Response to L2/24-126 (CheonHyeong Sim's Comments on L2/24-125)

To: CheonHyeong Sim
From: Gen Kojitani(genkjtn@gmail.com)

Date: 2024-06-02

Response to L2/24-126 (CheonHyeong Sim's feedback to my proposal L2/24-125)

First of all, thank you for your detailed feedback on my proposal document. I will provide my thoughts on each section of your feedback.

Single-source charaers

I completely agree with the points you have made. As I cannot deny the possibility that the words that have only one source (i.e., the background is gray in the table of L2/24-125) were invented within the source 『一九六五〜一九七五年度頃の略字』, I will consider **further investigation of the usage** or **deleting them** from the proposal.

Cursive forms

I completely agree with your points here as well. **I will remove** from the proposed document anything that can be considered merely cursive style (such as 御, 前, and 揃).

Similar shapes with Han Ideographs

I generally agree with this, but I have one question. As you pointed out, I think that many of the **Han-Katakana Letters**, including U+1AFB5 (⬚辶チ) and U+1AFB6 (⬚辶ト), and the **Han-Hangul Hybrid Letters** should be considered as normal CJK Unified Ideographs, as I did in my previous proposal **L2/23-139** (e.g. ⬚广マ/⬚尸ソ).

However, I recall that ⬚木キ (an abbreviation of the character 機, widely used in Japan) was **rejected** by UTC at the time of the draft of L2/23-139 because "the third stroke of the right-component キ does not exist in normal CJK Unified Ideographs." I think this issue needs to be discussed.

Whether to use combining marks

Regarding this, <u>there are some points I do not agree with</u>.

U+1AFAC (􀀀言コ) and U+1AFAE (􀀀言ゴ) are not just different in pronunciation, but are also commonly used as abbreviations of the separate characters "講" and "護", respectively, and have different meanings. For example, when considering compatibility in document searches or web searches, it is preferable to search for 􀀀言コ as "講" and 􀀀言ゴ as "護", but if the use of combining voiced kana voicing marks is permitted, 􀀀言ゴ <u>may be mistakenly detected when searching for "講"</u>. Your sample of "不" does not have a difference in meaning (both means 'not') and appears to simply represent a difference in sound (between 'fu' and 'bu'), so it seems different from the this case.

Additionally, for U+1AFA8 (􀀀言ギ), U+1AFB8 (􀀀ド寸), U+1AFB9 (􀀀􀀀ド), etc., **there are no samples** in which the versions without the kana voicing marks are used, so I believe it is inappropriate to register the versions without the kana voicing marks in UTC.

In addition, for 􀀀􀀀ド in particular, <u>the kana voicing marks will be combined in a position different from the usual position (upper right of the character)</u> when combined, so there seems to be a problem with the definition of a combining kana voicing mark.

About the script properties

<u>I completely agree with the points you have made</u>.

Lastly

This is not a response to the feedback I received, but I would like to add my opinion.

I have noticed that my proposal L2/24-125 has sparked discussions on the Internet in Japan (on social media sites such as X). To avoid any misunderstanding, I would like to clarify that <u>I am not in a position to affirm (or deny) any political activities based on far-left ideology in Japan</u>. However, I believe that there is value in encoding these characters and digitizing documents when studying and investigating document records from the 1960s and 1970s. When I say that some letters are "commonly used in Japan," I simply mean that there are relatively many examples of their use with images such as photographs posted on the Internet, and <u>I do not intend to promote such ideology</u>.

I also understand that further discussion is needed on the <u>choice of characters</u>, <u>normalization of character naming conventions</u>, <u>code point ordering</u>, and <u>consideration for future expansion</u>.

(end of document)