Nicanor’s System of Punctuation

René Nünlist

The ancient grammarian Nicanor of Alexandria (second century A.D.) is the author of an elaborate system of punctuation. Owing to its complexity, the system was and is a potential source of confusion among readers. The present contribution attempts to clarify the picture by giving a concise account as a set of rules, each illustrated with examples. The goal is to expound the system as such, not to discuss what might have led Nicanor to develop it.¹

1. There are two principle sources for Nicanor’s system of punctuation: (i) the comprehensive description in schol. Dion. Thr. 26.4–28.8 Hilgard, which provides a short definition and an example for each punctuation mark; (ii) the relevant scholia to the Iliad that discuss individual passages.² The two sources

¹ This paper owes much to the only modern attempt to give a comprehensive description of Nicanor’s system: L. Friedländer, Nicanoris περὶ Ἰλιακῆς στιγμῆς reliquiae emendatiores² (Berlin 1857). To revisit the question is nevertheless justified for two reasons: (i) Friedländer’s account is not well suited for quick reference because it is fairly long (well over 100 pages) and written in Latin. (ii) Friedländer spends comparatively little time on describing Nicanor’s system and rationale as such. Instead there is a curious tendency to focus on passages where, to Friedländer’s mind, Nicanor got it wrong; cf. D. Blank, “Remarks on Nicanor, the Stoics and the Ancient Theory of Punctuation,” Glotta 61 (1983) 48–67, at 48.

² The text of schol. Dion. Thr. is reprinted in the Appendix below, together with a selection of the Homeric scholia that form the backbone of this paper. For summaries see C. Wendel, “Nikanor (27),” RE 17 (1936) 274–277, at 276–277 (in German), and Blank, Glotta 61 (1983) 49–51 (in English). Useful as they are, they both omit the examples and, in the case of the ἀνυπόκριτος ὑποστιγμή (see §3.2), fail to point out the errors that are explained in n.18 below.
largely concur and complete each other, with the following picture emerging: the system consists of eight marks in total, five στιγμαί (see §2), two υποστιγμαί (§3) and one διαστολή (§4). The eight marks differ with a view to function, delivery, and typography.3

2. The hardest punctuation mark is the στιγμή. It is roughly equivalent to a full stop and put after sentences that are considered complete (αὐτοτελής). There are five variants (in descending order of ‘hardness’):

2.1 The τελεία στιγμή is put when the next sentence is connected asyndetically (i.e. without a connecting particle).

Examples:4

(a) μάντι κακῶν οὐ πό ποτέ μοι τὸ κρήμνου εἶπας. ἰ ἰ εἰ τοι τά κάκ‘ ἐστι φίλα φρεσι μαντεύεσθαι (Il. 1.106–107).

(b) οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανή. εἰς κόιρανος ἐστώ (Il. 2.204, cf. schol. A Il. 2.204–205 Nic.).

(c) ἀλλὰ σὺ … περίσχεο παιδὸς ἡμός. ἐλθοῦσ’ ὄλυ μόνον ὅλισαι κτλ. (Il. 1.393–394, cf. schol. A Il. 1.393a Nic.).

Vocatives (with or without imperative phrase) are regularly rounded off by a τελεία στιγμή.5 To Nicanor’s mind, Homer is fond of asyndeton (which leads to a τελεία στιγμή) in transitions (μεταβάσεις).6

In delivery, the τελεία στιγμή is indicated by four χρόνοι of

3 The present account focuses on the function of the punctuation marks and briefly touches upon the topic of delivery. For the (less than clear) typographical details, see Wendel, RE 17 (1936) 276–277.

4 The examples in the section on στιγμαί follow a tripartite structure: (a) is the example given in schol. Dion. Thr. (usually supplemented in order to make it easier to understand); (b) is an example that Nicanor’s note expressly attributes to this specific category; (c) is an example that can be shown to fall into this specific category even though Nicanor’s note indicates only the general category στιγμή (see §2.6).

5 Schol. A Il. 1.59a Nic., schol. A Il. 1.106a Nic. (i.e., after μάντι κακῶν in example (a), without schol. Dion. Thr. taking note of it), schol. A Il. 2.56a Nic., etc.

6 Schol. A Il. 11.150 Nic.
2.2 The ὑποτελεία στιγμὴ is put when the next sentence is connected by means of a particle (e.g. δὲ, γὰρ, ἀλλά, αὐτάρ).

Examples:

(a) πολλὰς δὲ ἱφθίους ψυχὰς Ἀἰδί προίαψεν ἔρωτον. οὕτως δὲ ἑλώρια τεῦχε κύνεσιν (II. 1.3–4).
(b) εἰ περ γὰρ κ’ ἐθέλησιν Ὀλύμπιος ἀστεροπητής, 1 ἐξ ἐδεόν στυφελίζει. ὁ γὰρ πολὺ φέρτατός ἐστιν (II. 1.580–581, cf. schol. A II. 1.580–583a Nic.).
(c1) ἀλλὰ ἦτοὶ ἐπεσιν μὲν ὁνείδισον ὡς ἔσεται πρὸς ἕξερέω (II. 1.211–212, cf. schol. A II. 1.211–212aNic.).
(c2) τετρήχει δ’ ὀγορῃ. ὑπὸ δὲ στεναχίζετο γαῖα (II. 2.95, cf. schol. A II. 2.95–96 Nic.).

The ὑποτελεία στιγμὴ is indicated by three χρόνοι of silence.

2.3 The πρώτη ἄνω στιγμὴ is put after a sentence that contains a μὲν, ἢ, or οὐ that in turn is taken up by δὲ, ἢ (ἢ), or ἀλλὰ in the next sentence.

Examples:

(a) αἴδεσθεν μὲν ἀνήνασθαι· δεῖσαν δ’ ὑποδέχθαι (II. 7.93).
(b) οὐ μὲν κήρυσσον (Nic.: ἐκήρυσσον vulg.)· τοῖ δ’ ἱγείροντο μᾶλ’ ὥκα (II. 2.52, cf. schol. A II. 2.52a Nic.; see Appendix).
(c) ἢ Ῥ’ ὀὕτις πόλειμος τε κακὸς καὶ φύλοπις οἰνή ἔσεται· ἢ φιλότητα μετ’ ἀμφοτέρους] τίθητι Ζεύς (II. 4.82–84 [with Nicanor’s accentuation], cf. schol. A II. 4.82–83a1 Nic.).

This is the only note that expressly mentions the ὑποτελεία στιγμὴ (and this particular solution, which takes στυφελίξαι to be an optative, is only one of three suggestions for this passage). At first sight, this finding is surprising, especially when held against the substantial number of notes that expressly mention the τελεία στιγμή (twenty on the first three books of the Iliad alone).

A possible answer might be that asyndeton (i.e. τελεία) is the exception and connection by means of particles (i.e. ὑποτελεία) the rule. No other στιγμή will have been as frequent in Nicanor’s text as the ὑποτελεία, which therefore counts, so to speak, as the default.

This is an inference from the fact that the τελεία στιγμὴ has four χρόνοι and the πρώτη ἄνω στιγμὴ two. It is confirmed by schol. h II. 2.877b (printed in Erbse’s Testimonienapparat and the Appendix below), see Friedländer 119.

This is the only example found in the extant notes on the Iliad.
The πρώτη ἀνω στιγμή is indicated by two χρόνοι of silence (schol. A II. 2.52a Nic.; see Appendix).

2.4 The δευτέρα ἀνω στιγμή is put between sentences that are connected by means of καὶ.

Examples:
(a) καὶ ἕνα πάροιθ’ αὐτῶι καθέξετο· καὶ λάβε γούνων (Il. 1.500).
(b) Ζεῦ ἄνα, δός τίσασθαι (…) ἵ διὸν Ἀλέξανδρον· καὶ ἐμῆς ὑπὸ χερσὶ δάμασσον (Il. 3.351–352, cf. schol. A Il. 3.352a Nic.).
(c) καὶ κε τὸ βουλοίμην· καὶ κεν πολὺ κέρδιον ἤνεν (Il. 3.41, cf. schol. A Il. 3.41–42 Nic.).

The δευτέρα ἀνω στιγμή is indicated by one χρόνος of silence (schol. A II. 2.131–132 Nic.; see Appendix).

2.5 The τρίτη ἀνω στιγμὴ is put between sentences that are connected by means of τε.

Examples:
(a) Κύλλαν τε ζαθέην· Τενέδοιο τε ἱφι ἀνάσσεις (Il. 1.38).
(b) No example preserved.
(c) Γλαυκὸς δ’ ἔγνω ἣσιν ἐνὶ φρεσί· γήθησέν τε κτλ. (Il. 16.530, cf. schol. A Il. 16.530–531a Nic.).

The τρίτη ἀνω στιγμή is in all likelihood indicated by one χρόνος of silence.

2.6 In practice, Nicanor’s notes, at least in their extant form, regularly fail to specify which of the five στιγμαί is actually meant. Likewise, the instruction to start a new sentence (ἀπ’ ἀλλης ἀρχῆς προφέρεσθαι vel sim.) presupposes a preceding στιγμή, just as the instruction to take a clause by itself (καθ’ ἑαυτό) presupposes a στιγμή on each end. In all these cases, readers are expected to decide for themselves which type of στιγμή is meant.

10 This is one of only two notes that explicitly mention the δευτέρα ἀνω στιγμή, the other being schol. A II. 2.131–132 Nic.

11 The example is curious because it comes from what most readers would analyse as a relative clause (ὁς Χρύσην ἄμφιβεβηκας | Κύλλαν τε ζαθέην κτλ.). Nicanor perhaps took ὁς to be a demonstrative pronoun, as he sometimes does (Friedländer 34).
2.7 Normally speaking, a στιγμή requires the relevant sentence to be complete (αὐτοτελής). Nicanor is, however, prepared to admit some exceptions when the sense requires a στιγμή even though the sentence is not, strictly speaking, complete. These στιγμαί are called ἐν αἰτήματι.\(^{12}\)

3. The two ύποστιγμαί and the διαστολή (§4) represent softer punctuation marks. They are put after a clause that is incomplete and are therefore roughly equivalent to a comma.\(^{13}\)

3.1 The ἐνυπόκριτος ύποστιγμή marks the pivot between subordinate clause and main clause (in this sequence, which Nicanor considers an ὀρθὴ περίοδος, cf. §4.1).\(^{14}\) The rule applies to all preceding subordinate clauses alike (temporal, causal, conditional, purpose, comparative, relative, etc.).\(^{15}\)

Examples:\(^{16}\)

(a) ὦμος δ’ ἡριγένεια φάνη ῥωδόδακτυλος Ἡώς, 1 καὶ τὸτ’ ἔπειτ’ ἀνάγοντο κτλ. (Il. 1.477–478).

(b\(^1\)) οὔνεκα δη νῦν διὸν Ἀλέξανδρον Μενέλαος 1 νικήσας ἐθέλη στυγερὴν ἐμὲ ὀίκαδ’ ἀγεσθαι, 1 τούνεκα δη νῦν δεῦρο δολοφρονέουσα παρέστης (Il. 3.403–405, cf. schol. A Il. 3.403–405\(^{a}\) Nic.; see...


\(^{13}\) The approximate equation στιγμή ≈ full stop and ύποστιγμή/διαστολή ≈ comma must be read against the backdrop of the observation that “Nicanor’s eight-fold system is the elaboration of a two-fold system, distinguishing complete and incomplete phrases” (Blank, Glotta 61 [1983] 51).

\(^{14}\) The term ἐνυπόκριτος no doubt means that the relevant clause receives a particular delivery (ὑπόκρισις), for instance, by raising the pitch of the voice from where it descends into the main clause (Friedländer 59).

\(^{15}\) The definition in schol. Dion. Thr. appears to presuppose a neat correlation between subordinate and main clauses (διφα – τώφα, ὦμος – τήμος, ὦτε – τῶτε, ἔως – τέως, ὦπου – ἔκει), which may represent something like the ideal case (cf. example (b\(^1\)) with Nicanor’s note). The total of Nicanor’s notes, however, does not support such a narrow definition; hence the more general description given above in the main text.

\(^{16}\) The paragraph on ύποστιγμαί can do without examples of the type (c) because Nicanor’s notes provide enough examples of the type (b).
When several subordinate clauses precede the main clause they are separated by additional ἐνυπόκριτοι υποστιγμαί.

Example:

(b) ἀλλ᾿ ὅτε δὴ σύλων ἐπὶ μενεπτόλεμος Πολυποίτης, ὁ ὅσσον τὶς τ’ ἔρριψε καλαύροπα βουκόλος ἀνήρ, ἣ δὲ ἐλισσομένη πέτεται διὰ βιοῦ ἀγελαίας, τὸ συν παντὸς ἐγὼ ἄγωνος ὑπέρβαλε (Il. 23.844–847, cf. schol. A Il. 23.844–847 Nic.; see Appendix).

The ἐνυπόκριτος υποστιγμή is indicated by one χρόνος of silence (schol. A Il. 8.206–207a Nic.). This probably applies to the other υποστιγμή as well.

3.2 The ἀνυπόκριτος υποστιγμή marks the pivot between the end of an insertion (διὰ μέσου, i.e. parenthesis broadly understood) and the main clause.

Examples:

(a) [Il. 3.33–36].

(b) οἳ δὴ νῦν ἔσται σιγῇ, πόλεμος δὲ πέπαυται, ἀσπίσι κεκλιμένοι (Il. 3.134–135 [the insertion underscored], cf. schol. A Il. 3.134b Nic.; see Appendix).

The punctuation mark before the insertion depends on whether

Like all ancient punctuation systems, Nicanor’s lacks a question mark. The fact that line 405 is a question must be put into words (ἡθικῶς πυνθάνεται, schol. T Il. 3.405 Nic., cf. πεντικός in schol. A Il. 1.290–291 Nic., etc.). The same holds true mutatis mutandis for the exclamation mark, which modern editors still eschew (indicated by θαυμασιμος/θαυμαστικός in schol. A Il. 5.638b Nic., etc.).

The example in schol. Dion. Thr. is more confusing than helpful because the author has made two fundamental mistakes. The last word in the διὰ μέσου part (here παρειάς, Il. 3.35) is normally marked by an ἀνυπόκριτος υποστιγμή (never an ἐνυπόκριτος υποστιγμή). And the word right before the διὰ μέσου part (here βήσης, 3.34) never receives an ἀνυπόκριτος υποστιγμή (see below). Moreover, the author wrongly claims that these insertions always fall between the subordinate and the main clause in ὀρθαὶ περιόδοι. In reality, the insertion can ‘interrupt’ all kinds of constructions (see e.g. example (b)).
it rounds off a subordinate or a main clause. In the former case §3.1 applies (ἐνυπόκριτος ύποστιγμή), in the latter §4.1 (διαστολή), as in the example.

To mark the end of an insertion (διὰ μέσου) appears to be the sole function of the ἐνυπόκριτος ύποστιγμή. It seems likely that Nicanor invented this particular punctuation mark for a syntactic phenomenon that he recognised in at least 65 Iliadic passages.\(^{19}\)

4. The βραχεῖα διαστολή (henceforth: διαστολή) is Nicanor’s softest punctuation mark.\(^{21}\) As such it is the one whose range of applications is particularly wide.

4.1 The διαστολή marks the pivot between the main clause and the subordinate clause (in this inverted sequence, which Nicanor considers an ἀνεστραμμένη περίοδος, cf. §3.1). The rule applies to all subsequent subordinate clauses alike.

Examples:

(a) ἢ κεν γηθήσαι Πρίαμοι Πριάμοι τε παῖδες | ἄλλοι τε Τρῶες μέγα κεν κεχαροίατο θυῷ, | εἰσφῶϊν τάδε πάντα πυθοίατο, | ἀρνάενοιν (Il. 1.255–257).

(b) καὶ νῦ κεν ἔρυσσέν τε καὶ ἀσπετον ἢρατο κῦδος, | ἐρά’ ὀξὺ νόησε Διὸς θυγάτηρ Ἀφροδίτη (Il. 3.373–374, cf. schol. A Il. 3.374a Nic.; see Appendix).

When several subordinate clauses follow the main clause they

\(^{19}\) This is a minor simplification because long insertions can receive additional ἐνυπόκριτοι ύποστιγμαι in the middle (cf. schol. A Il. 1.234–240a Nic.), cf. the multiple ἐνυπόκριτοι ύποστιγμαι that connect several subordinate clauses (§3.1).

\(^{20}\) For Nicanor’s treatment of διὰ μέσου in general, see R. Nünlist, “Two Cornerstones of Nicanor’s Syntactic Explanations,” RivFil 147 (2019) 395–416. In exceptional cases, the insertion (διὰ μέσου) is marked on either side with a διαστολή (Friedländer 79–80, with ref. to schol. A Il. 13.787a Nic.). The reason seems to be that the insertion is very short. Note, however, that the equally short insertion in Il. 11.242 receives the regular punctuation (schol. A Il. 11.242–243a Nic.).

\(^{21}\) Given that there is one διαστολή only, the specification βραχεῖα is strictly speaking superfluous, which is why it is frequently omitted. The term in schol. Dion. Thr. is ύποδιαστολή.
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are separated by additional διαστολαί.

Example:


When a subordinate clause is surrounded by a main clause, a διαστολή marks the beginning of the subordinate clause and an ἐνυπόκριτος ὑποστή λή its end (in accordance with §3.1).

Example:

(b) σὺ δὲ σῷ μεγαλήτωρι θυμῷ ἐξίςας. [διαστ.] ἀνδρα φέριστον ὄν ἀθόναιτοι περ ἐίσαον, [ἐνυπ., ὑποστ.] ἱ ἰμήςας (II. 9.109–111, cf. schol. A Il. 9.110a Nic.; see Appendix). 22

The function of the διαστολή described in this paragraph is the only one that has an explicit theoretical basis in the ancient material. What follows is an attempt to deduce further categories from recurrent types of notes and their respective explanations. 23

4.2 The διαστολή separates clauses that share a common element (κοινόν) and are therefore not complete.

Examples:

ἀμφί δ᾽ ἀρ᾽ ὀμοίοιν βάλετο ξύφος ἀργυρόηλον | χάλκεον, σαῦταρ ἐπείτα (sc. ἀμφ᾽ ὀμοίοιν βάλετο) σάκος μέγα τε στιβαρὸν τε (II. 3.334–335, cf. schol. A Il. 3.335a1 Nic.; the reader must mentally supply the predicate phrase).

ἀλλ᾽ ἄγε Πατρόκλῳ ἐφεπε κρατερώνηξας ἱππος, ἵ ἰ ἰ κέν πῶς μιν ἐλης, δοῇ δὲ τοι ἐυχος Ἀπόλλων (II. 16.724–725, cf. schol. A Il. 16.725 Nic.: the διαστολή after ἐλης is owed to the fact that, as a κοινόν, the conjunction αἱ κεν governs both subordinate clauses). 24

4.3 The διαστολή marks off appositions and comparable forms of epexegesis.

---

22 Whereas modern editors put a comma after φέριστον, Nicanor wants the διαστολή to come after εξίςας.

23 Therefore, a differentiation between different types of examples (a, b, c) is no longer appropriate.

24 As an alternative, the note considers putting a στιγμή (sc. ὑποτελεία), with δοῇ δὲ τοι ἐυχος Ἀπόλλων becoming an independent sentence. For Nicanor’s treatment of κοινόν in general, see Nünlist, RivFil 147 (2019) 408–414.
Examples:


ἡδὲ δὲ οἱ κατὰ θυμὸν ἀρίστη φαινετο βουλή, ἐπ᾽ Ἀτρείδη Ἀγαμέμνονι οὐλὸν Ὀνειρον (II. 2.5–6, cf. schol. A II. 2.5b Nic.; see Appendix).

4.4 The διαστολή separates words in juxtaosition that must not be taken together. Or, put differently, it indicates which words are to be taken together.

Examples:

ὁ μὲν εὔχεσθο πάντ᾽ ἀποδοῦναι, δήμῳ πιφαύσκων (II. 18.499–500, cf. schol. A II. 18.499–500b Nic.: δήμῳ is the indirect object of πιφαύσκων, not ἀποδοῦναι).

(Zeus) ἀστράψας δὲ, μάλα μεγάλ᾽ ἔκτυπε (II. 17.595, cf. schol. A II. 17.595 Nic.: μάλα μεγάλ(α) is an intensifier of the thunder, not the lightning).

οὕτω δ᾽ ἰημοίνες Δαναῶν, ἔλον ἄνδρα ἔκαστος (II. 16.351, cf. schol. A II. 16.351a Nic.: to take Δαναῶν with ἄνδρα would create an inconsistency [ἀπεμφαίνον]).

αὐτοὶ δ᾽ (...) 1 στείομεν, εἰ κεν πρῶτον ἐρύξομεν ἀντιάσαντες, 1 δούρατ᾽ ἀνασχόμενοι (II. 15.296–298, cf. schol. A II. 15.298 Nic., where he deliberates whether or not to put a διαστολή after ἀντιάσαντες or, in other words, whether δούρατ᾽ ἀνασχόμενοι goes with the main or the subordinate clause).

All examples, except for the last, punctuate the text in a way that might strike modern readers as odd because it impedes the reading flow. Nicanor, however, is keen to make the syntactic construction as transparent as possible. He says so explicitly in the case of the fairly numerous διαστολαί that are put πρὸς τὸ σαφέστερον (or the like).25

25 Schol. A II. 11.4 Nic., schol. A II. 11.227a Nic., schol. A II. 11.397–398 Nic., etc. Friedländer (84) perceives a difference between schol. A II. 16.65–70 Nic. and schol. A II. 16.68a Nic. and concludes that a διαστολή πρὸς τὸ σαφέστερον is optional. Such an understanding clashes with the fact that Nicanor regularly uses the verbal adjective διασταλτέον (incl. Friedländer’s own example) and, even more tellingly, declares such διαστολάι to be ἀναγκαῖαι in schol. A II. 6.38–41 Nic., as Friedländer himself acknowledges (84 n.2). For an optional διαστολή see e.g. schol. A II. 13.260a Nic.
4.5 The διαστολή can be used to segment lists of similar words/expressions, for instance, a chain of epithets.

Example:

ἐχε δ᾿ αἰγίδα θοὺριν, ῥεινή, ἀμφιδύσεων, ἀριπρεπέ(α) (Il. 15.308–309, cf. schol. A Il. 15.308–309 Nic.: here and elsewhere Nicanor is of the opinion that such a punctuation/delivery results in increased emphasis).

5. Even though it is not, strictly speaking, a punctuation mark, it may nevertheless be worth mentioning another lectional sign in Nicanor’s system: the συναφή. It refers to a sublinear mark that combines two to three words which together form one semantic unit.

Example:

..., ἐπεὶ ἡ καὶ ἐμὸν βέλος ὄξυ πάροισθεν (Il. 20.437, cf. schol. A Il. 20.437b Nic., which considers the two underlined words a unit and glosses them with τὸ ὀξυμμένον κατὰ τὸ ἐμπροσθεν). The alternative term for συναφή is ὑφ᾿ ἕν (schol. A Il. 12.228–229a Nic.).

6. No fewer than five punctuation marks are indicated by one χρόνος of silence (δευτέρα and τρίτη ἄνω στιγμή, both ὑποστιγμαί, and the διαστολή). It is not clear how the listener is to tell the difference between, say, a τρίτη ἄνω στιγμή and a διαστολή (the two ὑποστιγμαί differ in intonation). Nor is it clear whether Nicanor discussed the issue.

APPENDIX

Schol. Dion. Thr. 26.4–28.8 Hilgard:

ἳνα δὲ μὴ δόξη τις ἡμᾶς ὁγνοεῖν καὶ τὴν τοῦ λεχθέντος Νικάνορος διατύπωσιν τὴν περὶ τῶν στιγμῶν, ὅπως τὰ ὑποστιγμαί ἢ ἡμῖν προείρηται (sc. p.24.16–18 Hilgard), δεῖ ὡς ἐν συντόμῳ ἐνταῦθα μνησθῆναι τῆς τε θέσεως αὐτῶν καὶ τῆς διαφορᾶς τῆς τῷ Νικάνορι εἰρημένης· (…)

Lest anyone believe that we are unaware of said Nicanor’s system of punctuation, the names of which we have mentioned already, it is necessary to give here a brief summary on where to put the marks and how this differs from what Nicanor says. (…)

[2.1] ἢ μὲν οὖν τελεία στιγμή τίθεται ἐν τῷ μέσῳ τόπῳ τῆς τελευταίας γραμμῆς τοῦ στοιχείου τοῦ τελευταίου ἐν τοῖς ἀσυνδέτοις λόγοις, ὡς ἐπὶ
The teleia στιγμή (lit. complete point) is put in the middle area of (i.e. behind) the final stroke of the final letter in asyndetic sentences; for instance, in mánti kakkón, oú pò poté moi to kríghnon éipas, <it is put> on (i.e. behind) éipas, that is, the teleia is put on its final letter because the subsequent sentence is asyndetic.

[2.2] ἢ δὲ ὑποτελεία ὀλίγον ὑποκάτω τοῦ μέσου τοῦ στοιχείου τοῦ ἐσχάτου, ὅτε ἐπιφέρεται ὁ “dé” ἢ ἄλλος τις σύνδεσμος τῶν ἴσοδυναμοῦντων τῷ “dé,” λέγω δὲ τὸν “γάρ,” τὸν “ἀλλά,” τὸν “αὐτάρ,” τὸν “αὐτῷ,” ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ “ηρώων. αὐτοὺς ἢ ἐλώρια” (Il. 1.4) εἰς τὸν ἢρων ἢ ὑποτελεία τίθεται διὰ τὸ ἐπιφέρεσθαι τόν “δέ.” οὕτω γὰρ δοκεῖ τῷ ἡμετέρῳ γραμματικῷ, φημὶ δὲ τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι, καὶ μάλλα εὗ, ὡς γέ μοι δοκεῖ· ἐφὲ δὲ ἐν τούτῳ παρευρακέναι τὸν Νικάνορα, τὴν μὲν ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τῆς συφυμίας διαφοράν ὅρισάμενον τῶν πρῶτων δύο στιγμῶν, φημὶ δὲ τῆς τελείας καὶ τῆς ὑποτελείας, τὴν δὲ θέσιν καὶ τὸν τόπον τῶν αὐτῶν ταῖς δύο ἱσονέμονα· οὐ δεὶ οὖν τὴν τελείαν καὶ τὴν ὑποτελείαν ἐν τῷ μέσῳ τῆς στοιχείου τιθέναι, ὡς γέ φησι Νικάνωρ, ἐπεὶ ποιά διαφορά ἔσται αὐτῶν; ἀλλὰ τὴν μὲν τελείαν ἐν τῷ μέσῳ, τὴν δὲ ὑποτελείαν ὑποκάτω ὀλίγον τοῦ μέσου τοῦ τελευταίου στοιχείου.

The ὑποτελεία <στιγμή> (lit. less than complete point) <is put> slightly below the middle area of (i.e. behind) the final letter when δέ follows (sc. in the next sentence) or some other conjunction with the same force as δέ, namely γάρ, ἀλλά, ἀτάρ, αὐτάρ; for instance, in ἡρώων. αὐτοὺς δὲ ἐλώρια, the ὑποτελεία is put on (i.e. behind) the νῦ of ἡρώων, owing to the subsequent δέ. For this is how our grammarian, I mean Apollonius (sc. Dyscolus), sees it, and rightly so, as it appears to me. He said that in this respect Nicanor was wrong when, on the one hand, he determined the difference in duration of the silence (i.e. pause) of the first two punctuation marks, I mean the τελεία and the ὑποτελεία, and, on the other, attributed the position (sc. within the sentence) and the same <typographical> place to both.26 The τελεία and the ὑποτελεία are not to be placed both in the middle of (i.e. behind) the <final> letter, as Nicanor claims; for what will be the difference between them? Instead the τελεία <is to be placed>

26 In light of the opposing terms τελεία vs. ὑποτελεία, this is unlikely to be an accurate rendering of what Nicanor actually said on the issue (Friedländer 4).
in the middle, and the ὑποτελεία slightly below the middle area of (i.e. behind) the final letter.


The πρώτη ἄνω <στιγμή> (lit. first high point) is put above the final stroke of the final letter when μὲν or ἦ or οὖ precedes and δὲ or ἦ or ἀλλά follows (sc. in the next sentence); for instance, in αἰδεύθην μὲν ἀνύνασθαι, the πρώτη ἄνω is put on the final iota of ἀνύνασθαι because δὲ follows (sc. in the next sentence), with μὲν preceding.


The δευτέρα ἄνω <στιγμή> (lit. second high point) too is put above the final stroke of the last letter and is embraced by a diplé from outside (i.e. ->) when καί follows (sc. in the next sentence); for instance, in καί ὅτι πάροικθ αὐτῶι καθέζετο· καὶ λάβε γούνων, the δευτέρα ἄνω is put on the omicron of καθέζετο because καί follows.

[2.5] ἢ δὲ τρίτη ἄνω τίθεται καὶ αὐτή ἐπάνω μὲν τῆς τελευταίας γραμμῆς τοῦ τελευταίου στοιχείου, περιέχεται δὲ ὑπὸ διπλῆς ἑξοθεν, ὡς εἰπώρεται ὁ “τέ,” ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ “Κύλλαν τε ζαθέννις· Τενέδιοι τε ἢ ἣ αὖσεις” (II. 1.38) εἰς τὸ τοῦ “ζαθέννις” τίθεται ἡ τρίτη ἄνω, εἰπώρεσθαι τοῦ “τέ” συνδέσμῳ.

The τρίτη ἄνω <στιγμή> (lit. third high point) too is put above the final stroke of the final letter and is embraced by a diplé from inside (i.e. <) when τε follows (sc. in the next sentence); for instance, in Κύλλαν τε ζαθέννις· Τενέδιοι τε ἢ ἣ αὖσεις, the τρίτη ἄνω is put on the nu of ζαθέννις because the conjunction τε follows.

[3.1] ἢ δὲ υποστιγμή ἢ ἐνυπόκριτος τίθεται ὑπόκατω μὲν τῆς τελευταίας γραμμῆς τοῦ τελευταίου στοιχείου, ὁλὸν δὲ ἐξωτέρω ἐκ πλατίου νεῦρου, ἐν τοῖς ὁρθαῖς περιόδοις, τούτεστιν ὅτε πρόκειται τὸ “ὅρα,” ἢ τὸ “ῄμος,” ἢ τὸ “ἴσω,” ἢ τὸ “ὤπο,” εἰπώρεσθαι δὲ τὸ “τόφρα,” τὸ “τῆμος,” τὸ “τότε,” τὸ “τέος,” τὸ “ἐκεῖ,” καὶ τὰ ὄμοια, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ “ῄμος δ’ ἤργειναι φάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἡώς” (II. 1.477 etc.) εἰς τὸ τοῦ “Ἡώς” τίθεται ἡ ἐνυπόκριτος, εἰπώρεσθαι τοῦ “τότε” (e.g. καί τὸ “ἐκεῖ” ἵππεις ἄνάγοντα κτλ.).
The ἐνυπόκριτος ὑποστιγμή (lit. point below with special intonation) is put below the final stroke of the final letter, slightly outside displaced sideways (i.e. to the right) in ‘straight periods’, that is, when ὄφρα or ἤμος or ὅτε or ὥς or ὅπου precede (sc. in the subordinate clause) and τόφρα, τήμος, τότε, τέως, ἐκεῖ, or the like follow (sc. in the subsequent main clause); for instance, in ἤμος δ’ ἤριγενεα φάνη ροδοδάκτυλος Ἡώς, the ἐνυπόκριτος is put with (i.e. below) the sigma of Ἡώς because τότε follows (sc. in the main clause).

[3.2] ἡ δὲ ὑποστιγμή ἡ ἐνυπόκριτος τίθεται καὶ αὐτῇ ὑποκάτω τοῦ τελευταῖον γράμματος ύπό τὴν ἐσχάτην καὶ κατωτάτην γραμμήν τοῦ στοιχείου, ἐν δὲ ταῖς μεταξὺ πρὸ τῆς ἀνταποδόσεως τῶν ὀρθῶν περιόδων ἀναφοννυμέναις ἑτέραις περιόδοις, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ “ὡς δ’ ὅτε τίς τε δράκοντα ἰδὼν παλίνορσος ἅπετη ὑήρεσιν ἐν βήσησις” (II. 3.33–34) ἐντοῦθα τίθεται ἡ ἐνυπόκριτος, ὡς ἐν δὲ τῷ “γοῦια” 3.34) καὶ εἰς τῷ “ἀνεχώρησεν” (3.35)· μεταξὺ γὰρ <πρὸ> τῆς ἀνταποδόσεως ἑτέραις περιόδοι ἐνετέθησαν· εἰς δὲ τῷ “παρειάς” (3.35) ἡ ἐνυπόκριτος· εὐθέως γὰρ ἐπιφέρεται ἡ ἀνταπόδοσις.

The ἐνυπόκριτος ὑποστιγμή (lit. point below without special intonation) too is put below the final letter, below the last and lowest stroke of the letter, in the intervening parts of the sentence that are uttered before the main clause of ‘straight periods’; for instance, in ὡς δ’ ὅτε τίς τε δράκοντα ἰδὼν παλίνορσος ἅπετη ὑήρεσιν ἐν βήσησις, the ἐνυπόκριτος is put here (sc. below the final letter of βήσησις) and likewise with γοῦια and ἀνεχώρησεν. For other parts of the sentence have been inserted before the main clause. An ἐνυπόκριτος <ὑποστιγμή> is put with (i.e. below the final letter of) παρειάς. For the main clause follows immediately upon it.

[4.1] ἡ δὲ υποδιαστολὴ κατὰ πάντα τῶν προλαβουσῶν στιγμῶν ἐνήλιοι καὶ αὐτῷ τῷ στίγματί μὴ ἐκεῖνα νυπῆ τις· ὡς οἱ ἄλλοι, ἀλλὰ τὸν τόπον ἔχειν τοῦ χέρος τόνυν· τίθεται δὲ καὶ αὐτῇ ὑποκάτω τῆς ἐσχάτης γραμμῆς τοῦ τελευταίου γράμματος· ὡς χεῖ στίς τῇς, τῆς προειρήσει, ἐν ταῖς ἀνεκτραμμέναις περιόδοις, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ “ἡ κεν γηθήσαται Πρίαμος<Πριάμῳ τοις παῖδες> ἀλλοι τε Τρώες μέγα κεν κεκαθαρίσαυ θυμῷ, εἰ σφοῖν τάδε πάντα πνεύματο μαρμαραν μενον” (II. 1.255–257) εν τῷ “θυμῷ” τίθεται ἡ υποδιαστολὴ· ἐπιφέρεται γὰρ τὸ “εἰ σφοῖν” καὶ

27 Neither is the exact position of the mark clear nor how it differs from the confusingly similar position of the ἐνυπόκριτος ὑποστιγμή.
28 For the errors in this section see n.18 above.
ποιεῖ ἀντεστραµµένην τὴν περίοδον· ἢ γὰρ ὀρθὴ περίοδος ἢν “εἰ σφώην τάδε πάντα πυθοίατο, ἢ κεν γηθήσαι Πρίαµος” (Il. 1.257+255).

The ύποδιαστολή (comma below) is completely different from the previous punctuation marks in that even in its form it is not a dot as the others, but has the shape of an acute accent. It too is put below the last stroke of the final letter, just like an acute <accent>, as mentioned, in ‘inverted periods’. For instance, in ἢ κεν γηθήσαι Πρίαµος <Πριάµοι τε ποίδες> ἄλλοι τε Τρόας μέγα κεν κεχαροίατο θυµῷ, εἰ σφώην τάδε πάντα πυθοίατο μαρναµένουη, a ύποδιαστολή is put on (i.e. below the final letter of) θυµῷ because εἰ σφώην (i.e. the subordinate clause) follows and inverts the period. The ‘straight period’ would be εἰ σφώην τάδε πάντα πυθοίατο, ἢ κεν γηθήσαι Πρίαµος.

Schol. A Il. 2.23b Nic.: τελεία στιγµή κατὰ τὸ τέλος, ἐπεὶ ἀσύνδετος ὁ λόγος, τέσσαρες δὲ σύντοµα καὶ συµµόταν. <There is> a τελεία στιγµή at the end (sc. of the line) because the <next> sentence is asyndetic. It is equivalent to four χρόνοι of silence.

Schol. h Il. 2.877b: ύποτελεία γὰρ ἔσται, ἢτις τρίχρονος δύναται εἶναι (codd.: τρεῖς χρόνος δύναται Friedländer).

There will be a ύποτελεία (sc. at the end of book 2), which is equivalent to three χρόνοι of silence.

Schol. A Il. 2.52a Nic.: ἐπὶ τὸ “κήρυσσον” ἄνω πρώτη στιγµή, ἢτις δύο δύναται χρόνος σιωπῆς.

<There is> an ἄνω πρώτη στιγµή on κήρυσσον, which is equivalent to two χρόνοι of silence.

Schol. A Il. 2.131–132 Nic.: ἐπὶ δὲ τὸ “πλάζουσι” (132) θετέον τὴν ἄνω δευτέρα στιγµήν, ἢτις ἕνα χρόνον δύναται σιωπῆς.

One must put an ἄνω δευτέρα στιγµή on πλάζουσι, which is equivalent to a single χρόνος of silence.

Schol. A Il. 3.403–405a Nic.: ύποστικτέον δὲ ἐν ύποκρίσει εἰς τὸ “ἀγεσθαι” (404), ἐπεὶ τῶν ἀνταποδοτικῶν ἐστι καὶ ταύτα, “οὐνεκα” (403) — “τοῦνεκα” (405).

An ἐνυπόκριτος ύποστιγµή must be put on ἀγεσθαι, because these too belong to the correlatives, οὐνεκα — τοῦνεκα.29

29 The expression ἐν ύποκρίσει is a common variant of ἐνυπόκριτος (cf. schol. A Il. 9.110a Nic., also in this Appendix), but can mean other things as well, for instance, “in dissimulation” (i.e. ironically, e.g. schol. Eur. Or. 488).
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An <ἐνυπόκριτος> ὑποστιγμή must be put on Πολυποίτης, ἀνήρ, ὀγελαίας. For another subordinate clause follows upon the first.\(^{30}\)


The half-verse πόλεμος δὲ πέπαυται is an insertion (lit. in the middle); therefore we put a comma on σιγή and an ἀνυπόκριτος ὑποστιγμή on πέπαυται.

Schol. A II. 3.374a Nic.: πάλιν διαστολή πρὸ τούτου· ἀνέστραπται γὰρ ἡ περίοδος. ὅρθη δ’ ἐν ἐγένετο οὕτως· “εἰ μὴ ᾗρ’ ὥξυ νόησε, καὶ νῦ κεν εἴρυσ<σ>έν τε.”

<There is> again a comma before this line because the period is inverted. A straight <period> would have read thus: εἰ μὴ ᾗρ’ ὥξυ νόησε, καὶ νῦ κεν εἴρυσ<σ>έν τε.


It seems good to put a comma on εἰξας, an ἐνυπόκριτος ὑποστιγμή on ἐτίσαν.

Schol. A II. 2.5b Nic.: βραχὺ διασταλτέον κατὰ τὸ τέλος· μέρος γὰρ κατὰ (cod.: καὶ Friedländer) τὸ ἐπιφερόμενον τῆς περιόδου.

One must put a short comma (sc. and not a ‘harder’ punctuation mark) at the end (sc. of the line) because what follows equally belongs to the period.
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\(^{30}\) There can be no doubt that the ἐνυπόκριτος is meant even though the scholion does not say so explicitly.