

2012-02-12

Universal Multiple-Octet Coded Character Set
International Organization for Standardization
Organisation Internationale de Normalisation
Международная организация по стандартизации

Doc Type: Working Group Document

Title: Response to the contribution N4232 about the Rovas scripts

Source: Gábor Hosszú (Hungarian National Body)

Status: National Body Contribution

Action: For consideration by UTC and ISO/IEC JTC1/SC2/WG2

Date: 2012-02-12

This document contains the comments of the Hungarian Standards Institution (Hungarian National Body) on the recent contribution of Prof. András Róna-Tas (N4232). Please send any response regarding to this document to Dr. Gábor Hosszú (email: hosszu@eet.bme.hu).

The Hungarian National Body welcomes the expert opinion of Prof. A. Róna-Tas, as it indicates that Hungarian scientists at the highest level as well demonstrate their concerns about the encoding of the Rovas scripts.

First of all, the letter of Prof. Róna-Tas supports the consequent opinion of the Hungarian NB that the **name of this script must contain both the word “Hungarian” and “Szekely”**, instead of various faulty expressions for naming this script – including the terms “Hungarian Runic”, “Old Hungarian”, and “Native Hungarian” – that individual enthusiasts have been insisting on for years to push through. The contribution of Prof. Róna-Tas gives further proof that at the Rovas-related ad-hoc meetings of the former WG2s inappropriate decisions were made about the names of this script. Note, that in 2011, the ad-hoc in Helsinki accepted the term “Old Hungarian” (N4110); however, the Hungarian NB clarified the deficiencies of this expression. Similarly, in 2009, the ad-hoc of the Dublin WG2 meeting forced the term “Hungarian Runic” despite of the explicit objection of the Hungarian representative (N3640), who participated in the ad-hoc meeting in person. **Based on previous experiences, the Hungarian NB explicitly opposes making any final decision without the consent of the representative of the Hungarian NB. If the representation is required to be in person, it will be arranged from the next meetings onward.**

Furthermore, the Hungarian NB agrees with Prof. Róna-Tas, that the Szekely-Hungarian Rovas script already existed even before the 13th century. Consequently, it is necessary not only to research the Szekely-Hungarian Rovas relics of that period but take the latest findings and scientific results into consideration at every aspect of the encoding process.

According to Prof. Róna-Tas, there are several open scientific questions related to the Szekely-Hungarian Rovas, the Carpathian-basin Rovas, and the Khazarian Rovas scripts. According to his contribution, there is no urge to encode of the Szekely-Hungarian Rovas based on fundamentally

erroneous and scientifically unbacked ideas. Although, for practical reasons the user community does require the encoding at the earliest possibility, the open questions of the Rovas scripts need scientific discussions with the possibly widest professional and user base publicity.

The Hungarian NB fully agrees with Prof. Róna-Tas stating “*I do not see a need for any hurry.*” In accordance with the open questions highlighted by Prof. Róna-Tas, keeping the current block of the Szekely-Hungarian Rovas (with the erroneous name “Old Hungarian”) in the PDAM is unacceptable.

Finally, Prof. Róna-Tas sets the right road map, as after answering the historical questions, “*The second step would be the general acceptance of a modern variant*”. This clearly indicates that the encoding of the Rovas scripts has to serve primarily the needs of the user community of the contemporary utilization.