

Source:	TianHeng Shen(沈天珩, aka CheonHyeong Sim)
Title:	<b>FEEDBACK</b> for <i>V–source Glyph and Codes Updates</i>
Subtitle:	Objection to the Glyph Change of U+237C3
Status:	Individual Contribution on IRG #59
Action:	To be considered by IRG and Việt Nam

In IRGN2556, Việt Nam proposed to change the glyph of U+237C3 from 𣎵木夢 (aka 𣎵木𣎵苗夕) to 𣎵木𣎵苗歹. First let’s see the previous versions of the glyph of U+237C3:



Figure 1 The Previous Versions of U+237C3 from zi.tools

We can see that, before Unicode5.1, the single column charts showed the one with 歹, but from Unicode5.2, the V–source glyph was fixed to the one with 夕(the style of 夕 is not important here), and from Unicode6.1, the V–source glyph was changed back to the one with 歹, while from Unicode11.0, it was fixed to the one with 夕 for the 2<sup>nd</sup> time.

We can learn from that that Việt Nam wants to change back the glyph for the 2<sup>nd</sup> time, and their reason is to distinguish it from U+2C13A, move the original V–source V2–796F to U+2C13A, and change the V–source on U+237C3 to VN–F20C2. Then I will elaborate the reasons why I object to changing the glyph back.

Firstly, it seems to be very unfriendly to the font designers due to the frequent changes. We sincerely hope that the glyph would be stable.

Secondly, we can see that many of the characters mentioned in the original proposal are half–duplicate characters(that means, some of the glyphs on a codepoint are the

same as all the glyphs on another codepoint). But U+237C3 is not a "half-duplicate" from U+2C13A but a "duplicate" since the UCS2003 was moved from the CodeCharts. So after moving V2-796F to U+2C13A, adding VN-F20C2 to U+237C3 is not a "horizontal extension" but a "new addition". Actually even the evidence from the original proposal(Page 6) only shows the one with 夕 but no evidence refers to the one with 𠂇, I think it is not good to create a non-existent glyph out of thin air just to force a distinction. What is obvious is that the form 𠂇苗一𠂇 is extremely rare than 夢, if the form actually exists, I hope Việt Nam could give out the corresponding evidence, or I think keep both U+237C3 and U+2C13A as 𠂇木夢 would be better, because there are many duplicate characters in Unicode due to the issues left over from history.

(End of document)