ARCHILLOCHUS FR. 122 WEST (AP. STOB. 4.46.10)

Χρημάτων ἰδίπτων οὐδὲν ἐστὶν οὐδ' ἀπώμοτον
οὐδὲ θαυμάσιον, ἐπειδὴ Ζεὺς πατήρ 'Ολυμπίων
ἐξ μεσαμβρίας ἔδηξε νῦντ', ἀποκρύψας φάσος
ἤλιον ἱλάμπωντος, λυγρὸν δ' ἥλιον ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους δέος.

οὐδὲν οὐδ' ἀπώμοτον
οὐδὲ θαυμάσιον, ἐπειδὴ Ζεὺς πατήρ 'Ολυμπίων
ἐξ μεσαμβρίας ἔδηξε νῦντ', ἀποκρύψας φάσος
ἤλιον ἱλάμπωντος, λυγρὸν δ' ἥλιον ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους δέος.

3 μεσαμβρίας O. Hoffmann: μεσαμβρίας S

(1) This is an old crux, caused by the fact that λυγρὸν is unmetrical. Now, since λυγρὸν as applied to δέος is trivial (“ab­gegriffen”, Wilamowitz), it must be out of place here. Conse­quently, we must discard Moritz Haupt’s attempt to keep λυγρὸν by changing ἤλιον λάμποντος into ἤλιον λάμποντι (though this change was adopted by E. Hiller, O. Crusius, Fr. Blass, and recently by B. Gentili, Polinnia, Florence 1967).

(2) Next step: in view of the Homeric formula λάμπον φάσον ἥλιον, Mähly’s conjecture φάσον ἤλιον λάμπον looks attractive. But then what to do with the remaining -τος λυγρὸν? His own τοσούτων does violence to palaeography, and the same holds good of those who read λάμπον: in Sitzler’s τὸ λυγρὸν the article is uncalled for; in Meineke’s θαλυκὸν and in Bergk’s στενυφιμὸν both palaeography and sense suffer.

(3) Consequently, it seems safer to assume that ἤλιον λάμποντος is sound, in view of, e.g., Ἰλιάδ 17.650 ἤλιοος δ' ἐπέλαμψε; Solon 13.23 West λάμπει δ' ἥλιον μένος, and to limit the daggers to λυγρὸν only (contra West).

(4) Now, all scholars who accept point (3) see in λυγρὸν a scribal error and try to emend it. If we leave aside Meineke’s ἄγον and Bergk’s ἄγον (for λυγρὸν) as gesucht, we are left with the choice between Bentley’s ὄχρον... δέος (compare Homer’s...
χλωρόν δέος) and Valckenaer’s ὑγρόν... δέος. The former makes good sense but is palaeographically improbable, the latter – widely accepted – is palaeographically convincing but cannot be paralleled.

(5) Here I must disagree – though in emphasis only – with both Kamerbeek (who reads αὗτον for λυγρὸν) and Renehan (who defends Bentley’s ὑγρὸν). In view of Sappho’s ἰδέως and τρόμος at Fr. 31.13 L.-P., and in view of Plautus Mostell. 395 madeo metu (Wilamowitz’s parallel), I feel that a “cold sweat”, or rather a “sweat-causing fear”, ὑγρὸν δέος, was possible in Greek. As for the metaphor, already Weber had referred to Homeric hymn 19.33 πόθος ὑγρός. If this “melting, languishing desire” is manifested in the girl’s wet eyes (cf. LSJ, s. ὑγρός, II.5), then the possibility for a “wet fear” being manifested in sweat caused by this fear I think cannot be ruled out. But my point (against Wilamowitz and others who defend ὑγρὸν) is that such a daring expression as ὑγρὸν δέος, though possible, is not likely in the rather plain narrative of Archilochus Fr. 122.

(6) Kamerbeek’s αὐτὸν... δέος makes good sense, in view of, e.g., Menander Epitrep. 901 Sandbach αὐτὸς εἶμι τῶν δέει; Theocritus 24.61 ξηρὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ δείοντος. However, I think it must be dismissed on two grounds: it is palaeographically implausible (for λυγρὸν), and the phrase αὐτὸν δέος is equally bold and unparalleled as is ὑγρὸν δέος.

(7) If λυγρὸν is unmetrical and trivial with δέος, and if it is not likely to be a scribal error, should not we then take a different approach to the crux? Why not assume that it is a supralinear, explanatory intrusive gloss which had ousted an established epithet for ‘fear’? If so then the best candidate seems to be αἵνως, in view of Iliad 11.117; 7.215 = 20.44 τρόμος αἵνως or Pindar Pyth. 5.61 αἵνως φόβου, “a dread fear”. Thus read: ἡλίων λάμποντος, αἵνων δ’ ἠλθ’ ... δέος.

ΑΙΝΟϹ is usually explained by the glossographers as ΔΕΙΝΟϹ (Orion, Hesychius, Suda), and δεινὰ is the variant reading of Diogenes Laertius (1.52) for λυγὰ at Solon 11.1 West. Thus, the way of corruption seems to have been: αἵνων > δεινὸν > λυγρὸν.