PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO INTRODUCTORY TEXT of N2798
N2798 = L2/04-189 Proposal for Cuneiform Encoding.
Ccontribution from Lloyd Anderson, Ecological Linguistics ecoling@aol.com

Proposal A.
In 3.3 Mergers and Splits, replace last clause
"even when this results in the duplication of glyphs as represented in fonts appropriate for some periods"
with
"even when distinct characters will be represented by the same glyphic shape in fonts appropriatefor periods where those characters are not distinguished"

Rationale: seems clearer.

***

Proposal B.
Re the last sentence of 3.4 applies, "In general, signs which shift from compound to complex or vice versa have been treated according to their Ur III manifestations".
Either (B.1.) add a complete listing of the cases to which the sentence applies so far, if the number is small, or (B.2.) give enough examples to clarify what is meant, if the number t which it applies is large. With all my best intentions, I cannot understand this sentence. As it stands, taken literally, it is a contradiction to 3.3 on maximizing distinctions, because this sentence could prohibit maximizing distinctions.

***

Proposa C.
In 3.5,either (C.1.) specify that TA* is a special case, with the following words if they are an accurate description of what is meant.
"Glyph variants which represent a significant distinction only in a very narrow time and place should be used to encode text only for that time or place. Even the same glyph used at other times and places should not be encoded distinctly if there is no significant distinction at those other times or places. Rather the character with less restricted usage should be encoded there."

Or if the paragraph was intended to have some other meaning, please make that clear. It it is intended as a general principle, not merely to apply to very restricted distinctions, then which should be used of two glyphs which are sometimes distinctive but sometimes mere variants ?

 Is there yet a third interpretation? Again I cannot understand this.

Question:
3.7 "In general, numerals have been encoded separately from signs which are visually identical but semantically different (e.g. ONE BAN2, TWO BAN2, etc. vs. MASH, PA, etc.)"
I do not see ASH, TAB, DISH, MAN encoded distinctly when numerals ? The examples given for ONE BAN2 vs. MASH, TWO BAN2 vs. PA, etc. are instances in which the general principle on splits and mergers dictates separate encoding in any case. So this clause adds nothing new and is contradicted by the examples ASH, TAB, DISH, MAN. Delete this sentence?