

To: UTC



L2/09-070

From: Anshuman Pandey and Deborah Anderson, SEI

RE: Comments on Kaithi Punctuation Marks and FPDAM 6

Date: 1 February 2009

Background:

I asked Anshuman Pandey, author of the Kaithi proposals (L2/08-194, etc.) to make a statement about Kaithi punctuation marks, since Kaithi is currently under ballot. I relay below his reply. In sum, he is in support of adding two characters, KAITHI SECTION MARK (glyph: ) and KAITHI DOUBLE SECTION MARK (glyph: ) , formerly called "word separator" and "sentence separator," respectively. If the UTC agrees in adding these, they could be placed in the two available holes at 110BE and 110BF. I can assist in creating the proposal forms for these two marks (which were described in an earlier version of the Kaithi proposal, L2/07-199 with representative glyphs and properties), if needed.

-----Original Message-----

From: Anshuman Pandey [mailto:pandey@umich.edu]

Sent: Thursday, January 29, 2009 7:51 PM

To: Deborah W. Anderson

Ultimately, I think Kaithi needs only the following kinds of punctuation marks:

1. danda (110C0)
2. double danda (110C1)
3. word separator middle dot (2E31)
4. abbreviation sign (110BB)
5. enumeration sign (110BC)
6. number sign (110BD)

Current Unicode characters can be used for other needed marks [see N3520, but cf. comments below].

Regarding swashes (separators):

I am in support of encoding the two Kaithi separators, but request they be named KAITHI SECTION MARK [for the single mark] and KAITHI DOUBLE SECTION MARK [for the double mark]. This name, I believe, most accurately represents the various contexts in which the swash marks exist.

Regarding colon and below-base slash:

After my study of Kaithi, I am against encoding colon and below-base slash. They are idiosyncratic. As a result, I don't recommend encoding these characters.