



presenting ... symbology

an editorial

The next two issues of this Bulletin delve into the foremost subject on many a dozenalists' mind: dozenal *SYMBOLGY*, the set of symbols one uses to convey dozenal numerals or digits. In order to write a number in base twelve, generally we need twelve symbols. Decimal, through the "Hindu-Arabic" numerals, gives us

only ten numerals. Many dozenalists have devised their own set of numerals, or they adopt the symbols prevalent in their dozenal society. Some fiercely guard their numerals under their own banners of reason; the subject is hotly debated in the DozensOnline forum. So we're focusing on *numerals* here. Thus, the DSA now offers you a deep study of symbology, and perhaps ultimately, "what are the appropriate symbols for duodecimal numerals?"

First, this study is not intended to definitively answer the question all by itself: it merely aims to equip you, the dozenalists, with as much information as possible so that the question can be debated more efficiently, with a thorough and broad common frame of reference. We anticipate your correspondence and participation in this effort. Here are a few notes about what we've done.

For this current symbology synopsis, the Dozenal Society of America has examined nearly every system of dozenal numeral symbols ever printed in its own journal, or those of our sister society, the Dozenal Society of Great Britain. We have also contacted dozenalists on internet forums and social media over a period of up to one year to elicit symbologies which have not been published, provided we are able to name the author to properly assign credit. These have been "remastered" (to borrow a term from digital audio) and appear throughout this and related works to serve as tools by which you and other dozenalists may use to get better acquainted with the various symbologies. Perhaps in the future these tools may help our societies and dozenalists everywhere agree on a standard set of duodecimal numerals. What you have before you is the fruit of a deep and massive effort.

We attempted to eliminate most of the differences in presentation style of symbologies, so you can focus attention as much as possible on their form and intent. Each symbology has been digitally reproduced and made into a typeface which blends as cleanly as possible with the typeface used in this *Bulletin*. By doing this, each symbology arguably appears as though it already serves as a standard in print, and all symbologies appear equally well treated. Now that each set has at least one font file, the DSA can reproduce tables and manipulate data in any of these symbologies. Compare this to reproducing the symbol sets by hand, or cutting and pasting facsimiles of these symbols here and there throughout this work. Refer to the tables at right to see how symbologies presented in original work have been remastered for use today.

There are some consequences to remastering the symbologies. You may notice that there are many ways to print a symbol, like a letter, which are not often seen in handwriting. The letters "a" and "g" in this article are probably not the way you see

them handwritten. We are also familiar with differences in font treatment (regular vs. *italic*), between a given symbol's appearance in different typefaces (serif vs. sans serif). So there is some "natural" variability even among the symbols we use everyday. A lot of this is due to "artistic license" or "style" a type designer, calligrapher, or even each one of us exercises whenever we write a symbol. This "license" or "style" extends to this work. In order to remaster the symbologies, the editor had to interpret them, then produce a symbol that fit into the new digital constraints. To be honest, this must have also happened in the legacy articles when editors of years past synopsised symbologies; they reproduced a symbol they may have heard described or saw in a book, and some unintentional alteration may have occurred then, too. Certain sets were checked by their authors; most of them have not, simply because the authors are no longer available. This said, the symbologies presented here appear to be acceptable renditions of the symbols proposed by dozenalists throughout the history of dozenal publication.

Although this symbology study began as an independent effort to summarize what we know about dozenal symbols, much is owed the DSGB's *Duodecimal Newscast*. In summer 2009, Mr. Shaun Ferguson sent copies of their publications. The summaries at Year 2 № 1 page 10; and Year 3 № 2 page 3 illustrated the diligence with which the early Members of the DSGB approached the problem. It is hoped that this current effort approaches theirs.

I hope you enjoy our excursion into the world of new numerals, and that you correspond with us in the coming months about what you've seen here. ❄❄❄

* See note 1 page 18; for notes regarding differences between the tables.

Present Convention	A.D. Gautier	Kingsland Camp	D.A. George	A. Chilton	Shaun Ferguson	F. Ruston	R.J. Hinton	D.A. Sparrow
0	0	ϕ	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	∟	1	/	1	/	ρ	∟
2	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟
3	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟
4	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟
5	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟
6	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟
7	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟
8	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟
9	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟
∞	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟
ε	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟

Excerpt from a table which originally appeared in "New Duodecimal Notations and Names", *Duodecimal Newscast*, Year 3, № 2, p. 3, 1165; (1961.)

Present Convention	A.D. Gautier	Kingsland Camp*	D.A. George*	A. Chilton	Shaun Ferguson	F. Ruston	R.J. Hinton	D.A. Sparrow
0	0	ϕ	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	∟	1	/	1	/	ρ	∟
2	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟
3	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟
4	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟
5	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟
6	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟
7	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟
8	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟
9	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟
∞	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟
ε	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟	∟

New interpretation of the original symbologies for consideration today