

Subject: Comments on L2/17-241

Date: 2017-07-26 (originally written on 2017-07-25)

To: UTC

From: Jaemin Chung

Pages: 2

L2/17-248

1. Provide evidence from published materials or the encoding will not happen. The Unicode Standard is not a place for making progress. It is the outcome of the realized progress.
2. The encoding of 11172 precomposed hangul syllables in Unicode is primarily due to the legacy character set known as KS X 1001 (formerly KS C 5601). KS X 1001 encoded 2350 frequently used hangul syllables as characters. But since those 2350 are not sufficient for modern Korean and since it was impossible to automatically get the correct components (jamo) from a precomposed syllable (and there *were* errors in the hand-crafted decomposition mappings in Unicode 1.1; see L2/17-080), Unicode and ISO/IEC 10646 decided to encode all the 11172 possible modern hangul syllables in a completely systematic order. If there was no legacy character set that encoded hangul syllables as characters, then there might have been no precomposed hangul syllables in Unicode. In short, the issue regarding your new hangul jamo (and syllables) is different from that regarding the precomposed 11172 hangul syllables in Unicode.
3. There were some hangul additions after 1996. In 2006 or 2007, the Korean National Body proposed to add additional 117 archaic hangul jamo, and those jamo were added in Unicode 5.2 (October 2009). The KATS even published the KS X 1026-1 standard (hangul processing guide for information interchange) based on those additions (therefore, “KATS had nothing to do with Hangul Unicode last twenty five years” is not correct). And those 117 archaic jamo were encoded because they were backed by actual usage from the past, unlike your proposal (and unlike other attempts to add *new* hangul jamo letters that were *not* used in the past).
4. There are already fonts that can combine Unicode hangul jamo (at U+1100–U+11FF, U+A960–U+A97F, and U+D7B0–U+D7FF; note that there are two additional blocks for hangul jamo) into syllables. HCR Dotum/Batang LVT and Source Han Sans/Serif are such fonts that are freely available online. Therefore, no more precomposed hangul syllables are needed today.
5. Simplified Chinese characters are “officially standardized” by the government of China (in other words, they are required by the Chinese government). Your new hangul jamo cannot be compared to them.
6.
  - 1) Adding a new hangul jamo is an invention, as you are introducing a new one that was not used in the past in hangul. It does not matter whether it is borrowed from another writing system or newly created. And why do R, V, and Z keep the same forms but not F? Yes, you *are* inventing new hangul jamo, especially for the [f] sound.
  - 2) And what if someone disagrees with the forms you are proposing? In fact, in 2007, someone created a ㄹ-like jamo for the [f] sound, a ㅂ-like jamo for the [v] sound, and a ㅍ-like jamo for the [ð] sound (see <http://news.donga.com/3/all/20071019/8502058/1>). This shows that there are no agreements on the forms of newly created jamo for non-Korean sounds (of course, since such new jamo are created by individuals who are not related to each other).
7. Again, why consonant sounds only? Why are you discriminating against vowel sounds? As I wrote in L2/17-126, there are some English vowel sounds that cannot be accurately written in hangul. The English words *bin* [bɪn] and *bean* [bi:n] have different vowel sounds, and the [ɪ] sound in the former cannot be accurately written in hangul. The vowel sound [ɔ] (English ⟨aw⟩ in *awful*) cannot be accurately written in hangul either – it is neither ㅓ nor ㅗ. Why are these not in your proposal? Why are you disregarding vowel sounds?

8. Prove this: “The Koreans are getting frustrated when they have to use “Fast” for the sound of “Past” in Korean writing. That is why Koreans eager to have the additions in Korean.”
9. You wrote “The encoding cannot be the preference for only certain person or company.” But your proposal is solely based on your preference for only (or for mainly) you.
10. About Section D
  - 1) About d1: The necessity of the additional vowel — clearly shows that it is impossible to accurately write English sounds in hangul.
  - 2) About d2 and d3: Again, if your proposal is accepted, then Korean speakers who know foreign languages other than English will definitely complain (and will make proposals for the sounds in those languages), since it is unfair to only cover English. Even though English is the de facto international language today, keep in mind that English is not the only language in this world and that not all loanwords in Korean are from English. Adding new hangul jamo only for English sounds is discrimination against other languages.
  - 3) About d4: People still need to handwrite sometimes.
11. This comment was contributed by who preferred not to be named:

The authors of L2/17-241, as they prominently express, claim that the borrowing of individual jamos should not count as an invention. This claim is in direct contradiction to the written history of Hangul.

While Hangul had been occasionally used for writing languages other than Korean throughout its history, consonantal jamos are mostly (if not always) made of other jamos and not borrowed from other scripts. For example there had been now obsolete jamos for distinguishing different kinds of sibilants in Chinese languages, but they are constructed by lengthening one stroke of corresponding jamos (e.g. ㄱ became ㄲ or ㅋ), not by borrowing (and probably simplifying) from, for example, Chinese characters. This observation can be partially attributed to the featural design of jamos.

Therefore one can conclude that any “borrowed” jamos should be deliberate additions, in the other words, inventions. It can be argued that their use is a more recent phenomenon, but then it would be too early to encode them anyway.

(End of document)