	ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 2/WG 2 N5219_Feedback		
Туре:	Working Group Document		
Title:	Feedback to N5219		
Source:	TCA and China		
Reference:	N5219		
Date:	2023-06-16		

Preface

The small seal coding finishing work was more complicated and tedious than expected. Originally, we only wanted to collate and create characters according to THX, but after many meetings with experts, we started to make corrections to the small seal forms by referring to the interpretations. In order to keep a complete record of the corrections, we submitted N5189 and N5190, and Suzuki's document N5219 is very good, especially Item 2 and Appendix, which integrates the previous comments with the correction records and makes it possible to track the correction process of each character more clearly. CMEX will integrate this document into https://seal.cmex.org.tw.

This document responds to two main issues of the N5219 document: **one is item 3**, "Comments for the classification of the glyph changes" and **item 4**, "Individual comments on two changes". The details are as follows:. :

1. About item 3. "Comments for the classification of the glyph changes"

N5219 mentions,

Once the code chart is published, the unifiable glyph changes will be acceptable. However, if the expected glyph change is non-unifiable, the new glyph should be coded as a new character to preserve the old "wrong" character for backward compatibility. The classification needs to be clearer to estimate the stability of the glyphs in the proposal. Therefore, categorizing the glyph changes in N5189 & 5190 is expected to be reconsidered. **But merging types #4 & #6, and taking all of them as unifiable glyph changes, is also an acceptable option.**

TCA agreed to combine #4 (the inconsistent component) and #6 (misprint of the original book), which would indeed be more appropriate. Is the proposal to call it "misprint of the original book"? We would like to hear what the experts think.

2. About "4. Individual comments on two changes"

The two glyphs raised in the N5219 document are questionable. The experts at TCA and China are of the opinion that the current corrected glyphs should be maintained and no further changes are required for the following reasons:

(1) Flipping of the glyph "今" (THX original: **介**; corrected glyph: 个)

The view of the experts at TCA and China is to maintain the amended form for the following reasons:

N5219, p. 5, proposes three principles for correcting the order of revision of characters, and both the TCA and China experts agree. However, in the case of the character " \Rightarrow ", experts found Xu Shen(許慎)'s interpretation problematic, so the experts referred to the "Jinwen \pm χ " and "Qin scripts 秦系文字", which are closely related to Small Seal, as well as to the way " \Rightarrow " is written as a component of other characters in THX, to make the glyph correction.

A. Xu Shen's (許慎) interpretation of "今" is different from the Shuowen Guwen "及".

According to Xu Shen, the part 7 underneath " \Rightarrow " is the Guwen form of the " \mathcal{B} ". In the \mathfrak{R} \mathfrak{I} , there are three Guwen forms for the character \mathcal{B} , but none of these three forms matches the character 7. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that Xu Shen's statement is in question.



B. Based on the "Jinwen 金文" and "Qin scripts 秦系文字" and the related characters containing the "今" component in THX.

In terms of script evolution, the ancient Chinese characters that follow in the footsteps of the Small Seal are the Jin and Qin scripts, both of which have the " \Rightarrow " form with the lower part



Table 1 (Source from: 小學堂字形演變 (sinica.edu.tw)) In THX, there are 32 Small Seal forms containing the ' \ominus ' component (see <u>note for details</u>), with the exception of the two Guwen forms ($\mathfrak{F} \cdot \mathfrak{F}$) for the " \mathfrak{F} ", the lower part of the " \ominus " component is of this form Γ ;

Therefore, for all these reasons, it is reasonable and well documented to correct the character " \uparrow " for " \uparrow ".

(2) Glyph changes of the "禺" component

The form $\bigoplus(\triangle)$, in terms of the evolution of its character form, is "the upper part of the vertical stroke does not come out of the head", as seen in the Oracle bones, the Jinwen and the Clerical script (see Table 2).

	Oracle Bone (甲骨文)	Bronze inscriptions (金文)	Clerical script (隸書)	
白	 (年437 合13000 年28093 無名組	長囟盉 長囟簋 西周中期 西周中期 集成9455 集成3581		
鬼		內 鬼作父丙壺 梁伯戈 西周中期 春秋早期 集成9584 集成11346	 	
Table 2				

(Source from: 小學堂字形演變 (sinica.edu.tw))

The evolution of the glyphs shows that the pre-Small Seal (Oracle bone and Jin) and after-Small Seal (Clerical) glyphs do not have the upper part of the vertical strokes, so it is logical to correct the 6 Small Seal characters in accordance with the systematic consistency of THX (see <u>note for details</u>).

(end of document)