Response of IP on version 1.8 of Kannada LGR (Proposal of 2008-06-15)

DATE: 2018-06-26

# Overview

All issues raised in previous IP response appear to have been incorporated.

# Conclusion

The documents approach readiness for public review. However, there remains a question about the cross-script variants with Sinhala.

Some suggested edits remain in the main document and in the XML.

# Comments on main document (.docx)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Issue** | **IP Comment** |
| 1 | In section 5 on p. 9, a Section Reference source is not connected. | Please adjust the link. |
| 2 | The word “perceptive” on 3rd last paragraph of p. 7 | Consider replacing with “perceptual”, “auditory” or “acoustic”. |
| 3 | Section 3.4.5 missing “s” after “Conjunct” (plural) | add “s” |
|  | Section 4: missing comma after “however” | Add comma |
|  | will be assigned (change to “has been” as this has now happened) | change to “has been” |
|  | Acknowledgement of Environment Limitations | change to “External limits on Scope”  This is an edit we ask for all LGRs |
|  | “However the Domain..”  missing comma after However | Add comma |
|  | “There are no variants within Kannada script. ”  Change to “the Kannada script” | Add “the” |
|  | is no other 🡪 are no other | Change to “are” (plural) |

Also:

One section on p. 3 of the .docx proposal contains a number of infelicities. IP suggests the following changes.

Current text:

Most of the public records were written during Mysore kings are in Modi script. No inscriptions were written in Modi script as this style is difficult to inscribe on a stone. This can easily be called the last developed script which taught even now in schools for cursive writing of Kannada.

Suggested text:

Most of the public records that were written in the period of the Mysore kings are in the Modi script. No inscriptions were written in the Modi script as this style is difficult to inscribe on a stone. This may be considered the latest developed form of the script, and is taught even now in schools as cursive writing for Kannada.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | Cross-script variants with Sinhala: | |  |
|  | C:\Users\asmusf\AppData\Local\Temp\fgafgigacbcbngoe.png | | |
|  | The set above shows the only consonant that is proposed as a variant with Sinhala. In the opinion of the IP the similarity between the Kannada (0CB0) and Sinhalese (0DBB) code points appears sufficiently remote to no longer be considered a homoglyph.  The same applies to the Telugu (0C30) / Sinhala (0DBB) pair.  With only a single consonant (plus two combining marks) the overlap between Sinhala and these two scripts appears rather limited.  As was the case with similar relation between SEA scripts, the IP would recommend to drop Sinhala 0DBB from the variant sets for both Kannada and Telugu.  If that is done, the only remaining characters are combining marks 0D82 and 0D83 which can no longer form a cross-script label. They could then also be removed. | Please reconsider the case for 0DBB as a cross-script variant. It appears marginal to the IP. If GP agrees to remove, 0D82 and 0D83 would also no longer be necessary.  (Same feedback applies to Telugu). | |
| 4 | Cross script variants with Telugu.  Some of the proposed variants are much closer than others. However, the IP’s position is that given the closely related nature of the Kannada and Telugu scripts, a slightly extended view of homoglyph may be appropriate. | No action. | |

# Comments on LGR specification (.xml)

Kannada files (updated xml and labels) have been input into IP scripts.  
  
No parsing errors reported from the XML.  
  
No test of variants as yet, since there has not yet been a detailed review.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Issue** | **IP Comment** |
|  | The discussion of implicit vowel/Halant is overly detailed and argumentative: it is worded to make it appear that there is a distinction between “Unicode” and how the script actually works.  “Implicit vowel ಅ (a) in consonants: All consonants (vyañjanas) in Kannada when written as ಕ (ka), ಖ (kha), ಗ (ga), etc. actually have a built-in vowel sign (matra) of vowel ಅ (a) in them. These consonants are actually ಕ್, ಖ್, ಗ್, etc., shown after removing the implicit vowel ಅ (a). In fact many grammar books on Kannada list the consonants by removing the implicit ಅ (a). In Unicode the character U+0CCD (್), which is the Kannada equivalent of Devanagari’s Halant (or Virama), U+094D (्), is applied to consonants to remove the implicit ಅ (a). Thus the consonant ಕ (ka) is actually ಕ್ + ಅ. But in Unicode it is ಕ (U+0C95 (ಕ)) + ್ (U+0CCD (್)) = ಕ್. More details in Section "3.4.4 Implicit vowel ಅ (a) in consonants" of the [[Proposal](file:///C:\src\idntables\test\LGR-3\staging4-NeoB\Element\lgr-3-Kannada-Script-2018-06-27-en.html#ref_Proposal)].”  For most users of the LGR, the fact that Halant is used with consonants is the most important piece of information needed to understand the label generation rules – the other details are available in the proposal document. | We suggest a streamlined version for the XML, as users can always look up more details:  “Implicit vowel ಅ (a) in consonants: All consonants code points in Kannada contain an implicit an vowel ಅ (a) .The Unicode character U+0CCD, which is the Kannada equivalent of Devanagari’s Halant (or Virama), U+094D, is applied to consonants to remove the implicit ಅ (a). A vowel sign (matra) applied to a consonant explicitly designates a vowel. More details in Section "3.4.4 Implicit vowel ಅ (a) in consonants" of the [Proposal].”  This suggested edit has been carried out in the attached XML. |
|  |  |  |
|  | The name of the proposal is incorrect | Corrected in attached XML |
|  |  |  |
|  | Detailed edits | An XML is attached that implements the above and several smaller detail edits. The IP requests that the GP review this and adopt or modify further as appropriate. |

# Comments on Test Labels

Kannada files (updated xml and labels) have been input into IP scripts.  
  
Test files (nicely annotated!) match IP findings for disposition.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Issue** | **IP Comment** |
| 1 | A few labels have a NBSP at the end; tool treats that as part of the label and reports it as invalid. |  |
|  |  |  |