1. Introduction

The "ordinary" hyphen, which is representable by U+002D HYPHEN-MINUS or U+2010 HYPHEN, usually is displayed by a single short horizontal dash, but has a considerable glyph variation: it can be slanted to oblique or doubled (stacked) according to the used font. For instance, in Fraktur (Blackletter) fonts, it commonly is represented by two stacked short oblique dashes.

However, in certain applications, double hyphens (consisting of two stacked short dashes) are used as characters with semantics deviating from the "ordinary" hyphen, e.g. to represent a definite unit in transliteration.

For such a special application, in this case for transliteration of Coptic, U+2E17 DOUBLE OBLIQUE HYPHEN was encoded ([1], example on p. 9).

However, there are other applications where the double hyphen is usually not oblique. For such applications, here a "DOUBLE HYPHEN" is proposed, which consists of two stacked short dashes which usually are horizontal.

In most cases described below, the "double hyphen" is essentially used like a hyphen. Thus, it inherits its properties (including its line breaking behavior) from U+2010 HYPHEN.

However, there are cases where the "double hyphen" is used to indicate a specific pronunciation (to denote the single pronunciation of consonants which usually constitute a digraph).
In such use, as well as in cases where an ordinary hyphen also were non-breaking, the double hyphen is non-breaking.

Instead of proposing a different character NON-BREAKING DOUBLE HYPHEN here, it is referred to the possibility to use an U+2060 WORD JOINER after the DOUBLE HYPHEN to achieve the same effect (for examples, see fig. 4).

It shall be noted that the superficially similar true letter U+ A78A MODIFIER LETTER SHORT EQUALS SIGN is not suitable for use as a "double hyphen" punctuation mark, as (besides the fact that the glyph is not necessarily the same in well-designed fonts) a letter (with is line breaking behavior and its suitability for searching) is not appropriate here.

1. Use in Transcriptions

The double hyphen is commonly used in transcriptions of German handwritten texts (fig. 1) and texts printed in Fraktur (Blackletter) into text of modern typographic appearance (fig. 2, 3), to represent any double hyphen found there, independent of the meaning of that punctuation mark in the original text (where its function could be equal to the ordinary hyphen).

This may be due to the fact that the hyphenation rules valid during the creation of the original text are different from the modern German hyphenation rules, and the use of modern (i.e. single) hyphens may be regarded as a distortion of the original text.

A more important reason is the desire to preserve the original hyphenation by denoting it by the double hyphen, while allowing the transcribed text to be hyphenated according to modern rules when presented as continuous text by modern (single) hyphens, without these hyphens to be misrepresented as part of the original text (fig. 3).

As the examples show, in absence of an encoded double hyphen, equals signs are used in spite of the fact that their typographic appearance is inferior in this use, as they are usually too long and thin to represent hyphens.

However, they are preferred over the the encoded double oblique hyphen, as this is considered not matching the modern font (especially when the original double hyphens are not explicitly oblique, as it is common for handwritten originals). In fact, oblique hyphens (single or double) look strange or peculiar to a German reader when found in German text set in Roman type.

2. Use as Phonetic Indicator

Fig. 4 shows an example where the DOUBLE HYPHEN is used to emphasize the dialectal pronunciation [st] for the German digraph “st”, which is pronounced [ʃt] in standard German, by writing “s fête”. (Emphasizing this pronunciation in literature for a common audience also means emphasizing someone’s origin from the city of Hamburg or its rural surroundings.)

3. Use in Non-Standard German Punctuation

In modern German literature, the double hyphen is heavily used by the author Arno Schmidt (1914-1979, [2]), who developed his own orthography deviating from the German standard one. He uses the double hyphen for some kinds of compound words, contrasting to other uses of the hyphen where he uses the standard (single) hyphen (fig. 4, 5). Also, he uses this to let words look like a compound word which in fact are none, thus emphasizing special connotations, or to mark special pronunciation or word emphasis (fig. 4).

(In modern standard German orthography, compound words usually are written by concatenating the constituents without gaps, spaces, or hyphens).

The author, due to his importance for German post-World-War-II literature and his challenging dealing with the German language, is often discussed and cited in germanistic, linguistic, and
literary critical works. In such texts, he usually is cited exactly, i.e. using his special orthography including the double hyphen (fig. 6).

While the use of Arno Schmidt's deviating orthography could be considered idiosyncratic as long as the author only had used it, (the rest of this paragraph is cited from [11]) but the use of it in studies of his work is not. All notation is originally idiosyncratic. Nobody argues that this is a case of a mainstream character, it's more in line with the symbols and letters we've added for specialized notations in mathematics and linguistics, or, more recently, the editing of archaic texts.

Moreover, the double hyphen, invented as it is for non-standard orthography, is now used elsewhere in the "Arno Schmidt style", especially to emphasize the components of German compound words (fig. 7). Thus, even when only its use as non-Standard German punctuation mark is taken into account, it has left the realm of idiosyncrasy anyway.
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Fig. 1: A screenshot from [3], representing double hyphens found in the original manuscript transcribed here. The headline translates "Register of the persons died in the parish ..." The modern orthography for "Familien-Name" and "Tauf-Name" ("family name" = surname and "baptizing name" = Christian name) is "Familiennname" and "Taufname".

Fig. 2: Title page of [4] (a Fraktur print of 1697) and [5] (its modern transcription of 2008), showing the transcription of the historic “−” by a (non-oblique) double hyphen when using a Roman font in the modern transcription. As a true double hyphen is not available, it is represented here by an equals sign in spite of its typographical shortcomings, rather than by an oblique double hyphen which looks even more strange with a Roman font.
Fig. 3: Another example from [4] (p. 19) and its modern transcription [5] (p. 31), showing a double hyphen for representing a hyphen from the original, besides an ordinary (single) hyphen for a word division in the transcription text.

Fig. 4: Scan from [6] (an 1994 edition of earlier stories of Arno Schmidt), p. 522 (an excerpt from the story "Caliban über Setebox" from 1958).

Red circles denote the use of the double hyphen to emphasize composite words.

Green circles denote the use to emphasize the pronunciation, e.g. s-t to denote the Northern German pronunciation of the "st" composite sound. In this case, obviously the use of the non-breaking variant of the double hyphen is appropriate (as illustrated by the second example "sstädtfindet").

Note that the first example (which is "Magnetstrahlen" in standard orthography, compound of "Magnet" + "Strahlen") had been written "Magnetstraaln" with capital S if the author had intended to emphasize the composite word here instead. It is presumed that the line break is wrong here. Correctly, the double hyphen is non-breaking (as there is no syllable break within the digraph "st"), and the line break has to be: "Magnetstraaln".

Using Unicode, this can be achieved by inserting a "soft hyphen" after "Magnet" (unless you had an automatic hyphenation system applicable to dialectal orthography), and a "word joiner" after "s + double hyphen".

Cyan squares denote ordinary hyphenation (note in the first example the composite word "Zoongrenze" is not emphasized).
Fig. 5: A scan from [7] (a fine edition of a late work of Arno Schmidt), p.143. Double hyphens are shown within red circles, together with some single hyphens (encircled purple) and (differently looking) equals signs (encircled green) on the same page, showing that the double is not a font variant of the latter two.

Fig. 6: A scan from [8], p. 169. This book dealing with German language uses the double hyphen (red circle) as well as the ordinary hyphens when citing Arno Schmidt, preserving the use of the original. Besides this, the ordinary hyphen is used for word division within the commenting text, as expected.

Fig. 7: Screenshot from a German blog [9], hosted by a leading German newspaper, the FAZ (Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung). In this blog, a somewhat sophisticated attitude prevails. The author of the blog entry writes the German word "Kunststoff" which means plastic, using the double hyphen to emphasize the meaning of the constituent parts of the compound word ("Kunst-Stoff" = *artificial* material), using the style which is known to well-read Germans in the subsequence of Arno Schmidt. As no real double hyphen is available, he uses the equals sign as substitute. For other text, he uses the ordinary (single) hyphen according to the standard German orthography rules.

Fig. 8: Screenshot from another German blog [10], also hosted by the FAZ (see legend of fig. 7). Here, the German orthography of the 18th century is mimicked to yield an ironic or sophisticated appearance. Also here, the double hyphen is used in a place where modern orthography would require a composite noun without an interruption.
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