical Tamil
11.50–12.30 pm Suganya Anandakichenin: The Madras Tamil Lexicon and the Śrīvaiṣṇava Corpus: A Love Story of Sorts
12.30–2.30 pm lunch break

afternoon

The Influence of Sanskrit (chair: Suganya Anandakichenin)

- 2.30–3.10 pm Neela Bhaskar & Giovanni Ciotti: Towards the Process of Standardisation – Tamil in the 19th Century
3.10–3.50 pm Charles Li: Linking the two T's: Tamil, Tibetan, & Other Commentaries on the *Amarakoṣa*
3.50–4.30 pm Victor d'Avella: Examining Tamil *nikaṇṭus* alongside Their Sanskrit Counterparts
4.30–5.00 pm tea break

keynote lecture

- 5.00–6.00 pm Jean-Luc Chevillard: Taming Randomness and Exploring Open-endedness: Ancient Tamil Lexicographers at Work
7.00 pm Conference Dinner

8th August, Tuesday

morning

Text Semantics 1 (chair: Victor D'Avella)

10.00–10.40 am T. Rajeshwari: Rare Words in *Patirrupattu*
10.40–11.20 am Indra Manuel: Language of *Paripāṭal* – Special Lexis

11.20–11.50 am coffee break

11.50–12.30 pm G. Vijayavenugopal: On understanding the Grammar, Language and Meaning of *Puṛanāṅṁūru*

12.30–2.30 pm lunch break

afternoon

Nikaṇṭus (chair: Eva Wilden)

2.30–3.10 pm Jean-Luc Chevillard & Margherita Trento: Beschi's *Caturakarāti* as a bridge between traditional *nikaṇṭus* and modern lexicographers of Tamil

3.10–3.50 pm Srilata Raman: Shifting Worlds: The *Nikaṇṭu*, Literature, and Lexicography in 19th-20th century Tamil India

3.50–4.20 pm tea break

Corpus Semantics (chair: Nikolay Gordichuk)

4.20–4.50 pm Maanasa Visweswaran: Semantics in the *Pattuppāṭṭu*: Indo-Aryan Loan Words, Isolated Occurrences

4.50–5.30 pm Erin McCann: Indexing the NATP: Observations and Challenges

7.00 pm Dinner for those who would like to

9th August, Wednesday

morning

Text Semantics 2 (chair: Jean-Luc Chevillard)

10.00–10.40 am Leo Rishi Nelson Jones: Some Interesting Lexicographical Questions from the *Tamiḷneri Viḷakkam*

10.40–11.20 am S. Saravanan: Some New Words and Their Meanings in Nālaṭiyār

11.20–11.50 am coffee break

Object Semantics (chair: E. Annamalai)

11.50–12.30 pm Nikolay Gordichuk: Words for 'Enemy' in the Old Tamil of the First Millenium

12.30–2.30 pm lunch break

afternoon

2.30–3.10 pm Roland Ferenczi: On Ancient Tamil waters: Shipping-Related Terms in Early Old Tamil literature

Lexicographical Shifts (chair: Giovanni Ciotti)

3.10–3.50 pm Eva Wilden: Tamilex: Why a New Tamil Dictionary and what Could It Look Like?

3.50–4.20 pm tea break

4.20–4.50 pm Anna Smirnitskaya: Tamil Lexicon and the Database of Semantic Shifts. Can the Model of Semantic Shifts Help to Understand the Structure of Meanings of Polysemous Tamil Words?

4.50–5.30 pm final discussion

Abstracts (in alphabetical order)

Suganya ANANDAKICHENIN (Universität Hamburg), “The Madras Tamil Lexicon and the Śrīvaiṣṇava Corpus: A Love Story of Sorts”

The definitions given by the *Madras Tamil Lexicon* are based on a number of works of various genres produced throughout two millennia. And this includes the Manippralam writings of the medieval Śrīvaiṣṇava Ācāryas, especially their *vyākhyānams* (commentaries), an important source indeed. These works, which reflect how Sanskritized Tamil was spoken and written by the Ācāryas, can attribute new meanings to words and expressions, Tamilize Sanskrit ones, or even coin new ones when necessary. And the *Lexicon* has incorporated a large number of such words and/or meanings. These Śrīvaiṣṇava works, especially Nampīlāi's *Īṭu Bhagavadviṣayam* (14th century), thus also provide hundreds of examples for the *Lexicon*. The use of such a rich source definitely makes the *Lexicon* a more “complete” and “inclusive” reference work, but at the same time, using the Śrīvaiṣṇava exegetical corpus (inter alia) is not without a few pitfalls, which the *Lexicon* sometimes fails to avoid. This paper shall mainly examine the manifold contributions of the Śrīvaiṣṇava writings to the making of this *Lexicon*, as well as the challenges that they seem to have presented the *Lexicon*-makers with.

E. ANNAMALAI (University of Chicago), “Change of Meaning as History”

Historians of the Tamil language focus more on the morphology of inflected words than on derived and compounded words. Another focus is on the origin of words if it is from outside Tamil. Attention paid to change in the meaning of words and its effect on a lexical network remains anecdotal. This paper will illustrate some semantic changes (of all three kings, viz., *mikūtal*, *kuraital*, *tiritā*) from the Sangam texts to the ethical texts and will highlight their significance for understanding how the history of the Tamil language throws light on the history of Tamil thoughts on the world and their codification in literature. This paper will be an argument for the mega project of Tamil historical lexicography to pay attention to the meaning of words in their occurrences in isolation and in collocations. The argument will necessarily bring to the center of attention the polysemy of words historically and the importance of the annotated and commented texts that are critically edited.

Neela Manasa BHASKAR (Universität Hamburg) & Giovanni CIOTTI (Universität Hamburg): “Towards Standardisation? Sanskrit Words in 19th-Century Tamil Spelling”

19th-century Tamil prose is significant, and yet, underrepresented in scholarship. This talk aims to highlight the linguistic, semantic and orthographic changes that took place in the early 19th century that set into motion the modern, somewhat uniform format of Tamil writing. If one were to identify the first movement towards a more standardised way of writing Tamil prose, it was probably in the offices of the 'Madras School of Orientalism', a dichotomous colonial body of Tamil literary producers, patrons and pandits, represented by the College of Fort St. George under the auspices of Francis Whyte Ellis, and the Mackenzie Collection of manuscripts under Colin Mackenzie. Here, the British (or rather, pan-European) sensibility of 'good' writing was applied to Tamil scholars as they taught Tamil (as is in the former case), and composed histories of South India (as is in

the latter). At the same time, other pockets of Tamil scholarship maintained and developed their own ways of writing Tamil, such as in the case of the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition. In the transference of medium from palm-leaf to print (mostly in Grantha), editorial choices were made in order to streamline writing and writing styles. The primary question here would be to investigate on what basis these choices were made by editors, and if a comparison of the older and current media could reveal any answers. The presentation will focus on the usage of Sanskrit and the adaptation of Sanskrit loan-words into these two 'factories' of Tamil prose, for their significant presence reveal a great deal about the complex dynamics of Tamil standardisation.

Jean-Luc CHEVILLARD (Histoire des théories linguistiques, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris), “Taming Randomness and Exploring Open-endedness: Ancient Tamil Lexicographers at Work”

Following the advice given in the last *nūṛpā* of the *Uriyiyal*, 17th chapter in the *Tolkāppiyam*, several Centamiḷ scholars have compiled a number of those scholarly instruments which are frequently referred to now as *Nikaṇṭuka!* and which were, until the 19th century, memorized by many successive generations of Tamil students. Nowadays, however, these instruments have been dethroned – and even made to appear obsolete – by dictionaries where they only appear as last resource authorities, when the dictionary compilers have not been able to find a “better” authority for a meaning. This marginalized situation does not help modern explorers of Centamiḷ to understand what it really meant to live with the *Tivākaram* or with the *Cūṭāmaṇi Nikaṇṭu* as part of one’s mental equipment. The current presentation will be centered on the transitional period, when 19th-century Tamil scholars who had grown up with *Nikaṇṭu*-s as familiar companions took up the challenge of transforming them into books, and had to face a number of choices in that daunting task, such as choosing titles for individual *nūṛpā*-s or splitting the metrical form of those into a discrete list of items. In doing that, they were also occasionally tempted to reorganize the data to be transmitted. An analysis of the choices which they made and of the variation which we see in the MSS which precede those early 19th-century books might allow us to partly overcome the great divide which modernity has brought with itself.

Victor D’AVELLA (Faculty of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies, University of Oxford), “Examining Tamil *nikaṇṭus* alongside their Sanskrit Counterpart”

The premodern Tamil lexicographical tradition developed in the general mould of the Sanskrit *koṣas*, especially Amarasimha’s *Nāmaḷiṅgānuśāsana*, by listing the names for objects in the world organized by topic and subtopic. In addition, such works also contain sections on words that have multiple meanings. For example, chapter 11 in the *Tivākaram* (*orucorpalporuṭ peyartt’ tokuti*) provides a list of words that have multiple meanings (*pal-poru!*) much on the model of the third *varga* in the third *kāṇḍa* of the *Amarakoṣa*, the *nānārthavarga* (“group of polysemic words”). Although such works served a variety of purposes, including building basic vocabulary, they also formed an integral part of a poet’s training. The sections on polysemic words became increasingly important over the course of time as poets attempted to compose poems under ever more restrictive conditions ranging from basic *etukai* to bitextuality and the decadent *citrakāvya*, where it was necessary to squeeze as many meanings out of a word as possible. In my presentation I will exam such sections in the Tamil *nikaṇṭus* alongside their Sanskrit counterpart and then provide ex-

amples of their usage in the explanation of a few difficult poems from the commentary to the *Taṇṭiyalaṅkāram*.

Roland FERENCZI (LHAS Oriental Collection, Budapest), “On Ancient Tamil Waters: Shipping-related Terms in early Old Tamil Literature”

In the early Old Tamil Caṅkam literary compositions, there are several terms that refer to the shipping technology of the ancient Tamils. In this paper, I attempted to collect and evaluate all this data. Considering the 10+ terms used for various watercraft and their rigging, I collected the relevant references, ranked the number of attestations, listed the glosses of early traditional thesauri (such as the *Piṅkalam* and the *Tivākaram*) and medieval commentaries. Thus, in light of all this, I tried to reconstruct their early meanings. Finally, I attempted to draw some historical conclusions regarding the early shipping of the Tamils.

Nikolay GORDICHUK (Universität Hamburg), “Words for ‘Enemy’ in the Old Tamil of the First Millennium”

Old Tamil has numerous equivalents to the English word ‘enemy’, and a better understanding of their semantics and usage remains a desideratum. For this purpose, a list of Tamil terms for ‘enemy’ in bilingual Tamil-English dictionaries has been compiled. The next productive stage, albeit imperfect, is the digital corpus of Old Tamil texts (roughly from the first millennium), that has already been analysed for occurrences of the listed words, so that their frequency, study distribution and typical collocations within the corpus may be better understood. As the number of words for ‘enemy’ is large, synonyms may then be classified into several types based on their etymology, usage and frequency. My presentation will also contain a close reading of some relevant passages that are mainly from, but not exclusive to, the *Puṟapporu! Veṅpāmālai*, so that the existing list of words may be understood with more nuance.

Charles LI (Universität Hamburg), “Linking the two T’s: Tamil, Tibetan, & other Commentaries on the *Amarakoṣa*”

The *Amarakoṣa* or *Nāmaṅgānuśāsana*, the well-known Sanskrit lexicon, has been continuously translated, commented upon, and re-arranged for at least a millennium, in over a dozen languages, from Persian to Burmese to Tibetan. The commentaries are particularly interesting, given that they are highly intertextual — quoting, reusing, reinterpreting, and translating a common body of lexicographical scholarship. This gives us a rare opportunity to study concrete textual parallels between the various languages used in India and beyond, as well as to look at the evolution of their vocabularies over time.

Indra MANUEL (EFEO, Pondicherry), “Language of the *Paripāṭal* - Special Lexis”

The *Paripāṭal* is one of the anthologies belonging to the *Eṭṭuttokai* group in the Sangam literature. This anthology originally contained 70 poems. Of those which have survived twenty-two have been included in the main section of the *Paripāṭal* and along with these, under the title *Paripāṭal*

Tiraṭṭu, two full poems and some fragments preserved in the quotes in the *Tolkāppiyam* and the *Puṟattirattu* are added. Of the 24 full poems that have survived, seven are dedicated to Tirumāl, eight to Cevvēl, and nine to river Vaiyai. These poems were written by 13 poets. Each poem has a colophon which gives the poet's name, the music mode for the and the composer of that music.

The *Paripāṭal* is considered as belonging to the later Sangam period. Kamil Zvelebil says that it is separated from the earliest Sangam work by at least three centuries. According to S. Vaiyapuri Pillai this compilation should have risen around the 4th century. A. K. Ramanujan places this near the 6th century.

The *Kalittokai* which is also considered as belonging to the later Sangam period shares many motifs and expressions with the other *akam* anthologies and its difference from them is mainly in the use of Kali metre and certain linguistic features.

On the other hand, the *Paripāṭal* differs very much from the other anthologies in content, metre as well as language. Its religious content reflected in the songs on Tirumāl and Cevvēl stands much in contrast to the other anthologies where religious and Puranic details were incorporated only as similes. Even though the Vaiyai songs depicting the flooding water in the *vaiyai* during the monsoon and activities associated with that are taken as belonging to the *akam* genre, the correlation is simply in the general context of lovers uniting or sulking and does not follow the *kiḷavi* structure or its motifs of the other anthologies.

The language of the *Paripāṭal* is also unique in many aspects. It has specific vocabulary domains related to the religious sector, numeral system etc. Also, many new lexical items appear. It would be interesting to investigate how far these are shared among other Sangam anthologies and how they are carried through later on. Certain grammatical categories also find repeated use here that requires careful study. This paper intends to concentrate on these areas.

Erin MCCANN (Universität Hamburg), “Indexing the NTP: Observations and Challenges”

The NTP, generally agreed to have been composed between the 5th and 9th centuries C.E., presents a number of novel and challenging lexical items and grammatical forms. Given the sometimes opaque nature of the poetic verses, our current tools (i.e. the TL, DEDR, etc.) have at times proven inadequate. Tasked with compiling the grammatical and semantic information provided by a team of scholars working on the NTP, I have noticed two important features of the text. In this presentation I will discuss, on the one hand, a number of terms that appear to expand certain semantic fields and, on the other, some otherwise unattested and/or innovative grammatical forms.

K. NACHIMUTHU (EFEO, Pondicherry), “The Old Tamil Commentaries in the Making of Tamil Dictionaries for Classical Tamil”

Among the classical Tamil texts, only a few have old commentaries. These commentaries provide invaluable evidence to the modern lexicographer in preparing a descriptive or historical lexicon, with the goal of mapping semantics on the basis of glosses given by those commentaries. Such glosses help the lexicographer fix the lexical and grammatical meaning of ‘free’ words, lexicalised constructions and some bound forms such as particles and clitics. Similarly, grammatical forms, citations and descriptions stand as evidence for the historical usage and context for several words. Learned commentators like Nacciṇārkkiniyār, Aṭiyārkunallār, Parimēlaḷakar and others possessed sophisticated knowledge in the fields of syntax, semantics and intertextuality, enabling

them to shed light on the grammatical identity of words and identification of the lemma. This becomes clear from their accurate glosses. As they were well-informed in grammatical treatises (such as the *Uriyiyal* section of the *Tolkāppiyam*) and traditional lexicons (*nikaṇṭus*), they were adept at providing parallels. They were also aware of dialectal differences and special registers, and their knowledge of Sanskrit enriched their glosses. This presentation thus aims at describing and comparing the semantic developments through the eyes of the commentators, thus providing a modern evaluation of their work. It will talk specifically about the potential contribution of the commentaries by Maṇakkuṭavar and Parimēlaḷakar to the *Tirukkuraḷ*, and also that of Nacciṇār-kkiṇiyār on the *Pattuppāṭṭu*, *Kalittokai*, and others.

Leo Rishi NELSON-JONES (Universität Hamburg), “Some Interesting Lexicographical Questions from the *Tamiḷneri Viḷakkam*”

In this paper, I will give a brief overview of my current research under the auspices of the Tamilex project. I am working towards publishing a critical edition and annotated translation of the *Tamiḷneri Viḷakkam*, a late first-millennium *ilakkaṇam* treatise on *akam* poetics, and its anonymous commentary. In this early stage of my research, I have so far compiled the 176 example poems cited in the commentary. For the purpose of this presentation, I will show some interesting lexemes found in these poems as case-studies. These poems have never before been translated and the vast majority of them remains anonymous or unidentified. The lack of research into especially the commentary means that the scope of analysis is wide, and there is much to glean from its study even outside of examining just the purely lexicographical data. Potentially, something about the provenance of these poems and their dating may come to light. Of course, morphological and syntactic analyses are connected to this, but my presentation for this conference will focus only on some lexicographical questions I have. They fall into three vague categories: rare words, uncommon usages, and diachronic developments. I will also provide an example for each of these categories alongside the poems in which they are found.

T. RAJESHWARI (EFEO, Pondicherry), “Rare Words in the *Patirruppattu*”

Among the works of Caṅkam literature, the *Patirruppattu* is unique. There is an old commentary for this text, which comes with its own, specific challenges. It is neither a summary of the text, nor is it a word-by-word meaning. Instead, it is only a series of incomplete, fragmented notes. While these are invaluable in the understanding of the root text, understanding the notes themselves present a challenge. Moreover, there are many rare words found in the root-text that do not occur in other Tamil works. They also remain unrepresented in modern lexicons, such as the *Madras Tamil Lexicon*. My presentation is a closer look at the glosses made for the root-text, which changes the understanding through their provision of context. I will describe, with examples, the way in which some phrases in the *Patirruppattu* cannot be taken in their own direct meaning, but must be understood within a context that only the fragmentary notes may provide. Some of the occurrences that I will highlight are: 1. *‘oru pakal: orē camayam/orē nēra(til)’* (*Pati*. 3:7); 2. *patappar (pe.)* = sand fort (n.) (*Pati*. 30:18); 3. *veyil yukaḷ - veyilil parakkum aṇuttiraḷ. ciṛiya aḷavu* = very little (*Pati*. 20:6); 4. *kaṭal nīntiya maram (pe.). marakkalam: kappal* = ship. (*Pati*. 76:4).

Srilata RAMAN (University of Toronto), “Shifting Worlds: The *Nikaṇṭu*, Literature, and Lexicography in 19th-20th century Tamil India”

Tamil learning and pedagogy till the 19th century, and the life of a person of letters, was structured and cultivated by the memorization of specific texts, including portions of the collation of words called the *nikaṇṭus*. Yet, already by the mid-19th century, the inclusion and memorization of the *nikaṇṭus* in the elite world of those who composed and transmitted Tamil poetry – the *pulavars* and *vittuvāṅs* — had become increasingly rare, and was very shortly, by the last years of the 19th century, to become entirely obsolete. This talk seeks to address the question of what engendered the obsolescence of the *nikaṇṭu* works in colonial modernity. In doing so, it also attempts to address what this obsolescence meant for how one was, henceforth, to conceive of “Tamil” the language, “Tamil” the literature and the life of a modern person of letters and learning, as these issues came to the fore against the re-thinking of lexicographical practices in the 19th century world of South India.

S. SARAVANAN (EFEO, Pondicherry), “A few New Words and their Meanings in the *Nālaṭiyār*”

The *Nālaṭiyār* is one of the didactic works in classical Tamil that has 400 *veṇṇpā* verses. It is supposed to have been composed by Jain saints, and is only second to the *Tirukkuraḷ* in terms of its capacity to elucidate moral principles. This paper highlights the diversity of the attested meanings of certain words that occur in the *Nālaṭiyār* with different meanings compared with their occurrences in other texts. These words will be historically discussed with the help of modern dictionaries, traditional *nikaṇṭus* and Tamil literary texts. In the *Nālaṭiyār*, some words that are not present in other texts, such as *ammāṇai*, *iruntai*, *kappi*, and so forth, are discussed specifically, with relation to their occurrences in the *Madras Tamil Lexicon*, the *Shanthi Sadhana Dictionary* and the *Dravidian Etymological Dictionary*. Ancient *nikaṇṭus* such as the *Tivākaram*, *Piṅkalam* and *Cūṭāmaṇi* do not consistently describe such words. The fact that many Caṅkam and post-Caṅkam texts contain certain words, whose meanings then change in the *Nālaṭiyār* will also be discussed.

Anna SMIRNITSKAYA, “The *Tamil Lexicon* and the Database of Semantic Shifts. Can the Model of Semantic Shifts Help to Understand the Structure of Meanings of the Polysemous Tamil Word?”

Evidently, there are polysemous words in every dictionary, and the *Tamil Lexicon* is not an exception. On the contrary, the dictionary “entry” of the *Tamil Lexicon* usually displays a wide variety of meanings from a wide time range — from the meanings of Sangam Literature through all the history of a word to the meanings we have nowadays. Separating them is usually an almost impossible task. But still there is hope that the recent evolving of the theoretical apparatus of semantic shifts can help in its solution.

The semantic shift notion describes cognitive proximity between two meanings, whether it be realized as polysemy, morphological derivation, semantic evolution, cognates or borrowings. The *Catalogue of Semantic Shifts* (datsemshift.ru) aims to collect as much as possible shifts from different languages of the world. For now it contains more than 8000 shifts from more than 1200 languages, with approximately 300 realizations from Tamil.

For example, the verb விழு-தல் *viḷu* ‘to fall’ has 30 meanings in the Tamil Lexicon [TL: 3721], such as ‘to fall down’; ‘to descend’; ‘to fall low, decline’; ‘to set, as the sun’; ‘to be defeated or overthrown’ etc.:

- | | | | | |
|-----|--------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-------------|
| (1) | inta | maṇitaṅ | viḷu-ntu | pōṇāṅ |
| | this | man | fall-Vbp | go-Pst-3Sgm |
| | ‘This man died’ (lit. «fell»). | | | |
| (2) | piṭkāy-iṅ | matippu | \$37-ākavīl-nt-atu | |
| | bitcoin -Gen | price | 37-Adv fall- Pst-3Sgn | |
| | ‘The price of bitcoin fell by \$37.’ | | | |
| (3) | avaṅ | vākkuvātatt-il | viḷu-ntu-viṭṭ-āṅ | |
| | he | argument-Loc | fall-Vbp-leave-Pst-3Sgm | |
| | ‘He failed in an argument.’ | | | |

Some of these cases of polysemy are described in the Database of Semantic Shifts, these are: to fall down – to decrease drastically, ID 0342 in the Database; to fall down - to fail, ID 0592; to fall down - to die, ID 0975 (the same polysemy: உதிர்-தல் *utir-tal*); to fall down - to set (of heavenly bodies), ID 1319; to fall down - to happen, ID 0934 etc. Aside from Tamil, they are registered in other languages of the world too. This description helps us understand the structure of polysemy of this word.

In the presentation we will consider examples of Tamil Lexicon polysemous “entries” and their representation in the Database of Semantic Shifts.

Margherita TRENTO (Centre d’études sud-asiatiques et himalayennes, École des hautes études en sciences sociales, Paris) & Jean-Luc CHEVILLARD (Histoire des théories linguistiques, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris), “Beschi’s *Caturakarāti* as a Bridge between Traditional *nikaṅṭus* and Modern Lexicographers of Tamil”

Costanzo Giuseppe Beschi (1680–1747), who is well-known for his *Caturakarāti* (CA) (1732), was, in a way, a predecessor of Tamilex (and many others). He had studied traditional Tamil *nikaṅṭus*, and was mostly faithful to them, but also introduced changes — chiefly, the alphabetical order. His important role was recognised by Louis Savinien Dupuis (1806–1874), one of the first editors of the CA, by the Orientalist Julien Vinson (1843-1926), and by the editor of the *Tamil Lexicon* Vaiyāpuri Piḷḷai (1891–1956). After reviewing their evaluations, we will turn to the new possibilities offered by the tools of Digital Humanities for comparisons (and critical editions), between the CA and earlier lexicons, and between different versions of the CA. We will then concentrate on possible simultaneous paths to be followed in the direction of a critical study and edition of the two very early manuscripts of the CA preserved in the Bibliothèque nationale de France (BNF) as Indien 227 and 228–229. We will present our attempts at linking Beschi’s CA with its sources whenever possible, especially the *Tivākaram*; at examining silent emendations in the editions of 1819 and 1824; and at examining the explicit corrections suggested in the 1824 appendices, and the consolidated corrections in the later editions.

V. VIJAYAVENUGOPAL (EFEO, Pondicherry), “On Understanding the Grammar/Language and Meaning of the *Puṛaṇāṅṭu*”

My paper addresses certain specific issues that occurred during my editorial work on the *Puṛaṇāṅṭu*. I first try to determine what ‘fixing’ a text entails. This is based on my understanding

of the nature of the text — it is a compilation of several different textual sources from various time-periods, and thus contains many linguistic and poetic variations. Additionally, I discuss the challenges of editing colophons. They consist of an amalgam of author-names, patron-names, and the problems associated with ambiguities regarding the same. As a matter of understanding the semantic aspects of the text, I also touch upon traditional Tamil poetics, and compare their insights with my readings of this text. Here, sentence structure is important to recognise, for it is not always straightforward. Finally, I talk about the development of the content of the various strands of textual sources I have consulted in my research. I talk specifically about the historical development of morphological categories.

Maanasa VISWESWARAN (Universität Hamburg), “Semantics in the *Pattuppāṭṭu*: Indo-Aryan Loans, Isolated Occurrences, and Semantic Developments”

Ascertaining the meaning of words in Caṅkam literature is no easy feat. This can be attributed to the fact that Caṅkam texts had mostly fallen into obscurity for a couple of centuries. Scholars who ‘rediscovered’ them in the 19th century had medieval commentaries at their disposal, but lacked access to a living tradition of exegesis. As for the second hyper-anthology, namely the *Pattuppāṭṭu*, we simply have the advantage of Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar’s 14th commentary, while for the *Tirumurukāṛruppaṭai* alone, we have five medieval commentaries (including that of Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar). Additionally, in the printed editions, we also have U. Vē. Cāminātaiyar’s helpful footnotes and indices, which provide parallels and glosses to difficult words (*arum patam*) respectively. As such, there is no dearth of navigational aids for the *Pattuppāṭṭu*, and yet, even in the face of other semantic possibilities, commentators’ glosses are often taken as indisputable, which then leads to them being the basis for further lexical entries in 20th century lexica (TL and DEDR). Cāminātaiyar too, more often than not, accepts Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar’s interpretations, providing further examples (often from younger texts) that concretise a particular meaning for a word. As such, in the making of a revised *Tamil Lexicon*, an imminent task is a re-investigation into the meanings of words, derivations and their lexical entries, for which a systematic semantic analysis is crucial. In order to provide a sample of such an undertaking, I shall present some examples from three of the *Pattuppāṭṭu* texts, namely the *Tirumurukāṛruppaṭai*, *Cirupāṇāṛruppaṭai* and *Neṭunalvāṭai*. We shall consider some examples of Indo-Aryan loans, isolated occurrences and semantic developments.

Eva WILDEN (Universität Hamburg), “Tamilex: Why a New Tamil Dictionary and what Could It Look Like?”

When having a closer look at the current lexicographical resources, we find, firstly, those with a wider scope – such as the *Tamil Lexicon* (TL), the *Dravidian Etymological Dictionary* (DED), and the *Varalāṛrumūrait Tamil Ilakkīyap Pērakarāti* (VAMTIPA) – and, secondly, corpus indexes such as have been produced in Trivandrum in the 1960s and, in recent years, by project Caṅkam and by NETamil. The current presentation will reflect on the goals and objectives that guided the huge dictionary projects of the 20th century and outline a new set of objectives that can be reasonably achieved within the new technological setup.

Put in a nutshell, the TL aimed at depicting the totality of the Tamil language, written and spoken, the DED was interested in morpho-semantic differentiation on the basis of that given material, the VAMTIPA narrowed down the source material to Tamil literature from the beginning up to 1800, but widened the semantic scope in order to document variety instead of trying to systemise.

Neither of them, however, was interested in distribution and statistics: they make no difference between a word or meaning that appear only once and a perfectly normal word that appears hundreds of times with a stable meaning. Moreover, they totally blank out the considerable amount of variance that can be observed within the transmission of the single texts, thus doing away with morphological, semantic and dialectal variety. It will be up to us, Tamilex, to demonstrate what difference a fully tagged electronic corpus of critical editions and quantitative analysis can make.