This proposal requests the encoding of three characters in the Old Italic script for North Italic use. If this proposal is accepted, the following characters will exist:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{𐌭} & \quad \text{OLD ITALIC LETTER YE} \\
\text{𐌮} & \quad \text{OLD ITALIC LETTER NORTHERN TSE} \\
\text{𐌯} & \quad \text{OLD ITALIC LETTER SOUTHERN TSE}
\end{align*}
\]

At a meeting in Glasgow attended by Debbie Anderson, Joe Eska, Michael Everson, Stefan Schumacher, David Stifter, and Ken Whistler it was agreed that it was appropriate to unify North Italic with Old Italic.

The character proposed for U+1032F 𐌯 OLD ITALIC LETTER SOUTHERN TSE is found in Magrè. It was previously proposed by Christopher C. Little as OLD ITALIC LETTER TTE in L2/12-386 “Revised Proposal to Encode Additional Old Italic Characters”. It may perhaps have been derived from a form of U+1032F 𐌔 OLD ITALIC LETTER SE (via one of its glyph variants ʣ or ʥ).

The character proposed for U+1032E 𐌮 OLD ITALIC LETTER NORTHERN TSE has been found in Sanzeno and Cles in the Non valley, Pfatten in the Bolsano area, and Ženjak in Slovenia. It is used for the same sound as U+1032F 𐌯 OLD ITALIC LETTER SOUTHERN TSE but was devised on a different basis. Note that this character is similar in shape to U+10322 OLD ITALIC NUMERAL FIFTY and to one of the Faliscan shapes of U+1031A OLD ITALIC LETTER EF.

The character proposed for U+1032D 𐌭 OLD ITALIC LETTER YE is documented in Cadore (Pozzale, San Vito, Calalzo (Làgole sanctuary), Auronzo), at the Monte Pore, in Friaul (Pozzuolo del Friuli, Verzegnis) and Istria (Idrija pri Bači). It may have been the forerunner of U+16C3 ἶ RUNIC LETTER JERAN J and eventually of U+16C4 ᵁ RUNIC LETTER GER. When doubled the letter kerns deeply with itself; compare 𐌭𐌭 ĳ and ἶ célib. Note that this character is similar in shape to one of the North Picene shapes of U+10302 OLD ITALIC LETTER KE.

Unicode Character Properties. Character properties are proposed here.

```
1032D;OLD ITALIC LETTER YE;Lo;0;L;;;;;;N;;;;;
1032E;OLD ITALIC LETTER NORTHERN TSE;Lo;0;L;;;;;;N;;;;;
1032F;OLD ITALIC LETTER SOUTHERN TSE;Lo;0;L;;;;;;N;;;;;
```
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Examples.

Figure 1. Example from Battista 1967: showing OLD ITALIC LETTER YE.

The text in an Old Italic font: ΦΥΤΙΚΑΚΟΣ[..]ΚΟΣ ΨΥ / ΔΟΡΟΜ ΤΡΥΨΙΚΑΤΕΙ ΤΟΛΕΡ
The text in a North Italic font: ΦΥΞΙΚΑΚΟΣ[..]ΚΟΣ ΨΥ / ΔΟΡΟΜ ΧΡΑΜΣΙΚΑΤΕΙ ΤΟΛΕΡ
Text reversed for LTR display: butijakos[..].kos ?? / donom trumusijatei toler

Figure 2. Example from Battista 1951:307 showing OLD ITALIC LETTER NORTHERN TSE.

The text in an Old Italic font: ΛΑΣΠΑ ΦΙΡΙΜΑΠΙΝΑΓΕ ΨΙ ΚΑΜΙΥΑΝΥ
The text in a North Italic font: ΛΑΣΠΑ ΦΙΡΙΜΑΠΙΝΑΓΕ ΨΙ ΚΑΜΙΥΑΝΥ
Text reversed for LTR display: laspa φιριμαπιναγε χι καςιχανу

Figure 3. Example from Morandi 1982:199 showing OLD ITALIC LETTER SOUTHERN TSE.

The text in an Old Italic font: ΠΕΙΤΕΡ ΨΙΒΙΡΑΤΕ ΨΙ
The text in a North Italic font: ΠΕΙΤΕΡ ΨΙΒΙΡΑΤΕ ΨΙ
Text reversed for LTR display: reitem uiu t’inaţe
Figure 4. A chart showing a set of common glyph variants for Old Italic. This is recommended to the Unicode Technical Committee for presentation as a Unicode Technical Note.
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