

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 Ὑλιακῆς στυγμῆς reliquiae emendatiores*² (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 ὑποστυγή (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 *ὑποστιγμαί* (§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 asynchronously (i.e. without a connecting particle).

Examples:⁴

(a) *μάντι κακῶν οὐ πώ ποτέ μοι τὸ κρήγυον εἶπας. ἰαίει τοι τὰ κάκ’ ἐστὶ φίλα φρεσὶ μαντεύεσθαι* (*Il.* 1.106–107).

(b) *οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανίη. εἷς κοίρανος ἔστω* (*Il.* 2.204, cf. schol. *A Il.* 2.204–205 Nic.).

(c) *ἀλλὰ σὺ ... περίσχεο παιδὸς ἔηος. ἰ ἔλθουσ’ Οὐλύμπόνδε Δία λίσαι 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.

silence (schol. A *Il.* 2.23b Nic.; see Appendix).

2.2 The ὑποτελεία στιγμή is put when the next sentence is connected by means of a particle (e.g. δέ, γάρ, ἀλλά, αὐτάρ).

Examples:

(a) πολλὰς δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν | ἠρώων. αὐτοὺς δὲ ἐλώρια τεῦχε κύνεσσιν (*Il.* 1.3–4).

(b) εἶ περ γάρ κ' ἐθέλησιν Ὀλύμπιος ἀστεροπητής, | ἐξ ἐδέων στυφελίζαι. ὁ γὰρ πολὺ φέρτατός ἐστιν (*Il.* 1.580–581, cf. schol. A *Il.* 1.580–583a Nic.).⁷

(c¹) ἀλλ' ἦτοι ἔπεισιν μὲν ὀνειδίσων ὡς ἔσεται περ. | ᾧδε γὰρ ἐξερῶ (*Il.* 1.211–212, cf. schol. A *Il.* 1.211–212a¹ Nic.).

(c²) τετρήχει δ' ἀγορή. ὑπὸ δὲ στεναχίζετο γαῖα (*Il.* 2.95, cf. schol. A *Il.* 2.95–96 Nic.).

The ὑποτελεία στιγμή is indicated by three χρόνοι of silence.⁸

2.3 The πρώτη ἄνω στιγμή is put after a sentence that contains a μὲν, ἦ, or οὐ that in turn is taken up by δέ, ἦ (ἦ), or ἀλλά in the next sentence.

Examples:

(a) αἶδεσθην μὲν ἀνήνασθαι· δεῖσαν δ' ὑποδέχθαι (*Il.* 7.93).

(b) οἱ μὲν κήρυσσον (Nic.: ἐκήρυσσον vulg.): τοὶ δ' ἠγείροντο μάλ' ὄκα (*Il.* 2.52, cf. schol. A *Il.* 2.52a Nic.; see Appendix).⁹

(c) ἦ ῥ' αὐτίς πόλεμος τε κακὸς καὶ φύλοπις αἰνῆ | ἔσεται· ἦ φιλότητα μετ' ἀμφοτέροισι τίθησι | Ζεὺς (*Il.* 4.82–84 [with Nicanor's accentuation], cf. schol. A *Il.* 4.82–83a¹ Nic.).

⁷ This is the only note that expressly mentions the ὑποτελεία στιγμή (and this particular solution, which takes *στυφελίζαι* 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.

⁸ This is an inference from the fact that the τελεία στιγμή has four χρόνοι and the πρώτη ἄνω στιγμή two. It is confirmed by schol. h *Il.* 2.877b (printed in Erbse's *Testimonienapparat* and the Appendix below), see Friedländer 119.

⁹ This is the only example found in the extant notes on the *Iliad*.

The *πρώτη ἄνω στιγμή* is indicated by two *χρόνοι* of silence (schol. A *Il.* 2.52a Nic.; see Appendix).

2.4 The *δευτέρα ἄνω στιγμή* is put between sentences that are connected by means of *καί*.

Examples:

- (a) *καί ῥα πάροιθ' αὐτοῖο καθέζετο· καὶ λάβε γούνων (Il. 1.500).*
- (b) *Ζεῦ ἄνα, δὸς τίσασθαι (...) | δῖον Ἀλέξανδρον· καὶ ἐμήϊς ὑπὸ χερσὶ δάμασσον (Il. 3.351–352, cf. schol. A Il. 3.352a Nic.).¹⁰*
- (c) *καί κε τὸ βουλοίμην· καὶ κεν πολὺ κέρδιον ἦεν (Il. 3.41, cf. schol. A Il. 3.41–42 Nic.).*

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

2.5 The *τρίτη ἄνω στιγμή* is put between sentences that are connected by means of *τε*.

Examples:

- (a) *Κίλλαν τε ζαθέην· Τενέδοιό τε ἴφι ἀνάσσεις (Il. 1.38).¹¹*
- (b) No example preserved.
- (c) *Γλαῦκος δ' ἔγνω ἦσιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶ· γήθησέν τε κτλ. (Il. 16.530, cf. schol. A Il. 16.530–531a Nic.).*

The *τρίτη ἄνω 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' ἄλλης 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 ἄνω στιγμή*, the other being schol. A *Il.* 2.131–132 Nic.

¹¹ The example is curious because it comes from what most readers would analyse as a relative clause (*ὃς Χρῦσην ἀμφιβέβηκας | Κίλλαν τε ζαθέην κτλ.*). Nicanor perhaps took *ὃς* 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 *ὑποστιγμαί* 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 ὑποστιγμή* marks the pivot between subordinate clause and main clause (in this sequence, which Nicanor considers an *ὀρθή 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) ἦμος δ' ἠριγένεια φάνη ροδοδάκτυλος Ἥως, | καὶ τότε ἔπειτ' ἀνάγοντο κτλ. (*Il.* 1.477–478).

(b¹) οὐνεκα δὴ νῦν δῖον Ἀλέξανδρον Μενέλαος | νικήσας ἐθέλει στυγερὴν ἐμὲ οἶκαδ' ἄγεσθαι, | τοῦνεκα δὴ νῦν δεῦρο δολοφρονέουσα παρέστης (*Il.* 3.403–405, cf. schol. *A Il.* 3.403–405a¹ Nic.; see

¹² All four extant examples (schol. *A Il.* 2.404–407 Nic., schol. *A Il.* 2.681–685 Nic., schol. *A Il.* 11.677b Nic., schol. *A Il.* 14.317a Nic.) deal with a *κοινόν*, which normally receives a *διαστολή* (§4.2).

¹³ The approximate equation *στιγμή* ≈ full stop and *ὑποστιγμή/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 (*ὄφρα* – *τόφρα*, *ἦμος* – *τῆμος*, *ὅτε* – *τότε*, *ἕως* – *τέως*, *ὅπου* – *ἐκεῖ*), which may represent something like the ideal case (cf. example (b¹) 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 *ὑποστιγμαί* can do without examples of the type (c) because Nicanor’s notes provide enough examples of the type (b).

Appendix).¹⁷

(b²) εἰ δέ κε μὴ δώησιν, ἐγὼ δέ κεν αὐτὸς ἔλωμαι | ἐλθὼν σὺν πλεόνεσσι
(*Il.* 1.324–325, cf. schol. *A Il.* 1.324–325 Nic.).

When several subordinate clauses precede the main clause they are separated by additional ἐνυπόκριτοι ὑποστιγμαί.

Example:

(b) ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ σόλον εἶλε μενεπτόλεμος Πολυποίτης, | ὅσσον τίς τ' ἔρριψε καλαύροπα βουκόλος ἀνὴρ, | ἣ δὲ ἐλισσομένη πέτεται διὰ βοῦς ἀγελαίας, | τόσσον παντὸς ἀγῶνος ὑπέρβαλε (*Il.* 23.844–847, cf. schol. *A Il.* 23.844–847 Nic.; see Appendix).

The ἐνυπόκριτος ὑποστιγμή is indicated by one χρόνος of silence (schol. *A Il.* 8.206–207a¹ Nic.). This probably applies to the other ὑποστιγμή as well.

3.2 The ἐνυπόκριτος ὑποστιγμή 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].¹⁸

(b) οἷ δὴ νῦν ἔαται σιγῆ, 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

¹⁷ Like all ancient punctuation systems, Nicanor's lacks a question mark. The fact that line 405 is a question must be put into words (ἠθικῶς πυνθάνεται, schol. *T Il.* 3.405 Nic., cf. πευστικῶς 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 θαυμασμός/θαυμαστικός in schol. *A Il.* 5.638b Nic., etc.).

¹⁸ 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 ἐνυπόκριτος ὑποστιγμή (never an ἐνυπόκριτος ὑποστιγμή). And the word right before the διὰ μέσου part (here βήσσης, 3.34) never receives an ἐνυπόκριτος ὑποστιγμή (see below). Moreover, the author wrongly claims that these insertions always fall between the subordinate and the main clause in ὀρθαὶ περίοδοι. 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 ὑποστιγμή), 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 ἀνυπόκριτος ὑποστιγμή.¹⁹ It seems likely that Nicanor invented this particular punctuation mark for a syntactic phenomenon that he recognised in at least 65 Iliadic passages.²⁰

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) ἦ κεν γηθήσαι Πριάμος Πριάμοιό τε παῖδες | ἄλλοι τε Τρῶες μέγα
κεν κεχαροῖατο θυμῶ, | εἰ σφῶϊν τάδε πάντα πυθοῖατο μαρναμένοϊιν
(*Il.* 1.255–257).

(b) καὶ νύ κεν εἴρυσσέν τε καὶ ἄσπετον ἦρατο κῦδος, | εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ὄξυ
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 ἀνυπόκριτοι ὑποστιγμαί in the middle (cf. schol. A *Il.* 1.234–240a Nic.), cf. the multiple ἐνυπόκριτοι ὑποστιγμαί 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.* 11.242–243a¹ 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 ὑποδιαστολή.

are separated by additional διαστολαί.

Example:

(b) ἡ μένετε Τρῶας σχεδὸν ἐλθέμεν, ἔνθα τε νῆες | εἰρύατ' εὐπρυμνοὶ
πολιῆς ἐπὶ θινὶ θαλάσσης, | ὄφρα ἴδητ(ε) κτλ. (*Il.* 4.247–249, cf. schol.
AbT *Il.* 4.247–248 Nic.).

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

Example:

(b) σὺ δὲ σῶ μεγαλήτορι θυμῷ | εἷξας, [διαστ.] ἄνδρα φέριστον ὄν
ἀθάνατοὶ περ ἔτισαν, [ἐνυπ. ὑποστ.] | ἠτίμησας (*Il.* 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:

ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' ὅμοισιν βάλετο ξίφος ἀργυρόηλον | χάλκεον, αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
(sc. ἀμφ' ὅμοισιν βάλετο) σάκος μέγα τε στιβαρόν τε (*Il.* 3.334–335,
cf. schol. A *Il.* 3.335a¹ Nic.; the reader must mentally supply the
predicate phrase).

ἀλλ' ἄγε Πατρόκλω ἔφεπε κρατερόνυχας ἵππους, | αἶ κέν πῶς μιν ἔλης,
δῶη δέ τοι εὐχος Ἀπόλλων (*Il.* 16.724–725, cf. schol. A *Il.* 16.725
Nic.: the διαστολή after ἔλης is owed to the fact that, as a κοινόν, the
conjunction αἶ κεν governs both subordinate clauses).²⁴

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

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

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 δῶη δέ τοι εὐχος Ἀπόλλων becoming an independent sentence. For Nicanor's treatment of κοινόν in general, see Nünlist, *RwFil* 147 (2019) 408–414.

Examples:

τῆσι θύρας ὥϊξε Θεανῶ καλλιπάρηος | Κισσηίς, ἄλοχος Ἀντήνορος
ἵποδάμοιο (*Il.* 6.298–299, cf. schol. *A Il.* 6.299 Nic.).

ἦδε δέ οἱ κατὰ θυμὸν ἀρίστη φαίνεται βουλή, | πέμψαι ἐπ' Ἀτρείδῃ
Ἀγαμέμνονι οὖλον Ὀνειρον (*Il.* 2.5–6, cf. schol. *A Il.* 2.5b Nic.; see
Appendix).

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

Examples:

ὃ μὲν εὐχέτο πάντ' ἀποδοῦναι, | δῆμῳ πιφάσκειν (*Il.* 18.499–500, cf.
schol. *A Il.* 18.499–500b Nic.: δῆμῳ is the indirect object of πιφάσκειν,
not ἀποδοῦναι).

(Zeus) ἀστράπας δέ, μάλα μεγάλ' ἔκτυπε (*Il.* 17.595, cf. schol. *A Il.*
17.595 Nic.: μάλα μεγάλ(α) is an intensifier of the thunder, not the
lightning).

οὔτοι ἄρ' ἠγεμόνες Δαναῶν, ἔλον ἄνδρα ἕκαστος (*Il.* 16.351, cf. schol.
A Il. 16.351a Nic.: to take Δαναῶν with ἄνδρα would create an in-
consistency [ἀπεμφαῖνον]).

αὐτοὶ δ' (...) | στείομεν, εἴ κεν πρῶτον ἐρύξομεν ἀντιάσαντες(,) |
δοῦρατ' ἀνασχόμενοι (*Il.* 15.296–298, cf. schol. *A Il.* 15.298 Nic.,
where he deliberates whether or not to put a *διαστολή* after ἀντι-
άσαντες or, in other words, whether δοῦρατ' 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 Il.* 11.4 Nic., schol. *A Il.* 11.227a Nic., schol. *A Il.* 11.397–398 Nic., etc. Friedländer (84) perceives a difference between schol. *A Il.* 16.65–70 Nic. and schol. *A Il.* 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 *διαστολαί* to be ἀναγκαῖαι in schol. *A Il.* 6.38–41 Nic., as Friedländer himself acknowledges (84 n.2). For an optional *διαστολή* see e.g. schol. *A Il.* 13.260a Nic.

4.5 The *διαστολή* can be used to segment lists of similar words/expressions, for instance, a chain of epithets.

Example:

ἔχε δ' αἰγίδα θοῦριν, ἰ δεινήν, ἀμφιδάσειαν, 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 ἦ καὶ ἐμὸν βέλος ὄξυ πάροιθεν (*Il.* 20.437, cf. schol. A *Il.* 20.437b¹ Nic., which considers the two underlined words a unit and glosses them with τὸ ὠξυμμένον κατὰ τὸ ἔμπροσθεν).

The alternative term for *συναφή* is ὑφ' ἔν (*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:

ἵνα δὲ μὴ δόξη τις ἡμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν καὶ τὴν τοῦ λεχθέντος Νικάνορος διατύπωσιν τὴν περὶ τῶν στιγμῶν, ὧν τὰ ὀνόματα ἤδη ἡμῖν προεῖρηται (*sc.* p.24.16–18 Hilgard), δεῖ ὡς ἐν συντόμῳ ἐνταῦθα μνησθῆναι τῆς τε θεσσεως 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] ἡ μὲν οὖν τελεία στιγμή τίθεται ἐν τῷ μέσῳ τόπῳ τῆς τελευταίας γραμμῆς τοῦ στοιχείου τοῦ τελευταίου ἐν τοῖς ἀσυνδέτοις λόγοις, ὡς ἐπὶ

τοῦ “μάντι κακῶν, οὐ πῶ ποτέ μοι τὸ κρήγυον εἶπας” (*Il.* 1.106) εἰς τὸ “εἶπας,” τουτέστιν εἰς τὸ τελευταῖον αὐτοῦ γράμμα ἢ τελεία τίθεται, τοῦ ἔφεξης λόγου (sc. αἰεὶ τοὶ τὰ κάκ' ἐστὶ φίλα κτλ.) ἀσυνδέτου ὄντος.

The τελεία στιγμῆ (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 μάντι κακῶν, οὐ πῶ ποτέ μοι τὸ κρήγυον εἶπας, <it is put> on (i.e. behind) εἶπας, that is, the τελεία is put on its final letter because the subsequent sentence is asyndetic.

[2.2] ἡ δὲ ὑποτελεία ὀλίγον ὑποκάτω τοῦ μέσου τόπου τοῦ στοιχείου τοῦ ἐσχάτου, ὅτε ἐπιφέρεται ὁ “δέ” ἢ ἄλλος τις σύνδεσμος τῶν ἰσοδυναμούντων τῷ “δέ,” λέγω δὲ τὸν “γάρ,” τὸν “ἀλλά,” τὸν “ἀτάρ,” τὸν “αὐτάρ.” ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ “ἠρώων. αὐτοὺς δὲ ἐλώρια” (*Il.* 1.4) εἰς τὸ ν τοῦ “ἠρώων” ἡ ὑποτελεία τίθεται διὰ τὸ ἐπιφέρεσθαι τὸν “δέ.” οὕτω γὰρ δοκεῖ τῷ ἡμετέρῳ γραμματικῷ, φημι δὲ τῷ Ἀπολλωνίῳ, καὶ μάλα εὖ, ὥς γέ μοι δοκεῖ· ἔφη δὲ ἐν τούτῳ παρεωρακέναι τὸν Νικάνωρα, τὴν μὲν ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τῆς σιωπῆς διαφορὰν ὀρισάμενον τῶν πρώτων δύο στιγμῶν, φημι δὲ τῆς τελείας καὶ τῆς ὑποτελείας, τὴν δὲ θέσιν καὶ τὸν τόπον τὸν αὐτὸν ταῖς δύο ἀπονέμοντα· οὐ δεῖ οὖν τὴν τελείαν καὶ τὴν ὑποτελείαν ἐν τῷ μέσῳ τοῦ στοιχείου τίθεναι, ὥς γέ φησι Νικάνωρ, ἐπεὶ ποία διαφορὰ ἔσται αὐτῶν; ἀλλὰ τὴν μὲν τελείαν ἐν τῷ μέσῳ, τὴν δὲ ὑποτελείαν ὑποκάτω ὀλίγον τοῦ μέσου τόπου τοῦ τελευταίου στοιχείου.

The ὑποτελεία <στιγμῆ> (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 ἠρώων. αὐτοὺς δὲ ἐλώρια, the ὑποτελεία is put on (i.e. behind) the *nu* of ἠρώων, 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.

[2.3] ἡ δὲ πρώτη ἄνω τίθεται ἐπάνω τῆς τελευταίας γραμμῆς τοῦ τελευταίου στοιχείου, ὅτε πρόκειται ὁ “μέν” ἢ ὁ “ἦ” ἢ τὸ “οὔ,” ἐπιφέρεται δὲ ὁ “δέ” ἢ ὁ “ἦ” ἢ ὁ “ἀλλά,” ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ “αἶδεσθην μὲν ἀνήνασθαι.” (II. 7.93) εἰς τὸ τελευταῖον ι τοῦ “ἀνήνασθαι” ἡ πρώτη ἄνω τίθεται διὰ τὸ ἐπιφέρεσθαι τὸν “δέ” (sc. δεῖσαν δ’ ὑποδέχθαι), τοῦ “μέν” προκειμένου.

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

[2.4] ἡ δὲ δευτέρα ἄνω τίθεται καὶ αὐτὴ ἐπάνω τῆς τελευταίας γραμμῆς τοῦ ἐσχάτου στοιχείου, περιέχεται δὲ ὑπὸ διπλῆς ἔξωθεν, ὅτε ἐπιφέρεται ὁ “καί,” ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ “καὶ ῥα πάροιθ’ αὐτοῦ καθέζετο· καὶ λάβε γούνων” (II. 1.500) εἰς τὸ ο τοῦ “καθέζετο” τίθεται ἡ δευτέρα ἄνω, τοῦ “καί” ἐπιφερομένου.

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

[2.5] ἡ δὲ τρίτη ἄνω τίθεται καὶ αὐτὴ ἐπάνω μὲν τῆς τελευταίας γραμμῆς τοῦ τελευταίου στοιχείου, περιέχεται δὲ ὑπὸ διπλῆς ἔσωθεν, ὅτε ἐπιφέρεται ὁ “τέ,” ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ “Κίλλαν τε ζαθέην· Τενέδοιό τε ἴφι ἀνάσσεις” (II. 1.38) εἰς τὸ ν τοῦ “ζαθέην” τίθεται ἡ τρίτη ἄνω, ἐπιφερομένου τοῦ “τέ” συνδέσμου.

The τρίτη ἄνω <στιγμή> (lit. *third high point*) too is put above the final stroke of the final letter and is embraced by a *diple* from inside (i.e. <·) when τε follows (sc. in the next sentence); for instance, in Κίλλαν τε ζαθέην· Τενέδοιό τε ἴφι ἀνάσσεις, the τρίτη ἄνω is put on the *nu* of ζαθέην because the conjunction τε follows.

[3.1] ἡ δὲ ὑποστιγμὴ ἡ ἐνυπόκριτος τίθεται ὑποκάτω μὲν τῆς τελευταίας γραμμῆς τοῦ τελευταίου στοιχείου, ὀλίγον δὲ ἐξωτέρω ἐκ πλαγίου νεύουσα, ἐν ταῖς ὀρθαῖς περιόδῳ, τουτέστιν ὅτε πρόκειται τὸ “ὄφρα” ἢ τὸ “ἦμος” ἢ τὸ “ὅτε” ἢ τὸ “ἕως” ἢ τὸ “ὅπου,” ἐπιφέρεται δὲ τὸ “τόφρα,” τὸ “τῆμος,” τὸ “τότε,” τὸ “τέως,” τὸ “ἐκεῖ,” καὶ τὰ ὅμοια, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ “ἦμος δ’ ἠριγένεια φάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἥως” (II. 1.477 etc.) εἰς τὸ ς τοῦ “Ἥως” τίθεται ἡ ἐνυπόκριτος, ἐπιφερομένου τοῦ “τότε” (e.g. καὶ τὸτ’ ἔπειτ’ ἀνάγοντο 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?²⁷) in 'straight periods', that is, when ὄφρα or ἤμος or ὅτε or ἕως or ὅπου precede (sc. in the subordinate clause) and τόφρα, τῆμος, τότε, τέως, ἐκεῖ, or the like follow (sc. in the subsequent main clause); for instance, in ἤμος δ' ἠριγένεια φάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἥώς, the ἐνυπόκριτος is put with (i.e. below) the *sigma* of Ἥώς because τότε follows (sc. in the main clause).

[3.2] ἡ δὲ ὑποστιγμὴ ἢ ἀνυπόκριτος τίθεται καὶ αὐτὴ ὑποκάτω τοῦ τελευταίου γράμματος ὑπὸ τὴν ἐσχάτην καὶ κατωτάτην γραμμὴν τοῦ στοιχείου, ἐν δὲ ταῖς μεταξὺ πρὸ τῆς ἀνταποδόσεως τῶν ὀρθῶν περιόδων ἀναφωνουμέναις ἑτέραις περιόδοις, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ “ὡς δ' ὅτε τίς τε δράκοντα ἰδὼν παλίνροσος ἀπέστη οὔρεος ἐν βήσσης” (Il. 3.33–34) ἐνταῦθα τίθεται ἢ ἀνυπόκριτος, ὁμοίως καὶ εἰς τὸ “γυῖα” 3.34) καὶ εἰς τὸ “ἀνεχώρησεν” (3.35)· μεταξὺ γὰρ <πρὸ> τῆς ἀνταποδόσεως ἕτεραι περίοδοι ἐνετέθησαν· εἰς δὲ τὸ “παρειάς” (3.35) ἢ ἐνυπόκριτος· εὐθέως γὰρ ἐπιφέρεται ἢ ἀνταπόδοσις.

The ἀνυπόκριτος 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 παλίνροσος ἀπέστη οὔρεος ἐν βήσσης, the ἀνυπόκριτος is put here (sc. below the final letter of βήσσης) and likewise with γυῖα 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.²⁸

[4.1] ἡ δὲ ὑποδιαστολὴ κατὰ πάντα τῶν προλαβουσῶν στιγμῶν ἐνήλλακται, ὡς καὶ αὐτῷ τῷ στίγματι μὴ εἶναι νυγμὴ τις, ὡς αἱ ἄλλαι, ἀλλὰ τὸν τύπον ἔχειν τοῦ ὀξεός τόνου· τίθεται δὲ καὶ αὐτὴ ὑποκάτω τῆς ἐσχάτης γραμμῆς τοῦ τελευταίου γράμματος, ὡς ὀξεῖα δὲ τις, ὡς προεῖρηται, ἐν ταῖς ἀντεστραμμέναις περιόδοις, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ “ἢ κεν γηθήσαι Πρίαμος <Πριάμοιό τε παῖδες> ἄλλοι τε Τρῶες μέγα κεν κεχαροῖατο θυμῷ, εἰ σφῶϊν τάδε πάντα πυθοῖατο μαρναμένοιιν” (Il. 1.255–257) ἐν τῷ “θυμῷ” τίθεται ἢ ὑποδιαστολή· ἐπιφέρεται γὰρ τὸ “εἰ σφῶϊν” καὶ

²⁷ Neither is the exact position of the mark clear nor how it differs from the confusingly similar position of the ἀνυπόκριτος ὑποστιγμή.

²⁸ For the errors in this section see n.18 above.

ποιεῖ ἀντεστραμμένην τὴν περίοδον· ἡ γὰρ ὀρθὴ περίοδος ἦν “εἰ σφῶϊν τάδε πάντα πυθοῖατο, ἧ̂ κεν γηθήσαι Πρίαμος” (*Il.* 1.257+255).

The ὑποδιαστολή (*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 ἧ̂ κεν γηθήσαι Πρίαμος <Πρίαμοίό τε παῖδες> ἄλλοι τε Τρῶες μέγα κεν κεχαροῖατο θυμῷ, εἰ σφῶϊν τάδε πάντα πυθοῖατο μαρναμένοιιν, a ὑποδιαστολή is put on (i.e. below the final letter of) θυμῷ because εἰ σφῶϊν (i.e. the subordinate clause) follows and inverts the period. The ‘straight period’ would be εἰ σφῶϊν τάδε πάντα πυθοῖατο, ἧ̂ κεν γηθήσαι Πρίαμος.

Schol. A *Il.* 2.23b Nic.: τελεία στιγμή κατὰ τὸ τέλος, ἐπεὶ ἀσύνδετος ὁ λόγος. τέσσαρας δὲ αὕτη χρόνους σιωπῆς δύναται.

<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: ὑποτελεία γὰρ ἔσται, ἥτις τρίχρονος δύναται εἶναι (codd.: τρεῖς χρόνους δύναται Friedländer).

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

Schol. A *Il.* 2.52a Nic.: ἐπὶ τὸ “κήρυσσον” ἄνω πρώτη στιγμή, ἥτις δύο δύναται χρόνους 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 δευτέραν στιγμήν, ἥτις ἓνα χρόνον δύναται σιωπῆς.

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

Schol. A *Il.* 3.403–405a¹ Nic.: ὑποστικτέον δὲ ἐν ὑποκρίσει εἰς τὸ “ἄγεσθαι” (404), ἐπεὶ τῶν ἀνταποδοτικῶν ἔστι καὶ ταῦτα, “οὔνεκα” (403) — “τοὔνεκα” (405).

An ἐνυπόκριτος ὑποστιγμή must be put on ἄγεσθαι, because these too belong to the correlatives, οὔνεκα — τοὔνεκα.²⁹

²⁹ The expression ἐν ὑποκρίσει 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).

Schol. A II. 23.844–847 Nic.: ὑποστικτέον “Πολυποίτης” (844), “άνήρ” (845), “άγελαιάς” (846)· τῆ γάρ προτέρα προτάσει έτέρα έπενήνεκται.

An <ένυπόκριτος> ὑποστιγμή must be put on Πολυποίτης, άνήρ, άγελαιάς. For another subordinate clause follows upon the first.³⁰

Schol. A II. 3.134b Nic.: δια μέσου τὸ ήμιστίχιον “πόλεμος δὲ πέπανται”· διόπερ διαστέλλομεν ἐπὶ τὸ “σιγῆ,” στίζομεν δὲ άνυποκρίτως ἐπὶ τὸ “πέπανται.”

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

Schol. A II. 3.374a Nic.: πάλιν διαστολή πρὸ τούτου· άνέστραπται γάρ ή περίοδος. ὀρθή δ' άν έγένετο ούτως· “εί μή ἄρ' ὄξυ νόησε, καί νύ κεν είρυσ<σ>έν τε.”

<There is> again a comma before this line because the period is inverted. A straight <period> would have read thus: εί μή ἄρ' ὄξυ νόησε, καί νύ κεν είρυσ<σ>έν τε.

Schol. A II. 9.110a Nic.: ὁ λόγος αίρει διαστέλλειν ἐπὶ τὸ “είξας,” ὑποστίζειν δὲ ἐν ὑποκρίσει ἐπὶ τὸ “ἔτισαν.”

It seems good to put a comma on είξας, an ένυπόκριτος ὑποστιγμή on ἔτισαν.

Schol. A II. 2.5b Nic.: βραχὺ διασταλτέον κατὰ τὸ τέλος· μέρος γάρ 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.

December, 2019

Institut für Altertumskunde
Albertus-Magnus-Pl.
D-50923 Cologne, Germany
rene.nuenlist@uni-koeln.de

³⁰ There can be no doubt that the ένυπόκριτος is meant even though the scholion does not say so explicitly.