

Basic Letter Shape Variant Analysis

Latin GP Member: Bill Jouris

i vs l vs ı vs İ

Latin Small Letter I (0069) vs Latin Small Letter Dotless I (0131)

i vs l	i vs l	ı vs l	i vs l	i vs l	<i>i vs l</i>	<i>ı vs l</i>	i vs l	i vs l	<i>i vs l</i>	<i>i vs l</i>
Arabic Transparent	Arabic Transparent Bold	Arabic	Arabic Black	Arabic Bold	Arabic Bold Italic	Arabic Italic	Calibri	Calibri Bold	Calibri Bold Italic	Calibri Italic
i vs l	<i>i vs l</i>	i vs l	i vs l	i vs l	<i>i vs l</i>	i vs l	i vs l	i vs l	i vs l	<i>i vs l</i>
Calibri Light	Calibri Light Italic	Calibri	Calibri Bold	Calibri Bold Italic	Calibri Italic	Calibri Math	Calibri	Calibri Bold	Calibri Bold Italic	Calibri Italic
i vs l	i vs l	<i>i vs l</i>	<i>i vs l</i>	ı vs l	i vs l	<i>i vs l</i>	<i>ı vs l</i>	<i>ı vs l</i>	i vs l	i vs l
Comic Sans MS	Comic Sans MS Bold	Comic Sans MS Bold Italic	Comic Sans MS Italic	Comic Sans	Comic Sans Bold	Comic Sans Bold Italic	Comic Sans Italic	Comic Sans	Comic Sans Bold	Comic Sans Bold
i vs l	<i>i vs l</i>	i vs l	i vs l	<i>i vs l</i>	<i>i vs l</i>	ı vs l	ı vs l	i vs l	i vs l	i vs l
Constantia Bold Italic	Constantia Italic	Constantia	Constantia Bold	Constantia Bold Italic	Constantia Italic	Constantia	Constantia	Constantia Bold	Constantia Bold Italic	Constantia Bold

The dot is readily perceptible . . . IF the user is sensitized by familiarity to the possibility of a dotless I (which only occurs in a couple of languages). Otherwise, the user sees what he expects to see. But based on the criteria for visual similarity, this would not be a variant.

Mats made the case, based on case folding, for these being treated as variants. I concur, for this and other reasons. But this is a perception argument, not a basic letter shape one.

Decision: Variant

Latin Small Letter Dotless I (0131) vs Latin Small Letter Iota (0269)

In the italic versions of any of the serif fonts (e.g. Times New Roman or Consolas) these are identical. For example:

ı vs l (Times New Roman) *ı vs l* (Consolas)

l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l
Analys Transparent	Analys Transparent Bold	Analys	Analys Black	Analys Bold	Analys Bold Italic	Analys Italic	Carlton	Carlton Bold	Carlton Bold Italic	Carlton Italic	Carlton Light	
l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l
Carlton Light Italic	Carlton	Carlton Bold	Carlton Bold Italic	Carlton Italic	Carlton Light	Carlton	Carlton Bold	Carlton Bold Italic	Carlton Italic	Carlton Semi Bold	Carlton Semi Bold Italic	
l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l
Carlton Semi Bold Italic	Carlton Semi Bold Italic	Carlton	Carlton Bold	Carlton Bold Italic	Carlton Italic	Carlton	Carlton	Carlton Bold	Carlton Bold Italic	Carlton Italic	Carlton	
l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l	l vs l
Carlton Bold	Carlton Bold Italic	Carlton Italic	Carlton	Carlton New	Carlton New Bold	Carlton New Bold Italic	Carlton New Italic	Carlton New	Carlton New Bold	Carlton New Bold Italic	Carlton New Italic	Carlton New Bold

Decision: Variant

Latin Small Letter L with Acute (013A)

I'm not sure why this even got included here. Yes, in a san-serif font a small letter L with acute is indistinguishable from a **capital** letter I with acute:

l vs l

But compared to any of the Small Letter I variations? Not only not a variant, but probably not even confusable.

Decision: Not a Variant