



Finglass, P. J. (2007). *vûv* and *vuv* in Pindar. *Mnemosyne*, 60(2), 269-273. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156852507X194791>

Peer reviewed version

Link to published version (if available):  
[10.1163/156852507X194791](https://doi.org/10.1163/156852507X194791)

[Link to publication record on the Bristol Research Portal](#)  
PDF-document

This is the accepted author manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via Brill Academic Publishers at DOI: 10.1163/156852507X194791. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

## University of Bristol – Bristol Research Portal

### General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:  
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/brp-terms/>

## νῦν AND νυν IN PINDAR

In the 1995 Mondadori edition of Pindar's *Pythians*, Bruno Gentili and his fellow editors have removed various long-standing emendations from the text, usually out of a desire to return to manuscript readings. This is not necessarily a bad thing. Erroneous conjectures can retain a foothold in the texts of ancient authors for longer than they deserve; and it is a mark of good scholars that they reconsider problems which predecessors have regarded as settled. Too often, however, the decisions of the Mondadori editors seem to have been motivated by dogmatic conservatism rather than appreciation of sense, metre, and the limits of manuscript authority. In this note I reconsider one such decision.

Pindar's *Eleventh Pythian* opens with an invocation of Semele, Ino and Alcmena, who are told to gather at the shrine of Apollo, the Ismenium, ἔνθα καὶ νυν ἐπίνομον ἠρωίδων / στρατὸν ὁμαγερέα καλεῖ συνίμεν (sc. Ἀπόλλων): 'where now also (or 'even now') Apollo summons the local crowd of heroines to gather together' (lines 7-8). I leave καὶ νυν unaccented as this is the point at issue. The manuscripts read καὶ νῦν. In his edition (1616, 370 and 378) Erasmus Schmid reaccented the phrase καὶ νυν. Schmid's reading has been generally preferred by editors until Gentili restored the καὶ νῦν of the manuscripts.<sup>1)</sup>

Our choice between the two forms is complicated by the differing conventions of ancient and modern accentuation. NYN has two different senses: one temporal ('now'), the other inferential ('then, therefore') (cf. Schwyzer 1934-71, ii. 570-1). Temporal NYN almost always has a long vowel; inferential NYN may have a long or a

short vowel. According to ancient convention (post-dating Pindar), NYN was given the circumflex when the vowel was long, and left unaccented when the vowel was short (cf. Ruijgh 1957, 64-7). The meaning was not taken into consideration. Some modern scholars retain this practice (e.g. Austin and Olson 2004, xcvii-xcviii). However, most prefer to write temporal NYN with the circumflex, and inferential NYN without it, without regard for the length of the vowel. I adopt such a course in this article, though with one modification, which will become clear below.

In making our decision the first issue which we must consider is manuscript authority. Both in an earlier article (1989, 44 n. 24) and *ad loc.* in the Mondadori edition Bernardini (who writes the commentary on Gentili's text) declares 'non è necessario cambiare il  $\nu\hat{\upsilon}\nu$  dei codd. in  $\nu\nu\nu$ '. So too Calabrese de Feo (1987, 41) speaks of  $\nu\nu\nu$  as an 'emendamento' to 'il testo tradito'. But talk of 'changing' and 'emendments' is inappropriate here. Pindar did not write the accents himself. They were added long after him by editors with no greater access to his intentions than we.<sup>2)</sup> The paradosis is simply NYN. The language of the scholars just quoted suggests that they do not understand the difference between a change to the manuscript reading and a reinterpretation of the paradosis. I emphasise this point, which should be obvious, because it is regrettably apparent that a great number of editors of Greek texts are ignorant of it.<sup>3)</sup>

Hence both  $\nu\nu\nu$  and  $\nu\hat{\upsilon}\nu$  have equal ancient authority. Can metre help us decide between them? ἔνθα καὶ  $\nu\nu\nu$  ἐπίνομον ἥρωίδων is correctly interpreted by Snell–Maehler (1987-9, i. 98) and by West (1982, 62) as a glyconic followed by a cretic (-u-uudu- -u-). If we read καὶ  $\nu\hat{\upsilon}\nu$ , we get a long instead of a short in the fourth element,

which is not licit in glyconics. Bernardini *ad loc.* argues ‘metricamente la lunga al posto della breve non crea difficoltà perché si ha una responsione tra epitrìto -u-- e ditrocheo -u-u’. Yet trochees are not found elsewhere in the ode, which is instead full of glyconics and glyconic-related rhythms. Such cutting up of metrical sequences into tiny, artificial metra could be used to justify almost any irregularity, and we need not take it seriously here. Metre requires a short upsilon.

The third criterion which we must consider is sense. The context demands a word meaning ‘now’, as indicated in the translation above. By contrast, ‘therefore’ has no place here. So at first sight metre and sense appear to be pulling in opposite directions. The former requires a short vowel, which seems to imply inferential  $\nu\nu\nu$ ; the latter demands the meaning ‘now’, which should be  $\nu\hat{\upsilon}\nu$ .<sup>4)</sup> Only a  $\nu\nu\nu$  with a short vowel meaning ‘now’ would resolve our difficulty. Does such a word exist?

Though uncommon, it certainly does. In Pindar it almost always occurs in the combination  $\text{KAI NYN}$ , a phrase which he uses fourteen times. Seven (*O.* 3.34, 7.13, *P.* 3.66, 4.42, 9.71, 11.7, *N.* 6.8) have a metrically guaranteed short upsilon, with one further likely on metrical grounds (*O.* 10.78).<sup>5)</sup> One (*I.* 5.48) has a metrically guaranteed long upsilon, and a further one is likely, again for metrical reasons (*P.* 4.64). Four more (*P.* 5.20, *N.* 5.43, *I.* 8.61, fr. 52nc.9 = S5c.9 Rutherford (*Paeon* 13)) are followed by a word beginning with a consonant, and hence may have a long or short upsilon. In each of the certain cases of short upsilon, Race’s 1997 Loeb uses the word ‘now’ in a temporal sense. In each case his translation is obviously right.<sup>6)</sup>

There is one certain Pindaric example of temporal  $\text{NYN}$  with a short vowel which does not follow  $\text{καί}$ : *P.* 11.43-4 ἢ πατρὶ Πυθονίκῳ / τό γέ νυν ἢ Θρασυδάκῳ

(‘either now for his father Pythonicus, or for Thrasydaeus’), where metre demands the short syllable. Like temporal NYN with a short vowel after καί, the νυν here appears in a position suitable for an enclitic (after another enclitic, γε). This may mean that short-vowel NYN is enclitic.<sup>7</sup>) There are some three dozen further instances of temporal NYN in Pindar where the following word begins with a consonant. The length of the upsilon is thus indeterminate. If we assume that short-vowel NYN is enclitic, then where NYN begins a sense unit it did not have a short vowel. In several places, however (*O.* 1.105, 9.40, 14.15, 14.20, *P.* 4.263, 4.290, 5.20, 5.117, 6.43, *N.* 5.43, 7.101, *I.* 5.38, 6.47, 7.37), NYN occupies a position where it might be enclitic, and so we cannot rule out the possibility that Pindar used a short vowel in these cases.

There is some evidence in other early authors for νυν with short upsilon in a temporal sense. According to Ruijgh (1957, 64), there are two metrically-guaranteed instances of νυν with short upsilon in Homer. In one (*Il.* 23.485) the sense is inferential (‘come now’, δεῦρό νυν), whereas in the other (*Il.* 10.105, from the pseudo-Homeric *Doloneia*) the particle must have a temporal force (‘Certainly Zeus will not accomplish all Hector’s intentions, *which he is now hoping for*’, ὄσα πού νυν ἐέλπεται). Sappho fr. 128 Voigt = Lobel–Page δεῦτέ νυν ... has a metrically guaranteed short upsilon. As the line probably begins a poem the νυν cannot be inferential, and so must be temporal. Sappho fr. 103.5 Voigt = 103.8 Lobel–Page may show the same phenomenon if Lobel’s supplement is correct. Alcaeus fr. 292.2 Voigt = Lobel–Page and inc. auct. fr. 34a.6 Voigt = Alcaeus fr. 259.6 Lobel–Page are too exiguous for us to determine the sense or prosody of the νυν. Temporal νυν with short upsilon is also found at Parmenides 28 B

19.1 (i. 245.15) Diels–Kranz (καὶ νυυ ... / καὶ μετέπειτ' ...) and [Epicharmus] fr.  
275.6 and 276.11 Kassel–Austin.<sup>8</sup>)

It is hard to draw conclusions from this distribution of authors. The frequency of such forms in Pindar may suggest a Dorian connexion (cf. the pseudo-Epicharmean fragments), but in the absence (to date) of any in Stesichorus and Ibycus means that we cannot be sure of this. In any case, this hypothesis cannot explain the instances in the *Doloneia* and Sappho. What is certain is that νυυ with short upsilon in a temporal sense does exist, and that Pindar made extensive use of it. We can hardly write this with a circumflex, which never falls on a short vowel. Hence we must acknowledge a slight inconsistency in what has become the traditional means of accentuating NYN, or else return to the ancient practice of accenting according to the length of the upsilon without regard for the meaning. Whichever method is followed, editors should continue to print νυυ at *P.* 11.7, as Schmid did all those years ago in 1616.<sup>9</sup>)

All Souls College  
University of OXFORD  
OX1 4AL  
United Kingdom  
patrick.finglass@all-souls.ox.ac.uk

P.J. FINGLASS

- 1) Gentili first published his text of this poem in Gentili 1989.
- 2) Accents do not appear on papyri before the second century B.C. and are plausibly connected with the scholarly work of Aristophanes of Byzantium: cf. Probert 2003, 11-13.
- 3) There is confusion over this point in a recent edited volume devoted to the language of Sophocles, where Rijksbaron (2006, 136-7 n. 18) argues ‘the accents in our MSS have less authority than the words in these MSS. They should not be ignored, of course, but ultimately the putting of accents on ambiguous forms is a matter of interpretation’. This statement appears internally inconsistent: for if ‘ultimately the putting of accents on ambiguous forms is a matter of interpretation’, then why should manuscript accentuation not be ignored? Elsewhere in his paper (pp. 129, 144), Rijksbaron distinguishes between manuscript accentuation and modern ‘conjectures’ which adopt different accentuation, as if manuscript accentuation possessed some ancient authority.
- 4) Willcock refers to this apparent contradiction when he says that  $\nu\hat{\upsilon}\nu$  is ‘clearly preferable if we have no worries about responsion’ (1997, 14).
- 5) At *P.* 3.66, 4.42 and 9.71 Gentili prints  $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\iota \nu\nu\nu$  in his edition. In his apparatus on each occasion he notes that the manuscripts read  $\nu\hat{\upsilon}\nu$ , although there is no discussion of any of the passages in the commentary. It is odd that he accepts a reinterpretation of the paradosis in these three cases without demur, and yet goes to such lengths to reject it at *P.* 11.7.
- 6) Bernardini on Pind. *P.* 11.7 defends  $\nu\hat{\upsilon}\nu$  on the grounds that ‘l’uso di  $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\iota \nu\hat{\upsilon}\nu$  per indicare il tempo presente e la ripetitività di un atto è del resto ben attestato in Pindaro’, citing *P.* 4.64, 5.20, *N.* 5.43, *I.* 5.48, 8.61. But since this sense is found even more often

in Pindar with *καί νυν*, her argument is without value. Moreover, as we have seen, in three of these examples the *upsilon* is of indeterminate length.

7) If correct, this would not affect the question of accentuation, as postpositive enclitics can carry an accent (cf. Zwicky 1985, 287 and Adams 1994, 91 n. 3). Hajdú 1989 does not discuss *νυν*.

8) The related Homeric particle *νύ* also occasionally appears in a temporal sense with a short *upsilon*: cf. Ruijgh 1957, 59 and 1990, 219-20 n. 15 = 1991-6, ii. 633-4 n. 15.

9) I am grateful to Professor J.N. Adams and to *Mnemosyne*'s anonymous referee for helpful comments.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY



- Adams, J.N. 1994. *Wackernagel's Law and the Placement of the Copula esse in Classical Latin* (Cambridge)
- Austin, C.F.L., Olson, S.D. 2004. *Aristophanes: Thesmophoriazusae* (Oxford)
- Bernardini, P.A. 1989. *Il proemio della Pitica XI di Pindaro e i culti tebani*, in: Beister, H., Buckler, J. (eds.), *Boiotika. Vorträge vom 5. internationalen Bötien-Kolloquium, Institut für Alte Geschichte Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München 13.-17. Juni 1986* (Munich), 39-47
- Calabrese de Feo, M.R. 1987. *Interpretazione e restauro testuale in Pindaro Py. I 92-94 e Ne. VI 29-30*, in: Buongiovanni, A. M. et al. (eds.), *Interpretazioni antiche e moderne di testi greci* (Pisa), 25-44
- Diels, H. 1951-2. *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*<sup>6</sup>, 3 vols. (Berlin) (rev. W. Kranz)
- Gentili, B. 1989. 'La *Pitica XI* di Pindaro. Testo critico e traduzione', in: Anceschi et al., *Mnemosynum. Studi in onore di Alfredo Ghiselli* (Bologna), 251-9
- . 1995. *Pindaro, Le Pitiche. Introduzione, testo critico e traduzione di Bruno Gentili. Commento a cura di Paola Angeli Bernardini et al.* (Rome and Milan)
- Hajdú, I. 1989. *Über die Stellung der Enklitika und Quasi-Enklitika bei Pindar und Bakchylides* (Lund)
- Kassel, R., Austin, C.F.L. 1983-. *Poetae Comici Graeci*, 8 vols. to date (Berlin and New York)
- Lobel, E., Page, D.L. 1963. *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford)
- Probert, P. 2003. *A New Short Guide to the Accentuation of Ancient Greek* (Bristol)

- Race, W.H. 1997. *Pindar*, 2 vols. (London and Cambridge, Mass.)
- Rijksbaron, A. 2006. 'On false historic presents in Sophocles (and Euripides)', in: De Jong, I. J. F., Rijksbaron, A. (eds.), *Sophocles and the Greek Language. Aspects of Diction, Syntax and Pragmatics* (Leiden and Boston)
- Ruijgh, C.J. 1957. *L'Élément achéen dans la langue épique* (Assen)
- . 1990. *La place des enclitiques dans l'ordre des mots chez Homère d'après la loi de Wackernagel*, in: Eicher, H., Rix, H. (eds.), *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie. Jacob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute. Kolloquium der indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 13. bis 15. Oktober 1988 in Basel* (Wiesbaden), 213-33 [= 1991-6, ii. 627-47]
- . 1991-6. *Scripta minora ad linguam graecam pertinentia*, 2 vols. (Amsterdam) (ed. A. Rijksbaron and F.M.J. Waanders)
- Rutherford, I. 2001. *Pindar's Paeans: a Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre* (Oxford)
- Schmid, E. 1616. *Pindarou Periodos, hoc est Pindari lyricorum principis, plus quam sexcentis in locis emaculati, ut jam legi & intelligi possit, Olympionikai. Pythionikai. Nemeonikai. Isthmionikai illustrati* (Wittenberg)
- Schwyzler, E. 1934-71. *Griechische Grammatik. Auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns griechischer Grammatik*, 4 vols. (Munich) (rev A. Debrunner)
- Snell, B., Maehler, H. 1987-9. *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis*, 2 vols. (Leipzig)
- Voigt, E.-M. 1971. *Sappho et Alcaeus: Fragmenta* (Amsterdam)
- West, M.L. 1982. *Greek Metre* (Oxford)
- Willcock, M.M. 1997. Review of Gentili 1995, CR N.S. 47, 13-15

Zwicky, A.M. 1985. *Clitics and Particles*, Language 61, 283-305