To: Unicode Technical Committee  
From: Prof. Sun Bojun et al. (via Debbie Anderson, SEI, UC Berkeley)  
Subject: Feedback on L2/20-166 Tangut Glyph Modifications and Corrections  
Date: 18 December 2020

From Prof. Sun Bojun:

I sent your mail [appended to the end of this document] to Prof. NieHongyin and Jia Changye and they gave me more clarification you needed on Tangut Glyph Modifications and Corrections. I agree with them. Please see the following.

From Prof. NieHongyin:

The proposal emphasizes the distinction between jointed and unjointed glyph forms as  and  and  and  etc., and suggests they be unified into jointed forms. The proposal is acceptable for the authors’ carefully observation and hard working, though such distinctions are not so necessary in literary learning.

Those distinctions of jointed and unjointed glyphs do not play any roles of distinctive feature in Tangut literature. I believe they are caused by calligraphic habit of Chinese writing. One of the most peculiarities of Chinese calligraphy is emphasizing the “beginning and end of a stroke” (bifeng 笔锋), which often break a jointed stroke into two. For example, the Chinese character 乃 is often written as  by calligraphers. We all know that the unjointed glyphs are the most common on xylographs in the 13-14 century Hangzhou, because all the carvers there are Chinese without knowing Tangut, that is to say, they carved Tangut glyphs according to Chinese calligraphic habit, thus we see that many jointed strokes were broken into unjointed ones. In the Tangut era, there were also lots of xylograph carvers proved to be Chinese, I believe that the same habit occurred then.

Anyway, I support the present proposal to decide the jointed strokes as the standard glyphs, and believe most of the Chinese scholars will support it.

From Prof. Jia Changye:

孙老师：您好！

您发的邮件我看了，前些日子对魏安的新提案认真看了，总的说对魏安的提案没意见。他对每一个字符作了认真考证，并与之前不太规范的字符作了对比，提案很细致，如能按这个提案落实，错字将大大降低。因无部首目录，个别字符看起来分类有点混乱，但就单个字符来看，没有问题。总之同意。

请您给黛比老师写个意见并问好。
(Google translate)
Teacher Sun: Hello!

I read the email you sent. I took a serious look at Wei An’s new proposal a few days ago, and generally said that I have no problem with Wei An’s proposal. He has made serious research on each character and compared it with the previously not standardized characters. The proposal is very detailed. If it can be implemented according to this proposal, typos will be greatly reduced. Because there is no radical list, the classification of individual characters looks a bit confusing, but as far as individual characters are concerned, there is no problem. In short agree.

Please write an opinion and say hello to Teacher Debbie.

Thank you!

Original email to Dr. Sun and Andrew West from Debbie Anderson (dated 15 December 2020):

The Unicode Script Ad Hoc discussed the feedback from Dr. Sun (appended below), but needed clarification from Dr. Sun on https://www.unicode.org/L2/L2020/20166-n5134-tangut.pdf, as the message relayed from Andrew (appended) was not clear. (I am cc’ing Liang Hai, in case the experts on Dr. Sun’s side can benefit from some additional explanation in Chinese.)

Our questions and comments:

Dr. Sun: Though no comments or opinions were received last time, can you again ask the experts for their explicit opinions? For example, a summary of the proposal in the experts’ own language can be a good sign that they indeed agree with the changes.

The members of the Unicode Script Ad Hoc group consider the changes to be architecturally significant, because they lead to a number of fundamental reanalyses of character identities.

If the experts have not thoroughly reviewed and understood the proposal, we are concerned it may lead to problematic disputes in the future. The Unicode group wants to be sure the experts fully understood what the changes will mean, and that they agree with the changes.

魏安博士，

我已经把字表转给了各位老师，他们没有提出什么意见，我也没有看出什么问题。

疫情期间请多多保重，祝一切顺利！

伯君 上