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The character ø U+AB3E LATIN SMALL LETTER BLACKLETTER O WITH STROKE was proposed for encoding in Revised proposal to encode “Teuthonista” phonetic characters in the UCS, N4081, L2/11-202.

Its character name and representative glyph are problematic because they are based on one low quality high contrast sample from Sievers 1901, p. 103:

Here are the glyphs from that sample and the representative glyph in Unicode:

Sievers 1910 p. 103  Sievers 1910 p. 103  Unicode

Here are glyphs from better quality samples in the same Sievers 1901, p. 103 and in Sievers 1893, p. 96:

Sievers 1910 p. 103  Sievers 1910 p. 103  Sievers 1893 p. 96  Sievers 1893 p. 96

Eduard Sievers used letters with superscript digits as modifiers for phonetic symbols. The symbols ø¹ and ø² with ø U+00F8 LATIN SMALL LETTER O WITH STROKE were used and not ø¹ and ø² with ø U+AB3E LATIN SMALL LETTER BLACKLETTER O WITH STROKE.
Furthermore, Eduard Sievers’ phonetic symbols are general phonetic symbols not limited to German dialectology.

There’s no evidence that a Blackletter o with stroke was or is used in German dialectology.

**Proposed note in Unicode charts and NamesList**

The Unicode charts for Latin Extended-E (Range: AB30–AB6F) should be updated with the following note:

```
\texttt{AB3E}
  * not used in German dialectology
```

**Samples**

![Figure 1. Sievers 1893, p. 96 showing \(\phi^1\) and \(\phi^2\), not \(\phi^1\) and \(\phi^2\).](image1)

![Figure 2. Sievers 1893, p. 97 showing \(\phi^1\), not \(\phi^1\).](image2)
Figure 3. Sievers 1893, p. 98 showing $\phi^2$, not $\phi^2$.

Figure 4. Sievers 1901, p. 103 showing $\phi^1$ and $\phi^2$, not $\phi^1$ and $\phi^2$.

Figure 5. Sievers 1901, p. 105 showing $\phi^1$ and $\phi^2$, not $\phi^1$ and $\phi^2$.
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