L2/25-050

Source:	CheonHyeong Sim (沈天珩)		
Title:	Request to Move KP1-5FBF to U+2544B		
Date:	2025-01-18		
Action:	To be considered by CJK & Unihan WG and UTC		

This document requests to move KP1-5FBF (硁) from U+7841 (硁) to U+2544B (硁).



Generally,  $\underline{2}$  and  $\underline{3}$  could be unified since they are both simplified froms of  $\underline{9}$  (the former one is Chinese-simplified form, while the latter one is Japanese-simplified form). However,  $\underline{3}$  is also a traditional component (e.g. in  $\underline{1}$ ) or the Chinese-simplified form of  $\underline{9}$  (e.g. in  $\underline{9}$ ), in these cases, it could not be unified with  $\underline{3}$ .

For this particular case, 硁 (kēng in Chinese; kyŏng in Korean) is the Chinese-simplified form of 硜, while 硁 (guài in Chinese; koe in Korean) is a traditional character with some variants 蓯, 碇, ॡ, etc. Thus the separate encoding is necessary and correct. KP1– 5FBF looks similar but different to both 硁 and 硁. In KPS 10721, the characters with the same radical and the same residual strokes are arranged in phonetic order. To determine what KP1–5FBF really is, we may have a look at the pronunciation.

KP1-5FBD	KP1–5FBE	KP1–5FBF	KP1-5FC0	KP1-5FC1
砢	砖	硁	砮	硌
kyŏng	koe	koe	no	tong

KPS 10721 reconstructed by CheonHyeong Sim

If KP1-5FBF is a variant of U+7841, i.e. its pronunciation would be *kyŏng*, then it should not be placed between *koe* and *no* (it is even obvious that *kyŏng* comes before *koe*). Thus it would more likely to be a variant of U+2544B, which could ideally fit the phonetic order.

What we have done before (ref. L2/22-238 and L2/22-247 (P50)) is to move KP1-50FB (浫), KP1-5B5D (宮) and KP1-7EF4 (酦) to the correct codepoints according to their pronunciations. Hence, personally I think that we have the right also to move KP1-5FBF to the correct codepoint since the rationale is provided.

(End of document)