Date: 2009-4-10

Universal Multiple-Octet Coded Character Set			
UCS			
TO CATE OF THE CALLS OF THE CALLS			

ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/WG2 IRGN 1546

Source:	IRG Ad Hoc
Title:	Additional section to Annex S

Below in accordance with IRG resolution M31.6 is the IRG proposed additional section to Annex S of ISO/IEC 10646: 2003. This is the second of two documents produced under the WG2 endorsement of IRG review and feedback on Annex S given in WG2 resolution M51.36.

S.5 Clarification of unification procedure

The examples provided in this annex **are not to be considered exhaustive**, and therefore it is necessary to be able to apply the rules and principles set forth in this annex to new situations. The rules, principles, and illustrations in this annex are descriptions of the calligraphic traditions and conventions used for CJK ideographs, not a set of mathematical transformations.

When applying the unification rules and principles, the following points should be considered:

- Non-cognate characters are not unified.
- Cognate characters, meaning that they share the same readings and meanings, are unified according to the table below:

	Actual Shape	
	Different	Exact Match
Same Abstract Shape	Unify	Unify
Different Abstract Shape	Do Not Unify	

S.5.1 Clarification of differences of actual shape

In accordance with the unification based on the analysis of components model of S.1.3 a pair of glyphs with different actual shape but the same abstract shape can be used as components to generate other pairs of glyphs in the same way. For example, given $\mathfrak{R} \bullet \mathfrak{A}$ have the same abstract shape then the following are also pairs with the same abstract shape:-

悦·悦, 挽·棁, 效·敚, 梲·棁, 涗·涚, 稅·税, 脱·脱, 蜕·蜕, 說·説, 銳·鋭, and 閱·閱.

Although (皡•皡) have the same abstract shape, and their corresponding components (皋•皋) also have the same abstract shape (cp. 翱•翱), this does not imply that the corresponding top right hand components (白•自) also have the same abstract shape outside of this particular context. A relatively complex character is sometimes modified when written smaller as part of another character.

The following groups of ideographs shown below are further examples of differences of actual shape but with the same abstract shape when used as components: $\mathcal{K} \cdot \mathcal{K} \cdot \mathcal{K}$

S.5.2 Clarification of differences of abstract shape

In accordance model of S.1.3 a pair of glyphs with different abstract shape that have more than one component can be used as components to generate at least one pair of glyphs with a difference of abstract shape. For example given <math> have different abstract shape then it follows 月 also have different abstract shape.

Adding like components to pairs with different abstract shapes usually, but not always, results in pairs of different abstract shape. Though as S.1.4.3 'Different structure of corresponding components' illustrates, usually adding like components to a pair of glyphs with different abstract shapes leads to pairs of different abstract shape, therefore for example because $\[mathbb{H}\]$. $\[mathbb{H}\]$ are of different abstract shape then the same is true for $\[mathbb{H}\]$. $\[mathbb{H}\]$, $\[mathbb{H}\]$,

The following groups of ideographs are further examples of differences of abstract shape:- 冒•冒,麻•麻,嘗•尝,黨•党,兩•两,尋•寻,産•产,當•当,會•会,愈•佥, 喬•乔,壽•寿,平•주.