


1. Unifications

Serial No.	Source Ref.	Response
00456	UK-02821	<p>Disagree to unification with U+2219E. They are non-cognate and have two different entries in 《汉语方言大词典》 (p. 5877 and p. 6382 shown below). The two characters have the same phonetic element (开) so have the same pronunciation, but they have different semantic elements. U+2219E means “小束”, and its semantic element is “束”. On the other hand, the evidence for UK-02821 shows it is a measure word used in the book <i>Riyong suzi</i> 《日用俗字》 written by Pu Songling 蒲松龄.</p> <p><b>策</b> *jiǎn ㄐㄧǎㄣˇ &lt;量&gt;箔的计算单位。冀鲁官话。山东。《蒲松龄集·日用俗字·泥瓦章》：“一间只有箔三～，或扎稔子更拖泥。”</p> <p><b>策</b> jiǎn ㄐㄧǎㄣˇ ①&lt;动&gt;捆扎。吴语。浙江宁波。陈训正《甬谚名谓辑记》：“～，小束也。今俗称约略束物曰～。”②&lt;量&gt;束。⊖胶辽官话。山东临朐。1935年《临朐续志》：“俗谓麻一束曰一～。”⊖西南官话。贵州。许庄叔《黔雅·释器用》：“今通言一束物曰一～。”⊖吴语。浙江定海。</p>
01126	UK-01489	<p>Disagree to unification with U+221B5 or U+2AA8A as they are non-cognate and have different glyph shapes. UK-01489 is a variant of U+6CBB 治, whereas U+221B5 and U+2AA8A are both variants of 約 (as shown by the CNS11643 website).</p>
01416	UK-02632	<p>Agree to disunification. As shown in IRGN2108 UK-02632 and U+2BF4A are not cognate and have different glyph shapes. Therefore we request to add UK-02632 back to WS2015, and include it in the CJK Ext. G submission.</p>
02341	UK-01583	<p>Disagree to unification with UK-01622. There is no rule to support this unification.</p>
02393	UK-01584	<p>Disagree to unification with U+80B0 as 月 and 匀 are not unifiable components.</p>

## UK Response to Consolidated Comments on IRGN2269 WS2015 v. 5.0

Serial No.	Source Ref.	Response
02541	UK-01392	<p>Disagree to unification with U+7544 or U+2C3BF as they are non-cognate and have different glyph shapes. UK-01392 is a variant of 甫, (see page 6 of 《西周粮田考》 written by 裘锡圭 <a href="https://max.book118.com/html/2017/0505/104557308.shtm">https://max.book118.com/html/2017/0505/104557308.shtm</a>). On the other hand U+7544 is a variant of 留, and U+2C3BF is a variant of 曾 (see 《殷周金文字宝》 written by 王宏源).</p> <p style="text-align: center;">  <sup>2C3BF</sup> 曾字之省。在甫疆自，在曾、鄂師次。         </p>
02543	UK-01520	<p>Disagree to unification with U+753E or U+7544 as they are non-cognate and have different glyph shapes. The evidence is clear that UK-01520 is a variant of 畎, which is non-cognate with U+753E and U+7544.</p>

UK Response to Consolidated Comments on IRGN2269 WS2015 v. 5.0

03677	UK-01430	<p>Disagree to unification with U+2C7CF as the two characters are not cognate. U+2C7CF is a variant of U+2A4D4 龍 and 虯 meaning “horned dragon”. 《漢語大字典》：同「虯」。《廣雅·釋魚》：「有角曰龍龍。」王念孫疏證：「虯與龍同。」《集韻·幽韻》：「虯，《說文》：『龍子有角者。』或作龍。」 On the other hand UK-01430 is an archaic form of 秋 “autumn”, and originally represented a kind of insect.</p> <p>There are additional sources that show UK-01430, for example 《篆隸萬象名義》 and 歐陽詢: 《藝文類聚》（文淵閣四庫全書本），卷六十四, P. 9:</p> <p>形声字。甲骨文作“𠂔”，即《万象名义》卷二十五之“𠂔”字，象形。其本义是一种昆虫，甲骨文中假借为“秋”。或添加了“火”旁作“𠂔”形。此即《说文》籀文之“𠂔”字。战国文字中多省文作“秋”，或添加了“日”旁。甲骨文：“戊寅卜，宾贞：今秋吾方其征于饗。”（《合集》6352）《说文》：“秋，禾谷孰也。从禾，𠂔省声。𠂔，籀文不省。”或以为“秋”是会意字。由于秋季收割后要烧荒以备播种，故从禾，从火会意。甲骨文中习见“今秋”，多是指季节之“秋”。从天文历法上说，秋是一年四季中夏后冬前的季节，但是甲骨文中只有春秋，没有冬夏。秋天又是收获的季节，故《说文》云“禾谷孰（熟）也”。《书·盘庚》：“若衣服田力穡，乃亦有秋。”又引申为“时机”、“时候”之义。又音训为“愁”等。同时它也是“鞦（秋）韁（千）”之“鞦”的简化字。（王志平）</p>
-------	----------	--

它部

非 文畏及非

龜 如何及地、異

宛 破文婿、元用龍

龜 居遠及腐、貨  
金古文

龜 之龜及龜

電部

電 莫耿及蟻

屬 力振及虎

宛 時遮及地

龜部

龜 人三及甲、綠甲邊

龜 寺傑及虬、龍元角

電 同上





1307

Serial No.	Source Ref.	Response
		<p>而成門籍外扉而為戶既取陰於庭樾又因籬於芳杜  草則蘋萍芡芰菁藻蕙菰石衣海髮黃荇綠蒲動紅荷  於輕浪覆碧葉於澄湖其陸卉則紫萐綠施天薯山韭  鴈齒麋舌牛唇蕤首若乃園宅殊制田圃異區李衡則  橘林千樹石崇則雜果萬株竝豪情之所侈非儉志之  所娛欲令紛披蓊鬱吐綠攢朱開丹房以四照舒翠葉  而九衢其林鳥則翻泊頡頏遺音下上楚雀多名流鶯  雜響或斑尾而綺翼或綠衿而絳穎好葉隱而枝藏乍</p> <p>藝文類聚 九</p>

# UK Response to Consolidated Comments on IRGN2269 WS2015 v. 5.0

Serial No.	Source Ref.	Response
04396	KC-04205	<p>KC-04205 should not be unified with U+2E86E 銖 as 未 wèi and 末 mò are not normally unifiable components, and in this case the two characters are non-cognate, and have different phonetic components.</p> <p>U+2E86E was used for an unknown chemical element before 1949, and this Chinese character was named as “未知” (“unknown”) so has 未 wèi on the right.</p> <p>On the other hand, 銖 末 was used in Thailand in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century for the currency unit Baht, pronounced <i>puak</i>, and so has 末 mò (entering tone) on the right as a phonetic. See Chen Lijun 陈丽君, 泰”銖”释疑 (An Explanation of Thailand Monetary “銖”) in <i>Journal of Radio &amp; TV University (Philosophy &amp; Social Sciences)</i> 2011.3:</p> <p>[摘要] 泰国 19 世纪的银币单位 <i>Tical</i> 为 <i>Baht</i> 取代后, 华人针对 <i>Baht</i> 发明音译字“金末”读为“<i>Puak</i>”。因此字不见于中国, 改为“銖”。厦门方言中“抹”“沫”“末”均读 <i>buat</i> 与 <i>Baht</i> 发音接近; 泰王朝创建钱币时直接引用中国钱币“銖”作主币衡量计值单位, 故读“<i>Puak</i>”的“金末”自然改为“銖”。</p> <p>[关键词] 泰国货币; 銖; 考证; 金末</p> <p>[中图分类号] J028 [文献标识码] A [文章编号] 1008-0597(2011)03-0081-02</p> <p><b>Abstract:</b> While silver monetary unit “<i>Tical</i>” of 19th century replaced by “<i>Baht</i>”, the Chinese people in Thailand invented a transliterated character “銖” pronouncing “<i>Puak</i>” to refer to “<i>Baht</i>”, not existed in Chinese it was changed to character “銖”. Not in Xiamen dialect “抹”“沫”“末” pronounced “<i>buat</i>” is similar to “<i>Puak</i>” but Chinese currency “銖” is regard as a count – value unit of master currency when Thai Dynasty established currency, “銖 (read as “<i>Puak</i>”) is transferred to “銖” naturally.</p> <p>The two characters also occur as Zhuang characters with different readings and meanings. See <i>Zhuang Proverbs from China</i> 《中国壮族谚语》 (广州世界图书出版广东有限公司, 2015) pages 23 and 306:</p> <p>On p. 23 U+2E86E 銖 銖 末 is pronounced <i>myaex</i> in Zhuang and means 锈 in Chinese, and or “rust” in English — 末 is the phonetic.</p> <div data-bbox="544 1285 1513 1581" style="background-color: #f0f0f0; padding: 10px;"> <p>Cauq <b>myaex</b> bungz hek, vaq dek bungz doengz.</p> <p><b>銖</b> 鏜恪, 禡嚟鏜同。</p> <p>锅头生锈碰客人, 裤子破裂碰老同。</p> </div> <p>On p. 306 銖 末 is pronounced <i>mwt</i> in Zhuang and means 钝 in Chinese, or “blunt” in English — 末 is the phonetic.</p> <div data-bbox="544 1688 1513 1984" style="background-color: #f0f0f0; padding: 10px;"> <p>Van <b>mwt</b> lai bag mbouj ndaej fwenz, vah ndongj lai hab mbouj ndaej vunz.</p> <p><b>鏜</b> 糶擗否菘杖, 吡糶糶否菘佗。</p> <p>斧太钝劈不了柴, 话太硬合不得人。</p> </div>

## UK Response to Consolidated Comments on IRGN2269 WS2015 v. 5.0

Serial No.	Source Ref.	Response
05325	UK-02441	<p>Disagree to unification with U+2CE0F as they are non-cognate and have different glyph shapes. UK-02441 is the simplified form of U+9D56 written 鷓 or 鷓 pronounced bī. U+2CE0F is the simplified form of U+2A05C, pronounced láng. The phonetic elements on the left side of each character have different readings and are not unifiable.</p> <p>  說文·鳥部</p> <p>《說文》：“鷓，𪗇鷓也。从鳥，自聲。”朱駿聲通訓定聲：“《爾雅·釋鳥》：‘鷓鴣，戴鷓。’按：當從《說文》作𪗇鷓。”</p> <p>bī 《廣韻》彼及切，入緝幫。又居輒切。緝部。 〔𪗇鷓〕見“𪗇”。</p> <p> “鷓”的类推简化字。</p> <p> 【鷓】 lóng ㄌㄨㄥˊ</p> <p>【鷓鴣】〈名〉鷓。古方言。《方言》第八：“鷓，自关而东，周郑之郊，韩魏之都谓之~。”清钱绎笺疏：“《广雅》：~，鷓也。是~为鷓之总名。”</p>

### 2. Radicals

Serial No.	Source Ref.	Response
02823	UK-01453	Disagree. Leave the radical as 111 矢 as this is the most obvious radical.
03582	UK-02801	Disagree. The radical of the corresponding traditional form U+2B239 輦 is 140 艸 so UK-029801 should also be 140.
01142	UK-01732	Agree.
02393	UK-01584	Disagree. It is difficult for end users to search for this character if the radical is changed to 130 肉.

# UK Response to Consolidated Comments on IRGN2269 WS2015 v. 5.0

## 3. Evidence

Serial No.	Source Ref.	Response
00047	UK-02962	<p>It is derived from a Khitan character, but this character is not attested in Khitan texts and so cannot be encoded in the Khitan script. The use of this character in Chinese texts shows that it has been assimilated into the Han script, and its encoding is analogous to the encoding in Ext. B of corrupt forms of four Tangut characters. See detailed explanation on page 3 of IRGN2107Proposal.pdf:</p> <p><b>Justification for Encoding UTC-02962 and UTC-02963</b></p> <p>UTC-02962 𐰇 and UTC-02963 𐰈 are different versions of the same Khitan character meaning "main army", which are quoted in Song dynasty Chinese-language historical sources. These characters are not attested in any known Khitan Large Script inscriptions, and may well not accurately reflect the correct Khitan Large Script form of the character, and so would probably not be candidates for encoding in a future Khitan Large Script block. The two characters are only found embedded in Chinese texts, and can be considered to have been assimilated into the Chinese script, as they are written in the same style as the surrounding Chinese characters (see Figs. 1704 and 1705).</p> <p>Scholars studying Khitan history need to be able to represent the Chinese historical texts using these characters in Unicode, and we believe that encoding these two particular characters as CJK unified ideographs is the most appropriate way of dealing with them. We do not intend for this to set a precedent for encoding Khitan Large Script characters attested in Khitan inscriptions as CJK unified ideographs.</p> <p>This situation is similar to the case of the four characters 𐰇𐰈𐰉𐰊 in Ext. B, which are corrupted forms of the Tangut characters 𐰇𐰈𐰉𐰊 shown on a Tangut coin in the Song dynasty numismatic work <i>Quán Zhì</i> 泉志 by Hong Zun 洪遵, and later included in the <i>Kangxi Dictionary</i>.</p>
01512	UK-01624	We confirm that the character is correct.
01559	UK-01555	Disagree. The evidence is correct.
02111	UK-01533	Disagree. Although partially illegible, this transcription form is used by several scholars of ancient Chinese texts, and so is required for encoding.
02387	UK-01480	Agree.

## 4. Glyphs

Serial No.	Source Ref.	Response
00047	UK-02962	Agree.
00569	UK-01651	Agree.
01205	UK-01482	Agree with Henry, and UK has requested to update the font.



## UK Response to Consolidated Comments on IRGN2269 WS2015 v. 5.0

Serial No.	Source Ref.	Response
01322	UK-01467	Agree with Henry, and UK has requested to update the font.
01680	UK-01747	Agree.
01685	UK-02755	Agree.
01732	UK-01380	Disagree. UK has updated the evidence in Page 17 of <a href="http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/irg/irg47/IRGN2155_UK_ReviewP2.pdf">http://appsrv.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/~irg/irg/irg47/IRGN2155_UK_ReviewP2.pdf</a> .
01824	UK-01538	Agree.
03349	UK-01402	Agree.
03658	UK-01562	Agree.
03677	UK-01430	Disagree.
04254	UK-01460	Agree.
04505	UK-02827	Agree.
04801	UK-01598	Agree.
04907	UK-02310	Agree with Henry, and UK has requested to update the font.
04909	UK-02312	Agree with Henry, and UK has requested to update the font.
05315	UK-02432	Agree with Henry, and UK has requested to update the font.
05329	UK-02445	Agree with Henry, and UK has requested to update the font.
05330	UK-02445	Agree with Henry, and UK has requested to update the font.
05372	UK-02483	Agree with Henry & Eiso, and UK has requested to update the font.

### 5. SC and TS

Agree with all the comments except J comments on 03658 (UK-01562) and 04318 (UTC-01312).

For UTC-01312, the stroke count is correct as 长 has 4 strokes.

For UK-01562, the stroke count is correct as 辛 has 7 strokes 臣 has 6 strokes, 13 in total.

### 6. IDS

Agree with all the comments except SAT comment on 01560 (UK-01599), H comment on 03503 (UK-01659), and T comment on 04917 (UK-01551).

## UK Response to Consolidated Comments on IRGN2269 WS2015 v. 5.0

### 7. Record errors

Serial No.	Source Ref.	Response
03555	UK-01950	Disagree.

### 8. T/S

Serial No.	Source Ref.	Response
01497	UK-01505	Disagree. There is no corresponding character 醫支, and 医 is not a simplification of 醫 in this case.
05207	UK-02565	Agree.
05215	UK-02573	Agree.