Subject: Comments on L2/10-083
From: Shriramana Sharma <samjnaa@gmail.com>
Date: Thu, 29 Jul 2010 20:21:43 +0530
To: Rick McGowan <rick@unicode.org>
CC: Eric Muller <emuller@adobe.com>, Anshuman Pandey <pandey@umich.edu>, Vinodh Rajan <vinodh.vinodh@gmail.com>

<div style="border:1px solid black; display:inline-block">

L2/10-266

</div>

Dear Rick,

Please take the following as my official feedback (just plaintext) to Eric Muller's
L2/10-083.

This is with reference to Eric Muller's L2/10-083, drawing upon my own previous document
L2/09-423. It indirectly also affects Anshuman Pandey's L2/09-330.

Eric has noted that North Indian scripts use a round circle as abbreviation sign, and
that there is a proposal to encode the same abbreviation separately for Gujarati
(L2/09-330). He surmises that Bengali also uses such a sign but gives no attestation for
this.

Eric recommends that script-specific abbreviation signs are encoded and therefore the
script property of the existing "Devanagari" abbreviation sign at 0970 to be changed
from "common" to "devanagari".

However, in my previous document L2/09-423 I have shown that South Indian scripts use
the Indic danda-s as abbreviation signs.

Therefore if script-specific abbreviation signs are to be encoded, then South Indian
scripts should get separate danda characters since it is danda-s that are used as
abbreviation signs in those scripts.

This will once more affect the question of script-specific danda-s -- "if South Indian
scripts get separate danda-s, then why not North Indian ones too".

Therefore to avoid any confusion and not ***unnecessarily*** disturb status quo, I feel that
it would be appropriate to treat the abbreviation signs just like the danda-s and NOT
encode script-specific characters.

The Kaithi situation is, I feel, different. The danda-s have been shown to have a
distinct shape in Kaithi. So Kaithi got its own danda-s. It is possible that a separate
abbreviation sign was then encoded for Kaithi to complete the set of punctuation
characters. So Kaithi cannot act as a precedent in the abbreviation sign matter,
especially since the danda situation is also involved as shown above.

Thus it is better to NOT encode script-specific abbreviation signs. This would also
imply that L2/09-330 should not be implemented, and that the script property of 0970 be
maintained as "common".

--
Shriramana Sharma

.