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This is the first draft of a proposal for adding a few mathematical and letterlike characters.

Background

Unicode 3.2, but also Unicode 3.1 and to a lesser degree Unicode 4.0 added mathematical characters to support the mathematical user community. The large number of character involved made these additions a rather complex undertaking. During a recent review of the mathematical classification and mapping to the ISO 9573-13 entity sets for addition to Unicode Technical Report #25, Unicode support for Mathematics, several characters were found missing. In some cases, these can more or less directly be encoded by combining sequences, and where that was possible, they were removed from the request before completion of this proposal. In reviewing existing character collections, some non-mathematical letterlike characters were discovered and are proposed here for addition.

Note: The characters in this proposal are not strongly related to each other. They can and should be discussed individually. They are presented here in conjunction primarily for convenience.

One of the goals of MathML is complete support for the SGML entity sets from ISO 9573-13. Providing this support allows existing SGML documents to be carried forward into MathML. The mapping of these entity sets has three issues

1. some entities have no reasonable character to map to
2. some entities map to a character already mapped by a different entity form the same entity set
3. some entities map to a character already mapped by a different entity from another entity set

where characters are missing or were mistakenly unified, character additions are proposed in the List of proposed characters. For the other types of issues that arise in mapping ISO 9573, a final recommendation has not been made. However, the entities and characters in question are noted in http://www.unicode.org/~asmus/Notes_on_mapping_ISO_9573.html.

A preponderance of existing mathematical literature is encoded in TeX format and related formats (LaTeX, etc.). TeX and its derivatives are macro languages that combine layout and glyph selection instructions directly with an entity (macro) definition. This leads to particular concerns when trying to represent existing mathematical texts in a model that is based on character encoding.

List of proposed characters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Name / Code</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[]</td>
<td>COMBINING LONG DOUBLE SOLIDUS OVERLAY</td>
<td>This should look like a doubled 0338. The STIX project has the use of the following double slashed combinations attested: double-slashed: italic A, italic E, italic F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>suggested code: 0358</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[]</td>
<td>PERPENDICULAR</td>
<td>Existing 22A5 UP TACK is mapped to two different entities perp (perpendicular) and bot (bottom, i.e. up tack), from the same ISO 9573-13 entity set (ISOTECH). The difference between these two symbols is the way they are laid out and used: Perp, is an infix relation like &lt;, and gets extra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DOUBLE-STRUCK SMALL PI

This is used by systems like Mathematica to unambiguously designate the value of $\pi = 3.14159265358979\ldots$, since the ordinary Greek letter could also be used for unrelated variables. This character completes the series of double-struck Greek operators and special values found in the range U+213D..U+213F

```latex
\perp
```

and

```latex
\bot
```

which means that `$\perp$` and `$\bot$` will by default use the same symbol, but with different white space behaviour. A `\mathrel` is an infix relation like `<`, and a `\mathord` is a normal letter like $x$, that gets no special spacing.

### MATHEMATICAL ITALIC DOTLESS I

These dotless characters are primarily intended as a compatibility character to map the ISOAMS entities `imath` and `jmath` or TeX `\imath` and `\jmath`. Most commonly, mapping these entities to the mathematical italic i or j and removing the dot when composing with math accents would result in the intended display.

There are documents in which the undotted i and j are used contrastively with the dotted versions. See Additional information on `imath` and `jmath` symbols.

### MATHEMATICAL ITALIC DOTLESS J

Besides mathematical use, both dotless characters can be found in other fields, such as phonetic transcriptions, but not necessarily in their italic form.

The `\imath` and `\jmath` are by default always italic. Their appearance in TeX (and in the ISO 9573 entity sets) is similar to the shapes shown in the illustrations in this proposal. It is suggested not to unify the `\imath` with the existing U+0130 DOTLESS I because `\imath` is never used in situations where case mapping occurs. However if that should be desired after all, then the `dotless j` would also be the upright character.

### DOTLESS J

Many fonts contain dotless i and j glyphs, to be used to place accents on i and j. In Unicode, placing an accent on a an i or j character removes the dot, therefore there is no need for a character to represent the dotless base character, `unless` it is used standalone. Dotless i is used in Turkish, however `dotless j` is also used. For example in transliteration of the the Khakas language. A relevant quote from a paper describing the method:

http://home.arcor.de/marcmarti/khakas/xakvoc/xakvoc_intro.htm

...employs two additional letters, a j without dot, and a j with comma-like dot. According to his dictionary, these graphemes represent a y preceded by a soft t and by a soft d respectively;

The other letter mentioned can be encoded as `j + 0313`

### PER SIGN

This is a character used in print as an abbreviation for the word per, in expressions such as 'per day' or 'per month'. See Additional information on...
### Additional information on the imath and jmath symbols

Generally, \texttt{\imath} and \texttt{\jmath} in TeX are simply used as base forms to apply math accents to. However, mathematical equations can have entire sub-expressions underneath a math accent, e.g. when a 'wide hat' is placed on top of \texttt{i+j}. as in this example:

\[
\widehat{\imath + \jmath} = \hat{\imath} + \hat{\jmath}.
\]

In such a situation a renderer can no longer rely simply on the presence of an adjacent combining character to substitute the undotted glyph, and whether the dots should be removed in such a situation is not 100% predictable. In TeX, this decision is left to the author, and some authors would want to use the dotted forms as in \texttt{\widehat{\imath + \jmath}}. Authors are also known to have applied \texttt{\imath} and \texttt{\jmath} explicitly without a dot. Here is one example of an electronically published journal article making use of unaccented \textit{dotless i and j}.


See especially the last line of Hypothesis 4.2 (b) on page 8 of the pdf which comes from this TeX source:

\[
\imath \in \{\textbf{I} \} \text{ (resp. } \jmath \in \{\textbf{J}\})\}$.


### Additional information on the Per sign


[@] [per] lb / £ $ % + - × ÷ =

There it's definitely upper case, in the sense that it extends from the top of the l and b to below the baseline.
Modern use in print can be found a.o. in a modern printed edition of 17th- to 19th century handwritten English letters (Miller, Kerby A., Arnold Schrier, Bruce D. Boling, & David N. Doyle. 2002. Irish immigrants in the land of Canaan letters and memoirs from colonial and revolutionary America, 1675-1815. Oxford, Oxford UP) where it is used to abbreviate per in 'per day' or 'per week'.

While the origin of this character may have been a handwritten contraction, its use in print can be considered well established.

More on the origin

The per sign can also be found along with other symbols used in the OED at http://dictionary.oed.com/public/help/Advanced/symbols.htm#mod1letter. (Not all these symbols are currently part of Unicode.)

It is probably the sign indicated by the editors of The Papers of George Washington at http://gwpapers.virginia.edu/search/index.html:

The ampersand has been retained and the thorn transcribed as "th."
The symbol for per ($PR$) is used when it appears in the manuscript.

Unfortunately this ($PR$) does not appear in any of the transcription or facsimile examples on the website. But at http://www.roma.unisa.edu.au/07305/symbols.htm#Percent part of an Italian manuscript of 1684 is shown in which an early form of the percent sign is preceded by what seems to be this same per sign. The graphic can be seen more clearly at http://www.roma.unisa.edu.au/07305/Symbolsfolder/S406.JPG. The suspected origin of the glyph for the per sign the $p$ with a bar through its descender which was the standard medieval character for "per".

See http://www.rootsweb.com/~chevaud/abbrev.htm for a version with a single loop, seemingly a calligraphic development of the version found at http://www.lib.umich.edu/eebo/docs/dox/instruct.html called "&abper".

See also both http://www.hum.ku.dk/ami/handbook/chapter4.html (and search on "persarum") and http://helmer.hit.uib.no/mufi/proposal/range9-v2.html (and search on "&pbardes").

Relation to the barred P

The difference between medieval and more modern glyphs is great and a $p$ with a bar though the descender has also been used to indicate a fricative labial or an $f$-sound in some phonetic and transliteration traditions. For example $f$ or $p$ with bar above the character or below the descender is generally used today in transliterating Hebrew. Accordingly it might be best to code two symbols, a $p$ with a bar through the descender (with corresponding uppercase) to indicate the both medieval per sign and modern phonetic usage of barred $p$ and a separate character per sign for the more modern swirl descentant of the medieval per sign.

This suggestion has been raised before; here are some pointers to the mail archives of relevant discussions: There is a mention of barred-p by Robert Lloyd Wheelock at http://www.unicode.org/mail-arch/unicode-ml/y2002-m09/0019.html, though he visualizes $p$ with a bar through the bowl, not the descender. An answer by Jim Allan is at http://www.unicode.org/mail-arch/unicode-ml/y2002-m09/0039.html and has links to a number of fonts with barred characters. though only Junicode He privately reported having seen $p$ with a bar through the stem listed in Hebrew transliteration tables, and perhaps elsewhere. Of the fonts he cites, only the Junicode fonts available at http://www.engl.virginia.edu/OE/junicode/junicode.html has a $p$ with a bar through the descender — which he takes to be the medieval per sign — as well as the upper case, a $P$ with a bar through the stem.

Additional information on the Papyrus symbol

This is one of the symbols used by biblical textual critics. The site http://www.sil.org/computing/fonts/silgreek/SILApparatusFonts.html gives a font showing that clearly places this symbol in the context of other symbols used for special characters used as part of New Testament scholarly apparatus.
From this listing it is clear that the glyph for the P does not match the other Fraktur forms in this font. It is less angular and more calligraphic in style. Here is a note from *The Greek New Testament* (United Bible Societies, Fourth Revised Edition, Second Printing, 1994) regarding 1 Peter 3:15, reproduced using the SIL Galatia and SIL Apparatus font families (quoted from the same site).

6 15 {A} τὸν Χριστόν Ἡ Β Ψ 33 945 1175 1243 1611
1739 1852 1881 2138 2464 itar, t, w, z vg syrp, h copsa, bo arm (geo)
Clement; (Jerome) η τὸν θεόν 81 322 323 436 1067 1241 1292 1409
1505 1735 2298 2344 Byz [K L P] Lect (l 593 τὸν θεόν αὐτὸν; l 1441 τὸν

The rendition of this symbol in the main table is slightly more embellished than the one shown font above, and comes from the book by John Dominic Crossan, *The Birth of Christianity Discovering What Happened in the Years Immediately After the Execution of Jesus* (New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 1998). Here’s an excerpt:

Roberts and Skeat give that same list with the addition of one more example—a text that Skeat had recently edited, the P. Oxy. 3523 text of John 18:36–19:7, known as New Testament ψ90 (1983: 40–41; NDEIC 7.242–244). It too is a papyrus

For comparison, here are the Fraktur symbols from other sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1D513</td>
<td>1D52D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unicode 4.0

A Walden font Fraktur

Old English MT

The Walden font Fraktur comes the closest to the proposed symbol, but even it is decidedly more angular, esp at the top of the bowl.

In conclusion, the symbol shape does not draw from run-of-the-mill Fraktur fonts, in fact, it seems to have become disassociated from other Fraktur characters used in the same context, and should therefore not be unified with 1D513.
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A. Administrative

1. Title: Additional Mathematical and Letterlike Characters

2. Requester's name: Asmus Freytag (on behalf of STIX and MathML)

3. Requester type (Member body/Liaison/Individual contribution):

4. Submission date: _______________

5. Requester's reference (if applicable):

6. (Choose one of the following):
   This is a complete proposal: yes
   or, More information will be provided later: _______________

B. Technical - General

1. (Choose one of the following):
   a. This proposal is for a new script (set of characters):
   Proposed name of script: _________________________________________________
   b. The proposal is for addition of character(s) to an existing block: yes
      Name of the existing block: _________several____________________________

2. Number of characters in proposal: _______8______

3. Proposed category (see section II, Character Categories): _____various__

4. Proposed Level of Implementation (1, 2 or 3)
   (see clause 14, ISO/IEC 10646-1: 2000): ______1_and_3__
   Is a rationale provided for the choice? no
   If Yes, reference: _______________________________________________________

5. Is a repertoire including character names provided? yes
   a. If YES, are the names in accordance with the character naming guidelines in Annex L of ISO/IEC 10646-1: 2000? yes
   b. Are the character shapes attached in a legible form suitable for review? yes

6. Who will provide the appropriate computerized font (ordered preference: True Type, or PostScript format) for publishing the standard?
   True Type or PostScript format
   If available now, identify source(s) for the font (include address, e-mail, ftp-site, etc.) and indicate the tools used:
   ___________________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________

7. References:
   a. Are references (to other character sets, dictionaries, descriptive texts etc.) provided? yes
   b. Are published examples of use (such as samples from newspapers, magazines, or other sources) of proposed characters attached? yes

8. Special encoding issues:
   Does the proposal address other aspects of character data processing (if applicable) such as input, presentation, sorting, searching, indexing, transliteration etc. (if yes please enclose information)? where applicable_______________________________________________________

9. Additional Information:
   See the other sections of this document.

C. Technical - Justification

1. Has this proposal for addition of character(s) been submitted before? no
   If YES explain __________________________________________________________

2. Has contact been made to members of the user community (for example: National Body, user groups of the script or characters, other experts, etc.)? yes
   If YES, with whom? _mathml working group, STIX, other experts_ yes
   If YES, available relevant documents: see other sections

3. Information on the user community for the proposed characters (for example: size, demographics, information technology use, or publishing use) is included? yes
   Reference: see other sections

4. The context of use for the proposed characters (type of use; common or rare) varies
   Reference: see other sections
5. Are the proposed characters in current use by the user community? __yes__
   If YES, where? Reference: ____________see other sections__________

6. After giving due considerations to the principles in Principles and Procedures document (a WG 2 standing document) must the proposed characters be entirely in the BMP? __not entirely__
   If YES, a rationale provided? __from context__
   If YES, reference: ____________see other sections__________

7. Should the proposed characters be kept together in a contiguous range (rather than being scattered)? __isolated__

8. Can any of the proposed characters be considered a presentation form of an existing character or character sequence? __yes__
   If YES, is a rationale for its inclusion provided? __yes__
   If YES, reference: ____________see other sections__________

9. Can any of the proposed characters be encoded using a composed character sequence of either existing characters or other proposed characters? _No_
   If YES, is a rationale for its inclusion provided? ______________
   If YES, reference: ________________________________

10. Can any of the proposed character(s) be considered to be similar (in appearance or function) to an existing character? __yes__
    If YES, is a rationale for its inclusion provided? __yes__
    If YES, reference: ____________see other sections__________

11. Does the proposal include use of combining characters and/or use of composite sequences (see clauses 4.12 and 4.14 in ISO/IEC 10646-1: 2000)? __yes__
    If YES, is a rationale for such use provided? __no__
    If YES, reference: ____________see other sections__________
    Is a list of composite sequences and their corresponding glyph images (graphic symbols) provided? ______________
    If YES, reference: ________________________________

12. Does the proposal contain characters with any special properties such as control function or similar semantics? ______none____
    If YES, describe in detail (include attachment if necessary) __________

13. Does the proposal contain any Ideographic compatibility character(s)? _N_ 
    If YES, is the equivalent corresponding unified ideographic character(s) identified? ______________
    If YES, reference: ________________________________