

**To:** UTC  
**From:** Debbie Anderson, SEI, UC Berkeley  
**Subject:** Feedback on *pushpika*  
**Date:** 28 May 2018

In the Script Ad Hoc recommendations for the April-May 2018 UTC ([L2/18-168](#)), we reviewed the request by Srinidhi and Sridatta (§1 of [L2/17-424](#)) to add Newa and Kannada to the set of scripts in the ScriptExtensions property for U+A8F8 DEVANAGARI SIGN PUSHPIKA. We made no recommendations, but instead recommended the UTC take up the topic.

I was tasked with checking with Shriramana Sharma for his opinion. Below is his response:

I would prefer for the *pushpika* to be unified across Indic scripts where there is an identifiable unity in the glyph skeleton. It does not matter whether the script is northern/southern. IMO apart from some characteristics (which branched off early in script history) related to the letters/vowel signs etc, the north/south dichotomy doesn't extend to such punctuation as seen in the case of the dandas, svvara markers etc.

So I support the Devanagari *pushpika* to be extended for the other scripts including Tigalari. Script specific decorative punctuation such as the somewhat different floral punctuation shown by the Tigalari proposal may be removed from the main proposal and the author requested to make a separate argument for separate encoding if consistent distinctive usage is seen.

Note: The UTC's decision will affect the outcome of whether U+0D53 MALAYALAM SIGN PUSHPIKA (or, MALAYALAM END OF TEXT, as originally proposed by Srinidhi and Sridatta in [L2/18-015](#)) should be separately encoded.\*

\*Other documents related to L2/18-015 (which have been taken into account in the Script Ad Hoc recommendations L2/18-168):

[L2/18-034](#) Feedback on L2/18-015 proposing Malayalam punctuation mark – Sharma

[L2/18-009](#) Comments on Public Review Issues from Eduardo Marín Silva

[L2/18-145](#) Feedback on name for MALAYALAM END OF TEXT MARK (L2/18-015) - Anderson