0. Summary. This proposal requests the encoding of a casing partner to one existing UCS character, the change of some properties of that existing UCS character, and the addition of two new casing letters used in medieval European texts. If this proposal is accepted, the following characters will exist:

- 204A TIRONIAN SIGN ET
  - Irish Gaelic, Old English, …
  - typically drawn at x-height with a slightly angled full-length descender
  - 0026 & ampersand
  - A7F0 tironian sign capital et
  - 1F670 ῦ script ligature et ornament

- A7F0 LATIN CAPITAL LETTER TIRONIAN ET
  - 204A tironian sign et

- A7F1 LATIN CAPITAL LETTER TIRONIAN ET WITH HOOK
  - Middle English, …

- A7F2 LATIN SMALL LETTER TIRONIAN ET WITH HOOK
  - Middle English, Latin, …

- A7F3 LATIN CAPITAL LETTER TIRONIAN ET WITH HOOK AND STROKE
  - Middle English, Latin, …

- A7F4 LATIN SMALL LETTER TIRONIAN ET WITH HOOK AND STROKE

1. Background. A variety of medieval manuscripts across a number of centuries treat the TIRONIAN SIGN ET as a letter of the alphabet, and cases it when in sentence-initial position. Modern transcribers of documents containing these letters have distinguished them as casing, sometimes using the digit 7 as a font workaround. The simple two-stroke shape of the character ǝ as used in the insular tradition (for Irish and Old English) was lost in time to a form with a hooked base, sometimes with a long extension of the topbar encircling the glyph. Another descendent of the original insular character has a strong horizontal stroke through it; this may or may not have the long hooked stroke, or it may have a very short top stroke entirely. Modern editors distinguish the glyphs of the insular, hooked, and hooked-with-stroke form even in a single publication.
2. Property changes for U+204A. Encoded in the General Punctuation block, U+204A will require some property changes for this proposal to be successful. The current property values for U+204A are:

```
gc=Po, Other_Punctuation
ccc=0, Not_Reordered
bc=N, Other_Neutral
lb=AL (Alphabetic)
Mirrored=No
Script=Common
Grapheme_Base=Y [derived]
```

Proposed property values for U+204A are:

```
gc=Ll, Lowercase_Letter
ccc=0, Not_Reordered
bc=L, Left_To_Right
lb=AL (Alphabetic)
Mirrored=No
Script=Latin
Changes_When_Uppercased=Y [derived]
Alphabetic=Y [derived]
Changes_When_Titlecased=Y [derived]
Lowercase=Y [derived]
Grapheme_Base=Y [derived]
Changes_When_Casemapped=Y [derived]
Cased=Y [derived]
```

With regard to the Pattern_Syntax value, it is True for U+204A because it is in the General Punctuation block. This value cannot be changed due to stability policy. Because of the Pattern_Syntax value for U+204A, even after the change of General_Category to Ll, U+204A will not be usable in identifiers.

3. Usage. These characters are typically used to represent the Latin word et, the Old English word ond, and the Irish word agus, all of which mean ‘and’. In Irish only the paradigmatic insular glyph ꟰ is used—by modern Irish users, not just by medievalists—and the hooked glyphs and barred glyphs of ꟲ and ꟴ are unknown and simply would not be recognized by anyone. Unification of the hooked characters with or without bars would result in illegibility in Irish texts (and public signage), and is therefore inappropriate. Just as significant, however, is the distinction presses like Oxford have made of the three letters, particularly where discussion the provenance and age of a manuscript in palaeographic studies is relevant. Glyphic variation in the hooked glyphs includes swash forms like ꟲ and ꟳ (both forms occurring also with the horizontal stroke), or like ꟳ, but modern editors do not distinguish these from the regular hooked glyphs without swash.

4. Glyphs. A variety of glyph shapes are available for the hooked TIRONIAN ETs, as can be seen in the Figures below. For the reference glyphs, we have chosen a typographic hybrid of the bow of an inverted digit 2 and the crossbar of a digit 7, as shown in Figure 12: ꟲ ꟳ. Constructing the hooked glyphs from such pieces will usually yield an attractive glyph harmonious with the base font. It should be noted, however, that since U+204A was encoded in Unicode 3.0. many implementations of it have been seriously incorrect. The typically bad glyph is no more than an x-height down-and-left right angle, as in Lucida Grande ꟲ. The correct shape has a slightly thicker horizontal at x-height, often slightly bowed downwards, and with a thinner vertical going down to the descender length of the letter p, usually offset towards the left from true vertical. The glyph should never be identical to digit 7: ꟲ.
5. **Identifiers.** As the characters proposed here are historical characters, we expect that none of these six characters would be required in IDNA identifiers.

6. **Ordering.** The Old English alphabet was formally ordered by Byrhtferð in the year 1011 for the purposes of numerology. His alphabetical order included both **ampersand** & and the **tironian sign** \( \gamma \).

\[
A \ B \ C \ D \ E \ F \ G \ H \ I \ K \ L \ M \ N \ O \ P \ Q \ R \ S \ T \ V \ X \ Y \ Z \ & \ \gamma \ \wp \ \d\ \æ
\]

Today's default UCS order is somewhat different. The \( \gamma \) **Tironian sign** ET is ordered as punctuation, after & **ampersand**:

\[
\ldots / \langle \backslash < \& < \gamma < \# < \% \ldots
\]

Since the Tironian marks are related in a certain sense to some of the Latin abbreviation letters, it seems sensible to put them, interfiled, between Norse \( \韔 \) Vend (which derives from \( \ddf \) Wynn) and 3 LATIN LETTER ET:

\[
A << (\AE) < B < C < D << D < E < F < G < H < I < J < K < L < M < N < O < P < Q < R < S < T < U < V < X < Y < Z < \wp < \gamma < \gamma << \gamma << \gamma << \gamma << \gamma << \gamma << \wp << \gamma \ldots
\]

7. **Unicode Character Properties.** Character properties are proposed here.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{A7F0: Tironian Sign ET; Ll; 0; L;} & ; ; ; ; N ; ; ; ; A7F0 ; ; A7F0 \\
\text{A7F0: Latin Capital Letter Tironian ET; Lu; 0; L;} & ; ; ; ; N ; ; ; ; 20A4 ; \\
\text{A7F1: Latin Capital Letter Tironian ET with Hook; Lu; 0; L;} & ; ; ; ; N ; ; ; ; A7F2 ; \\
\text{A7F2: Latin Small Letter Tironian ET with Hook; Ll; 0; L;} & ; ; ; ; N ; ; ; ; A7F1 ; ; A7F1 \\
\text{A7F3: Latin Capital Letter Tironian ET with Hook and Stroke; Lu; 0; L;} & ; ; ; ; N ; ; ; ; A7F4 ; \\
\text{A7F4: Latin Small Letter Tironian ET with Hook and Stroke; Ll; 0; L;} & ; ; ; ; N ; ; ; ; A7F3 ; ; A7F3
\end{align*}
\]

8. **Bibliography**
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Figure 1. Old English text, “The Ormulum”, written early 13th century, Oxford Bodleian Library, Junius MS 1, fol. 3r. At the beginnings of sentences the letters A, I, V, Þ, and þ are given alongside capital ꟰. The Ormulum is written in a very precise orthography and is an extraordinarily important source of our knowledge of Middle English pronunciation. From Wright 1960, Plate 2.

Figure 2. Old English text, “The Ormulum”, written early 13th century, Oxford Bodleian Library, Junius MS 1, fol. 3r. In this transcription a distinction between capital ꟰ and small ȝ has not been made, likely due to typographic constraints. From Wright 1960, Plate 2.
Figure 3. Latin and Old English text, “The Gifts of Bishop Leofric”, written early 13th century, Exeter Cathedral Library, MS 3501, fol. 2r. At the beginnings of sentences the capital 7 can clearly be seen. (There are other examples of this in the manuscript as well.)

Figure 4. Transcription of the Bishop Leofric text from Conner 1993. Here, with 7-shaped glyphs lowercase ȝ and uppercase ȝ are distinguished.

Figure 5. Transcription of another MS containing the Bishop Leofric text, from an edition of the Anglo-Saxon charters. Here both lowercase ȝ and uppercase ȝ are clearly distinguished.

Figure 6. Translation of the text in Figure 5.
Figure 7. Middle English text, ‘Vices and Virtues’, written c. 1200, British Museum, Stowe MS 34, fol. 20r. Here the early hooked form of ꟲ TIRONIAN ET WITH HOOK can be seen. From Wright 1960, Plate 3.

‘VICES AND VIRTUES’, the earliest of all Middle English dialogues, composed in the Essex dialect, about A.D. 1200.

Written about A.D. 1200.

Vellum: 22 x 16 cm.

A vigorous, individualistic hand closely related to the court-hand of the time.

Note. The vertical stroke of the $a$ is normally now brought well up but some examples preserve hint of the insular $a$ ($\alpha$); a remarkable form of $z$ is used, the $e$ being superscript and linked to the top part of the vertical of the $a$; long $s$ appears throughout; continental $f$ and $r$ are now normal; after $a$ the $z$-form of $r$ is used; ‘yogh’ ($\gamma$) still preserves in its angularity traces of its origin in the insular $g$ ($\gamma$); hard $g$ is represented by $c$.

what is now to be the normal form; the insular or uncial $d$ ($\delta$) is used; $\eta$ and $\theta$ are used; $\rho$ and $\varphi$ are clearly differentiated; $e$ and $f$ are well differentiated, the cross-bar of the latter being firmly made (and the vertical does not yet appear above it); $i$ has sometimes an upward slanting stroke.

Abbreviations are rare; $\rho$ is used for $fat$ and the Tironian nota for $and$ (in a rather elaborate form $\tau$); the horizontal mark of contraction is sometimes hooked at the end.

Correction is by a dot under the letter to be deleted (e.g. $f$ in l. 12); this is normal medieval practice.

Text printed in: Vices and Virtues, ed. F. Holt-hausen (E.E.T.S., o.s., nos. 89, 159 (1888, 1921)).

Another specimen in: Pal. Soc., ser. ii, pl. 94.

Our plate shows fol. 20r.

TRANSCRIPTION

\[ \text{\begin{align*}
\text{ðanne \ art \ tu \ rhtuis} & \ \text{þaue \ æure \ gode} \ \text{drædnesse \ mid} \ \text{þe} \ , \ \text{þ} \ \text{ðu} \\
\text{ði} \ \text{ne \ forliæ} & \ \text{Dægescy} \ \text{gode} \ \text{e} \ \text{þi \ uppe} \ \text{ðe} \ \text{ðat \ nåfing} \\
\text{ne \ ma} \ \text{ðe} \ \text{deri} \ \text{.} & \ \text{þi} \ \text{ære} \ \text{opene} \ \text{to} \ \text{ði} \ \text{æne} \ \text{b"enes} \ . \ \text{ðat} \\
\text{na} \ \text{
\text{\text{æge} \ \text{de} \ \text{ne} \ \text{ple} \ \text{ærmen} \ \text{Dus} \ \text{de} \ \text{ratt} \ \text{de} \ \text{hale} \ \text{gast} \ \text{de}}
\end{align*}} \]

Figure 8. Transcription of Figure 7, showing ꟲ TIRONIAN ET WITH HOOK. In the discussion both the forms $\gamma$ and $\zeta$ are distinguished by the editor. From Wright 1960, Plate 3.

Figure 9. Close-up example of the type cut for ꟲ TIRONIAN ET WITH HOOK as shown in Figure 8. Compare Figure 12; the shape there without the crossbar is also acceptable for this character.
Figure 10. Middle English text, “Chronicle of Robert of Gloucester”, written between 1300 and 1325, British Museum Cotton MS Caligula A.xi, fol. 165r. Two examples of ꟴ TIRONIAN ET WITH HOOK AND STROKE can be seen. From Wright 1960, Plate 10.

Figure 11. Transcription of Figure 10. From Wright 1960, Plate 10.

Figure 12. Close-up example of the type cut for ꟴ as shown in Figure 11.

Figure 13. Middle English text, “The Pricke of Conscience”, written 1405 by John Farnelay, British Museum Additional MS 32578, fol. 76r. In the first line ꟴ TIRONIAN ET WITH HOOK AND STROKE can be seen, and in the last line ꟲ TIRONIAN ET WITH HOOK is used. From Wright 1960, Plate 16.

Figure 14. Transcription of Figure 13. Here the editor distinguishes both characters in his transcription. From Wright 1960, Plate 16.

Figure 15. Latin biblical text written in 1407 showing an example of ꟴ TIRONIAN ET WITH HOOK AND STROKE: “gl’o₂ a uigīṭī ānis ꟲ uīp ŵēs” = “gulorum a uiginti annis super omnes”.

Figure 16. German text dated 1768 showing ꟲ in the last line in the abbreviation ꟲc. “etc.”.
Figure 17. Middle English text, “Travels of Sir John Mandeville”, written c. 1410–20, British Museum Cotton MS Titus C.xvi, fol. 60v. Here ε TIRONIAN ET WITH HOOK AND STROKE is written with an inverted breve diacritic (which can be achieved in the usual way with U+0311). As in Figure 13, the headbar of the glyph has acquired a strong downstroke. From Wright 1960, Plate 17.

Figure 18. Transcription of Figure 17. In addition to its literary and historical value, this text is important as it is a source for the names of the letters thorn (þoอนา) and yogh (ȝoghัง). From Wright 1960, Plate 17.

Figure 19. Middle English text, Claudian’s “De Consulatu Stiliconis”, written in 1445, British Museum Additional MS 11814, fol. 6r. Here ε TIRONIAN ET WITH HOOK AND STROKE is written with a macron (which can be achieved in the usual way with U+0304). Here the headbar of the glyph is greatly truncated. From Wright 1960, Plate 19.

Figure 20. Transcription of Figure 19. From Wright 1960, Plate 19.

Figure 21. English text, “Secrees of Old Philisoffres”, written 1469 by William Ebesham, British Museum Lansdowne MS 285, fol. 152r. Here ε TIRONIAN ET WITH HOOK AND STROKE is written with a headbar which is greatly truncated. From Wright 1960, Plate 24.

Figure 22. Transcription of Figure 21. From Wright 1960, Plate 24.
Figure 23. Chart of medievalist characters from the ninth edition (1879) of The Court-Hand Restored, a manual of early handwriting whose first edition was published in 1773. Here ε TIRONIAN ET WITH HOOK AND STROKE is represented with a rather clumsy glyph derived from a tilde-like swash and lowercase letter t. From Wright 1879.

Figure 24. Latin text in the Cornish play, “Origo Mundi”, written late 14th century, Bodley MS 791, fol. 6r. The text shows ε LATIN SMALL LETTER TIRONIAN ET WITH HOOK AND STROKE alongside the regular Latin word et at the end of the line.
Figure 25. Latin text in the Cornish play, “Bewnans Ke”, written late 14th century, Peniarth MS 105B, fol. 1r. The text shows ꟱ LATIN CAPITAL LETTER TIRONIAN ET WITH HOOK with its headbar descending in a leftwards curl. The text reads “Et ibit Keladoc ſuper lapidē iterū et manebit ſedens” “Et ibit Keladocus super lapidem iterum et manebit sedens” ‘And Ke mounts the stone again and will remain seated.’

Figure 26. Latin text in the Cornish play, “Origo Mundi”, written late 14th century, Peniarth MS 105B, fol. 4r. The text shows ꟲ LATIN SMALL LETTER TIRONIAN ET WITH HOOK with its headbar descending in a leftwards curl. The text reads: “Keladocus et garçon veniunt ad regem” ‘Ke and the garçon go to the king’.

Figure 27. Latin text in manuscript about the English royal family written c. 1284, British Library Additional MS 24686, fol. 12r. The text shows ꟳ LATIN SMALL LETTER TIRONIAN ET WITH HOOK AND STROKE with its headbar descending in a short leftwards curl. From Parkes 1993, Plate 21.
Figure 28. Latin text in J. Fisher’s Defensio regie assertionis contra Babylonicam captiuitatem, Cologne, written in 1525. The text shows ꟲ LATIN SMALL LETTER TIRONIAN ET WITH HOOK. From Parkes 1993, Plate 36.

Figure 29. English text in John Whitgift’s The defense of the answere to the admonition against the reply by T[homas] C[artwright], London, written in 1574. The text shows ꟸ LATIN SMALL LETTER TIRONIAN ET WITH HOOK AND STROKE with a hairline descending in a leftwards curl from its headline. From Parkes 1993, Plate 37.
Figure 30. Latin text, a commentary on Paul’s letters, written c. 1442, Oxford, Balliol College, MS 30, fol. 119v. The text shows \( \varepsilon \) LATIN SMALL LETTER TIRONIAN ET WITH HOOK AND STROKE with its headbar descending in a short leftwards stroke. From Parkes 1979, Plate 24 (ii).

Figure 31. Latin text, a commentary on Paul’s letters, written c. 1442, Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Wood Empt. 15 (SC. 8603), fol. 106r. The text shows numerous examples of \( \varepsilon \) LATIN SMALL LETTER TIRONIAN ET WITH HOOK, nicely drawn with its headbar descending in a long rightwards curve. In the fourth line from the bottom there is a form \( \varepsilon \) combined with U+0353 COMBINING FERMATA, which has the reading eciam. From Parkes 1979, Plate 3 (i).
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