

Viewpoints on the Structural Description of Chinese Characters


Tomohiko Morioka

Abstract. This paper is about our viewpoints and methodology concerning the description of the structure of Chinese characters. First, we describe how components can be detected in characters. When a character is used as a component of a compound character and its shape appears without significant change, then the component can be easily identified. However, in many cases, it is not so easy to find the components that build a character out of purely visual features. One of the factors is simplification of the graphic form when characters are assembled out of components. Such a change of glyph form reduces the connection with pronunciation and meaning of the original character and increases the symbolic aspect of the character. It is particularly complicated when multiple components are combined, transformed and demotivated into a symbolic component. Here we discuss these issues with respect to the productivity of components and to the relationships between components and characters.

1. Introduction

Most Chinese characters (漢字) can be represented by a combination of components. For example, the character “林” (forest) has the same component “木” (tree) on the left and right, and the character “雲” (cloud) has component “云” (phonetic part) placed under the component “雨” (rain). The structure of Chinese characters, which consists of a combination of components, is not only an abstract expression of its shape, but is also related to its semantic and phonetic values. Therefore, to understand a Chinese character, it is important to find out what components are used, where they are placed in the characters, and how they are combined.

In this paper, such a description of the structure of Chinese character is called a *Hanzi structure description* (漢字構造記述; structure description of Chinese character) (Morioka, 2018b). Various formalisms have been used to describe Hanzi structure. Nowadays a quite widespread formalism is the one of Ideographic Description Sequences (IDS) defined in

Tomohiko Morioka  0000-0001-5315-3383
47 Kitashirakawa-Higashioguramachi, Sakyo, Kyoto, 606-8265, Japan
E-mail: tomo@zinbun.kyoto-u.ac.jp

Y. Haralambous (Ed.), *Grapholinguistics in the 21st Century 2020. Proceedings*
Grapholinguistics and Its Applications (ISSN: 2681-8566, e-ISSN: 2534-5192), Vol. 5.
Fluxus Editions, Brest, 2021, pp. 683–712. <https://doi.org/10.36824/2020-graf-mori>
ISBN: 978-2-9570549-7-8, e-ISBN: 978-2-9570549-9-2

ISO/IEC 10646 (*Information technology—Universal Coded Character Set (UCS) 2014*). In this paper, we use the IDS formalism to describe Hanzi structure. For example,

- 林 = 𣏟木木
- 雲 = 𣏟雨云

in IDS.

In these two examples we can easily detect components and infer structure. However, in some cases, the situation is ambiguous, e.g.,

- 旗 = 𣏟方 𣏟 or 𣏟 𣏟 其?
- 羸 = 𣏟言 𣏟月 女 𣏟 or 𣏟羸女?

How do we detect components and the corresponding structure in such cases?

2. Etymological View

When a character is used as a component of a compound character and its shape is simply inserted into it without significant change, the component can be easily detected via its shape. For example, the character “林” (forest) appears to have two components “木” (tree) arranged side-by-side. Therefore, the structure of “林” can be written as “𣏟木木”.

Some structures have been preserved even though the graphic forms of Chinese characters have changed significantly over the centuries. For example, “𣏟” is an Oracle-bone character corresponding to the modern character “林”. Its structure can be written as “𣏟 𣏟 𣏟,” which is similar to “𣏟木木” (“𣏟” is an Oracle-bone character corresponding to the modern character “木”).

Similarly, the character “雲” (cloud) seems to consist of a component “雨” (rain) placed above a component “云” (the structure being “𣏟雨云”). The Oracle-bone character “𣏟” corresponds to the modern character “雲” as a character, but corresponds to “云” as a component of Hanzi structure.¹ That is, it is considered that “雲” was formed by adding the semantic component “雨” to distinguish it from morphemes other than “雲” because “云” was used phonetically. Anyway, in this case as well, the components can be easily found just by looking at the characters.

However, in many cases, it is not so easy to find the components of a character just by examining the graphic form of the character. One of the causes of the problem is simplification of the graphic form of components when they are assembled into characters. For example, “隆” (eminent, exalt) looks like a combination of “β” and “夆” on the left and right,

1. In Mainland China, “云” is a simplified Chinese character corresponding to “雲”.

namely “冫 隆”. However, “𠂔” (Small Seal form (小篆) of Shuowen corresponding to “隆”) seems to contain the component “生” (“生” (be born, living, raw)) inside the component “降” (“降” (fall)), so that the structure could be “冫 降 生”. Compared to the Small Seal form, Hanzi structure of “隆” should be described as “冫 降 生”. Through this structural analysis, we see that “降” can be considered as being a simplified form of “降” or a component of it. As described above, there are two approaches to structural description: a structural description based on appearance and a structural description based on etymological explanation.

To adopt the latter position, the etymological knowledge of the Chinese character is required. However, characters with clear etymology are only a small part of the whole, and the etymological data on many characters are unclear or unknown.

3. Component Models

Historically, Hanzi structure descriptions (or the underlying analysis) were written for humans. For example, *Shuowen Jiezi* (說文解字; Shuowen), which is considered to be the oldest radical-based Chinese character dictionary, describes the kinds of components that comprise each compound character. The analysis of Hanzi structures in Shuowen is based on the so-called six-categories classification model (六書) and focusing on components motivated by pronunciation and meaning. In this model, each component is considered to be derived from a character, and each component is considered to (partially) inherit the phonetic and/or semantic value of the original character.

In the twentieth century, Tang Lan (唐蘭) proposed a new research approach and the three-categories classification model (三書). He also focused on graphemes that were not motivated by pronunciation or meaning and named them “symbol characters” (記号字; unmotivated characters), see also Slaměniková (2019). Qiu Xigui (裘錫圭) also made great contributions to the study of symbol characters. Tatsuro Asahara (浅原達郎) greatly contributed to Qiu Xigui’s approach by avoiding the classification of components, and by proposing a symbolization (demotivation) model based on a more relational viewpoint (Asahara, 1996). According to this theory, instead of considering the classification of semantic, pronunciation and symbolic components, it is assumed that associative keys connect characters and components motivated by meaning and pronunciation (or act as symbolization filters to remove them).

Each table consists of five columns. The first column (“char”) display the characters, the second column (“structure”) its structure, the third column (“component”) the components, and the fourth column (pn) indicates the number of character objects in the CHISE character ontology that contain the given *component*. Columns other than *char* are divided into upper and lower subrows. The upper subrow contains information about functional structure and the lower one contains information about apparent structure.

The accuracy value is calculated by the following formula:

$$A_x = \frac{N_{px}^2}{N_p(N_{pf} + N_{pa})} \cdot 100.$$

Let S_{pf} be a set of character objects in the CHISE character ontology that have a functional component, and let $N_{pf} = n(S_{pf})$ (pn value of the upper subline).

Similarly, let S_{pa} be a set of character objects in the CHISE character ontology that have a apparent component, and let $N_{pa} = n(S_{pa})$ (pn value of the lower subline).

Let $S_p = S_{pf} \cup S_{pa}$, and let $N_p = n(S_p)$.

Let x of A_x and N_{px} be a variable to select f (functional) or a (apparent).

Note that the CHISE character ontology is based on the Multiple Granularity Hanzi Structure Model (Morioka, 2015; 2018a), so that each number f - pn and a - pn denotes the plural glyph granularity of Chinese characters such as abstract character, unified-glyph, abstract-glyph (字體), etc. In addition, the CHISE character ontology also includes character objects that cannot be unified by the existing CJKV Unified Ideographs of UCS. However, these tables show only representative glyphs and abstract characters of UCS: <character> indicates abstract characters and characters without angle brackets denote representative glyphs. Some abstract components unify multiple abstract characters, which are expressed as: <人/入/入/>.

TABLE 1. ㇀㇁ LRB ↔ ㇂ L ㇃ RB (111)

char	structure	component	pn	accuracy
㇀	㇂(㇃)多	<㇃>	167	98.8
	㇂方㇂(㇃)多	㇂(㇃)多	1	0.1
㇁	㇂(㇃)疋	<㇃>	167	98.8
	㇂方疋	疋	1	0.1

旂	□(𠂇)子	〈𠂇〉	167	88.0
	□方字	字	11	0.4
〈旒〉	□(𠂇)巾	〈𠂇〉	167	87.0
	□方巾	巾	12	0.5
旅	□(𠂇)辰	〈𠂇〉	167	84.2
	□方辰	辰	15	0.7
〈旅〉	□(𠂇)辰	〈𠂇〉	167	84.2
	□方辰	辰	15	0.7
〈旋〉	□(𠂇)(疋)	〈𠂇〉	167	81.5
	□方(疋)	〈疋〉	18	1.0
施	□(𠂇)也	〈𠂇〉	167	42.9
	□方(包)	〈包〉	88	11.9
〈滕〉	□(朕)水	〈朕〉	25	92.5
	□(月/月/月/月)□(夨/尖)水	□(夨/尖)水	1	0.2
〈勝〉	□(朕)力	〈朕〉	25	92.5
	□(月/月/月/月)□(夨/尖)力	□(夨/尖)力	1	0.2
Same as above	〈滕〉, 〈騰〉, 〈騰〉			
〈滕〉	□(朕)(衣)	〈朕〉	25	85.7
	□(月/月/月/月)(袞)	〈袞〉	2	0.6
〈滕〉	□(朕)(糸/糸/糸)	〈朕〉	25	61.0
	□(月/月/月/月)(綦)	〈綦〉	7	4.8
〈滕〉	□(朕)巾	〈朕〉	25	61.0
	□(月/月/月/月)(褱)	〈褱〉	7	4.8
〈滕〉	□(朕)巾	〈朕〉	25	61.0
	□(月/月/月/月)(褱)	〈褱〉	7	4.8
騰	□朕鱼	朕	20	90.7
	□(月)□夨鱼	□夨鱼	1	0.3
騰	□朕衣	朕	20	90.7
	□(月)□夨衣	□夨衣	1	0.3
Same as above	騰, 騰			
騰	□朕田	朕	20	82.6
	□(月)(畚)	〈畚〉	2	0.9

膳	𠄎腠言	腠	20	69.4
	𠄎(月)𠄎𠄎言	𠄎𠄎言	4	2.8
𧈧	𠄎(𧈧)虫	(𧈧)	18	89.8
	𠄎𧈧𠄎(女/夕)虫	𠄎(女/夕)虫	1	0.3
𧈨	𠄎(𧈨)貝	(𧈨)	18	81.0
	𠄎𧈨𠄎(女/夕)貝	𠄎(女/夕)貝	2	1.1
𧈩	𠄎(腠)足	(腠)	15	87.9
	𠄎(月)𠄎(关)足	𠄎(关)足	1	0.4
𧈪	𠄎(𧈪)魚	(𧈪)	15	87.9
	𠄎(卓)𠄎(人/入/へ)魚	𠄎(人/入/へ)魚	1	0.4
Same as above	𧈪, 𧈫, 𧈬, 𧈭, 𧈮, 𧈯, 𧈰, 𧈱, 𧈲, 𧈳, 𧈴, 𧈵			
𧈶	𠄎(𧈶)干	(𧈶)	15	36.0
	𠄎(卓)𧈶	(𧈶)	10	16.1
𧈷	𠄎𧈷火	𧈷	15	87.9
	𠄎(卓)𠄎人火	𠄎人火	1	0.4
𧈸	𠄎𧈷飛	𧈷	15	87.9
	𠄎(卓)𠄎人飛	𠄎人飛	1	0.4
Same as above	𧈸, 𧈹, 𧈺, 𧈻, 𧈼, 𧈽, 𧈾, 𧈿			
𧈿	𠄎𧈷戈	𧈷	15	77.9
	𠄎(卓)𠄎人戈	𠄎人戈	2	1.4
𧉀	𠄎𧈷日	𧈷	15	77.9
	𠄎(卓)𠄎人日	𠄎人日	2	1.4
𧉁	𠄎𧈷木	𧈷	15	77.9
	𠄎(卓)𠄎人木	𠄎人木	2	1.4
𧉂	𠄎腠黑	腠	14	87.1
	𠄎(月)𠄎𠄎黑	𠄎𠄎黑	1	0.5
𧉃	𠄎腠魚	腠	14	87.1
	𠄎(月)𠄎𠄎魚	𠄎𠄎魚	1	0.5
𧉄	𠄎腠巾	腠	14	87.1
	𠄎(月)𠄎𠄎	𠄎𠄎	1	0.5
𧉅	𠄎腠木	腠	14	76.6
	𠄎(月)𠄎𠄎	𠄎𠄎	2	1.6

贖	☐ 朕貝	朕	14	54.3
	☐ 月 ☐ 夬貝	☐ 夬貝	5	7.0
媵	☐ 朕女	朕	14	54.3
	☐ 月 ☐ 夬女	☐ 夬女	5	7.0
媵	☐ 朕土	朕	14	54.3
	☐ 月 ☐ 夬土	☐ 夬土	5	7.0
〈隆〉	☐ 〈降〉生	〈降〉	13	86.2
	☐ 冫 ☐ 夬生	☐ 夬生	1	0.6
痼	☐ 〈疒〉臣	〈疒〉	11	84.0
	☐ 月 ☐ 一臣	☐ 一臣	1	0.7
〈臈〉	☐ 〈疒〉(萬)	〈疒〉	11	84.0
	☐ 月 ☐ 一(萬)	☐ 一(萬)	1	0.7
Same as above	〈癩〉, 〈癩〉, 〈癩〉, 〈癩〉, 〈癩〉			
疾	☐ 〈疒〉矢	〈疒〉	11	71.6
	☐ 月 ☐ 一矢	☐ 一矢	2	2.4
〈疾〉	☐ 〈疒〉矢	〈疒〉	11	71.6
	☐ 月 ☐ 一矢	☐ 一矢	2	2.4
Same as above	癩, 〈癩〉			
穀	☐ 穀米	穀	10	82.6
	☐ 蓄 ☐ 彳米	☐ 彳米	1	0.9
贖	☐ 數貝	數	19	81.9
	☐ 男 ☐ 女貝	☐ 女貝	2	0.9
贖	☐ 數虫	數	19	68.2
	☐ 男 蚤	蚤	4	3.1
僚	☐ 〈攴〉系	〈攴〉	9	81.0
	☐ 亻 ☐ 支系	☐ 支系	1	1.1
僚	☐ 〈攴〉足	〈攴〉	9	81.0
	☐ 亻 ☐ 支足	☐ 支足	1	1.1
〈脩〉	☐ 〈攴〉月	〈攴〉	9	66.9
	☐ 亻 ☐ 支月	☐ 支月	2	3.4
〈佞〉	☐ 〈仁〉女	〈仁〉	16	79.0
	☐ 亻 (妄)	〈妄〉	2	1.3

佞	𠄎仁女	仁	16	79.0
	𠄎(佞)𠄎(妄)	𠄎(妄)	2	1.3
〈临〉	𠄎(临)𠄎(𠄎/田)	𠄎(临)	7	76.6
	𠄎(临)𠄎(𠄎/田)	𠄎(临)𠄎(𠄎/田)	1	1.6
〈隍〉	𠄎(隍)山	𠄎(隍)	7	76.6
	𠄎(隍)𠄎(差)山	𠄎(差)山	1	1.6

TABLE 2. 𠄎𠄎 | RB ↔ 𠄎𠄎 | 𠄎 RB (112)

char	structure	component	p ⁿ	accuracy
儻	𠄎(儻)足	𠄎(儻)	54	96.4
	𠄎(儻)𠄎(女/女)足	𠄎(女/女)足	1	0.1
〈儻〉	𠄎(儻)里	𠄎(儻)	54	96.4
	𠄎(儻)𠄎(女/女)里	𠄎(女/女)里	1	0.1
Same as above	〈儻〉, 〈儻〉, 〈儻〉, 儻, 儻, 〈儻〉, 〈儻〉, 〈儻〉, 〈儻〉			
〈儻〉	𠄎(儻)具	𠄎(儻)	54	93.0
	𠄎(儻)𠄎(女/女)具	𠄎(女/女)具	2	0.2
〈儻〉	𠄎(儻)糸/糸/𠄎(糸)	𠄎(儻)	54	93.0
	𠄎(儻)糸	糸	2	0.2
修	𠄎(修)多	𠄎(修)	54	81.0
	𠄎(修)多	多	6	1.1
〈修〉	𠄎(修)多	𠄎(修)	54	81.0
	𠄎(修)多	多	6	1.1
〈儻〉	𠄎(儻)田	𠄎(儻)	54	59.5
	𠄎(儻)田	田	16	5.3
〈儻〉	𠄎(儻)木/木	𠄎(儻)	54	47.9
	𠄎(儻)木	木	24	9.5
儻	𠄎儻足	儻	36	94.7
	𠄎(儻)女足	女足	1	0.1
儻	𠄎儻糸	儻	36	94.7
	𠄎(儻)糸	糸	1	0.1
Same as above	儻, 儻, 儻, 儻, 儻, 儻			

脩	☐攸貝	攸	36	89.8
	☐亻☐攸貝		☐攸貝	2
條	☐攸火	攸	9	25.0
	☐亻☐攸火		☐攸火	9
脩	☐攸田	攸	9	16.7
	☐亻☐攸田		備	13

TABLE 3. ☐☐ ATR ↔ ☐ A ☐ TR if T is *tare* (121)

char	structure	component	pn	accuracy
膚	☐卢骨	卢	65	97.0
	☐(卜)☐厂骨		☐厂骨	1
序	☐卢子	卢	65	97.0
	☐(卜)☐厂子		☐厂子	1
Same as above	〈膚〉, 〈凵〉, 〈凵〉, 〈昏〉			
虔	☐卢又	卢	65	94.1
	☐(卜)☐厂又		☐厂又	2
〈虔〉	☐卢又	卢	65	94.1
	☐(卜)☐厂又		☐厂又	2
𦉳	☐(𦉳)來	〈𦉳〉	26	92.7
	☐救廩		廩	1
〈𦉳〉	☐(𦉳)貝	〈𦉳〉	26	92.7
	☐救(貝)		〈貝〉	1
Same as above	〈𦉳〉, 〈𦉳〉, 〈𦉳〉, 〈𦉳〉, 〈𦉳〉			
〈𦉳〉	☐(𦉳)鳥	〈𦉳〉	26	86.2
	☐救廩		廩	2
〈𦉳〉	☐(𦉳)(來)	〈𦉳〉	26	86.2
	☐救(廩)		〈廩〉	2
Same as above	〈𦉳〉, 〈𦉳〉, 〈𦉳〉			
〈𦉳〉	☐(𦉳)巾	〈𦉳〉	26	80.4
	☐救(巾)		〈巾〉	3

〈𦉳〉	☐(𦉳)文	〈𦉳〉	26	75.1
	☐救(𦉳)	〈𦉳〉	4	1.8
𦉳	☐(𦉳)水	〈𦉳〉	26	75.1
	☐救(𦉳)	〈𦉳〉	4	1.8
Same as above	〈𦉳〉, 〈𦉳〉, 〈𦉳〉			
〈𦉳〉	☐(𦉳)干	〈𦉳〉	26	70.3
	☐救(𦉳)	𦉳	5	2.6
〈𦉳〉	☐(𦉳)女	〈𦉳〉	26	70.3
	☐救☐𦉳女	☐𦉳女	5	2.6
𦉳	☐(𦉳)里	〈𦉳〉	26	66.0
	☐救(𦉳)	𦉳	6	3.6
〈𦉳〉	☐(𦉳)牛	〈𦉳〉	26	66.0
	☐救☐𦉳牛	☐𦉳牛	6	3.6
〈𦉳〉	☐(𦉳)毛	〈𦉳〉	26	62.1
	☐救☐𦉳毛	☐𦉳毛	7	4.5
〈𦉳〉	☐(𦉳)万	〈𦉳〉	26	44.4
	☐救(𦉳)	𦉳	13	11.2
〈𦉳〉	☐(𦉳)(里)	〈𦉳〉	26	13.8
	☐救(𦉳)(厘)	〈厘〉	44	39.6
〈𦉳〉	☐(产)初	〈产〉	22	91.5
	☐(立/文)☐𦉳初	☐𦉳初	1	0.2
〈𦉳〉	☐(产)(兼)	〈产〉	22	91.5
	☐(立/文)(廉)	〈廉〉	1	0.2
Same as above	〈𦉳〉, 〈𦉳〉, 〈𦉳〉			
〈𦉳〉	☐(产)兼	〈产〉	22	84.0
	☐(立/文)☐𦉳兼	☐𦉳兼	2	0.7
〈𦉳〉	☐(产)言	〈产〉	22	61.7
	☐(立/文)☐𦉳言	☐𦉳言	6	4.6
〈𦉳〉	☐(产)火	〈产〉	22	22.9
	☐(立/文)灰	灰	24	27.3
〈𦉳〉	☐(产)𦉳	〈产〉	21	91.1
	☐(刀/𠂔/力/𠂔/𠂔)☐ 𦉳𦉳	☐𦉳𦉳	1	0.2

〈詹〉	□(产)詹	(产)	21	91.1
	□(刀/ㄥ/力/夕/夕)□ 厂詹	□厂詹	1	0.2
Same as above	〈廉〉, 〈危〉			
〈侯〉	□(产)失	(产)	21	83.4
	□(刀/ㄥ/力/夕/夕)□ 厂失	□厂失	2	0.8
〈侯〉	□(产)失	(产)	21	56.3
	□(刀/ㄥ/力/夕/夕)疾	疾	7	6.3
危	□(产)(巳)	(产)	21	11.1
	□(刀/ㄥ/力/夕/夕)厄	厄	42	44.5
詹	□产詹	产	21	91.1
	□(夕)□厂詹	□厂詹	1	0.2
詹	□产詹	产	21	91.1
	□(夕)□厂詹	□厂詹	1	0.2
侯	□产失	产	21	83.4
	□(夕)□厂失	□厂失	2	0.8
侯	□产失	产	21	56.3
	□(夕)疾	疾	7	6.3
〈巖〉	□(产)(磊)	(产)	14	87.1
	□山□(厂/丌)(磊)	□(厂/丌)(磊)	1	0.5
〈巖〉	□(产)(堯)	(产)	14	87.1
	□山□(厂/丌)(堯)	□(厂/丌)(堯)	1	0.5
Same as above	〈巖〉, 〈嶂〉, 〈巖〉, 〈巖〉, 〈巖〉, 〈巖〉, 〈巖〉, 〈巖〉, 〈巖〉, 〈巖〉			
彦	□产(彡)	产	11	84.0
	□立□厂(彡)	□厂(彡)	1	0.7
廉	□产兼	产	11	84.0
	□立□厂兼	□厂兼	1	0.7
廉	□产兼	产	11	71.6
	□立□厂兼	□厂兼	2	2.4
彦	□产彡	产	11	47.3
	□立彦	彦	5	9.8

詹	产言	产	11	41.9
	立广言	广言	6	12.5

TABLE 4. ㊦㊧ ADR ↔ ㊦ A ㊧ DR if D is not tare (122)

char	structure	component	pn	accuracy
死	㊦(歹)巳	(歹)	451	99.6
	㊦一㊦(夕/夕/夕)巳	㊦(夕/夕/夕)巳	1	0.1
〈死〉	㊦(歹)(巳/己/巳/巳)	(歹)	451	99.6
	㊦一㊦(夕/夕/夕)(巳/己/巳/巳)	㊦(夕/夕/夕)(巳/己/巳/巳)	1	0.1
〈死〉	㊦(歹)(匕/七)	(歹)	451	99.6
	㊦一㊦(夕/夕/夕)(匕/七)	㊦(夕/夕/夕)(匕/七)	1	0.1
死	㊦歹匕	歹	113	93.3
	㊦一死	死	4	0.2
𠂇	㊦𠂇尸	𠂇	33	94.2
	㊦白𠂇	𠂇	1	0.1
〈𠂇〉	㊦(𠂇)尸	(𠂇)	23	91.8
	㊦白㊦(匕)尸	㊦(匕)尸	1	0.2
石	㊦(厂)口	(厂)	22	91.5
	㊦一㊦厂口	㊦厂口	1	0.2
〈布〉	㊦(厂)巾	(厂)	22	91.5
	㊦一㊦厂巾	㊦厂巾	1	0.2
寢	㊦宀𠂇	宀	19	90.3
	㊦宀𠂇𠂇	𠂇	1	0.3
寐	㊦宀采	宀	19	90.3
	㊦宀(寐)	(寐)	1	0.3
Same as above	寢, 寤, 寐, 寐, 寐, 寢, 寐, 〈寢〉			
寢	㊦宀𠂇	宀	19	81.9
	㊦宀(寢)	(寢)	2	0.9
寐	㊦宀臬	宀	19	74.6
	㊦宀𠂇臬	𠂇臬	3	1.9
寤	㊦宀吾	宀	19	74.6
	㊦宀(寤)	(寤)	3	1.9

病	𠃉(宀)丙	𠃉(宀)	17	89.2
	𠃉(宀)𠃉(月/丩)丙	𠃉(月/丩)丙	1	0.3
〈寢〉	𠃉(宀)寢	𠃉(宀)	17	89.2
	𠃉(宀)𠃉(月/丩)寢	𠃉(月/丩)寢	1	0.3
Same as above	〈寤〉, 〈寢〉, 〈寐〉, 〈寤〉, 〈寤〉, 〈寐〉, 〈寤〉, 〈寐〉, 〈寤〉, 〈寐〉			
寤	𠃉(宀)言	𠃉(宀)	17	80.1
	𠃉(宀)𠃉(月/丩)言	𠃉(月/丩)言	2	1.1
〈寤〉	𠃉(宀)言	𠃉(宀)	17	80.1
	𠃉(宀)𠃉(月/丩)言	𠃉(月/丩)言	2	1.1
着	𠃉(艹)目	𠃉(艹)	12	85.2
	𠃉(艹)𠃉(月/丩)目	𠃉(月/丩)目	1	0.6
羞	𠃉(艹)丑	𠃉(艹)	12	85.2
	𠃉(艹)𠃉(月/丩)丑	𠃉(月/丩)丑	1	0.6
Same as above	〈羞〉, 〈羞〉, 〈羞〉			

TABLE 5. 𠃉 E 𠃉 R ↔ 𠃉 E 𠃉 R (131)

char	structure	component	pn	accuracy
屮	𠃉(屮)曳	𠃉(屮)	9	81.0
	𠃉(屮)𠃉(月/丩)曳	𠃉(月/丩)曳	1	1.1
屮	𠃉(屮)婁	𠃉(屮)	9	81.0
	𠃉(屮)𠃉(月/丩)婁	𠃉(月/丩)婁	1	1.1
屮	𠃉(屮)喬	𠃉(屮)	9	81.0
	𠃉(屮)𠃉(月/丩)喬	𠃉(月/丩)喬	1	1.1
〈屮〉	𠃉(屮)𠃉(曳/曳)	𠃉(屮)	9	81.0
	𠃉(屮)𠃉(月/丩)𠃉(曳/曳)	𠃉(月/丩)𠃉(曳/曳)	1	1.1
〈屮〉	𠃉(屮)𠃉(婁/婁/婁)	𠃉(屮)	9	81.0
	𠃉(屮)𠃉(月/丩)𠃉(婁/婁/婁)	𠃉(月/丩)𠃉(婁/婁/婁)	1	1.1
屮	𠃉(屮)桀	𠃉(屮)	9	81.0
	𠃉(屮)𠃉(月/丩)桀	𠃉(月/丩)桀	1	1.1
〈屮〉	𠃉(屮)婁	𠃉(屮)	9	81.0
	𠃉(屮)𠃉(月/丩)婁	𠃉(月/丩)婁	1	1.1

〈厖〉	□(厥)虫	〈厥〉	67	94.3
	□(厂/丌)□(夬)虫	□(夬)虫	2	0.1
〈康〉	□康心	康	55	96.5
	□广□隶心	□隶心	1	0.1
〈庚〉	□庚(凡)	庚	51	96.2
	□广□夬(凡)	□夬(凡)	1	0.1
〈奉〉	□庚十	庚	51	96.2
	□广□夬十	□夬十	1	0.1
Same as above	〈夙〉, 〈夙〉, 〈夙〉, 夙			
〈原〉	□(原)水	〈原〉	48	96.0
	□(厂/丌)□泉水	□泉水	1	0.1
麤	□麻鳥	麻	45	95.7
	□广(鷩)	〈鷩〉	1	0.1
磨	□麻口	麻	45	95.7
	□广(替)	〈替〉	1	0.1
Same as above	麤, 糜, 摩, 魔, 磨, 靡, 糜, 摩			
磨	□麻言	麻	45	91.7
	□广(替)	〈替〉	2	0.2
磨	□麻吕	麻	45	87.9
	□广□林吕	□林吕	3	0.4
磨	□声夊	声	43	95.5
	□广□曲夊	□曲夊	1	0.1
磨	□声衣	声	43	95.5
	□广□曲衣	□曲衣	1	0.1
Same as above	〈磨〉, 〈磨〉, 〈磨〉, 〈磨〉, 〈磨〉, 〈磨〉, 磨			
磨	□声且	声	43	91.3
	□广□曲且	□曲且	2	0.2
〈庶〉	□声灬	声	43	91.3
	□广□曲灬	□曲灬	2	0.2
Same as above	〈磨〉, 〈磨〉			
磨	□声从	声	43	87.4
	□广□曲从	□曲从	3	0.5

鹿	𠩺𠩺比	𠩺	43	87.4
	𠩺𠩺比	𠩺比	3	0.5
〈鹿〉	𠩺𠩺	𠩺	43	87.4
	𠩺𠩺	𠩺	3	0.5
〈鹿〉	𠩺(比)	𠩺	43	80.3
	𠩺(比)	𠩺(比)	5	1.1
〈麇〉	𠩺(食)	〈麇〉	35	94.5
	𠩺(饗)	〈饗〉	1	0.1
〈麇〉	𠩺(面)	〈麇〉	35	94.5
	𠩺(醫)	〈醫〉	1	0.1
Same as above	麇, 〈麇〉, 麇, 〈麇〉			
歷	𠩺(止)	〈歷〉	34	94.4
	𠩺(止)	𠩺(止)	1	0.1
〈曆〉	𠩺(田)	〈歷〉	34	94.4
	𠩺(替)	〈替〉	1	0.1
Same as above	〈歷〉, 〈曆〉, 〈曆〉, 〈曆〉, 〈歷〉, 〈歷〉, 〈歷〉, 〈歷〉, 〈歷〉			
〈曆〉	𠩺(甘)	〈歷〉	34	89.2
	𠩺(替)	〈替〉	2	0.3
曆	𠩺(石)	〈歷〉	34	89.2
	𠩺(石)	𠩺(石)	2	0.3
〈歷〉	𠩺(止)	〈歷〉	34	89.2
	𠩺(止)	𠩺(止)	2	0.3
膺	𠩺(目)	〈膺〉	31	93.8
	𠩺(目)	𠩺(目)	1	0.1
膺	𠩺(口)	〈膺〉	31	93.8
	𠩺(口)	𠩺(口)	1	0.1
Same as above	膺, 膺, 膺, 膺, 膺, 〈膺〉			
應	𠩺(心)	〈應〉	31	88.2
	𠩺(心)	𠩺(心)	2	0.4
鷹	𠩺(鳥)	〈應〉	31	88.2
	𠩺(鳥)	𠩺(鳥)	2	0.4
Same as above	鷹, 鷹			

褒	□府衣	府	29	93.4
	□广□付衣	□付衣	1	0.2
腐	□府肉	府	29	93.4
	□广□付肉	□付肉	1	0.2
〈賡〉	□府貝	府	29	87.5
	□广□付貝	□付貝	2	0.5
瘼	□府天	府	29	82.1
	□广□付天	□付天	3	0.9
〈瘼〉	□府天	府	29	82.1
	□广□付天	□付天	3	0.9
曆	□厥甲	厥	27	93.0
	□广□獸甲	□獸甲	1	0.2
𤇗	□灰匕	灰	24	92.2
	□广□火匕	□火匕	1	0.2
〈𤇗〉	□灰(匕)	灰	24	92.2
	□广□火(匕)	□火(匕)	1	0.2
〈愿〉	□厚心	厚	21	91.1
	□广□(享)心	□(享)心	1	0.2
卮	□(斤)(巴)	〈斤〉	20	90.7
	□(广)□一(巴)	□一(巴)	1	0.3
〈卮〉	□(斤)(巴)	〈斤〉	20	90.7
	□(广)□一(巴)	□一(巴)	1	0.3
〈卮〉	□(斤)(巳/己/巴/巴)	〈斤〉	20	90.7
	□(广)□一(巳/己/巴/巴)	□一(巳/己/巴/巴)	1	0.3
〈斤〉	□(斤)丁	〈斤〉	20	82.6
	□(广)(丁)	(丁)	2	0.9
〈斤〉	□(斤)乙	〈斤〉	20	82.6
	□(广)(乙)	〈乙〉	2	0.9
卮	□(斤)巴	〈斤〉	20	82.6
	□(广)□一巴	□一巴	2	0.9
后	□(斤)口	〈斤〉	20	5.2
	□(广)(口)	〈口〉	68	59.8
〈市〉	□(斤)巾	〈斤〉	20	4.0
	□(广)巾	巾	80	64.0
𤇗	□尿牛	尿	16	88.6
	□尸□水牛	□水牛	1	0.4
〈廩〉	□庫(虫)	庫	16	88.6
	□广□車(虫)	□車(虫)	1	0.4
𤇗	□麻鬲	麻	16	88.6
	□广□秝鬲	□秝鬲	1	0.4

曆	☐麻日	麻	16	88.6
	☐广日秝日	☐秝日	1	0.4
Same as above	歷, 曆, 歷, 曆, 曆, 曆, 曆, 曆, 曆			
歷	☐麻火	麻	16	79.0
	☐广日秝火	☐秝火	2	1.3
厯	☐麻心	麻	16	79.0
	☐广日秝心	☐秝心	2	1.3
曆	☐厥骨	厥	16	88.6
	☐广日歛骨	☐歛骨	1	0.4
歷	☐厥虫	厥	16	88.6
	☐广日歛虫	☐歛虫	1	0.4
〈厯〉	☐雁(直)	雁	10	82.6
	☐广日(隹)直	☐(隹)直	1	0.9
〈歷〉	☐雁(贝)	雁	10	82.6
	☐广日(隹)贝	☐(隹)贝	1	0.9
厯	☐雁貝	雁	10	69.4
	☐广日(隹)貝	☐(隹)貝	2	2.8
〈厯〉	☐(厶)木	〈厶〉	10	82.6
	☐广日犬木	☐犬木	1	0.9
〈厯〉	☐(厶)手	〈厶〉	10	82.6
	☐广日犬手	☐犬手	1	0.9
Same as above	〈厶〉, 〈厶〉			
〈厯〉	☐(厶)土	〈厶〉	10	69.4
	☐广日犬土	☐犬土	2	2.8
庶	☐庶灬	庶	9	81.0
	☐广焮	焮	1	1.1
度	☐庶又	庶	9	81.0
	☐广彳	彳	1	1.1
Same as above	慮, 庶			
度	☐庶火	庶	9	56.3
	☐广彳	彳	3	6.3
席	☐庶巾	庶	9	47.9
	☐广帛	帛	4	9.5
屬	☐屮(蜀)	屮	9	81.0
	☐尸日丰(蜀)	☐丰(蜀)	1	1.1

犀	𠂔犀牛	犀	9	81.0
	𠂔尸𠂔牛	𠂔牛	1	1.1
Same as above	犀, 〈犀〉, 〈犀〉, 〈犀〉, 〈犀〉			
愿	𠂔原心	原	8	79.0
	𠂔广𠂔泉心	𠂔泉心	1	1.3
〈贗〉	𠂔贗真	贗	7	76.6
	𠂔广𠂔(偽)真	𠂔(偽)真	1	1.6
〈贗〉	𠂔贗火	贗	7	76.6
	𠂔广𠂔(偽)火	𠂔(偽)火	1	1.6
〈席〉	𠂔席 ^灬	席	7	76.6
	𠂔广𠂔(𠂔/𠂔/𠂔/𠂔/𠂔) ^灬	𠂔(𠂔/𠂔/𠂔/𠂔/𠂔) ^灬	1	1.6
〈度〉	𠂔席又	席	7	76.6
	𠂔广𠂔(𠂔/𠂔/𠂔/𠂔/𠂔)又	𠂔(𠂔/𠂔/𠂔/𠂔/𠂔)又	1	1.6
Same as above	(度), 〈慮〉			
〈席〉	𠂔席巾	席	7	49.0
	𠂔广𠂔(𠂔/𠂔/𠂔/𠂔)	𠂔(𠂔/𠂔/𠂔/𠂔)	3	9.1
〈庥〉	𠂔席火	席	7	34.0
	𠂔广𠂔(𠂔)	𠂔(𠂔)	5	17.4

TABLE 7. 𠂔𠂔 LRB ↔ 𠂔𠂔 LBR (210)

char	structure	component	p _n	accuracy
〈穀〉	𠂔(穀)赤	𠂔(穀)	40	95.2
	𠂔𠂔吉赤(爻)	𠂔吉赤	1	0.1
〈穀〉	𠂔(穀)羊	𠂔(穀)	40	95.2
	𠂔𠂔吉羊(爻)	𠂔吉羊	1	0.1
Same as above	〈穀〉, 〈穀〉, 〈穀〉, 〈穀〉, 穀, 穀, 穀, 〈穀〉, 〈穀〉			
〈穀〉	𠂔(穀)豕	𠂔(穀)	40	90.7
	𠂔𠂔吉(豕)(爻)	𠂔吉(豕)	2	0.3
𠂔穀	𠂔(穀)木	𠂔(穀)	40	90.7
	𠂔𠂔索(爻)	索	2	0.3
Same as above	穀, 〈穀〉, 〈穀〉, 〈穀〉, 〈穀〉, 〈穀〉, 〈穀〉			

〈穀〉	☐(穀)出	(穀)	40	86.5
	☐☐日吉出(爰)	☐日吉出	3	0.5
〈穀〉	☐(穀)子	(穀)	40	86.5
	☐☐亭(爰)	亭	3	0.5
Same as above	(穀), (穀)			
〈穀〉	☐(穀)卵	(穀)	40	82.6
	☐☐日吉卵(爰)	☐日吉卵	4	0.9
穀	☐穀缶	穀	32	94.0
	☐☐日吉缶(爰)	☐日吉缶	1	0.1
穀	☐穀口	穀	32	94.0
	☐☐吉(爰)	吉	1	0.1
Same as above	穀, 穀, 穀, 穀			
穀	☐穀林	穀	32	88.6
	☐☐日吉林(爰)	☐日吉林	2	0.4
穀	☐穀目	穀	32	88.6
	☐☐日吉目(爰)	☐日吉目	2	0.4
Same as above	穀, 穀, 穀, 穀			
穀	☐穀子	穀	32	83.6
	☐☐亭(爰)	亭	3	0.8
穀	☐穀火	穀	32	83.6
	☐☐日吉火(爰)	☐日吉火	3	0.8
穀	☐穀出	穀	32	83.6
	☐☐日吉出(爰)	☐日吉出	3	0.8
穀	☐穀卵	穀	32	79.0
	☐☐日吉卵(爰)	☐日吉卵	4	1.3
穀	☐穀禾	穀	32	79.0
	☐☐(豪)(爰)	(豪)	4	1.3
〈頰〉	☐(頰)女	(頰)	28	93.2
	☐☐日多女(覓/頁)	☐日多女	1	0.2
〈穎〉	☐(頰)(末)	(頰)	20	90.7
	☐☐日(七)/七(末)(覓/頁)	☐(七)/七(末)	1	0.3
〈穎〉	☐(頰)禾	(頰)	20	82.6
	☐☐日(七)/七(禾)(覓/頁)	☐(七)/七(禾)	2	0.9
〈穎〉	☐(頰)示	(頰)	20	51.0
	☐☐(崇)(覓/頁)	(崇)	8	8.2

〈穀〉	𠂇𠂇𠂇士↗(爰)孚	𠂇𠂇士↗(爰)	11	84.0
	𠂇𠂇𠂇士↗(孚)爰	𠂇𠂇士↗(孚)	1	0.7
〈穀〉	𠂇𠂇𠂇士↗(爰)土	𠂇𠂇士↗(爰)	11	84.0
	𠂇𠂇𠂇士↗(土)爰	𠂇𠂇士↗(土)	1	0.7
Same as above	(穀), (穀), (穀), (穀), (穀), (穀)			
〈穀〉	𠂇𠂇𠂇士↗(爰)𠂇口米	𠂇𠂇士↗(爰)	11	71.6
	𠂇𠂇𠂇士↗(𠂇口米)爰	𠂇𠂇士↗(𠂇口米)	2	2.4
〈穀〉	𠂇𠂇𠂇士↗(爰)告	𠂇𠂇士↗(爰)	11	71.6
	𠂇𠂇𠂇士↗(告)爰	𠂇𠂇士↗(告)	2	2.4
〈穀〉	𠂇𠂇𠂇士↗(爰)牛	𠂇𠂇士↗(爰)	11	71.6
	𠂇𠂇𠂇士↗(牛)爰	𠂇𠂇士↗(牛)	2	2.4
穀	𠂇穀告	穀	10	82.6
	𠂇𠂇𠂇告爰	𠂇𠂇告	1	0.9
穀	𠂇穀牛	穀	10	82.6
	𠂇𠂇𠂇牛爰	𠂇𠂇牛	1	0.9
Same as above	穀, 穀, 穀, 穀, 穀, 穀			
𠂇	𠂇(𠂇)谷	(𠂇)	7	76.6
	𠂇(𠂇)谷又	𠂇(𠂇)谷	1	1.6
〈𠂇〉	𠂇(𠂇)谷/谷	(𠂇)	7	76.6
	𠂇(𠂇)谷/谷又	𠂇(𠂇)谷/谷	1	1.6
𠂇	𠂇(𠂇)貝	(𠂇)	7	60.5
	𠂇(𠂇)貝又	𠂇(𠂇)貝	2	5.0
〈𠂇〉	𠂇(𠂇)貝	(𠂇)	7	60.5
	𠂇(𠂇)貝又	𠂇(𠂇)貝	2	5.0
〈𠂇〉	𠂇(𠂇)貝	(𠂇)	7	60.5
	𠂇(𠂇)貝又	𠂇(𠂇)貝	2	5.0
〈𠂇〉	𠂇(𠂇)立	(𠂇)	7	76.6
	𠂇(𠂇)立	𠂇(𠂇)立	1	1.6

TABLE 8. 𠂇𠂇 AEM ↔ 𠂇 A 𠂇 EM if E is *kamae* (411)

char	structure	component	pn	accuracy
〈𠂇〉	𠂇(𠂇)	𠂇	199	99.0
	𠂇(𠂇)𠂇(𠂇)	𠂇(𠂇)	1	0.1
𠂇	𠂇(𠂇)	𠂇	199	84.1
	𠂇(𠂇)	𠂇	18	0.7

《𦏧》	𦏧(𦏧)束	《𦏧》	43	91.3
	𦏧(𦏧)𦏧	《𦏧》	2	0.2
《𦏧》	𦏧(𦏧)米	《𦏧》	43	91.3
	𦏧(𦏧)𦏧米弓(𦏧)	𦏧(𦏧)𦏧米弓	2	0.2
Same as above	《𦏧》, 《𦏧》, 《𦏧》, 《𦏧》, 《𦏧》, 《𦏧》, 《𦏧》, 《𦏧》			
《𦏧》	𦏧(𦏧)𦏧	《𦏧》	43	87.4
	𦏧(𦏧)𦏧(𦏧)	《𦏧》	3	0.5
《𦏧》	𦏧(𦏧)𦏧	《𦏧》	43	87.4
	𦏧(𦏧)𦏧(𦏧)弓(𦏧)	𦏧(𦏧)𦏧(𦏧)弓	3	0.5
《𦏧》	𦏧(𦏧)每	《𦏧》	43	87.4
	𦏧(𦏧)𦏧每弓(𦏧)	𦏧(𦏧)𦏧每弓	3	0.5
《𦏧》	𦏧(𦏧)孝	《𦏧》	43	87.4
	𦏧(𦏧)𦏧孝弓(𦏧)	𦏧(𦏧)𦏧孝弓	3	0.5
𦏧	𦏧(𦏧)曾	𦏧	19	90.3
	𦏧(𦏧)𦏧曾弓(𦏧)	𦏧(𦏧)𦏧曾弓	1	0.3
𦏧	𦏧(𦏧)辱	𦏧	19	90.3
	𦏧(𦏧)𦏧辱弓(𦏧)	𦏧(𦏧)𦏧辱弓	1	0.3
Same as above	𦏧, 𦏧, 𦏧, 𦏧			
𦏧	𦏧(𦏧)弗	𦏧	19	81.9
	𦏧(𦏧)𦏧弗弓(𦏧)	𦏧(𦏧)𦏧弗弓	2	0.9
𦏧	𦏧(𦏧)酉	𦏧	19	81.9
	𦏧(𦏧)𦏧酉弓(𦏧)	𦏧(𦏧)𦏧酉弓	2	0.9
Same as above	𦏧, 𦏧, 𦏧, 𦏧, 𦏧, 𦏧			
𦏧	𦏧(𦏧)𦏧	𦏧	19	74.6
	𦏧(𦏧)𦏧(𦏧)弓(𦏧)	𦏧(𦏧)𦏧(𦏧)弓	3	1.9
𦏧	𦏧(𦏧)每	𦏧	19	74.6
	𦏧(𦏧)𦏧每弓(𦏧)	𦏧(𦏧)𦏧每弓	3	1.9
𦏧	𦏧(𦏧)孝	𦏧	19	74.6
	𦏧(𦏧)𦏧孝弓(𦏧)	𦏧(𦏧)𦏧孝弓	3	1.9
𦏧	𦏧(𦏧)咸	𦏧	10	82.6
	𦏧(𦏧)𦏧咸弓(𦏧)	𦏧(𦏧)𦏧咸弓	1	0.9
𦏧	𦏧(𦏧)𦏧	𦏧	10	82.6
	𦏧(𦏧)𦏧𦏧弓(𦏧)	𦏧(𦏧)𦏧𦏧弓	1	0.9
𦏧	𦏧(𦏧)采	𦏧	10	82.6
	𦏧(𦏧)𦏧采弓(𦏧)	𦏧(𦏧)𦏧采弓	1	0.9

𦉳	𦉳去	𦉳	10	82.6
	𦉳弓去弓𦉳	𦉳弓去弓	1	0.9
𦉳	𦉳(𦉳)	𦉳	10	69.4
	𦉳弓(𦉳)弓𦉳	𦉳弓(𦉳)弓	2	2.8
𦉳	𦉳付	𦉳	10	69.4
	𦉳弓付弓𦉳	𦉳弓付弓	2	2.8

TABLE 11. 𦉳 A 𦉳 LRC ↔ 𦉳 A 𦉳 LCR (611)

char	structure	component	p ⁿ	accuracy
〈齋〉	𦉳(齊)貝	〈齊〉	30	93.7
	𦉳文𦉳貝	𦉳貝	1	0.1
〈齋〉	𦉳(齊)韭	〈齊〉	30	93.7
	𦉳文𦉳韭	𦉳韭	1	0.1
Same as above	〈齋〉, 〈齋〉, 〈齋〉			
齋	𦉳(齊)示	〈齊〉	30	82.6
	𦉳文𦉳示	𦉳示	3	0.9
〈羸〉	𦉳(羸)糸	〈羸〉	23	91.8
	𦉳(音)𦉳(月)糸(凡)	𦉳(月)糸(凡)	1	0.2
〈羸〉	𦉳(羸)貝	〈羸〉	23	91.8
	𦉳(音)𦉳(月)貝(凡)	𦉳(月)貝(凡)	1	0.2
Same as above	羸, 羸, 羸, 羸, 羸, 羸, 羸, 羸, 羸, 羸, 羸, 羸, 羸, 羸			
〈羸〉	𦉳(羸)馬	〈羸〉	23	84.6
	𦉳(音)𦉳(月)馬(凡)	𦉳(月)馬(凡)	2	0.7
羸	𦉳羸魚	羸	16	88.6
	𦉳(音)𦉳(月)魚凡	𦉳(月)魚凡	1	0.4
羸	𦉳羸叟	羸	16	88.6
	𦉳(音)𦉳(月)叟凡	𦉳(月)叟凡	1	0.4
Same as above	羸, 羸, 羸, 羸, 羸, 羸, 羸			
〈齋〉	𦉳(齊)月/月/月/月	齊	7	76.6
	𦉳(音)𦉳(月/月/月/月)𦉳	𦉳(月/月/月/月)𦉳	1	1.6
齋	𦉳齋魚	齊	7	60.5
	𦉳(音)𦉳(月)魚	𦉳(月)魚	2	5.0

𩚑	𩚑齊魚	齊	7	60.5
	𩚑𩚑月魚丨	𩚑月魚丨	2	5.0
羸	𩚑羸虫	羸	7	76.6
	𩚑𩚑月虫凡	𩚑月虫凡	1	1.6
羸	𩚑羸羊	羸	7	76.6
	𩚑𩚑月羊凡	𩚑月羊凡	1	1.6
羸	𩚑羸(果)	羸	7	60.5
	𩚑𩚑月(果)凡	𩚑月(果)凡	2	5.0

TABLE 12. 𩚑 AM 𩚑 LRC ↔ 𩚑 AM 𩚑 LCR (612)

char	structure	component	p#	accuracy
𩚑	𩚑𩚑貝	𩚑	4	64.0
	𩚑𩚑亡口𩚑月貝(𩚑)	𩚑月貝(𩚑)	1	4.0
𩚑	𩚑𩚑羊	𩚑	4	64.0
	𩚑𩚑亡口𩚑月羊(𩚑)	𩚑月羊(𩚑)	1	4.0
𩚑	𩚑𩚑女	𩚑	4	64.0
	𩚑𩚑亡口𩚑月女(𩚑)	𩚑月女(𩚑)	1	4.0

In many cases, especially in the trivial ones, the accuracy of the functional structures is high. Often these results are also consistent with the etymological structure. For example, in the case of “脩” (table 2), the accuracy of 𩚑攸田 is lower than the accuracy of 𩚑𩚑备. In fact, 𩚑𩚑备 seems to correspond to the etymological structure. However, since these results were calculated with respect to a simple count of the number of CHISE character objects, productivity of a component was divided by the number of glyph-variants of the component. For example, component 𩚑 is written in various forms such as “羸,” “羸,” “羸,” “羸,” “羸,” “羸,” “羸,” “羸,” “羸,” “羸,” etc. As the result, the productivity of apparent components (𩚑月x凡, 𩚑月x𩚑, etc.) increases and the accuracy of the functional structure decreases. Therefore, if information on variant-relations is available, it is better to normalize the glyphs (close to the original forms), its structure and components.

5. Conclusion

Structural description of Chinese character should be based on Chinese character analysis (Chinese character studies), like grammatical analysis of natural language. For this reason, it is desirable to describe Hanzi structure based on etymological explanations. Etymological knowledge

is required to perform the task, however this information is missing for many atypical Chinese characters, in fact the *majority* of CJKV Unified Ideographs of UCS.

On the other hand, if we consider the “(degree of) componentness” of Chinese characters, a (candidate for) component that produces more Chinese characters is more likely to be considered as an actual component. Considering components with respect to productivity does *not* require any etymological knowledge on characters and therefore can be calculated whenever we have a dataset of Hanzi structure descriptions at our disposal.

Based on this hypothesis, we conducted an experiment using the structural data on Chinese characters from the CHISE character ontology. As a result, we found that components based on etymological knowledge are more likely to have a higher productivity.

References

- Asahara, Tatsuro [浅原達郎] (1996). 漢字の字符 [*Chinese Character Graphemes*]. URL: <http://yuetgu.zinbun.kyoto-u.ac.jp:8098/yg/rs/jihu.pdf>.
- Information technology—Universal Coded Character Set (UCS)* (2014). ISO/IEC 10646:2014. International Organization for Standardization (ISO).
- Morioka, Tomohiko [守岡知彦] (2015). “Multiple-policy Character Annotation based on CHISE.” In: *Journal of the Japanese Association for Digital Humanities* 1.1, pp. 86–106.
- (2018a). “Integration of a Chinese Character Ontology Title and Historical Glyph Examples.” In: *9th International Conference of Digital Archives and Digital Humanities (DADH 2018)*. Taiwanese Association for Digital Humanities / Dharma Drum Institute of Liberal Arts, pp. 287–300.
- (2018b). “項書き換え系を用いた漢字字体の包摂規準の形式化の試み [An Attempt to Formalize Unification Rules of Chinese Characters Based on Term Rewriting System].” In: 情報処理学会論文誌 [*Journal of the Information Processing Society of Japan*] 59.2, pp. 332–340.
- Slaměńíková, Tereza (2019). “On the Nature of Unmotivated Components in Modern Chinese Characters.” In: *Proceedings of Graphemics in the 21st Century, Brest 2018*. Ed. by Yannis Haralambous. Brest: Fluxus Editions, pp. 209–226.