

ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/WG2/IRG N2371

Universal Multiple-Octet Coded Character Set International Organization for Standardization

Doc Type: ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/WG2/IRG

Title: Glyph for U+2F2A KANGXI RADICAL LAME

Source: John H. Jenkins (井作恆)

Status: Member Body Contribution

Action: None

Date: 2019-05-03

In the charts for ISO/IEC 10646, the glyphs for U+2F2A KANGXI RADICAL LAME 尢 and U+2E90 CJK RADICAL LAME THREE 尢 are identical. The glyphs for both are in turn identical to the glyph for U+5C22 尢.

Among the common alternate shapes for Kangxi radical 43 is 尢, which is encoded as U+21BC1. It is clear that the separate encoding of U+2E90 was intended to capture the variation of 尢 and 尢.

The *Kangxi Dictionary* itself gives radical 43 the glyph 尢 and uses 尢 as an alternate form (see Figure 1). This also matches the glyph used on page 5 in the original proposal, SC2 N3213, dated 1998-10-28 and submitted by China:

<https://www.unicode.org/L2/L1998/02n3213.pdf#page=5>.

Kangxi's practice is the reverse of most modern dictionaries, which commonly give the 尢 glyph as the base shape and 尢 as an alternate (if they include alternates at all).

It's clear that it is inappropriate to use the same glyph for both characters. There are two alternatives: changing the glyph of U+2F2A KANGXI RADICAL LAME to 尢 and leave the glyph for U+2E90 CJK RADICAL LAME THREE unchanged; or, change the glyph for U+2E90 CJK RADICAL LAME THREE to 尢 and leave the glyph for U+2F2A KANGXI RADICAL LAME unchanged.

At UTC meeting 159, held in San José, California from 30 April through 3 May 2019, the decision was made to adopt the former option. The rationale for this decision was three-fold:

First, this will match the glyph used in China's original proposal.

Second, the names of the block and character both imply that the glyph used should match the actual value in the *Kangxi Dictionary* itself.

Finally, although this is contrary to the general practice today, it defines a single, standard reference to use when determining the proper glyph for characters in this block.

“Common practice” is too vague a criterion to be useful.

This also is more in accordance with IRG practice, which is to carefully match the glyphs used in the Universal Character Set with those in the source documents. In this case, inasmuch as the *Kangxi Dictionary* is the source document, its glyph should be used.

Precedents for this action are to be found in:

<https://www.unicode.org/L2/L2003/03362-n2659.pdf>

<https://www.unicode.org/L2/L2004/04423-kangxi-defects-revisited.pdf>

The UTC solicits input from the IRG on the matter.

