

ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/WG2/IRG N**2556**—response to 2556R

Date 2022–10–04

Source:	TianHeng Shen(沈天珩, aka CheonHyeong Sim)
Title:	RESPONSE to IRGN2556R
Subtitle:	About the Glyph Changes of U+237C3 and U+25873
Status:	Individual Contribution on IRG #59
Action:	To be considered by IRG and Việt Nam

For U+237C3, I submitted an objection in the FEEDBACK in May. I hoped that Việt Nam could give out an evidence of the 𠂇 one, but in the later 2556R, Việt Nam still could not.

The pictures in 2556R are still the old version of Unicode. We can clearly see that, since Unicode14.0, the UCS2003 column in CJK–ExtB has been removed, but in 2556R the column still exists. For now, U+237C3 has and only has a single V–source. If we move V2–796F from U+237C3 to U+2C13A, then U+237C3 will have no source on it. In this situation, adding a “new character” with no evidence on a codepoint without any existing sources seems to be very worrisome -- although from the glyphs themselves, they are unifiable. I seriously do not hope this absurd decision to be made.

If the initiator of evil of this kind of decision appears, then for example, U+23040 and U+27959 are also a pair of duplication (both 𠂇咸咸角支) with complementary sources, then we assume that one day T–source proposes to move T5–7B69 to U+23040, and privately created a 𠂇咸咸角女 or a 𠂇咸咸角支 with no evidence to encode it on U+27959, could this decision really be accepted? If so, this may become a way to deal with all the duplications -- but it seems more like to be a joke.

For U+25873, my suggestion is to move it to U+2585E if the glyph change is made. There are two reasons. Firstly, the original evidence of U+2585E (GKX–0858.17) is

like 替, whose structure is closer to the new V–source glyph than U+25873's structure, and, the bottom part is 𠂇, which is the same as the new V–source glyph,

although the G–source glyph on this codepoint is normalized; Secondly, VS18 替 of U+2585E submitted by Hanyo–Denshi is almost the same as the new V–source glyph. It will not be a wrong decision to keep it on U+25873, but it seems to be a better decision to move it to U+2585E. This operation is similar as the movements of V1–4B79 (from U+5098 to U+20302) etc.

(End of document)