

Sagittal

A Microtonal Notation System

by George D. Secor and David C. Keenan

Introduction

George Secor began development of the Sagittal (pronounced “SAJ-i-tl”) notation system in August 2001. In January 2002 he presented what he had developed to the Yahoo group *tuning* and offered to consider suggestions for improvements. At that stage the system could notate the equal temperaments with 17, 19, 22, 29, 31, 41, and 72 divisions per octave. Little did he know that he had provided a unifying symbolic principle which would ultimately be developed into a system capable of notating almost any conceivable microtonal tuning.

In the early stages of the discussion, one idea that surfaced repeatedly was that a set of symbols indicating prime-number comma alterations to tones in a Pythagorean series might be used to notate *both* rational intervals (e.g. just intonation or JI) *and* equal divisions of the octave (EDOs). Similar ideas had previously been proposed by Hermann Helmholtz, Alexander Ellis, Carl Eitz, Paul Rapoport, Daniel Wolf, Joe Monzo, and others¹, but these had never been implemented in a performance notation to such an extent as was being discussed. As a first step, Gene Ward Smith suggested that it would be desirable that there be no more than one comma symbol per prime number, and a selection of 19-limit commas was tentatively identified to define the semantics of the notation.

David Keenan enthusiastically observed that these commas came in an assortment of sizes that made the objective theoretically feasible, but he also realized that devising a set of distinct and recognizable symbols suitable for a performance notation was not going to be a simple matter. For the next year and a half the authors worked together to expand and refine these ideas into a notation system that would be both versatile and powerful, but for which the required complexity would not make it more difficult to do the simpler things. The first year of this process was carried out in the Yahoo groups *tuning* and *tuning-math* and benefited from the input of many other people. The process is recorded in the archives of these groups in all its excruciating detail, complete with numerous dead-ends. Eventually the input from others ceased and we decided to finalize the more esoteric details off-list. The following is an introduction to the resulting system.

¹ See the “HEWM” article in Joe Monzo's *Tonalsoft Encyclopaedia of Tuning* at <http://www.tonalsoft.com/enc>.

A Quadruple Feature

The Sagittal notation uses a conventional staff on which the natural notes are in a single series of fifths, with sharps and flats (and doubles thereof) indicating tones that are members of that same series, regardless of the particular tonal system being notated². Therefore, if the notation is used for just intonation, these notes will indicate a Pythagorean tuning. For an equal division of the octave, they will indicate the tones in a series built on that division's best approximation of a fifth.

To indicate alterations to tones in a chain of fifths, the Sagittal notation makes use of new symbols that combine four excellent features of prior notations:

- 1) Arrows pointing up or down that have been used to indicate alterations in pitch in each direction, most often (but not always) for quartertones;
- 2) Multiple vertical strokes (frequently – and mistakenly! – attributed to Giuseppe Tartini, but) first used by Richard Stein to indicate multiples of a semi-sharp;
- 3) Sloping lines used by Bosanquet to indicate commatic alterations in pitch; and
- 4) Mildred Couper's merging of two laterally mirrored "stemmed" symbols to create a third symbol representing the combined alteration of the first two.

Mirrored Arrows

All of the new symbols of the Sagittal notation are various kinds of arrows pointing either up or down to indicate the direction of pitch alteration (the term *Sagittal* being derived from the Latin *sagitta*, arrow³). Pairs of symbols that mirror each other vertically indicate equal-but-opposite amounts of pitch alteration, and the apparent size of each symbol generally corresponds to the amount of alteration.

A simple three-segment arrow is used to indicate an alteration in pitch of a *unidecimal diesis* (32:33, ~53.3 cents, approximately a quartertone) in just intonation or its equivalent number of degrees in a temperament. For simplicity we will call this the *11-diesis*. In temperaments in which a sharp or flat alters by an even number of degrees, the 11-diesis will usually be half of this, in which case the symbol is equivalent to a semisharp or semiflat. Such is the case with 72-EDO, where the apotome⁴ (or sharp/flat) is 6° and the 11-diesis (or semisharp/semiflat) is 3°.

² The Sagittal accidentals may also be used in a consistent manner with systems that do not use a conventional staff, or have more or less than seven nominals, which may not be in a series of fifths, but that is beyond the scope of this article.

³ In August of 2001, while George Secor was looking through back issues of *Xenharmonikôn* seeking ideas to use in the new notation, he found a comment by Ivor Darreg (*Xenharmonikôn* 7&8, *Xenharmonic Bulletin* No. 9, Oct. 1978, "The Calmer Mood. 31 Tones/Octave", p. 15), which referred to a sharp symbol with an arrow affixed to the upper left as "sagittarian notation". After puzzling over the meaning for a moment, he concluded that the term would have been more suitable for an archer than for arrows and that the word "sagittal" might be better. Once he had devised the arrow-like symbols for 72-EDO with left and right barbs and multiple arrow shafts, he realized that the new name was a perfect fit.

⁴ Strictly speaking, an *apotome* is a *Pythagorean* chromatic semitone, but it is used here as a generic term designating the chromatic semitone occurring in any temperament or division of the octave.

Stein's Influence

The first row of symbols in Figure 1 shows the popular combination of Richard Stein's fractional sharp quartertone symbols with Bernd Zimmermann's fractional flat symbols (which included Stein's semi-flat symbol).⁵ Note that we have made the backwards-flat narrower than the forwards-flat to reduce left/right confusability and to make it look more like a *half* flat. We have included these symbols in the Sagittal font as they have become something of a *de facto* standard when only quartertones are needed. However, various attempts to extend symbols such as these in some logical fashion to even finer divisions are, in our opinion, too cumbersome. While we have rejected these particular symbols in favor of another popular notation for quartertones (the up and down arrows), we retain the essential idea from Stein's semi- and sesqui- sharps.

Stein/Zimmermann notation	bb	db	b	d	q	‡	#	##	⊠
Pure sagittal notation	↘	↘	↓	↓	q	↑	↑	↑	↑
Mixed-symbol version	bb	↘b	b	↓	q	↑	#	↑#	⊠

Figure 1 - Comparison of Sagittal Notation with Stein/Zimmermann Notation

In the Sagittal system Stein's multiple vertical strokes are combined with the quartertone arrow to produce multi-shaft Sagittal sharp and sesquisharp arrows that are as intuitive as Stein's symbols, besides being invertible to indicate fractional flats. These are shown in the second row of Figure 1. Instead of four shafts, the double-sharp and double-flat symbols have two shafts that cross to form an elongated "X", one end of which is truncated at the arrowhead. This has the advantage of making them easier to distinguish from the three-shaft sesqui- symbols, besides retaining a resemblance to a conventional double-sharp symbol. To make the triple-shaft easier to distinguish from the double-shaft we vary the spacing between shafts.

If the abandonment of the conventional sharp and flat symbols seems a bit shocking, we should realize that, though they have served us well since they were devised in the Middle Ages, 21st-century microtonality might be better served by something else, and perhaps it is time for an upgrade. We can continue to call these new symbols sharps and flats with semi-, sesqui-, and double- prefixes added as appropriate, inasmuch as it is only the symbols that are changing, not their names or meanings.

However, we recognize that not everyone will agree with this approach, so we have also provided the option of using the Sagittal notation system without abandoning the conventional sharp and flat symbols by presenting the notation in two flavors:

- 1) The Evo(lutionary) or mixed-symbol flavor retains existing sharp and flat symbols and uses only the new single-shaft Sagittal symbols in combination with these, thus eliminating the "Stein" feature (see the third row of Figure 1). While this flavor

⁵ Stein, Richard H., 1909, *Zwei Konzertstücke*, cello & piano, op. 26, 2nd edn. with explanatory preface/epilog. Stein's own sesquiflat symbol confusingly consisted of two of his semiflat symbols (the backwards flats) and so has been replaced with the more logical combination of backwards and forwards flats due to Bernd Alois Zimmerman (1961).

requires fewer total symbols for a music font, it results in a greater number of symbols on a manuscript, which tends to give it a more cluttered appearance when chords are notated. However, this flavor would have an easier learning curve, which would enable wind and string players to master sight-reading more quickly.

- 2) The Revo(lutionary) or pure flavor discards the existing single and double sharp and flat symbols and replaces them with Sagittal single and double apotome symbols that mean exactly the same thing. Revo Sagittal symbols take up less space on a manuscript, thereby presenting a cleaner appearance. However, it is necessary to learn which symbols are *apotome complements*, i.e., pairs of symbols that, added together, equal an apotome. The Revo flavor would probably be more easily read by keyboard players (once the symbols are learned), inasmuch as there would be less possibility for confusion or ambiguity in perceiving which symbols alter which notes, since there is a one-to-one relationship between the two.

It is possible for the two flavors of the notation to coexist, with one or the other being preferred for different applications, or the Evo flavor might serve as an intermediate step toward the eventual exclusive adoption of the Revo flavor. Whatever the case, having two flavors should not produce very much confusion, since the single-shaft symbols have exactly the same meaning in both.

Bosanquet's Influence

The third idea to be incorporated into the notation is Bosanquet's use of sloping lines to indicate commatic alterations. This is illustrated in the top row of Figure 2 as it would be adapted for use in 72-EDO, where the apotome (i.e., sharp or flat alteration) is equivalent to 6 syntonic or Didymus commas, 80:81, which we will refer to as the *5 comma* from this point on. These lines by themselves do not provide a foolproof way to distinguish up from down, but if either one of them is placed to the left of a vertical line, a half-arrow is formed, which clearly points in the appropriate direction, providing an unmistakable indication of its meaning. In the second row of Figure 2, the 5-comma down and up is represented by the two symbols immediately to the left and right of the natural sign. The 5-comma symbol-pair is basic to the Sagittal notation, being used for this single purpose in the overwhelming majority of EDOs, as well as for rational (or JI) notation. As stated previously, up-and-down opposites are not created by rotating a symbol by 180 degrees, but rather by mirroring it vertically.

Bosanquet commatic notation	b	-b	--b	~~~~	~	~	b	-	--	---	~#	-#	#
Early sagittal notation	↓	↘	↘	↓	↘	↓	b	↑	↗	↗	↑	↗	↑
Revised with curved flags	↓	↘	↘	↓	↘	↓	b	↑	↗	↗	↑	↗	↑
Mixed-symbol version	b	↘	↘	↓	↘	↓	b	↑	↗	↗	↑	↘	↘

Figure 2 - Comparison of Sagittal Notation with Bosanquet Commatic Notation for 72-EDO

When communicating about the notation via electronic mail, we use combinations of ASCII characters (the characters shown on western keyboards) to simulate Sagittal symbols: the vertical bar (or “pipe”) character “|” to represent an arrow shaft, a capital “X” to represent the crossed lines of the double apotome, and slash “/” and backslash “\” characters to represent half-arrowheads, which we call *flags*. Thus the 5-comma symbol that represents 1 degree of 72-EDO ($1^{\circ}72$) consists of a single arrow shaft and straight left flag, /|, while the 11-diesis symbol that represents $3^{\circ}72$ has a single shaft with straight left and right flags, /|\. (A shorter name for a straight flag is a *barb*.)

Couper’s Influence

One very important characteristic of the Sagittal system is the avoidance of the clutter resulting from multiple side-by-side microtonal symbols, such as occur in the notational systems of Bosanquet, Ben Johnston, and Paul Rapoport, and most recently in the "Extended Helmholtz-Ellis JI Pitch Notation" of Marc Sabat and Wolfgang von Schweinitz. This was accomplished by incorporating Mildred Couper’s principle of *merging the vertical shafts* of two arrow-like symbols to make a symbol for the sum of their alterations, but only for total alterations up to some threshold. In Couper’s case that threshold fell between 3 and 4 quartertones, in Sagittal it falls between 3 and 4 twelfthtones.




Figure 2.5 - Couper’s Influence on the Development of Sagittal Notation

This is illustrated in Figure 2.5, where a backwards-flat semi-flat symbol (representing a quartertone, $1^{\circ}24$) is merged with a conventional flat symbol (representing a semitone, $2^{\circ}24$) to produce a sesqui-flat ($3^{\circ}24$) symbol. In Sagittal this same principle was initially applied to arrive at a symbol for $2^{\circ}72$ by subtracting the left barb from the $3^{\circ}72$ symbol, /|\, leaving a single shaft and right barb, |\.. (This same principle was subsequently used to produce additional symbols capable of notating many more temperaments and just tunings.) The other Sagittal symbols for 72-EDO follow logically by combining the Couper and Stein principles, as shown in the second row of Figure 2.

Reducing Lateral Confusability

Due to the possibility of confusion between symbols that are lateral mirror images of one another, particularly when sight-reading at high speed, we decided that a different sort of flag should be used in place of a right barb |\ for $2^{\circ}72$, and we agreed on a single-shaft symbol with a convex curved right flag (shown in the third row of Figure 2), which we designated to represent a septimal or Archytas comma, 63:64. We will refer to this as the *7 comma* from this point on. A shorter name for a convex flag is an *arc*. The ASCII notation for an arc is a parenthesis that curves away from the vertical line character, so a 7-comma-up is |). For the ASCII simulation of downward pointing arrows, vertical lines are replaced with exclamation marks, and “X” is replaced with “Y”. We have also devised

an ASCII *shorthand* for single-shaft symbols only, where each is represented by a single ASCII character. ASCII simulations of the symbol sequences in rows 3 and 4 of Figure 2 are shown in Figure 3.

\!/	!/	!!)	\!/	!)	\!	/	/)	/\)	\	/ \
b	b	b)	\!/	!)	\!	/	/)	/\	#)	# \	#
b	b/	bf	v	t	\	h	/	f	^	#t	#\	#

Figure 3 - ASCII Simulation of Sagittal Symbols for 72-EDO

Note that in the ASCII simulation the Evo flavor has the sharp or flat character to the *left* of the Sagittal symbol, so that it would immediately follow the letter indicating the letter nominal; e.g., F#\! would be the equivalent of F|!\.

If a 5 comma (80:81, ~21.5¢) is added to a 7 comma (63:64, ~27.3¢), the result (arrived at by *multiplying* the ratios) is the 35-diesis, 35:36 (~48.8¢), which is represented by a symbol that combines the 5-comma and 7-comma flags: /|). In addition to representing this comma exactly, the same symbol can also be used to represent the 13-diesis (1024:1053, ~48.3¢), which is almost the same size. We named the very small difference between these two intervals the *tridecimal schismina*⁶, 4095:4096, ~0.42 cents. By allowing such small intervals to be ignored, it is possible to achieve a more economical use of symbols.

A convex left flag or arc (|) was subsequently defined with the rather complex ratio 45056:45927 (~33.1¢) that, when added to the 7 comma, |), would result in (|) with ratio 704:729 (~60.4¢). This is the large 11 (abbreviated as 11L) diesis, which is useful as the apotome complement of the (medium-size) 11 diesis (abbreviated as 11M). In other words, /| plus (|) equals /||\ (a sharp, or apotome). Finally, if this left arc is combined with a right barb, the result is the large 35 (or 35L) diesis (|\, 8192:8505 (~64.9¢), which also differs from 26:27, the large 13 (or 13L) diesis (~65.3¢), by the tridecimal schismina. These symbols are also apotome complements, i.e., /|) plus (|\ equals /||\.

With these symbols (assuming that one is willing to ignore the tridecimal schismina), there are four different ways to notate 13-limit ratios that are in the neighborhood of a neutral third above C=1/1:

- 1) For 11/9, lower a Pythagorean E (81/64) by 704:729 giving E(!)
- 2) For 27/22, lower a Pythagorean E by 32:33 giving E\!
- 3) For 16/13, lower a Pythagorean E by 1024:1053 giving E\|)
- 4) For 39/32, lower a Pythagorean E by 26:27 giving E(!/

Notice that the symbols for the 11 diesises have both left and right flags alike (either barbs or arcs), while those for the 13 diesises each have one barb and one arc. With the 13-diesis symbols the potential for lateral confusability enters the picture, but we have

⁶ We adopted the term *schismina* to designate a very small class of intervals that are smaller than ~1.8 cents, in order to distinguish them from intervals such as the 19-schisma (512:513, ~3.38¢) and the 5-schisma (32768:32805, ~1.95¢).

alleviated the problem somewhat by specifying that the large 13-diesis symbol should be noticeably wider than the (medium-size) 13-diesis symbol.

To provide symbols for primes above 13 (and to notate finer divisions of the octave) we devised two more types of flags that can be used on either the left or right side of an arrow shaft. These are physically smaller in size and are used to symbolize smaller commas than either the straight or convex flags. The *concave flag* consists of a concave curve or *scroll*, while a *wavy flag* consists of a concavoconvex curve or *boathook*. Left and right scrolls are simulated in ASCII by `)|` and `|(|`, respectively, while boathooks are `~|` and `|~`. Each Sagittal symbol thereby consists of either one or two (or in rare instances three) flags. Where there are two flags, they are most commonly on opposite sides. To minimize lateral confusability between symbols that have the same flags on opposite sides, we specified that there should be differences in the physical sizes of the left and right versions of the same flag type, according to the sizes of the commas they represent.

The Spartan Symbol Set

We tried many different combinations for matching scrolls and boathooks with the commas, kleismas, and schismas associated with the higher primes before arriving at our final selection. Although at times it seemed that there would be no end to our discussion of how many schisminas could vanish on the head of an arrow, we never considered the time wasted that was spent on ideas that were subsequently discarded, because having tried as many ways as we could possibly think of, we could be more confident that we had found the best.

Fortunately, many tunings will require only the *Spartan* set of eight single-shaft symbol pairs, seven of which are composed of barbs and arcs alone (see Figure 4). With the Spartan symbol set it is possible to notate an extensive 5-limit pitch matrix (factors up to 5^4 and 5^{-4} exactly), all of the 9-limit consonances (exactly), and 16 harmonics and subharmonics (with the 13th harmonic approximated) in just intonation, plus over 40 equal divisions (including most of the popular ones below 100 tones per octave).




Figure 4 - The Spartan Symbol Set

It is therefore not necessary to learn very many of the symbols of the Sagittal notation in order to use it – only those required for a particular tuning or odd limit. Additional symbols may be learned as needed for more complicated tunings, higher odd limits, or special applications.

Symbol Definitions

Listed in Table 1 are some of the most commonly required single-shaft Sagittal symbols and the commas⁷ they represent. The preferred symbols for notating prime harmonic factors relative to the Pythagorean notes are shown in **bold type**. The symbols that represent commas used to notate the primes from 5 through 29 each have a single flag, except for 11 and 13. The 11 and 13-defining intervals are dieses rather than commas, and their symbols each contain two flags (i.e., the sum of two commas), inasmuch as it is not economical to have a single flag representing an interval as large as a diesis. The right barb \backslash is therefore defined as the 55 comma (55/54), i.e., \backslash the 11M diesis (33/32) plus \backslash the 5 comma (80/81), where the upward and downward left barbs cancel. We defined the right scroll \lrcorner as the 7/5-kleisma (5103:5120, the difference between the 7 and 5 commas, $\sim 5.8\phi$), and we found that (by ignoring various schisminas) it could also serve as the 13/11-kleisma (351:352, the difference between the 11M and 13M dieses, $\sim 4.9\phi$), or when added to the left boathook $\sim|$ that represents the 17-kleisma (2176:2187, $\sim 8.7\phi$), it would result in a symbol $\sim|\lrcorner$ that can represent the 17-comma (4096:4131, $\sim 14.7\phi$).

Although there is not a complete one-to-one correspondence of symbol-elements (or flags) to primes such as was originally proposed, still only eight flags are required to notate the eight primes from 5 through 29. For some of these primes there are symbols for two different commas, which (among other things) allows the 17th, 19th, and 23rd harmonics to be notated as alterations to either sharped or flatted notes in order to provide alternate spellings for the intervals these make with the 12th, 16th, and 18th harmonics.

In response to a request for a means to distinguish between pitches differing by a 5-schisma (32768:32805, $\sim 1.95\phi$), we introduced the *schisma accent mark*, which may be added to the left of a Sagittal symbol to alter pitch by a 5-schisma in either the same or opposite direction of the symbol. Two accented symbols, along with their apotome complements (also accented) are included in Table 1 to illustrate this: an *acute* (or upward-sloping) accent mark for an upward alteration in pitch, and a *grave* (or downward-sloping) accent to indicate a downward alteration. These accent marks greatly increase not only the number of available symbols, but also the number of ratios that can be notated exactly. In addition, they allow for finer distinctions in pitch that: 1) enable those rational intervals not represented exactly, to be approximated with greater precision, and 2) make it possible to notate finer divisions of the octave.

Where more than one ratio (or role) is given for a symbol in the table, the first one listed is the *primary role* for that symbol, i.e., the ratio that *exactly defines* that symbol. Secondary comma roles are therefore only *approximated* by symbols in the notation of rational (or just) pitches or intervals and are valid in a given EDO only if the difference

⁷ The term comma is used here in a broad or generic sense, whereas in Table 1 it is also used for a specific size category. We use the following boundaries, in approximate cents, for the following categories and (category symbols): 0c schismina(n) 1.8c schisma(s) 4.5c kleisma(k) 11.7c comma(C) 33.4c small-diesis(S) 45.1c [medium-]diesis(M) 56.8c large-diesis(L) 68.6c. The precise boundaries are at the square-roots of the ratios with the following prime exponent vectors [-84 53>, [317 -200>, [-19 12>, [27 -17>, [8 -5>, [-11 7>, [-30 19>. They were found necessary to distinguish small ratios having the same combination of prime factors above 3. This allows us to name such ratios according to the much simpler ratio they notate, hence 32768:32805 is simply "the 5-schisma" or "5s".

Table 1- Selected Sagittal Symbols and Their Commas

Symbol & Comma Name (up)	Comma Ratio & Size	Apotome Complement
┘ 5 schisma	32768:32805, ~1.95ϕ	↖ = ↗
┘ 19 schisma	512:513 , ~3.38ϕ	↖ = ↗
┘ 7/5 kleisma	5103:5120, ~5.76ϕ	↖ = ↗
┘ 13/11 kleisma	351:352, ~4.93ϕ	↖ = ↗
┘ 17 kleisma	2176:2187, ~8.73ϕ	↖ = ↗
┘ 11/7 kleisma	891:896, ~9.69ϕ	↖ = ↗
┘ sum of flags	189:190, ~9.14ϕ	↖ = ↗
┘ 17 comma	4096:4131 , ~14.73ϕ	↖ = ↗
┘ sum of flags	119:120, ~14.49ϕ	↖ = ↗
┘ 23 comma	729:736 , ~16.54ϕ	↖ = ↗
↖ 25 comma (diaschisma)	2025:2048, ~19.55ϕ	↖ = ↗
┘ 19 comma	19456:19683, ~20.08ϕ	↖ = ↗
┘ sum of flags	432:437, ~19.92ϕ	↖ = ↗
┘ 5 comma	80:81 , ~21.51ϕ	↖ = ↗
┘ 7 comma	63:64 , ~27.26ϕ	↖ = ↗
┘ 55 comma	54:55, ~31.77ϕ	↖ = ↗
┘ 11/7 comma	45056:45927, ~33.15ϕ	↖ = ↗
┘ 17/13 S-diesis	51:52, ~33.62ϕ	↖ = ↗
┘ 29 S-diesis	256:261 , ~33.49ϕ	↖ = ↗
┘ 11/5 S-diesis	44:45, ~38.91ϕ	↖ = ↗
┘ 13/7 S-diesis	1664:1701, ~38.07ϕ	↖ = ↗
┘ 17/11 S-diesis	1377:1408, ~38.54ϕ	↖ = ↗
↖ 25 S-diesis	6400:6561, ~43.01ϕ	↖ = ↗
↖ 13/5 S-diesis	39:40, ~43.83ϕ	↖ = ↗
┘ 35 M-diesis	35:36, ~48.77ϕ	↖
┘ 13 M-diesis	1024:1053, ~48.35ϕ	↖
┘ 125 M-diesis	243:250, ~49.17ϕ	↖
┘ 11 M-diesis	32:33 , ~53.27ϕ	↖
┘ 11 L-diesis	704:729, ~60.41ϕ	↖
┘ 35 L-diesis	8192:8505, ~64.91ϕ	↖
┘ 13 L-diesis	26:27 , ~65.34ϕ	↖
┘ 125 L-diesis	512000:531441, ~64.52ϕ	↖

symbols, respectively. (Some of these appear below, in Figure 6.) We call this the *Athenian*⁹ symbol set.

In Figure 5 there are two different symbols given for the 6th position in the sequence (not counting the natural sign). Using the 11/7-comma (|) in preference to the 55-comma (\) for this position results in the Athenian notation for just intonation (or rational pitches) which we refer to as *Medium-precision JI notation*. (If the 55-comma is used instead, this then becomes the symbol set for 224-EDO.¹⁰) When rational intervals or pitches must be *approximated* by symbols in Medium-precision JI notation, the difference in cents between the ratio of the desired pitch and that of a nearby tone in a Pythagorean sequence containing 1/1 is calculated, and the appropriate symbol is determined by reference to a table of boundaries (easily accomplished with a computer spreadsheet or other software, such as Scala¹¹), as illustrated in the diagram at the bottom of Figure 5. While it appears that pitch approximations could amount to as much as 3 cents, in actual practice approximations even as large as half this size rarely occur (due to the fact that the schismas which define the semantics of the notation are very small), and only then for ratios involving complex or unusual combinations of prime factors or less-preferred spellings. It is expected that the overwhelming majority of users will conclude that the Medium-precision JI symbol set is quite acceptable for their purposes, with higher-precision symbol sets being necessary only for certain theoretical (or other special) applications.

A Musical Example

A musical example in just intonation using Sagittal notation appears in Figure 6 in both Evo and Revo flavors. This example can be heard in various tunings on the Sagittal website at <https://sagittal.org/exmp/>. In the first measure the 5 comma symbol is used to make Pythagorean major thirds just; notice that the arrow-like symbol points downward and that the straight left flag also slopes downward.

⁹ Since we had already named one symbol set after Sparta, we thought it fitting to honor the other pre-eminent ancient Greek city-state with a symbol set name, particularly in light of its contribution to our musical heritage and its reputation as a philosophical forum (not unlike present-day Internet discussion groups).

¹⁰ Inasmuch as the 11/7-comma and 55-comma differ by less than 1.4 cents, either one would be suitable in this symbol sequence for notating either JI or 224-EDO. The 11/7-comma symbol seems to be preferable for JI, because it *exactly* notates two 11-limit consonances (11/7 and 14/11), whereas the 55-comma symbol is generally preferable in an EDO symbol set, because it results in matching sequences of flags (which are easier to remember) for the single- and double-shaft symbols in the Revo flavor. However, it might make sense to use instead whichever symbol does not result in a laterally-confusable pair for the EDO. This illustrates some considerations in choosing a good notation from the valid ones.

¹¹ Version 2.2 or later, of the Scala software, which supports the Sagittal notation, is available from the Scala Home Page at <https://www.huygens-fokker.org/scala/>.

3/2	5/3	7/4	9/5	16/9	8/5	3/2	15/8	7/4	13/8	11/8	11/6	117/64	27/16	15/8	1/1
5/4	4/3	3/2	3/2	4/3	5/4	5/4	11/8	13/8	3/2	5/4	7/6	45/32	3/2	3/2	3/2
1/1	1/1	5/4	6/5	1/1	1/1	1/1	9/8	1/1	1/1	1/1	1/1	9/8	21/16	3/2	21/16
		1/1	1/1											3/2	1/1
															5/4

Figure 6 - A Musical Example in Sagittal Notation

In measures 2 and 3 there are three different minor sevenths: 1) $7/4$ (a harmonic seventh) is a Pythagorean B-flat *lowered by a 7 comma*; 2) $9/5$ (a large minor seventh) is a Pythagorean B-flat *raised by a 5 comma*; and 3) $16/9$ is an *unaltered* Pythagorean B-flat. Observe the similarity in appearance between the two flavors of the symbols, particularly the positive slope of the straight flags for the second chord of measure 2 and for $8/5$ in the second beat of measure 3, which provides a clue that these are tones that are being *raised* by a 5 comma (even though the double-shaft symbols on the second staff are pointing *down*!).

Measure 4 uses some ratios of 11 and 13. Observe that different symbols (with like left and right flags) are used for $11/8$ (up from F) and $11/6$ (down from B), while $13/8$ (the first *approximated* ratio in this example) has a symbol with one convex and one straight flag. Using single-shaft symbols for the 11L and 13L diesis in the Evo flavor makes it unnecessary to combine sharps or flats with 11M or 13M-diesis symbols that alter in the opposite direction, after the idea that it is simpler to read half of a flat than a whole flat less half.

The first chord in measure 4 illustrates a potential for confusion that arises if two notes of a chord are positioned on the same line or space. With the Revo notation it should be clear that the left symbol alters the left note and the right symbol the right note (and if one of the notes is unaltered, then a natural sign could be used for clarity). However, with the Evo notation there are three symbols for two notes, which could tend to slow down the reading process. Moreover, if a situation is encountered where the first note is altered by only a single Sagittal symbol and the second by only a sharp or flat, a certain ambiguity occurs: do the two symbols together alter one or both notes, or does the left one alter one note and the right one the other?

This would seem to pose a strong argument in favor of adopting the Revo flavor, at least for any music containing chords. But for orchestral parts the Evo flavor would not suffer from this problem, and symphonic players would more likely appreciate its gentler learning curve.

Measure 5 has a more complex ratio ($117/64$) for one of the notes, but examination of the symbol will reveal it to be a ratio of 13 (an approximated ratio $9:8$ above the $13/8$ in the previous measure). This measure also contains the only sharped note in the example

(45/32); again note the significance of the downward slope of the straight flags in both flavors.

To aid in the determination of how the Athenian symbols are used for just intonation, Figure 7 has been provided for reference. The upper staff shows each ratio in Evo notation, while the lower staff illustrates the Revo Sagittal flavor. Quarter notes (crochets) are used to identify those instances where ratios are approximated by symbols, and three ratios (11/7, 14/11, and 25/16) are shown with alternate spellings. The exact alternate spelling for 25/16 is shown using a diaschisma symbol (to illustrate employment of an accented symbol), but Athenian-level notation would dispense with the accent mark, thereby approximating this ratio using a 5-comma-down symbol.

A Common Notation for JI and EDOs

This section heading, which has served as the subject line in most of the correspondence for our notation development project, asserts that the Sagittal notation can be used for both just intonation and equal divisions of the octave, but so far we have described only how Sagittal symbols are used to notate ratios. As was previously stated, for an EDO the nominals are in a chain of the best fifth of that EDO, but what about the accidentals? A first pass at notating EDOs is to specify that the best approximation to any ratio should be notated in the same way as that ratio. However, this by itself is insufficient to determine which symbol to use for a given number of degrees of a particular EDO, since in many instances there are two or more ratios (requiring different symbols) that are represented.

Theoretically, every Sagittal symbol is meaningful in any equal division of the octave, so any symbol could theoretically be used in one way or another to notate any EDO, as long as its primary comma role is a positive number of degrees in that EDO. This makes it possible under certain circumstances to sight-read a composition written for a larger EDO or in just intonation on an instrument designed for or tuned to a different EDO, so long as the player is aware of which commas vanish in which EDO. For example, 5-comma symbols would be ignored when translating just intonation into 19-EDO and 31-EDO, while 7-comma symbols would be ignored when translating into 22-EDO. Since this requires a knowledge of musical acoustics that the average musician cannot be expected to possess, the limitations for doing this reside with the player more than with the notation.

It is desirable that players should not have to cope with different sets of symbols for the same EDO in different compositions, so we have specified a *standard set* of symbols to be used for each EDO. These have been selected using several criteria, including a symbol's prime factor limit, the division's prime number errors and consistency, and validity of secondary comma roles. Consistency of symbol flag arithmetic for the single-shaft symbols has been strictly maintained, but occasional inconsistencies have been allowed for double-shaft apotome complements in cases where they are not likely to be noticed.

Figure 7 - Sagittal Athenian Notation for Just Intonation

The figure displays five systems of musical notation, each consisting of two staves. The notation uses a system of stems and flags to represent pitch intervals. Below each system, the corresponding just intonation ratios are listed.

System 1: 1/1, 3/2, 4/3, 5/3, 5/4, 6/5, 8/5, 7/4, 7/5, 7/6

System 2: 8/7, 10/7, 12/7, 9/5, 9/7, 9/8, 10/9, 14/9, 16/9

System 3: 11/6, 11/7, 11/8, 11/9, 11/10, 12/11, 14/11, 16/11, 18/11, 20/11

System 4: 13/7, 13/8, 13/9, 13/10, 13/11, 13/12, 14/13, 16/13, 18/13, 20/13, 22/13, 24/13

System 5: 15/8, 15/11, 15/13, 15/14, 16/15, 22/15, 26/15, 28/15, 17/16, 32/17, 25/16

To specify the symbol sets for the Revo flavor of the notation, it is necessary only to list the symbols used to alter consecutive degrees up to the apotome. In every case, double-shaft symbols are determined by using (in reverse order, beginning at the apotome) the apotome-complements of the single-shaft symbols (as shown in Figures 5 and 13). Beyond this point the symbols are re-used beginning from the left, replacing a single shaft with a triple and a double shaft with an “X” (in the same way as shown for the Athenian symbols in Figure 5).

For the Evo flavor, only the single-shaft symbols are used, either alone or in combination with conventional single and double sharp and flat symbols.

Listed in Figure 8 are the divisions that require no symbols other than those in the Spartan set. In some of these divisions the fifths have such large errors that the divisions are not 1,3,9-consistent. In such cases it may be preferable to notate these as subsets of larger divisions, even though their native-fifth notations generally require fewer symbols.

Listed in Figure 9 are some divisions for which the notation is more complicated. Most of these require symbols outside the Spartan set (e.g., those with scrolls and/or boathooks).¹² For several of these divisions (58, 111, 152, 176, 183, and 224) the single-shaft symbols were chosen so that the flags of the double-shaft symbols recapitulate those in a subsequence of the single-shaft symbols, which makes it much easier to remember the symbol sequences.

It needs to be emphasized that the comma sizes in cents, as listed for the various symbols in Table 1, apply only to rational or JI tunings, in which the symbols alter tones in a chain of Pythagorean fifths. In various EDOs these commas are represented by intervals that may be either larger or smaller than their rational sizes, or they may vanish altogether. This sometimes results in reversals in the size-order of the symbols, but in selecting the standard sets for the EDOs we have sought to minimize this.

¹² Sagittal notations for some EDOs not given in this paper may be found in the Periodic Table of EDOs at <https://sagittal.org> and in the Scala software, available at <https://www.huygens-fokker.org/scala/>. The latest version of the EDO notation file used by Scala may be found at https://sagittal.org/sag_et.par and new notations are discussed in the Equal Division Notations subforum of the Sagittal Forum at <https://forum.sagittal.org/viewforum.php?f=5>.

Figure 8

Equal Divisions Notated Using the Spartan Symbol Set

* updated	5:	⌋	using naturals C G D A E or 5 as a subset of 50
*	7:	⌋ ⌋	using naturals F C G D A E B or 7 as a subset of 56
	12, 19, 26:	⌋ ⌋	with 2, 3, 4, and 6 notated as subsets of 12, 13 as a subset of 26 *
*	16, 21:	⌋ ⌋ ⌋	with naturals F C G D A E B or 21 as a subset of 63, 16 subset 48
*	10:	⌋ ⌋	with naturals C G D A E or 10 notated as a subset of 50
*	35, 40:	⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋	with naturals F C G D A E B or 40 as a subset of 80
	17, 24, 31, 38:	⌋ ⌋	with 8 notated as a subset of 24
	45, 52:	⌋ ⌋	or 45 notated as a subset of 135 (TBD)
	15:	⌋ ⌋ ⌋	with naturals C G D A E or 15 notated as a subset of 60
	22, 29:	⌋ ⌋ ⌋	with 11 notated as a subset of 22
	36, 43:	⌋ ⌋ ⌋	with 18 notated as a subset of 36
	50, 57, 64:	⌋ ⌋ ⌋	or 57 notated as a subset of 171, or 64 as a subset of 128 (TBD)
*	27:	⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋	
	34, 41:	⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋	
	62, 69:	⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋	
	39, 46:	⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋	
	53:	⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋	
	51:	⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋	
	65, 72, 79:	⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋	
	56, 63:	⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋	
	77:	⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋	
	84:	⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋	
	89:	⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋	
	125:	⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋	
*	130:	⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋	
*	142:	⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋ ⌋	all the Spartan symbols

No microtonal notation system could be considered universal if it did not have the desirable properties that Gardner Read describes in his book *20th Century Microtonal Notation*. In particular it must cater to those who prefer to notate tunings relative to 12-tone equal temperament. In this application it must provide unique and consistent symbols for various fractions of the equal-tempered semitone. A set of symbols has been selected for this purpose, and although it adheres faithfully to the Sagittal principle of notating according to the best approximations of just or rational pitches, one may freely ignore this fact and simply consider the symbols as representing particular fractions of a semitone or tone. We call this the *12-Relative* or *Trojan*¹³ symbol set, and it is shown in Figure 10. Note that most Trojan symbols are also in the Athenian set.

Each symbol in this set has been assigned a size range for modification of tones relative to a 12-EDO circle of fifths (as indicated by the diagram near the bottom of Figure 10). The most obvious application of this is to EDOs which are multiples of 12. These are shown in the top part of Figure 10. Observe that in some cases the same symbol is used for several slightly different fractions of a tone; for example the left barb is used for 1/12, 1/14 and 1/16 of a tone. But in no case does the size for a symbol in any of these EDOs vary by more than ± 2 cents, thus allowing a player who must read parts in multiple tunings to develop an instrumental technique that uses nominal symbol sizes to arrive at approximate pitches, which may then be fine-tuned by ear. Again, it must be emphasized that these nominal symbol sizes in cents are valid only when the symbols are used to alter tones in a 12-EDO circle of fifths.

These three lists of EDOs are by no means exhaustive. We have also notated even higher divisions such as 270, 282, 306, 311, 342, 388, 494, 612, and beyond, as well as many below 224. We have followed the principle that the overall complexity of the complete notation system should not make the simpler things more complicated.

While the notation of linear or higher-dimensional temperaments has not been investigated by us in great detail, it has become evident that such a temperament may be readily notated using the notation for an EDO that closely approximates it. Meantone temperament may therefore be treated as if it were a subset of 31-EDO, while the Miracle temperament may be notated like 72-EDO. For an irregular set of tones which are not described by ratios, it would be necessary to find some suitable division of the octave into which they could be consistently mapped, and the symbols for that division could then serve as the notation for that set, even if the set itself does not contain octaves.

¹³ Since many musicians who use microtonal subdivisions of 12-equal have little or no desire to be involved with ratios, we thought it fitting to name this symbol set “Trojan”. This is in keeping with our “ancient city-states” theme, whereby we would be making available to them a gift-horse notation based on the rational numbers of JI. However, we need not fear that the ratios will escape and overrun the city; instead they will merely offer to provide a JI interpreting service, should this ever be required.

Adaptive Just Intonation

One planar temperament that deserves special mention in this discussion is that having generating intervals of 2:3 and $(80:81)^{1/4}$ – the just fifth and the quarter-comma of meantone temperament. By referring to Figure 5, one may observe that, since the 5-comma is 4 steps in the Medium-precision JI notation, these symbols may then be defined to represent *exact quarter-commas* in this temperament and may thereby be used to notate adaptive just intonation in which the pitches depart from a Pythagorean tuning by multiples of 1/4-comma.

An example of this is given in Figure 11, which illustrates a simple chord progression (a “comma pump”) in adaptive just intonation. Comma drift is eliminated by causing each repeated note to shift upward in pitch by 1/4 comma. As a result, each harmonic interval (or vertical sonority) is an exact 5-limit ratio, with only melodic intervals occurring as irrational ratios.¹⁴ With repeated notes this very small change in pitch is virtually inaudible, but in instances where a note is held over between chords, the best effect is achieved by executing a rapid upward glide (rather than an instantaneous change) in pitch.

Degrees of Medium-precision JI Notation (1/4 commas)

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
	↑	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓

Figure 11 - 1/4-Comma Adaptive Just Intonation in Sagittal Notation

Some Purely Practical Considerations

What about existing notations? There is one for 72-EDO devised by Ezra Sims in the 1970s with which many instrumentalists are already familiar. Should they be compelled to learn “yet another notation?” We think not. Good microtonal players are not abundant, and if they are not willing to learn a new notation, then that is their prerogative.

However, we don’t think that this is an insurmountable problem. Now that we can have computer-generated instrumental parts, it would also be possible to have software that could translate one notation into another and then print any given part in whatever notation a player is comfortable with.

But there is more to be taken into consideration. Players fluent with the Sims notation must realize that if they are asked to play in systems other than 72-EDO, then there is a real possibility that they would be required to read another notation – and for another tuning, yet another notation, at which point the real issue becomes clear: It is not so much having to learn a new notation that is the problem; rather it is discovering that the new notation that one has learned is not the end of the matter. And this will always be the case with *specialized* notations. While they each have their place and purpose, by their

¹⁴ This is further explained in the “adaptive JI” article in Joe Monzo's *Tonalsoft Encyclopaedia of Tuning* at <http://www.tonalsoft.com/enc/a/adaptive-ji.aspx>.

very nature they impose obstacles for composers who are attempting to get performances of works in different tunings.

There is a notation devised by Johnny Reinhard that would seem to overcome this problem in that it is not specific to any particular tuning. It is extremely easy to comprehend, and he claims that excellent results can be obtained with it. It consists of using 24-EDO notation (a variation of Stein's symbols) with numbers (i.e., signed integers) written above each note to indicate the number of cents by which that note should be altered to obtain the desired pitch. In essence, this is a notation for 1200-EDO that can approximate any pitch of any tuning to within half a cent and any interval to within one cent.¹⁵

But is this the *generalized* notation that we are seeking? While it is highly successful for the employment of extended techniques for altering pitch on conventional (flexible-pitch) instruments, the employment of cents numbers is not particularly useful for instruments of *fixed pitch* that have been specially built for new tunings, e.g., a refretted guitar, a xylophone or metallophone, or a synthesizer operated by a generalized keyboard controller. Should wind instruments for another division (or better yet, multi-system instruments) be developed, then increments of 1200-EDO are not going to be very helpful. It is arguable that, without special wind instruments for other divisions of the octave, microtonality would be unattainable except by those virtuoso wind players who are able to master extended techniques for altering pitch, thereby putting off any possibility that it might one day become a part of the musical mainstream.¹⁶ It should be clear that a generalized notation must not only be useful for all tunings, but also for all types of instruments, whether designed and built for 12-EDO or for alternate tunings.

In the course of the notation's development, we discussed a few other practical matters that should be mentioned:

- 1) The Sims notation confronts the reality of reading instrumental parts under less than optimal conditions (such as poor lighting and the greater reading distance required when two players share a music stand) by having symbols that can be easily distinguished under these circumstances. While the symbols of the Sagittal 72-EDO notation are quite distinct, tunings using more symbol pairs may require the use of slightly larger staves than usual for the parts in order to make them more readily distinguishable under adverse conditions.

¹⁵ This notation is employed extensively for performances produced by the American Festival of Microtonal Music, of which Johnny Reinhard is director; see <https://www.afmm.org/>.

¹⁶ Extended techniques require alterations in pitch (or "pitch-bending") of up to ± 50 cents using conventional instruments, which generally requires a great amount of skill in order to achieve both accurate pitch and a reasonably good tone. Wind instruments built for 31-EDO, for example, would allow musicians of lesser ability to play music written not only for that division, but also for 217-EDO. Since 31 is a subset of 217, all of the pitches of 217 could be produced on a 31-tone instrument by pitch-bending in increments of ~ 5.5 cents ($1/217$) up or down, up to a maximum of around ± 17 cents (i.e., less than a 5-comma, or hardly any more than what is required in 12-EDO to play diatonic music in tune). Similarly, instruments built in 19-EDO or 38-EDO could make multiples of those divisions (i.e., 152, 171, 190, and 494) attainable. Any of these larger divisions could also be used as approximations to just intonation.

2) An accommodation will be required for musicians who presently read the Sims notation, but are put off from learning the Sagittal notation because of the conflict in meaning between the virtually identical Sagittal 5-comma symbol pair (for $1^{\circ}72$) and the Sims symbol pair for $2^{\circ}72$. Ervin M. Wilson devised a modification to Bosanquet's sloping comma-lines that easily distinguishes the comma-up from the comma-down symbol by putting a vertical line through it. This causes it to resemble a "plus" sign, while leaving the comma-down symbol as is (resembling a "minus" sign). If the Sagittal 5-comma pair is replaced with the Wilson 5-comma pair, the result is the Sagittal-Wilson symbol set for 72-EDO. This is shown in the third row of Figure 12, where the horizontal strokes of the Wilson 5-comma symbol pair have been slanted and broadened in accordance with the recommendations of Daniel Wolf.¹⁷ The Sagittal-Wilson symbol set thus provides an intermediate step in a possible transition from Sims to Sagittal, with the potential for confusion minimized at each step in the process.

Pure Sagittal notation	↓	↳	↳	↓	↳	↳	↳	↳	↑	↳	↳	↑			
Mixed-symbol version	b	↳b	↳b	↓	↳	↳	↳	↳	↑	↳	↳	↑	↳#	↳#	#
Sagittal-Wilson notation	b	↳b	↳b	↓	↳	↳	↳	↳	↑	↳	↳	↑	↳#	↳#	#

Figure 12 - Comparison of Sagittal-Wilson Notation with Pure and Mixed Sagittal for 72-EDO

3) The excellent results achieved using the Reinhard method of notation for conventional instruments cannot be summarily dismissed. We have therefore concluded that it could be useful for a string, wind, or voice part in Sagittal notation to have the cents deviation from a 12-EDO pitch¹⁸ placed above the notes for those players who are able to benefit from this. In combination, these two approaches to notation would supply the same information in different formats that effectively complement one another. Given sufficient time a player could commit the cents deviations to memory for a frequently-played tuning and would then be able to rely mostly on the Sagittal symbols. Should instruments designed for microtonality subsequently become available, these parts would already be in a notation that would be meaningful to players using the new instruments.

¹⁷ See the "HEWM" entry at <http://www.tonalsoft.com/enc/h/hewm.aspx> beginning at the heading, "Daniel Wolf's version of HEWM" approximately halfway through the article. Since the Sagittal and HEWM notations both use the same up- and down-arrow pair for the 11 diesis, and since the Sagittal 7-comma symbol pair is somewhat similar in appearance to the HEWM 7-comma pair (particularly the down symbol), it would not be unreasonable to consider the Sagittal-Wilson symbol set as a dialect of HEWM notation.

¹⁸ While the Reinhard method makes use of numbers of cents modifying 24-EDO pitches, it is not possible to use separate quartertone symbols at the same time as Sagittal symbols, so the numbers would need to be specified relative to steps of 12-EDO. The numbers would therefore be wider in range, but would never require more than 2 digits.

It should be observed that only with divisions of the octave that are multiples of 12 will there be fixed deviations from 12-EDO pitches for the various Sagittal symbols, for it is only in these divisions that the symbols are indicating alterations to tones relative to a circle of fifths of exactly 700 cents. Even within this group of divisions a given symbol may differ slightly in size; e.g., the 5 comma is ~16.7 cents in 72-EDO, but it is ~14.3 cents in 84-EDO and 12.5 cents in 96-EDO. And outside this group the size of the 5 comma (relative to a system's best fifth) can get considerably larger, e.g., ~54.5 cents in 22-EDO. The important thing to keep in mind is that Sagittal symbols indicate *harmonic relationships* relative to a chain of fifths rather than fixed melodic intervals.

- 4) Since the Sagittal notation symbolizes intervals that are allowed to vary in size to accommodate many different tunings, it is necessary that sufficient information be provided in a score to specify the particular tuning that is intended, along with a pitch reference. It is expected that this information could be displayed in a standard format that will eventually be defined as a part of the formal specifications of this notation.

The Sagittal Font and Website

A scalable music font containing the Sagittal symbols (including the Wilson 5-comma symbol pair) is available free of charge at the Sagittal website, <https://sagittal.org>. This can be used with existing (and future) computer software products to generate high-quality music manuscripts in Sagittal notation. Also to be found at the Sagittal website are a character map for the font summarizing the uses of the various symbols, a set of scripts written by Jacob Barton to facilitate its use with the notation software *Sibelius*, and an entertaining "history" of the development of the Sagittal notation.

Engineered Evolution

In the early stages of its development, we decided to make the notation as versatile as we possibly could, because we recognized that if we took the time and effort to provide as much capability as possible from the start and to do it right, then it would be unlikely to need changing later (something that might upset those who had already started using it). Keeping this objective in mind, we devised specific symbols that could be used for many different tunings, both rational (JI) and tempered, making occasional modifications both to our choice of symbols that would be included in the Sagittal superset and to the exact definitions of those symbols.

Over the course of several years we took the notation through at least a half-dozen generations of development that, were it to occur by an evolutionary process involving actual microtonal practice, would probably require many centuries to arrive at. Sagittal notation could thus be described as a product of engineered evolution, but despite our best efforts we may well find that improvements are still possible, as it continues to be put to the test in actual use by others.

We eventually closed on a set of 31 single-shaft symbols¹⁹ (not counting accents, and counting vertically mirrored pairs as one symbol; see Figure 13) that can notate most EDOs of interest, some having as many as 400 tones in the octave, and all rational intervals to within about two cents. Rational intervals are notated *without reference to any temperament*, and all of the most common ones are notated *exactly*, so it is only the more complex (or less common) ratios that must be approximated by reusing symbols for simpler ratios.



Figure 13 - Complete Symbol Superset from Natural to Apotome (Sharp)

In response to a subsequent request for a means of distinguishing between pitches differing by the tridecimal schismina (4095:4096, ~0.42¢) in electronic music applications, we also introduced additional (wing-shaped) *mina accent marks* that can be added to the left side of a Sagittal symbol (either schisma-accented or unaccented) to indicate an additional alteration, either up or down, and either singly mina-accented (to alter pitch exactly or approximately by a tridecimal schismina) or doubly mina-accented (to alter pitch exactly or approximately by 2079:2080, ~0.83¢). These allow an even greater number of ratios to be notated exactly, while making it possible to notate divisions of the octave as high as 2460-EDO.

¹⁹ The symbols in Figure 13 that were not defined in Table 1 are as follows:)~| is defined as the 143-comma (143:144, ~12.064 cents); ~~| is the 49/11-comma (98:99, ~17.576 cents);)| is the 19/5-comma (40960:41553, ~24.884 cents);)) is the 19/7-comma (56:57, ~30.642 cents); ~|) is the 49S-diesis (48:49, ~35.697 cents); /|~ is the 23/5S-diesis (45:46, ~38.051 cents); ~|\ is the 23S-diesis (16384:16767, ~40.004 cents);)//| is the 13/5M-diesis (405:416, ~46.394 cents); (|~ is the 19/11M-diesis (171:176, ~49.895 cents); (/| is the 49M-diesis (3969:4096, ~54.528 cents);)/\ is the 49/5M-diesis (392:405, ~56.482 cents); |\ is the 49L-diesis (8388608:8680203, ~59.157 cents); |\| is the 19/11L-diesis (360448:373977, ~63.790 cents); and)|\| is the 13/5L-diesis (851968:885735, ~67.291 cents).

In accordance with this, we have also defined symbol sets to be used for several levels of precision in just intonation. While medium-precision (Athenian-level) JI, which uses twelve pairs of single-shaft symbols (without any accent marks), should be adequate for most purposes, we have also defined high-precision (in versions with or without schisma accents) and extreme-precision (utilizing both schisma and mina accents) symbol sets for those with more exacting requirements, in which case a trade-off of simplicity for precision must be taken into consideration.²⁰ Our objective is that, in order for a notation system to be acceptable to as many composers as possible, it must not only be able to notate just about anything that anyone might want to do, but also just about anything that anyone *thinks that they might want to do*. Though some of these advanced features of the Sagittal system would never be used by most composers, it may be reassuring to know that they are available, should they ever be needed.

While a casual first glance at the array of Sagittal symbols shown in Figure 13 might appear as bewildering as Chinese characters (or about what one might expect a 28th-century microtonal notation to look like), we can take comfort in the fact that most applications will use only a small fraction of these. As we have already seen, the most popular tunings require only the 3 single-shaft symbol pairs of the 72-EDO set, many other tunings require only the additional 5 pairs of the Spartan set, and practically everything else can be done with the additional 5 pairs of the Athenian set. (Developers of musical notation software who are including microtonal capabilities in their products should consider that it's not necessary to support the entire array of Sagittal symbols, inasmuch as the Spartan symbol set will readily meet the needs of most composers.)

Conclusion

We believe we have described a *generalized* notation system that can handle practically any tuning that anyone would ever want to use. It would be meaningful for both conventional instruments and those specially constructed for alternate tunings, as well as for the strings and voice. We believe the depth and breadth of sources and experience drawn upon and the level of consensus reached, not to mention the sheer number of hours expended, are unprecedented in any previous microtonal notation design effort. We believe the result is backward compatible, logically consistent, visually coherent, aesthetically beautiful, unified, intuitive, flexible, practical, readable, simple, portable, universal, and extensible. And we envision a future when all microtonal musicians, whether composers, performers or theorists, whatever their instrument or musical style, will share a single harmonically-based *lingua franca* of pitch, no matter whether their tuning is justly intoned, equally tempered, or on one of the many middle-paths.

²⁰ Possible low-precision SpartanJI notations can be found by mapping rational intervals to some division of the octave that is consistent to the required odd factor limit, e.g., to 72-EDO for 11-limit JI or to 130-EDO for 15-limit JI. 130-EDO uses almost the entire "Spartan" symbol set, while 72-EDO uses a subset of Spartan that might be called the "Sagittal starter set". For comparison, the medium-precision (or "Athenian") JI set referred to in the text has a pitch resolution comparable to 224-EDO (in which the 5-schisma vanishes).

Acknowledgements

In closing, we wish to thank the following people for their comments, suggestions, and/or encouragement during the development of the Sagittal notation system (in alphabetical order): Yahya Abdal-Aziz, Jacob Barton, Gabor Bernath, Douglas Blumeyer, Graham Breed, Paul Erlich, Mark Gould, Kraig Grady, Aaron Hunt, Marc Jones, Carl Lumma, Herman Miller, Alison Monteith, Joe Monzo, Ted Mook, Manuel Op de Coul, Joseph Pehrson, Johnny Reinhard, Prent Rodgers, Joel Rodrigues, Klaus Schmirler, Margo Schulter, Samara Secor, Gene Ward Smith, Dan Stearns, Jon Szanto, Robert Walker, Robert Wendell, Danny Wier, and Ozan Yarman. But we take full responsibility for whatever shortcomings may remain in the notation, since the final decisions were ours.

We would also like to thank the following, who didn't know that they were contributing to Sagittal at the time (in chronological order of their contribution): Pythagoras of Samos, Archytas of Tarentum, Didymus the Musician, Claudius Ptolemy, Robert H. M. Bosanquet, Hermann von Helmholtz, Alexander Ellis, Richard Stein, Mildred Couper, Ervin M. Wilson, Ivor Darreg, Ezra Sims, Gardner Read, Paul Rapoport, and Daniel Wolf.

Without the collective insight and experience of these two groups of individuals, the development of the Sagittal notation system would not have been possible.

Reprinted (with updates) from *Xenharmonikôn, An Informal Journal of Experimental Music*, Volume 18 (2006). Last updated 2024 Aug 29.

The original published version may be found here: https://sagittal.org/sagittal_v1.pdf.