

Χρημάτων ἄελπτον οὐδὲν ἔστιν οὐδ' ἀπώμοτον
 οὐδὲ θαναάσιον, ἐπειδὴ Ζεὺς πατὴρ Ὀλυμπίων
 ἐκ μεσαμβροῆς ἔθηκε νύκτ', ἀποκορύψας φάος
 ἠλίου †λάμποντος, λυγρόν† δ' ἦλθ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους δέος.

3 μεσαμβροῆς O. Hoffmann: μεσημβρίας S 4 λάμποντος
 λυγρόν S: λαμπρόν, τοσοῦτον J. Maehly: λάμπον, τὸ λυγρόν J. Sitzler:
 λάμποντος, ὠχρόν R. Bentley, agn. Fr. Lasserre (1958), R. Renehan (*Studies in Greek Texts*, Hypomnem. 43, Berolini 1976, pp. 37 s.): λάμποντος, ὕγρον L. Valckenaer, agn. Ud. ab Wilamowitz (*Sappho u. Simonides*, p. 289 n. 2; *Menander. Das Schiedsgericht*, p. 216), L. Weber (*Philol.* 74, 1917, pp. 99 s.), E. Diehl (1936), M. Treu (1959), D. A. Campbell (1967), J. Tarditi (1968) alii: λάμποντος, αἶον J. C. Kamerbeek (*Mnemos.* 14, 1961, pp. 6 s.)

(1) This is an old *crux*, caused by the fact that λυγρόν is unmetrical. Now, since λυγρόν 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 λυγρόν by changing ἠλίου λάμποντος into ἠλίωι 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 λαμπρόν φάος ἠελίοιο, Mähly's conjecture φάος | ἠλίου λαμπρόν looks attractive. But then what to do with the remaining -τος λυγρόν? His own τοσοῦτον does violence to palaeography, and the same holds good of those who read λάμπον: in Sitzler's τὸ λυγρόν the article is uncalled for; in Meineke's θαλυκρόν and in Bergk's στενυγρόν both palaeography and sense suffer.

(3) Consequently, it seems safer to assume that ἠλίου λάμποντος is sound, in view of, e.g., *Iliad* 17.650 ἠέλιος δ' ἐπέλαμψε; Solon 13.23 West λάμπει δ' ἠελίοιο μένος, and to limit the daggers to λυγρόν only (*contra* West).

(4) Now, all scholars who accept point (3) see in λυγρόν a *scribal error* and try to emend it. If we leave aside Meineke's ἄκρον and Bergk's ἀργόν (for λυγρόν) as *gesucht*, we are left with the choice between Bentley's ὠχρόν... 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 *αῖον* for *λυγρόν*) and Renehan (who defends Bentley's *ὠχρόν*). In view of Sappho's *ἴδρω*s 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", *ὑγρόν 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 *ὑγρόν*) is that such a *daring* expression as *ὑγρόν δέος*, though possible, is *not likely* in the rather plain narrative of Archilochus Fr. 122.

(6) Kamerbeek's *αῖον... δέος* makes good sense, in view of, e.g., Menander *Epitrep.* 901 Sandbach *αἰός εἰμι τῶι δέει*; Theocritus 24.61 *ξηρόν ὑπαὶ δείου*s. However, I think it must be dismissed on two grounds: it is palaeographically implausible (for *λυγρόν*), and the phrase *αῖον δέος* is equally bold and unparalleled as is *ὑγρόν δέος*.

(7) If *λυγρόν* 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 *αἰνός*, in view of *Iliad* 11.117; 7.215 = 20.44 *τρόμος αἰνός* or Pindar *Pyth.* 5.61 *αἰνῶι φόβωι*, "a dread fear". Thus read: *ἠλίον λάμποντος, αἰνὸν δ'ἠλθ'*... *δέος*.

AINOC is usually explained by the glossographers as *ΔEINOC* (Orion, Hesychius, Suda), and *δεινὰ* is the variant reading of Diogenes Laertius (1.52) for *λυγρὰ* at Solon 11.1 West. Thus, the way of corruption seems to have been: *αἰνὸν* > *δεινὸν* > *λυγρόν*.

Urbana

Miroslav Marcovich