

















Character 3B, “Beleriandic MH”:




Used in the mode of Beleriand, this tengwa is to  what  is to . It is attested in DTS 31, and should surely be encoded.

Character 3C, “Anglo-Saxon WH”:

This character is attested in DTS 50 and 51, but has not been included in earlier encoding proposals, evidently because it was believed to be a ligature, possibly formed by Halla, , and the W-tengwa, . However, Rómen, , is used for /w/ in these specimina, not . This fact, together with the striking graphical similarity between  and , is, in my opinion, very strong evidence for an origin in . If it is then, indeed, a ligature, it is thus a ligature of  and .

Anyhow, is it really a ligature at all? That is, in the sense that it is an alternative way of drawing the combination of the tengwa Halla followed by a Rómen? I do not think that is a proper interpretation. Rather, it is a ligature only from a graphical point of view, a combination of an ascending stem, *telco*, (which is called Halla when used as a tengwa), and Rómen, or, to put it another way, a derivation from Rómen by the process of lengthening of the stem. (It is possible that we have a direct parallel to this in Hwesta Sindarinwa and Waiya:  is related to  in the same way, graphically as well as phonetically, that  is related to .)

Character 3D, Wai(y)a (or Vai(y)a):






We have, as of yet, only one example of this tengwa, in VT 46 (DTS 65). Arden R. Smith calls it “a previously unpublished variant of ”. Seeing that a tengwa shaped like *Úre*, , does not occur in DTS 65, and that Waiya actually fits better (considering its shape) in the tengwar table (DTS 9) at the place of *Úre* than does *Úre* itself, it could perhaps be argued that Waiya might be treated a glyph variant of *Úre*. However, this is only a speculation, and it could similarly be argued that it might be an alternative form of the W-tengwa, . Lacking any further details about this tengwa, I have encoded it for now, but not without hesitation.

(My hesitation stems mostly from the fact that we don’t know for how long this tengwa existed in this particular form in the development of the script. While we probably shouldn’t strive to unify tengwar from very different conceptual phases, we can’t very well encode each and every one of all the hypothetical highly experimental tengwar that possibly await publication, tengwar that Tolkien perhaps wrote down only once. The problem is that we don’t know whether Waiya is of this kind, or if it was of a more stable nature.)

Character 47, the E-tehta below:

This tehta, the below-the-tengwa counterpart to the E-tehta, is attested in DTS 51 (twice in line 5 and once in line 10). I have encoded it.

Characters 48, 4E and 4F, the doubled E-, O- and U-tehtar:

These doubled tehtar are indeed doubled, not only graphically but also semantically. As such, two on each other following single tehtar, i.e.   and  , respectively, convey exactly the same thing, namely a doubled (or longer) variant of the corresponding single tehtar. In other words, if the doubled tehtar should be encoded, they should have canonical decompositions into  etc. However, as I don’t see the need for such precompiled characters, I have decided not to encode them.

(Note that this does not apply to $\ddot{\circ}$ and $\ddot{\circ}$, as they are typically not used as mere combinations of the corresponding single dots, but as tehtar on their own. On the comparably rare occasions when a double over dot is used to indicate a long variant of the over dot, as in $\mathfrak{U}\mathfrak{X}$ in DTS 62, the sequence $\ddot{\circ}\ddot{\circ}$ should properly be used instead. Similarly, I think that \mathfrak{U} is not properly the same as \mathfrak{U} (which is never used by Tolkien); to accentuate this, I have given them slightly different appearances: \mathfrak{U} vs. \mathfrak{U} .)

Character 58 and 59, S-hooks: \mathfrak{S} \mathfrak{S}

The S-hook comes in many different shapes: it can be a simple hook, either pointing upwards or downwards, or it can be crossing itself, etc. Most of these variations are not semantically significant, and they should not be encoded as separate characters. One notable exception to this is the small hook, which is used together with Quesse, \mathfrak{Q} , to represent the latin letter “x”. The more common hook, \mathfrak{S} , is only used at the end of words, while \mathfrak{S} can be used in any position, even at the end of words, as seen in DTS 50: $\mathfrak{Y}\mathfrak{J}\mathfrak{S}$ (“wéox”). Following Tolkien’s usage, we may construct minimal pairs that demonstrate the semantic difference between the two hooks, for example $\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{S}$ (“lacks”) and $\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{S}$ (“lax”).

In the first official proposal, both S-hooks were encoded as characters, but in the discussion paper, another solution was proposed, namely to treat a following S-hook as a ligature with Silme. The largest problem with this approach is that it doesn’t provide a means to differ between the two hooks. Also, while \mathfrak{A} is quite plainly a ligature of $\mathfrak{B}\mathfrak{C}$, it is much less obvious that \mathfrak{C} should be treated as a ligature of $\mathfrak{C}\mathfrak{B}$. The best solution, I think, is to follow the example of the original proposal, and encode both S-hooks as separate characters.

Characters 70–7D, the Numerals.

The reason for them not being included in this version is because I haven’t designed the glyphs yet. I intend to include them in the future.

Unencoded variant: “Closed Silme Nuquerna”

In version 0.05 of Tengwar Telcontar, I tentatively encoded a variant of Silme Nuquerna, where the bowl is closed, as opposed to the regularly open bowl of Silme. The reason was that, while the open variant of Silme Nuquerna seemed to be used as an alternative to Silme to represent /s/ (as in DTS 19/20, 41 and 49), the closed variant, as seen in DTS 29–32; 45, 48 and 49, is reserved for special uses: either it is used to write the vowel /y/ in the Sindarin full mode, or it is used to represent the “soft” pronunciation of the Latin letter “c” in the English word “especial”.

However, there exist plenty of counterexamples to this observed trend: open forms of Silme Nuquerna are found, when the closed variant might have been expected based on the previous examples, in DTS 8 (the final, printed version of DTS 29–32) and, possibly, in DTS 13 (there used to represent the “c” in “since”). Conversely, closed Silme Nuquerna is used for /s/ in DTS 72 and 73 (the later of which exhibits open variants as well, used in the same way as the closed ones).

All in all, I do not believe that the evidence is strong enough to warrant a treatment of these two variants as anything else than alternative glyph shapes, and have hence decided not to encode the closed Silme Nuquerna as a separate character.