














































































# 1 Questions for Steve
























































Steve, below are questions I've compiled while reviewing the PC repertoire and your comments document. As you know, I am not a specialist of PC. These questions are all born out of my ignorance of PC, SAC, and related domains, and my general naivete about the scholarly practices of collating and naming such signs. Thank you for your patience with my inquiries.











































1. There are 88 signs slated for removal from the repertoire due to being out of chronological scope, ie. not from Uruk IV or Uruk III. Do any of these signs occur with signs from these periods? If so, then should they be encoded to support the complete representation of texts, whether in the PC block or in a different one? Also, do you have more details about which chronological periods they are from?
2. Sort order: I've fixed the internal sorting of numbers so that 1(N02), 2(N02), 1(N34), etc are grouped by the base N02 and not by the count, ie. 1(N02), 1(N34), 2(N02). I've also moved numbers to the end of the order, after 'Z', instead of keeping ordering after 'M', as in ORACC. Ideo-numeric compounds are ordered similarly, after 'Z'. We had identified the sort order as needing more discussion. How do we want to proceed with the sort order? Ideally, the sort order in Unicode would align with the scholarly order (or vice versa).
3. *tenu* vs non-*tenu* : Is there a rule or convention for calling a sign a *tenu* form vs. an allograph? For example, the sign  AD~b is a rotated form of  AD~a, but there is no *tenu* indication. The sign  ADDA@t is a rotated form of  ADDA, and is indicated as a *tenu* form, not an allograph.
4. Signs in compounds without independent attestation : Following the model for SAC, we're not encoding signs in compounds that do not occur independently. There are 40+ such signs (see section 9.2). While they won't be going into Unicode, I'd like to add them to the scholarly repertoire, similar to the @compoundonly signs you've listed in the PCSL ASL list. I would place them in the PCSL repertoire, and mark their Unicode status as 'compound-only sign, not scoped for inclusion in the Unicode repertoire'. How do you feel about that?
5. ZATU signs : Are there other specific names or aliases for ZATU signs? If so, would it make sense to rename the existing names? Are there new interpretations for  ZATU642,  ZATU675~b,  ZATU711,  ZATU737, etc.? These seem like they'd have different names, just based on their shapes, which are analogous to other non-ZATU-named signs.
6. AN : The sign  AN~v1 duplicates  AN, so you've recommended that it be removed. That would leave  AN and  AN~v2. I'd recommend renaming  from AN~v2 to AN~v1 to remove the gap in the variant sequence. Additionally, As  is a glyphic variant of  , not an actual alternate form, would it make sense to rename AN~v1 as AN~a, and consider it an allograph? That way it can be referenced in PCSL, even if it's not in the Unicode repertoire.
7.  $(BU\sim a \& BU\sim a) . NA_2 \sim a$  : The glyph  suggests that the two BU~a components are 'crossing' instead of 'over', compared to   $(BU\sim a \& BU\sim a) . NA_2 \sim a$ , in which they are positioned more one 'over' the other. Should  be renamed to  $(BU\sim a \% BU\sim a) . NA_2 \sim a$ ?
8.  $(BU\sim a \& BU\sim a) . NA_2 \sim b$  : You state that   $(BU\sim a \& BU\sim a) . NA_2 \sim b$  duplicates   $(BU\sim a \sim v1 \% BU\sim a \sim v1) . NA_2 \sim a @n$ , and that the former should be deleted. But for the record, should  $(BU\sim a \& BU\sim a) . NA_2 \sim b$  be renamed as  $(BU\sim a \sim v1 \% BU\sim a \sim v1) . NA_2 \sim b @n$ ? Also which glyph should be the representative form? The  is more






















































graphically aligned with related signs, such as  | (BU~a&BU~a).NA<sub>2</sub>~a|, than is .




















9. |DARA<sub>3</sub>~c×(KAR<sub>2</sub>~c.ŠE~a)| : The component  named DARA<sub>3</sub>~c in this sign differs from the conventional form  of DARA<sub>3</sub>~c that is found in  |DARA<sub>3</sub>~c×KAR<sub>2</sub>~b|. It also differs from the DARA<sub>3</sub> forms in  |DARA<sub>3</sub>~d×KAR<sub>2</sub>~b|,  |DARA<sub>3</sub>~d1×KAR<sub>2</sub>~b|,  |DARA<sub>3</sub>~d2×KAR<sub>2</sub>~a1|,  |DARA<sub>3</sub>~d2×(KAR<sub>2</sub>~a1.ŠE~a)|. It also differs from  DARA<sub>3</sub>~c~v1. Given that the other DARA<sub>3</sub> forms are distinguished allographically, does it make sense to do the same for the form in , eg DARA<sub>3</sub>~c1, so the compound would be renamed |DARA<sub>3</sub>~c1×(KAR<sub>2</sub>~c.ŠE~a)| ?
10. |DUG~a×LAM~b| : The sign  is given the name |DUG~a×LAM~b|. But, the form of LAM here appears to be  LAM~b~v1, not  LAM~b. Should the name be changed to |DUG~a×LAM~b~v1| ?
11. DUG~c@t : The CDLI-gh DUG~c has been separated into  DUG~c~v1 and  DUG~c~v3. Should the name DUG~c@t given to  be changed to DUG~c~v1@t?
12. DUG~c2@t : Similar to DUG~c@t above, should the name DUG~c2@t assigned to the new addition  be changed to DUG~c~v3@t?
13. |EN~c&EN~c| : The name suggests that this compound  consists of two stacked  EN~c. But, the  in the compound is considerably different. It's like the compound-only  EN~d in  |NUN~a+EN~d|. Is this  a variant of  EN~c, if so, should the compound be renamed to |EN~c~v1&EN~c~v1| ? Or is it an entirely different type of EN, and should be assigned a distinctive allograph, ie. EN~f, which would then give  the distinctive name |EN~f&EN~f| ?
14. |EZEN~a×(HI×1(N57).AN)| : The operator . in the name for  suggests that  (HI×1(N57)) is beside \* AN. But, the  is above the \*. Should this sign be renamed |EZEN~a×(HI×1(N57)&AN)| ? Compare to  |EZEN~a×(U<sub>2</sub>~b.A)|, where the  U<sub>2</sub>~b is beside || A, as suggested by the operator . in the name. If a rename is in order, should an inner group be added, eg. |EZEN~a×((HI×1(N57))&AN)|, cf.  | (HI×1(N57)).(HI×1(N57)) |.
15. |EZEN~a×LA~e| and |EZEN~a×LA~e|~v1 : These names are assigned to  and , respectively. However, the forms  and  of LA~e in the signs differ from the conventional  LA~e (removed due to chronological scope), and appear to occur only in these compounds. Moreover, for  the variant mark is applied to the entire compound rather than to the varying component. Should both of these signs be renamed to distinguish the different forms of LA~e using variant marks? For example  |EZEN~a×LA~e~v1| and  |EZEN~a×LA~e~v2| ?
16. |EZEN~b×6(N57)| : The sign  is marked for removal from the Unicode repertoire due to being out of chronological scope. However, the sign  EZEN~b is retained as is the variant  |EZEN~b×6(N57)|~v1 (see below). Given the inclusion of these signs, would it be suitable to also keep  ?
17. |EZEN~b×6(N57)|~v1 : The variant mark is applied to the entire compound  to distinguish it from  |EZEN~b×6(N57)| (removed from repertoire due to scope). Should the variant mark be applied to EZEN~b instead, to distinguish the conventional  from the compound-only form  ? That would result in  |EZEN~b×6(N57)| and  |EZEN~b~v1×6(N57)|
18. |GA~a~v1.ZATU753| and |GA~a~v4.ZATU753|~v1 : These names are assigned to  and , respec-

tively. But, there appears to be a mistake in the PCSL names. First, for  the ~v1 marker is outside of the compound. Second, the normative form of ZATU753 is . Should these be more appropriately named as  |GA~a~v1.ZATU753~v1| (where ZATU753~v1 is compound-only) and  |GA~a~v4.ZATU753| ?









19. GAN~b : This sign relates to four forms:  GAN~b,  GAN~b~v1,  GAN~b~v2,  GAN~b~v3. Should the names for some of these be revised, following the pattern for DUG~b? We have  DUG~b and  DUG~b~v1. It seems  should be GAN~b (squared left portion) instead of GAN~b~v3, and  should be GAN~b~v1 (triangular left portion) instead of GAN~b. The signs  and  seem like different allo-graphs of GAN~b altogether, eg. GAN~b2~v1 and GAN~b2~v2. So would it make sense to adopt the following renaming:  GAN~b,  GAN~b~v1,  GAN~b1~v1,  GAN~b1~v2 ?
20. |GAN~c×LAGAB~b| : This name is assigned to . Should the sign be renamed |GAN~c~v1×LAGAB~b| so that it more accurately indicates the base  GAN~c~v1 rather than  GAN~c?
21. |GAN~c×SIG<sub>7</sub>| : This name is assigned to . Should the sign be renamed |GAN~c~v1×SIG<sub>7</sub>| so that it more accurately indicates the base  GAN~c~v1 rather than  GAN~c?
22. |(GIŠ×(DIN.DIN))~a| and  |(GIŠ×(DIN.DIN))~b| have names that suggest a conventional form of GIŠ, but the two are entirely distinct graphically. Should the GIŠ forms be treated differently?
23. |GIŠ×ŠU<sub>2</sub>~b| : The form of GIŠ in  differs from the conventional form  of GIŠ. Should this form  be annotated as a variant of GIŠ, ie. GIŠ~v1? If so, the compound should be renamed |GIŠ~v1×ŠU<sub>2</sub>~b|.
24. |LAGAB~a×KUŠU<sub>2</sub>~a@t| : The  sign has a rotated form of KUŠU<sub>2</sub>, eg. . but is it  KUŠU<sub>2</sub>~a or  KUŠU<sub>2</sub>~b? It seems to be the latter, based on the bottom edge being tapered instead of fanning out. Or is  a new allo-graph, ie. KUŠU<sub>2</sub>~c?
25. |LAGAB~a×NUN~b| : Seems like  has some extra hashes at the end of  NUN~b. Can NUN~b take a varying number of slashes and still be NUN~b?... or do we have something like a NUN~c here? Compare to the allo-graphic difference in the number of hashes as distinguished in  TUR<sub>3</sub>~a and  TUR<sub>3</sub>~b.
26. LAM~b@r : This name is assigned to  which implies it is a reversed form of  LAM~b? Is this an accurate interpretation? If we look at KUR there is  KUR~a and  KUR~b, where  is truly a reversed form of , ie. \*KUR~a@r. Should  be assigned a new name, eg. LAM~b~v3, following  LAM~b~v1,  LAM~b~v2?
27. LAM~b@s : This name is assigned to  which suggests that the base form is  LAM~b. However, the base form resembles  LAM~b~v1. Should LAM~b@s be renamed to LAM~b~v1@s?
28. |LU<sub>2</sub>×GEŠTU~c3| : Name suggests that  is  LU<sub>2</sub> and  GEŠTU~c3. But the  GEŠTU~c3 here is reminiscent of the  in  |SAG~v1×GEŠTU~c|, as well as  in  |SAG×GEŠTU~a|. These all seem to be different allo-graphs of GEŠTU~c. Should they be marked as such?
29. MAR~a@t : The name assigned to  suggests that the sign is a *tenu* form of  MAR~a. The two forms have the same orientation, but the former is hatched. Maybe the @t here should be *gunu* instead, ie. MAR~a@g?

30. |MUŠEN.UR<sub>3</sub>~b2| : Name suggests the second component of  is  UR<sub>3</sub>~b2, but should it instead be , which appears to be a compound-only sign. This  seems like an allograph of UR<sub>3</sub>~b1, if not an actual variant, given the lack of hatches, (or maybe a *nutillu* form?...). I would suggest the sign be renamed, eg. |MUŠEN.UR<sub>3</sub>~c|... Also, see note below on |MUŠEN×PAP~a|...
31. |MUŠEN×PAP~a| : The sign  is suggested for deletion due to an incorrect identification in an unpublished Umma text. It seems like this sign should be renamed |MUŠEN.UR<sub>3</sub>~b2| instead of deleted... See note above on |MUŠEN.UR<sub>3</sub>~b2|...
32. |NINDA<sub>2</sub>×2(N01)| : in  the form of 2(N01) does not reflect the conventional  2(N01). Should this  be considered a variant of 2(N01), ie. 2(N01)~v1? Or is this typical of vertical stacking / horizontal sequencing patterns? Could it be a different N-form altogether?...
33. |NINDA<sub>2</sub>×GUDU<sub>4</sub>| : This CDLI-gh name applies to a sign with three variants:  |NINDA<sub>2</sub>×GUDU<sub>4</sub>|~v2,  |NINDA<sub>2</sub>×GUDU<sub>4</sub>|~v3,  |NINDA<sub>2</sub>×(HI~a1.AN.ME~a)|,  |NINDA<sub>2</sub>×(HI~a1.ME~a)|. The first two have been removed and the last two have been retained, but renamed. Wouldn't it make sense to rename the first two for consistency in the record, even though they are not part of the proposed Unicode repertoire? So, change  from |NINDA<sub>2</sub>×GUDU<sub>4</sub>|~v2 to |NINDA<sub>2</sub>×(HI.AN.ME~a)|, and  from |NINDA<sub>2</sub>×GUDU<sub>4</sub>|~v3 to |NINDA<sub>2</sub>×(HI.AN.ME~a)|? If we make these changes, then the original |NINDA<sub>2</sub>×GUDU<sub>4</sub>| names should be added as annotations to the PCSL database as well as the Unicode names list.
34. Glyphs for former |NINDA<sub>2</sub>×GUDU<sub>4</sub>| signs : The glyphs for these signs are identical in terms of composition, but CDLI-gh shows different sizes for them, eg.  |NINDA<sub>2</sub>×GUDU<sub>4</sub>|~v2 and  |NINDA<sub>2</sub>×(HI.AN.ME~a)|,  |NINDA<sub>2</sub>×GUDU<sub>4</sub>|~v3 and  |NINDA<sub>2</sub>×(AN.ME~a)|. Which form should be considered representative? (I think the smaller sized components are optimal, optically...)
35. NAB : Following on the question of when is a sign *tenu* and when is it not, we have  NAB and  NAB~v2. Are there semantic differences between these two? Could  be considered NAB@t?
36. |SAG×GEŠTU~a| : Name for  suggests that SAG should be , but the form used is the compound-only allograph . Should this SAG be distinguished, ie. |SAG~a×GEŠTU~a|?
37. |SAG×SAR~a| : Name for  suggests that SAG should be , but the form used is  SAG~v1. Should this be renamed to |SAG~v1×SAR~a|?
38. SAG@n : In the compound  |SAG@n×GEŠTU~b| the SAG@n is intended to refer to an unfinished form of , which is named SAG~v2, as in  |SAG~v2×GEŠTU~b|. However, the independent form of SAG@n in CDLI is . So,  should be considered as SAG~v2@n. It could be added as a new sign. But, in any case |SAG@n×GEŠTU~b| should be changed to |SAG~v2@n×GEŠTU~b| to account for the different forms of SAG@n.
39. |SAL.LAM~b| : The sign  is given the name |SAL.LAM~b|. But, the form of LAM here appears to be  LAM~b~v1, not  LAM~b. Should the name be changed to |SAL.LAM~b~v1|? See |DUG~a×LAM~b| above.
40. |SILA<sub>3</sub>~a×DUG~a|~v1 : This name assigned to  differentiates it from  |SILA<sub>3</sub>~a~v1×DUG~a|. The SILA<sub>3</sub>~a appropriately refers to , the sign in , and SILA<sub>3</sub>~a~v1 to the compound-only sign  in . The two already have distinctive names, so the variant marker in the name for , which occurs after the compound marker, is not needed. Would it be appropriate to rename |SILA<sub>3</sub>~a×DUG~a|~v1 to |SILA<sub>3</sub>~a×DUG~a|?























41.  $|SILA_3 \sim a \times GARA_2 \sim a|$  : Is  truly  $\times$    $GARA_2 \sim a$ , or could it be   $GARA_2 \sim a \times$    $SILA_3 \sim a$ ? I would have expected  $SILA_3 \sim a$  to function regularly as the container in compounds, so would have thought the more appropriate representation for  $|SILA_3 \sim a \times GARA_2 \sim a|$  to be . This is the only  $SILA_3 \sim a$  compound where  $SILA_3 \sim a$  is contained instead of the accompanying sign, compare to   $|SILA_3 \sim a \times DUG \sim b|$ ,   $|SILA_3 \sim a \times KA \check{S} \sim a|$ , etc.
42.  $|SILA_3 \sim a \times ZATU646|$  : The compound  has a form of   $ZATU646$  that three strokes instead of two: . Should this form be catalogued as an allograph of ? If so, this compound-only form could be named  $ZATU646 \sim a$ , and the compound would be renamed as  $|SILA_3 \sim a \times ZATU646 \sim a|$ .
43.  $|SILA_3 \sim c \times NI \sim a|$  : This name suggests that  has the component  $\times$   $SILA_3 \sim c$ , as found in   $|SILA_3 \sim c \times \check{S}U|$  and   $|SILA_3 \sim c \times ZATU687|$ . But, the form  $\times$  of  $SILA_3$  here differs from the other variants. It also looks like it could be a *nutillu* form of  $\times$   $SILA_3 \sim a$ , with the bar crossing the two diagonals, but missing the piece to the right. In any case, would it be appropriate to designate  $\times$  as an allograph similar to the  $\times$   $SILA_3 \sim d$  in   $|SILA_3 \sim d \times NI \sim a|$ ? If so, maybe  $|SILA_3 \sim e \times NI \sim a|$ , which would give  the name  $|SILA_3 \sim e \times NI \sim a|$ ?
44.  $SUKUD@g \sim b \sim v1$  : This sign  is named  $SUKUD@g \sim b \sim v1$ , implying it's a variant of   $SUKUD@g \sim b$ . But, it appears closer to a variant of   $SUKUD@g \sim d$ ? Does its name need to be revised? Also, see question about  $SUKUD@g \sim d$  below.
45.  $SUKUD@g \sim d$  : Is   $SUKUD@g \sim d$  truly a *gunu* form? Or a separate allograph?
46.  $SUM \sim a @t$  : This name is assigned to , implying it's a *tenu* form of   $SUM \sim a$ . But, it seems to be a *tenu* form of   $SUM \sim a \sim v1$ . Should the name for this sign be revised to  $SUM \sim a \sim v1 @t$ ?
47.  $\check{S}AB$  : There are four  $\check{S}AB$  signs:   $\check{S}AB \sim a$ ,   $\check{S}AB \sim a \sim v1$ ,   $\check{S}AB \sim b$ ,   $\check{S}AB \sim b \sim v1$ . The  $\sim v1$  forms seem more graphically complex. Should they be considered the representative forms? If so, should the variant annotations be flipped?
48.  $\check{S}E \sim a @t \sim v1$  : This is a compound-only sign that occurs in   $|GE\check{S}TU \sim a \times \check{S}E \sim a @t \sim v1|$  and   $|KA\check{S} \sim b \sim v1 \times \check{S}E \sim a @t \sim v1|$ . Its name suggests that it is a form of   $\check{S}E \sim a @t$  with a different rotation. However, the form  in  differs from the  in . In the former, the  $\check{S}E \sim a @t \sim v1$  closely resembles the normative   $\check{S}E \sim a$ . But, the  $\check{S}E$  in  appears to be a separate variant altogether, ie.  $\check{S}E \sim v2 @t$ . Should this distinction of the  $\check{S}E$  forms be maintained in the sign name?
49.  $|\check{S}E \sim a.NAM_2|$  and  $|\check{S}E \sim a.NAM_2 \sim v1|$  : These names are assigned respectively to  and . However, the independent  $NAM_2$  is . This is the form in   $|\check{S}E \sim a.NAM_2 \sim v1|$ . Should the names be swapped? The name  $|\check{S}E \sim a.NAM_2|$  is more suitable for . And as  has the variant , it should be renamed  $|\check{S}E \sim a.NAM_2 \sim a|$  or  $|\check{S}E \sim a.NAM_2 \sim v1|$ .
50.  $\check{S}EN \sim c$  and  $\check{S}EN \sim c @t$  : Should the names for these signs be flipped:   $\check{S}EN \sim c$  and   $\check{S}EN \sim c @t$ ? It seems like the base form is 'horizontal', so  should be the regular form and  the *tenu* form. Compare to   $DUG \sim c \sim v1$  and   $DUG \sim c @t$ .
51.  $TAR \sim c$  : This compound-only sign occurs has four occurrences:   $|UR_2 \times TAR \sim c|$ ,   $|U\check{S} \sim b \times TAR \sim c|$ ,   $|U\check{S} \sim b \sim v2 \times TAR \sim c|$ ,   $|AMAR \sim v2 \times TAR \sim c|$ . Its basic shape appears to be  $\times$ , as in  $|U\check{S} \sim b \times TAR \sim c|$  and  $|U\check{S} \sim b \sim v2 \times TAR \sim c|$ , with a *tenu* form in  $|UR_2 \times TAR \sim c|$ . However, the form in  $|AMAR \sim v2 \times TAR \sim c|$  is different. Is this  $TAR \sim c$  or possibly an allograph  $TAR \sim d$ ?

52. TUR@g : This name assigned to  implies a *gunu* form of  $\subset$  TUR. But, the sign appears to be  TUR~v3 instead. Should  be renamed TUR~v3@g?
53. |U<sub>4</sub>.3(N08)| : The compound  has a variant form (different vertical stacking) of  3(N08), which should be identified with a variant marker just as  \*3(N08)~v1 is indicated in  |U<sub>4</sub>×3(N01).3(N08)~v1|.
54. |U<sub>4</sub>×1(N01).5(N08)| : The sign  has a form of  5(N08) (different vertical stacking), which should be marked as a variant.
55. |U<sub>4</sub>×5(N57)| .. |U<sub>4</sub>×10(N57)| : This set of signs have variant positioning of numbers, which differs from the orientation of the normative signs indicated in their names:
-  |U<sub>4</sub>×5(N57)| :  5(N57)
  -  |U<sub>4</sub>×6(N57)| :  6(N57)
  -  |U<sub>4</sub>×7(N57)| :  7(N57)
  -  |U<sub>4</sub>×8(N57)| :  8(N57)
  -  |U<sub>4</sub>×10(N57)| :  10(N57)

On the other hand, the following relate set have similar orientations to their normative number signs:

-  |U<sub>4</sub>×1(N57)| :  1(N57)
-  |U<sub>4</sub>×2(N57)| :  2(N57)
-  |U<sub>4</sub>×3(N57)| :  3(N57)
-  |U<sub>4</sub>×4(N57)| :  4(N57)

Should |U<sub>4</sub>×5(N57)| .. |U<sub>4</sub>×10(N57)| be given allograph or variant annotations?

56. |UKKIN~b×5(N01)| : This sign  has a different orientation of its numerical component than the conventional  5(N01). Is an allograph or variant annotation needed for 5(N01)?
57. |URU~a3×KALAM~a| : The sign  has a form  of KALAM~a that differs from the named form  KALAM~a. Should the  be renamed to properly identify the component, ie. KALAM~g ?
58. |UŠ~b×TAR~d| : Even though the sign  |UŠ~b×TAR~d| has been removed from the Unicode repertoire, it should be renamed for consistency for record. The form of UŠ~b in the sign is more aligned with the compound-only sign  \*UŠ~b~v2 that occurs in  |UŠ~b~v2×TAR~c|, than with the conventional  UŠ~b, eg.  |UŠ~b×TAR~c|,  |UŠ~b&UŠ~b|. I suggest this sign  be renamed |UŠ~b~v2×TAR~d|.
59. |1(N57).ŠUBUR~v1| : This compound name for  distinguishes the compound-only  form of ŠUBUR from the conventional  form found in  |1(N57).ŠUBUR|. However, the 1(N57) in the former seems to be a *tenu* form, as compared to the 1(N57) in the conventional form. Should |1(N57).ŠUBUR~v1| be re-named as |1(N57@t).ŠUBUR~v1|? Or is the placement of the 1(N57) with regard to  naturally expected for 1(N57) given the shape of the variant ŠUBUR?
60. |1(N57)×SIG| : This name is assigned to , as a revision of CDLI-gh |SIG×1(N57)| due to the ordering of components in the compound. But, is the compound operator truly × ‘plus’ as opposed to . ‘beside’? Compare with  |2(N57).AB<sub>2</sub>| where there is similar compound behavior, but there is more containment in  than in . Neither appear to have ‘time’ behavior, s should |1(N57)×SIG| be renamed as |1(N57).SIG|?

61. 6(N57) in compounds : The  $\equiv$  6(N57) occurs in a few compounds, such as  $\equiv$  |6(N57).GAR| and  $\equiv$  |6(N57).KU<sub>3</sub>~a|, in which the representation of the number differs from the conventional sign. Should these forms annotated as variants?
62. 8(N57) in compounds : The  $\equiv$  8(N57) occurs in  $\equiv$  |8(N57).NI~b|, but with a different form. Should this form be marked distinctively?
63. ‘Ignore’ vs ‘keep’ : The data file has recommend = ‘keep’ for |1(N08@f)×1(N57)| and |1(N34)×1(N58)|. As these are pure numeric compounds, I’ve changed the recommendation from ‘keep’ to ‘ignore’ and added them to the list of numerical signs that should be moved to the archaic numbers proposal. Is this ok?
64. — |1(N57).1(N57)| is marked for removal, but given that it is a numerical compound, should it be ignored instead, and moved to the archaic numbers proposal?