This document requests to change the glyph for Khitan Small Script character U+18BD2 from 𘯒 to 𘯒 to accord with the originally-proposed glyph form.

The pre-proposal document for Small Khitan Script, *Towards an Encoding of the Khitan Small Script* (WG2 N4725R = L2/16-113R), prepared by Andrew West, Viacheslav Zaytsev, and Michael Everson, shows that the character that became U+18BD2 is attested in two different glyph shapes in the modern sources for the encoding repertoire. Seven sources use 𘯒, but the 2014 index of Khitan Small Script vocabulary, *Qidān xiǎozì cíhuì suǒyǐn* 契丹小字词汇索引, produced by Liú Pǔjiāng 刘浦江 and Kāng Péng 康鹏 gives 𘯒.
This document discusses the correct glyph form for this character on pp. 77–78, where evidence is shown that on the single stone inscription where the character is attested, it has the 甲 shape.

**No. 211 (甲).** This character occurs in the Epitaph for the Prefect of Zhuozhou (涿州刺史墓志) at positions 12-2 and 13-7 (see Liu & Kang 2014 p. 531). Chinggeltei 2002 does not include this character in his list of KSS characters, but he transcribes it as 甲 on p. 214. Jiruhe & Wu 2009 and Wu & Janhunen 2010 both follow the form given in Chinggeltei 2002. Jishi 2012 (p. 936) interprets it as 甲. Liu & Kang 2014 are the only source for Table 5 to write the character as 甲. Looking at the rubbing of the Epitaph for the Prefect of Zhuozhou (see Fig. 21) it is clear that 甲 is the correct form for this character.

**Fig. 3: Epitaph for the Prefect of Zhuozhou (positions 12-2 and 13-7 highlighted)**

**Fig. 3. WG2 N4725R = L2/16-113R pp. 77–78**
However, in the final joint proposal for encoding Khitan Small Script (WG2 N4738R2 = L2/16-245R2) by Sun Bojun, Wu Yingzhe, Jing Yongshi, Jiruhe, Viacheslav Zaytsev, Andrew West, and Michael Everson, U+18BD2 is given as 千.

![Diagram of Khitan Small Script](image)

**Fig. 4. WG2 N4738R2 = L2/16-245R2 p. 5**

This issue was discussed by Andrew West and Viacheslav Zaytsev in *Discussion of 29 proposed Khitan Small Script characters* (WG2 N4765 = L2/16-277), and their conclusion was to revert to the glyph form suggested in N4725R.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. 18BD2 千</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Discussion:** N4725R Fig. 21 (pp. 79–80) shows evidence of use in the Epitaph for the Prefect of Zhuozhou (澤州) or Zehou (澤州刺史墓誌銘銘石). It also shows the correct glyph form (＊), which is different to that given in N4738 (＊).
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**Conclusion:** Keep, as already attested. However, the glyph in N4738 is incorrect, and need to be corrected to match the form ＊ used in N4725R.

**Fig. 5. WG2 N4765 = L2/16-277 p. 14**
In *Summary of Ad Hoc Meeting on Khitan Small Script, 28 September 2016 (WG2 N4768 = L2/16-338)*, which was attended in person by Michael Everson and Khitan expert Prof. Wu Yingzhe, “agreement was reached on the glyph for 18BD2”. Unfortunately the summary of the meeting does not specify what the agreement was, but based on private email correspondence at the time it seems that Prof. Wu’s position was that the 𘯒 glyph form shown in the original rubbing of the epitaph inscription was semi-cursive ‘brush style’, and the 𘯒 glyph form was the regularized form of the character, which he preferred. The code charts for all subsequent ISO ballots show the 𘯒 glyph form, and no national bodies raised any concerns about the glyph, so that is the form used in the ISO/IEC 10646 and Unicode code charts when Khitan Small Script was added to the UCS.

Recently, the issue of the glyph form for U+18BD2 has been raised again due to the release of a set of Google Noto fonts for Khitan Small Script ([https://notofonts.github.io/#khitan-small-script](https://notofonts.github.io/#khitan-small-script)) which all use the 𘯒 glyph form (Noto Serif Khitan Small Script shown below, but Noto Fangsong KSS Rotated and Noto Fangsong KSS Vertical have the same glyph).

![Fig. 6. Glyph forms for U+18BD2 in Noto Serif Khitan Small Script](image)

In addition, *BabelStone Khitan Small Linear v. 13.007+* has 𘯒, and *Khitan Small Linear/Rotated/Vertical v. 13.008+* have 𘯒 for U+18BD2.
Conclusion

In my opinion, it is not appropriate to use a hypothetical regularized glyph form for U+18BD2 as it is not possible to be sure what the regular form of this character should be. Indeed, as the character is a *hapax legomenon* it is quite likely to be a semi-cursive form of a different encoded character such as U+18C80 ㅞ (see discussion in Fig. 3), in which case it makes no sense to artificially regularize it to a novel form. It is best to use a code chart glyph form that reflects the actual shape of the character in the original epigraphic source. Therefore, I request to change the glyph for U+18BD2 as shown below.
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