UTC Response to IRG Working Set 2017 Version 2.0 (IRG N2309) Consolidated Comments

2018-10-14

This document provides responses to comments against UTC-submitted ideographs in IRG Working Set 2017 Version 2.0 (IRG N2309). Evidence images (PNGs) are attached to this PDF file.

1) Unification Issues (pp 33 through 37):

00163 (UTC-03081): No ideograph with which to unify; Vietnam can submit a horizontal extension for V-F0CA3 in the future

00711 (UTC-03035): Disagree; not cognate with U+2A8EF; see additional evidence (00711-UTC03035.png and 00711-UTC03035-p228.png); this ideograph also appears in SJ/T 11239-2001 as 21-17 (see IRG N2233 page 13)

00855 (UTC-03086): Keep pending further evidence

01379 (UTC-00118): See additional evidence (01379-UTC00118-1.png and 01379-UTC00118-2.png); there were no comments against this ideograph, but the UTC chose to supply additional evidence

01531 (UTC-03133): Disagree; agree with UK's comments about disunifying U+3A9C

02527 (UTC-03127): Unify with U+247DD

02728 (UTC-01159): Intentionally disunified with U+753E/U+2F936; See Eiso's detailed report

02953 (UTC-03121): Unify with IRG WS 2015 02834 (T13-2F45)

03903 (UTC-03120): Unify with U+274A2

03964 (UTC-03130): Unify with U+2777B, only if proven cognate

04145 (UTC-03138): Unify with U+27FF8

04201 (UTC-03140): Disagree, unless proven cognate

04309 (UTC-03136): Unify with U+284F3

04802 (UTC-03110): Unify with U+29A50; non-unifiable variant of U+4BDA

04803 (UTC-03109): Unify with U+29A77

2) Radical Issues (page 175):

00067 (UTC-02987): Agree to change to Radical #158

00802 (UTC-03085): Keep Radical #32, because it will be easier to find

3) Evidence Issues (pp 240 and 241):

00045 (UTC-03021): Looks clear enough to me; this ideograph also appears in SJ/T 11239-2001 as 16-39 whose glyph is clear (see IRG N2233 page 12)

00163 (UTC-03081): Looks clear enough to me

00650 (UTC-02996): Looks clear enough to me; this ideograph also appears in SJ/T 11239-2001 as 26-25 whose glyph is clear (see IRG N2233 page 15)

00736 (UTC-03032): Looks clear enough to me; this ideograph also appears in SJ/T 11239-2001 as 21-79 whose glyph is clear (see IRG N2233 page 13)

00776 (UTC-03027): See additional evidence (00776-UTC03027.png)

01119 (UTC-03119): Keep pending further evidence

03692 (UTC-03040): This ideograph also appears in SJ/T 11239-2001 as 23-88 whose glyph is clear (see IRG N2233 page 14)

03774 (UTC-03106): See additional evidence (03774-UTC03106.png)

4) Vulgar Variant (page 293):

01353 (UTC-03147): The disunified examples provided by Henry set a precedent to not unify this particular character

5) Additional Evidence:

The following describes the additional evidence images that are referenced above, and whose images (PNGs) are attached to this PDF file.

00711-UTC03035.png: 00711 (UTC-03035) appears in 《篇海》（萬曆本）, and not cognate with U+2A8EF

00711-UTC03035-p228.png: 00711 (UTC-03035) is on page 228 of 《中华字海》, and not cognate with U+2A8EF

00776-UTC03027.png: 00776 (UTC-03027) appears in 《太平縣志》（天一閣藏明嘉靖刻本）, Volume 5, Folio 9a

01379-UTC00118-1.png: 01379 (UTC-00118) was originally a concocted ideograph from a novel and not suitable for encoding according to UAX #45. However, later I found there is an actual usage for it, so I proposed this ideograph for encoding. This ideograph is a transcription ideograph, and it's from page 865 of 《殷周金文集成引得》.《殷周金文集成引得》 is the reference of book 《殷周金文集成》, which is a collection of bronze inscriptions. The number 17.11283 means that this text is from chapter 17 of 《殷周金文集成》, collected from the 11283rd bronzeware.

01379-UTC00118-2.png: (Original bronze inscription, from 《殷周金文集成》中华书局1985, chapter 17, page 391) U+2C084 戬 is the straight transcription, while 01379 (UTC-00118) is the proposed normalized shape by scholars. In other words, 01379 (UTC-00118) appeared in the evidence is the normalized form of U+2C084 戬.

03774-UTC03106.png: 《汉语大词典》volume 9, page 480

That is all.