

TO: UTC

FROM: Jonathan Kew [JK] and Kamal Mansour [KM]

RE: Comments on Proposal to Encode 22 Characters for Arabic Pedagogical Use (WG2 N3460) L2/08-159 (and evidence from L2/06-039 "Preliminary Proposal to add Nuqta Characters to Arabic Block")

DATE: 23 May 2008

The following are comments by Jonathan Kew "[JK]" and Kamal Mansour "[KM]" regarding three characters contained in L2/08-159, for which evidence was being sought. A few additional remarks by Jonathan Kew on the evidence for these characters, as provided in L2/06-039, are appended to this document (#4).

#### 1. 088A ARABIC DOUBLE DANDA ABOVE

[KM] I have only seen the ones below as in 06FD and 06FE [JK] I am also only aware of these two instances below; I have not seen this used above.

#### 2. 0891 ARABIC DOUBLE KASHIDA BELOW

[KM] The term kashida is being used in the sense of a horizontal bar. I don't think any of the so-called Kashidas should be encoded.

(The single one above can be spacing Fatha 064E, below should be spacing Kasra 0650.) Both double kashidas (above & below) are equivalent to four dots as in 0687.

[JK] Yes, I agree -- I have not seen evidence for these, as distinct from the normal Fatha and Kasra (single bars) or as a handwritten alternate to 4 dots (double bars).

[KM] In older printed material, it is common to see the 4 dots in the place of the Tota.

[JK] Yes; an earlier variant of Urdu orthography used 4 dots for the retroflex letters that are now written with the "tota" (tah) mark.

#### 3. 0895 ARABIC TOTA BELOW

[KM] I have only seen the one above as in 0691.

[JK] I have seen it used below HAH in some experimental orthographies from northern Pakistan; however, I do not know if any of these has become established.

#### 4. COMMENTS ON THE EVIDENCE

[JK] The "examples" on pages 7-8 [of document L2/06-039] are, I believe, artificial constructions for the purpose of this document, and were intended to support \*combining\* nuqta diacritics (which are not under consideration at this point, having been considered and rejected already).

I have also seen documents in the past that presented pages from preschool writing primers, where the characters of the alphabet are deconstructed into basic shapes and added dots. I think such pedagogical materials are the possible "evidence" for these. However, my personal view is that such materials should more properly be considered graphics than text, and do not constitute evidence for the "character-ness" of these marks (which are revealingly referred to as "glyph parts" in the proposal itself).