six chalkoi (στρες), which H denoted, but rather five.8 On this explanation the presumed syntactical relationship between Τ and Χ was not addition but multiplication. There is a logic for this assumption. At Delos, for example, the symbol Τ served both in a context (ΦΠΠΦ = 4 ιρ.) and as a modifier indicating that the uris in question were drachmae (φΔ = 15 ιρ.) in 1971, however, Salvat and Vatin published a second, larger fragment of the Acraeana inscription, which seems to attest a price of Τ for I (A.1.5) red also TTX (A.2.1). On Tettel's finding TTTTL alone ought not to have existed and TTX should denote six chalkoi and so should be redundant given H. Moreover, at B 8 Salvat and Vatin read HTXX (Feyel read had ITXX). On Feyel's logic HTXX would have to amount to twelve chalkoi (664), or one obol, which ought to have been expressed simply with 1. Finally the price HT (A.1.21), 11 obols (6 + 5), would appear to be not only redundant with HTX (A.1.19, A.1.7, 21, B. persianum) but also inconsistent with Feyel's observation that Τ must be followed by X.

To salvage Feyel's system we might declare Τ (A.1.5) misread for TTX; TXX (A.1.19) misread for ΨΧΧ; HTXX (B.8) misread for ITXX or HTX; HT (A.1.21) misread for HTX. The text is in an admitted poor state of preservation. But even if we were to grant so many misreadings, we would still be left with a system in which ΤΣΩ denoted five chalkoi, a complication for which no parallel is found in Boeotian numerical notation. Salvat and Vatin attempted to remove the problem by suggesting that when the mason carved HTX, he really meant ITXX, i.e. that the mid-bar was a ligature joining I to Τ. They even went so far as to print ITX for HTX throughout their text. But H is very often a component of compound numerical characters in Boeotia (e.g. FEIX [X 1000], ΤΕ (X 1000), whose FE = 100).9 That Τ should represent a ligature between I and Τ, rather than H and IT, is no more likely than a system in which TXX equates six chalkoi. Salvat and Vatin constructed a system that could be fixed, which was an improvement, but replaced redundant with unpalatable orthography, which was not. The many redundancies in Feyel's system notwithstanding, that of Salvat and Vatin was no more plausible.

D. M. Schaps has sought a new solution, suggesting that Τ stands for profere, but for a putative Boeotian dialectal variant of τεταρτεμορίαν, which denoted a quarter-obol piece worth these chalkoi. The proposal is clever. If the resulting system produced no redundancies it might justify positing an otherwise unattested Boeotian form. But it does. According to Schaps's system HΙΟΧΧ (A.1.41) and HT (A.1.21) both denote nine chalkoi: HΙΟΧΧ = 3/4, ob. 2b; 6 ch. + 3 ch. = 9 ch.; HT = 3/4 ob. 2b, ob. i.e. 3 ch. = 9th. At D 16 Feyel read μων HTA, thinking (p.33) that Τ denoted τεταρτεμορίαν. If this was correct the whole argument would collapse. But a generation later Salvat and Vatin could not even read the text, or apparently any text after B.32. In fact, the entire text below B.32 is a mess. Feyel read ΜΒ 33-37 as follows: TΑΝΕΣΕΙΤΕ Π ρυμόι HTA Ι NΓΝΚΥΤOX. This does not inspire confidence that HTA is a number at all. Schaps thought Feyel's assumption improbable on grounds that if some other character denoted Τεταρτεμορίαν it would be strange not to find that character elsewhere in the inscription.10 This, however, ignores not only that one of the prices must have included τεταρτεμορίαν, which is not necessary, but also that Acraeia used an abbreviation for τεταρτεμορίαν in the first place, which is the fact Schaps is trying to establish. A τεταρτεμορίαν, however, was not simply three chalkoi or the equivalent weight, but rather a quarter-obol piece. Acraeia did not, so far as we know, strike quarter-obels.12 We can generate the Boeotian form τεταρτεμορίαν, but we still do not know whether τεταρτεμορίαν were struck at Acraeia, much less whether another city's fractions

8 Feyel, BCH 60 (1936) 32-33.
9 E.g., JEllis 1362 A.12: ΨΧΧΚΟΤ+ΦΠ = 13,014 drachmae: II 445.5. ΦΔ.
10 For a translation: M. N. Todd, Three Greek Numerical Systems, JHS 31 (1911) 27-34, at 34 n. [Ancient Greek Numerical Systems 37-44].
11 It is not clear from his comments, Schaps, SPh 69 (1987) 296 a. 9, whether he considered T for minibus more likely.
12 Moreover, the τεταρτεμορίαν is attested on stone only very rarely and apparently never in Boeotia.
enjoyed sufficient Acraphian circulation to earn their own abbreviation in state legislation. The problem is not diacritical possibilities but numismatic realities. Whereas Saivait and Vatin removed all redundancies, but introduced an unlikely ligature, Schaps pruned the number of redundancies to one, but introduced an untested Boeotian word for an untested Acraphian object.

It is, to my eye, almost unbelievable that Π should not indicate five chalkoi; the letter pi is so commonly found in Boeotian compound numerical characters, where it indicates multiplication by five: e.g. ΔΕ (≠ 5 x 100); 13 and ΔΕ stands very frequently for πέντεχορος. 14 In most place Π did indicate πέντε. Nevertheless, Feyer's system does not, on present evidence, appear viable, and neither does that of Saivait and Vatin.

But before we posit an otherwise non-existent dialectical form for a fractional coin that Acraphia many never have issued we should consider another possibility. For countless inhabitants of central and northwest Greece, including Boeotians,15 the number four began with the letter πι, not πέντε.16 Perhaps Π indicated not πέντε but πέντεχος, denoting four chalkoi. If so, then we would have a system with two redundancies, but entirely lacking in implausible ligatures and untested words: the uncertainly read ΠΤΧΧ (A.119) would be redundant given Η (A.ii.4; 6; B.28) and ΠΔΧΧ (B.81) given Π. Perhaps the first was in fact ΠΧΧ and the second simply ΠΧΧ, which not only seems to be visible in the photograph published by Feyer (BCH 60 [1936] pl. IV), but is also the most common price in the inscription and close to what Feyer had read in the first place (ΠΠΧΧX). I suggest, then, that whereas in Greek documents Π usually means "five", here it means "four", and if for this is cause for confusion, we may rest assured that for the fish-eaters and coin-counters of Sienetion, Acraphia was not.
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16 IG VII 178.5, 2418.10, 2420.22, 2576.37, 2451.7, 3171.1.18, 51, 3195--3205 parosia; SEG XXVI 575.5, 9, 11 (Larissa; 676.4, 5--6, 8, 10--18; XXXV 462--3 (Metropolis in Thessaly); M. Messinis-Diospolis, A Hellenistic Inscription from Skodros (Thessaly) and the Fortifications of the City, ARSA 84 (1993) 187--217; at 188: 191, A.35, B.22, 23, 24--25, 28--29; also the original parosia (species): IG VII 178.13 (note); 3172.42; 3176--2, Messinis-Diospolis, ARSA 88 (1995) 189--191 at B.3, 4, 10, 18, 28, 39, 66, 69; also SEG XXXVII 994.10 (Thessalian Metropolis); ΠΡΟΤΕΧΟΧΟΣ.