

**L2/03-267**

**From:** Tony Duff <tduff@attglobal.net>

**Date:** 2003-08-18 07:05:28 -0700

**To:** Christopher John Fynn <cfynn@gmx.net>, thdlunicode@list.mail.virginia.edu,  
rick@unicode.org, unicode@unicode.org

**Subject:** Re: [tibex] Re: Public Review Issues, reminder

Christopher John Fynn wrote:

>I notice there are a number of Tibetan characters in the review  
>document at <http://www.unicode.org/review/pr-12.html> these  
>currently all seem to be listed as in Punctuation\_Other, but not  
>in Terminal\_Punctuation - should any of them be treated  
>differently? While the western notion of sentence does not  
>exactly apply to Tibetan I should think that the presence of any  
>of the head marks (not at the top of a page) or U+0F12 after any  
>string would probably qualify as a "sentence boundary" in the  
>terms of this document.

>--

>Christopher J. Fynn

>

>

All of these should be Terminal\_Punctuation, if I understand what that is. Chris, you are welcome to digest this and formulate whatever. I don't think the yig.mgo should be. (A yig.mgo in the middle of a page should always have one of the following in relation to it but I suppose it could be argued on way or the other)/.

U+0F08 # TIBETAN MARK SBRUL SHAD  
U+0F0D # TIBETAN MARK SHAD  
U+0F0E # TIBETAN MARK NYIS SHAD  
U+0F0F # TIBETAN MARK TSHEG SHAD  
U+0F10 # TIBETAN MARK NYIS TSHEG SHAD  
U+0F11 # TIBETAN MARK RIN CHEN SPUNGS SHAD  
U+0F12 # TIBETAN MARK RGYA GRAM SHAD

Tony Duff