

## PROPOSAL SUMMARY FORM

**A. Administrative****1. Title**

Proposal for encoding additional Greek characters in the UCS

**2. Requester's name**

Thesaurus Linguae Graecae Project (University of California, Irvine)

**3. Requester type**

Expert contribution

**4. Submission date:**

2002-08-09

**5. Requester's reference****6. Completion**

This is a complete proposal. Additional information may be provided upon request

**B. Technical - General****1b. The proposal is for addition of character(s) to an existing block:****Name of the existing block:**

Greek and Coptic

Greek Extended

**2. Number of characters in proposal:**

208 characters

260 abbreviations

**3. Proposed category**

Categories B.2 and C

**4. Proposed Level of Implementation (1, 2 or 3) (see clause 14, ISO/IEC 10646-1: 2000):**

Level 1 (most characters) and 3 (for musical section) for combining characters.

**5a. Character names provided?**

Yes.

**5b. Character names in accordance with guidelines**

Yes.

**5c. Character shapes reviewable?**

Yes

**6a. Who will provide the appropriate computerized font for publishing the standard?**

TLG Project

**6b. Fonts currently available.**

A number of Greek Unicode fonts are already available and listed at: <http://www.tlg.uci.edu/help/UnicodeTest.html>.

Additional symbols for new characters to be added.

**6c. Font format**

True Type

**7a. Are references (to other character sets, dictionaries, descriptive texts etc.) provided?**

Yes

**7b. Are published examples of use (such as samples from newspapers, magazines, or other sources) of proposed characters attached?**

Yes.

**8. Does the proposal address other aspects of character data processing**

No.

**C. Technical - Justification****1. Has this proposal for addition of character(s) been submitted before?**

An preliminary version of this proposal was submitted in February 2002.

**2. Has contact been made to members of the user community**

Yes. The TLG has been in contact with a great number of experts in the field of Classics including textual criticism, papyrology, epigraphy, numismatics and historical linguistics. Earlier version of this proposal have been posted online and received extensive comments by members of the profession.

**3. Information on the user community for the proposed characters**

Scholarly community and individuals interested in Greek literature

**4. The context of use for the proposed characters (type of use; common or rare)**

Use varies. Some characters are common in extant Greek texts. Some appear less often. Approximate counts based on the TLG corpus have been included in the proposal when available.

**5. Are the proposed characters in current use by the user community?**

Yes. Characters are present in various editions of Greek texts and used extensively by scholars and students of Greek as well as individuals interested in the study of the Greek language. General references provided in attached bibliography.

**6. After giving due considerations to the principles in *Principles and Procedures document*, must the proposed characters be entirely in the BMP?**

Yes.

**If YES, is a rationale provided?**

Accordance with the Roadmap.

**7. Should the proposed characters be kept together in a contiguous range (rather than being scattered)?**

Some characters may be scattered. The majority falls into several contiguous ranges.

**8. Can any of the proposed characters be considered a presentation form of an existing character or character sequence?**

No. Some of the characters are visually similar or identical to existing ones but semantically different.

**9. Can any of the proposed characters be encoded using a composed character sequence of either existing characters or other proposed characters?**

Yes. However, existing characters produce unworkable results.

**10. Can any of the proposed character(s) be considered to be similar (in appearance or function) to an existing character?**

No.

**11a. Does the proposal include use of combining characters and/or use of composite sequences**

Yes (combining characters).

**11b. Is a list of composite sequences and their corresponding glyph images (graphic symbols) provided?**

No. However, all possible sequences are discussed in the proposal.

**12. Does the proposal contain characters with any special properties such as control function or similar semantics?**

No.

**13. Does the proposal contain any Ideographic compatibility character(s)?**

No.