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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 Alcmene, who are told to gather at the shrine of Apollo, the Ismenium, ἐνθα καὶ νῦν ἐπίνομον ἥρωιδων / στρατὸν ὀμογερέα καλεὶ 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 νῦν 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 νῦν. Schmid’s reading has been generally preferred by editors until Gentili restored the καὶ νῦν of the manuscripts.¹)

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. Schwyzter 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, xcvi-xcviij). 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 νῶν dei codd. in νῦν’. So too Calabrese de Feo (1987, 41) speaks of νῦν 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.3) 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.3)

Hence both νῦν and νῶν have equal ancient authority. Can metre help us decide between them? ἐνθα καὶ νῦν ἐπίνυομοι ἡμωίδων 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 νῶν, 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 epitrito -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 ννυ; the
latter demands the meaning ‘now’, which should be νυυ.⁴ Only a ννυ 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 КАІ ΝΥΝ, a phrase which he uses fourteen times. Seven (Ο. 3.34, 7.13, Ρ.
3.66, 4.42, 9.71, 11.7, Ν. 6.8) have a metrically guaranteed short upsilon, with one
further likely on metrical grounds (Ο. 10.78).⁵) One (Ι. 5.48) has a metrically
guaranteed long upsilon, and a further one is likely, again for metrical reasons (Ρ. 4.64).
Four more (Ρ. 5.20, Ν. 5.43, Ι. 8.61, fr. 52nc.9 = S5c.9 Rutherford (*Paean* 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.⁶)

There is one certain Pindaric example of temporal ΝΥΝ with a short vowel
which does not follow καί: Ρ. 11.43-4 ἦ πατρὶ Πυθονίκῳ / τὸ γέ νυν ἦ Θρασυδάρῳ
(‘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.7) 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’, δεύρο 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’, ὅσα πού νυν ἑλπίσει). Sappho fr. 128 Voigt = Lobel–Page δεύτε 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 (κ αÏ„ νυν ... / κ αÏ„ μετέπειται ...) and [Epicharmus] frs. 275.6 and 276.11 Kassel–Austin. 8)

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 νυν 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 νυν at P. 11.7, as Schmid did all those years ago in 1616. 9)
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1) Gentili first published his text of this poem in Gentili 1989.


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 νὺν is ‘clearly preferable if we have no worries about responson’ (1997, 14).

5) At P. 3.66, 4.42 and 9.71 Gentili prints καὶ νὺν in his edition. In his apparatus on each occasion he notes that the manuscripts read νῦν, 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 νῦν on the grounds that ‘l’uso di καὶ νῦν per indicare il tempo presente e la repetitività 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 καὶ υὐ, 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 υὐ.


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


Kassel, R., Austin, C.F.L. 1983–. *Poetae Comici Graeci*, 8 vols. to date (Berlin and New York)


Probert, P. 2003. *A New Short Guide to the Accentuation of Ancient Greek* (Bristol)


