



OXFORD

LYDIA

a POEM from the APPENDIX VERGILIANA:
INTRODUCTION, TEXT, TRANSLATION,
and COMMENTARY

BORIS KAYACHEV

·PSEUDEPIGRAPHIA LATINA·

PSEUDEPIGRAPHA LATINA

General Editors

ANTONY AUGOUSTAKIS

LAUREL FULKERSON

ROBERT KASTER

CHRISTINA KRAUS

PSEUDEPIGRAPHIA LATINA

Pseudepigrapha Latina offers a new series of modern commentaries on frequently neglected, falsely attributed, and anonymous Latin texts. The individual commentaries engage with questions of authorship and dating, traditional philological issues and style, as well as the literary context of these works.

Lydia
a Poem from the
Appendix Vergiliana

*Introduction, Text,
Translation, and Commentary*

BORIS KAYACHEV

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Boris Kayachev 2023

The moral rights of the author have been asserted

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Catalogue in Publication Data
Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2023942748

ISBN 978-0-19-287451-1

Printed and bound in the UK by
Clays Ltd, Elcograf S.p.A.

Links to third party websites are provided by Oxford in good faith and
for information only. Oxford disclaims any responsibility for the materials
contained in any third party website referenced in this work.

For Teddy

Gaudia semper enim tua me meminisse iuuabit.

Preface

This commentary on the *Lydia* is one of a diptych, the other tackling its more popular sibling, the *Dirae*. Initially the two were intended to appear together between the same covers, but when the editors of the *Pseudepigrapha Latina* series offered to publish the *Lydia* half as an independent volume, this suddenly made sense: the *Lydia* has never before received a commentary under its own name (nor in fact any substantial piece of scholarship), and it deserves one. I am grateful to the editors and anonymous readers at OUP, and *in primis* to Antony Augoustakis, for showing an interest in the project—and giving it this new form. Even if my treatment of the poem fails in every other respect, I hope the *Lydia* will have secured its own place, however small, on the shelves (and perhaps in the hearts) of classical scholars. But the decision came at a cost: separate publication makes it more difficult to cross-reference between the two commentaries, and some of my claims about the *Dirae* will have to be taken on faith, until its own commentary is published as well. In particular the reader needs to be warned that quotations from the *Dirae* follow the text established in the forthcoming work, without the specific textual arguments being repeated or even referenced here.

Both commentaries were produced as part of a project that received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 840190. I am also grateful to Oxford's Faculty of Classics, which hosted the project in 2019–21, and especially to Stephen Heyworth, who supervised it. It is difficult to overestimate Steve's input: his many acute ideas on the text of the *Lydia* are explicitly acknowledged throughout the commentary (with an asterisk used to signal that they are previously unpublished), but there is barely a page that has not benefitted from his advice, offered either in person when we regularly met during my work on the commentary, or later in writing when he read a nearly complete

typescript of the whole thing. I must also give thanks to Tristan Franklino, who on several occasions joined our discussions, to the colleagues and students who attended a seminar on the *Lydia* and the *Dirae* in Hilary 2021, as well as to Lydia Matthews, who lent a hand of support at an initial stage of the project. I am pleased too to thank Gail Trimble, who let me have a glance at, and cite, her forthcoming commentary on Catullus 64.

The bulk of this commentary was written during the infamous pandemic, most of which I spent confined within the walls (such as they are) of Wolfson College, Oxford. I owe it a debt of gratitude for awarding me a Non-Stipendiary Research Fellowship and letting me join its supportive community of scholars, students, and staff. I am also greatly indebted to friends and colleagues, from both within and beyond the college, who through their presence, corporeal or otherwise, made the time of the lockdown seem more of an adventure than an outright disaster: Nikolay Andreev, Arik Avdokhin, Peter Budrin, Aliona Chepel, Ana Dall'Agnol, Richard Davies, Dmitry Dundua, Nikolay Epplée, Cosima Frieden, Mattias Gassman, Arina Guseva, Gregory Hutchinson, Ching-haun 'George' Lin, Jesse Lundquist, Robert Maltby, Angelo Marra, Valters Negribs, Basil Nelis, Damien Nelis, Dmitry Nikolaev, Ira Pavlova, Elena Racheva, Jenya Sedinkina, Elizaveta Shcherbakova, Mikhail Shumilin, Felix Tennie, Anke Walter, and Maria Yurovitskaya. I am as ever grateful to my parents, Luiza and Alexander, for their unfailing care and support.

As I write these lines, my country of birth has for more than eight months been waging an unjust war against her neighbour. My ardent hope is that it will have stopped by the time this book is published.

London, All Hallows' Eve 2022

Contents

Introduction	1
1. The <i>Lydia</i> and the <i>Dirae</i> : Unity, Chronology, Authorship	3
2. Poetic Frameworks	14
3. A Note on the Language and Metre	39
4. Manuscript Tradition and the Text	41
Lydia	45
Text and Apparatus Criticus	45
Translation	49
Commentary	51
<i>Bibliography</i>	151
<i>Indexes</i>	163



OXFORD

LYDIA

a POEM from the APPENDIX VERGILIANA:
INTRODUCTION, TEXT, TRANSLATION,
and COMMENTARY

BORIS KAYACHEV

·PSEUDEPIGRAPHIA LATINA·

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

1. The *Lydia* and the *Dirae*: Unity, Chronology, Authorship

The *Lydia* came into existence in 1792, when Friedrich Jacobs realized that the last eighty lines (104–83) of the poem transmitted in the manuscripts of the *Appendix Vergiliana* under the title *Dirae* constitute in fact a separate poem in its own right.¹ The title *Lydia* is in turn attested for a (lost) book by Valerius Cato, with (part of) which Jacobs identified the ‘newly discovered’ text, following Scaliger’s attribution to Cato of the ‘original’ *Dirae*.² We shall later return to the question of authorship, but for the moment our focus will stay on that of unity. Jacobs adduced three fundamental arguments against the *Dirae* proper (1–103) and the *Lydia* being a single poem: (1) the former exhibits a clear ring composition, with the last stanza (98–103)—identified as such in the refrain (97 *extremum*)—echoing the first stanza (4–8);³ (2) the situations in the two poems are essentially different (in the *Dirae* the speaker is exiled from his farm, in the *Lydia* he is dying of lovesickness; in the *Dirae* the speaker invokes destruction upon his estate, in the *Lydia* the bucolic landscape continues to thrive); and (3) the style (‘tone’ in Jacobs’s terms) likewise differs notably between the two poems. Subsequent scholars developed and expanded these arguments, with some even coming to believe that the two poems are not by the same author.⁴ This extreme position had the regrettable consequence that several important studies from the last decades focus exclusively on the *Dirae*, with the *Lydia* remaining largely

¹ Jacobs 1792. ² Scaliger 1572, 433–4.

³ To this can be added that the *Lydia* too has a self-contained symmetrical arrangement, if less pronounced, see my analysis at the head of the commentary.

⁴ Note esp. Rothstein 1888, echoed by Fraenkel 1966, 151: ‘Nowadays it is also generally agreed... that the two poems, the *Dirae* and the *Lydia*, cannot have been written by one and the same man. Metre, style, and mentality... are all entirely different.’ Goodyear 1971, 39 is right to be more cautious.

overshadowed by its sibling.⁵ In his monograph, van der Graaf attempted to defend the unity of 1–183, but was duly rebuffed.⁶ In recent years, however, the unitarian position has gained in popularity, with scholars stressing points of contact between the two poems.⁷ Yet while these are real and do suggest close intertextual engagement, they can in no way overcome the positive indications that the *Dirae* and the *Lydia* are formally separate poems.⁸

The realization that the *Lydia* is not part of the *Dirae* poses the question of whether it is in fact a complete poem: as pointed out above, the *Dirae* exhibits a distinct ring composition, whereas the *Lydia*'s beginning and end are not explicitly signalled as such. Yet there are more subtle cues that speak against the suspicion of incompleteness. While the opening—*inuideo uobis, agri*—may indeed take the reader by surprise, the first sentence (104–6) announces the poem's narrative situation and its dominant theme quite unambiguously: the speaker misses his absent beloved.⁹ Formal parallels for opening a poem with a first-person indicative verb can be found, for instance, in Theocritus 12 (1 *κωμάσδω ποτὶ τὰν Ἀμαρυλλίδα*) and Bion's *Lament for Adonis* (1 *αἰάζω τὸν Ἄδωνιν*); though it is true that *κωμάσδω* and *αἰάζω* are, unlike *inuideo*, performative verbs, the repetition of *inuideo uobis, agri* in refrains at 111 and 123 does give the phrase a metadiscursive dimension, thus supporting its appropriateness as an opening (*αἰάζω τὸν Ἄδωνιν* is similarly repeated in refrains throughout the *Lament*).¹⁰ The *Lydia* peters out somewhat inconspicuously (and the final lines are marred by textual uncertainty: see 182–3n.), yet although it cannot fully be ruled out that our text is

⁵ Note esp. Fraenkel 1966, Goodyear 1971, Rupprecht 2007, Breed 2012.

⁶ Van der Graaf 1945, 127–34; contrast e.g. Schutter 1953, Luiselli 1960, and Van den Abeele 1969, besides Fraenkel 1966 and Goodyear 1971.

⁷ See e.g. Salvatore 1994, Lorenz 2005, Stachon 2014, 178–200, Holzberg 2020, 16–18, Schniebs 2021.

⁸ Lorenz (2005, 4) was in fact prudent to admit as much: 'Ob wir es tatsächlich mit einem oder zwei Gedichten zu tun haben, werde ich im Folgenden zunächst offen lassen. Wichtig ist, dass die *Dirae* als Einheit überliefert und die genannten Verbindungen zwischen beiden Texten oder Textteilen so offensichtlich sind, dass ihre gemeinsame Interpretation—als *ein* Gedicht oder als zusammengehöriges Gedichtpaar—unumgänglich ist. Dies würde selbst dann gelten, wenn ein weiterer Anonymus von den *Dirae* (vv. 1–103) zur Abfassung einer *Lydia* angeregt worden wäre und den vorhandenen Text gewissermaßen komplettiert hätte.'

⁹ Cf. in a way the opening of Theocr. 12, ἦλυθες, ὦ φίλε κούρε· τρίτῃ σὺν νυκτὶ καὶ ἡοῇ | ἦλυθες· οἱ δὲ ποθεῦντες ἐν ἡματι γηράσκουσιν, which is similarly 'unprepared', but likewise specifies the poem's circumstances—the speaker's much-awaited encounter with his beloved—clearly enough.

¹⁰ On the *Lydia*'s engagement with the *Lament for Adonis*, see section 2.

truncated, the suggestion of impending death in 182–3 is a suitably closural move. The poem also appears to have a loosely symmetric arrangement in three sections of three ‘stanzas’ each (see the discussion at the head of the commentary), which likewise seems to confirm that it is essentially complete. Finally, against the possibility that the *Lydia* may have had (and lost) a narrative frame, it can be noted that the *Dirae* too is an unframed monologue of a bucolic speaker. Having established that the *Lydia* is likely to be a separate and complete poem, we are in a position to assess its relationship to the *Dirae*.

The most salient link between the two poems is the name Lydia, which in both is given to the rustic speaker’s beloved.¹¹ Her identity is not explicitly specified in either poem, but both hint that she may be a kind of nymph, or at least that she has close ties with nature: in the *Lydia* she has the bucolic landscape all to herself, over which she exercises Orphic powers; in the *Dirae* Lydia is closely connected with the wood on the speaker’s estate (and with the estate in general) and likewise appears to be a singer (*Lydia* 110 *interdum cantat mihi quae cantabat in aurem*, *Dirae* 41 *non iterum dices* [sc. *carmina*] *crebro quae, Lydia, dixti*: note the formal structural similarity of the two lines).¹² On the verbal level, both poems associate her with the landscape by pointedly using the same adjective of Lydia and a topographical feature in a single sentence (*Lydia* 105–6 *hoc formosa* [sc. *prata*] *magis, mea quod formosa puella | in uobis nostrum tacite suspirat amorem*, *Dirae* 89 *dulcia rura, ualete, et Lydia dulcior illis*).¹³ Both poems have in common the notion that the speaker enjoyed a time of happiness with Lydia, from whom he is now parted (*Lydia* 123–4 *mea gaudia habetis | et uobis nunc est mea quae fuit ante uoluptas*, *Dirae* 103 *gaudia semper enim tua me meminisse iuuabit*), albeit for different reasons and under different circumstances.¹⁴ Besides these

¹¹ Fraenkel 1966, 151–3 was misguided to excise all references to Lydia from the *Dirae*, and has found little following, besides Goold in Fairclough and Goold 2000, 386–403; see contra Goodyear 1971, 32–9.

¹² Cf., eloquently, Hubaux 1930, 49: ‘les deux poèmes s’inspirent d’une même sensibilité, très caractéristique, faite à la fois d’un vif sentiment de la nature et d’une sorte de galanterie qui n’est point commune chez les poètes latins: dans les deux poèmes, la beauté de la femme aimée est intimement associée à la beauté de la nature’ (pace Luiselli 1960, 104).

¹³ Note further *Dirae* 32–3 (*cum*) *formosaeque cadent umbrae, formosior ipsa | silua cadet*, of a wood, but in terms more applicable to a person, with the implication that Lydia may be conceived of as a wood nymph.

¹⁴ In this respect, they can be contrasted with the typical comastic situation in which the lover addresses a reluctant beloved, as e.g. in Theocr. 3 and 20.

thematic and textual resonances centred around the figure of *Lydia*, two further points of contact are worth registering.¹⁵ One involves flowers being referred to as an attribute of Venus (*Lydia* 116 *uarios, Veneris spectacula, flores, Dirae* 20 *Veneris uario florentia prata decore*).¹⁶ The other case of coincidence seems more significant: both poems introduce the conceit of rivers either stopping or reversing their flow, and in doing so employ 'disjunctive' language to refer to the rivers' water, and specifically the term *lympa*, for which such usage is unattested in pre-Virgilian poetry and appears to allude to Varro's etymology *ab aquae lapsu lubrico* (*Lydia* 121 *tardabunt riui labentes murmure lymphas, Dirae* 67 *flectite currentes lymphas, uaga flumina, retro*: see 121n.). On the macro-level, both poems represent the protagonist's soliloquies, with no narrative framing: the similarity is the more remarkable as there are no close analogues in Virgil's *Eclogues* (the fourth is likewise monologic, but is spoken in an authorial voice, not a bucolic character's; the seventh is formally spoken by a single herdsman, but is effectively a restaging of a past contest).¹⁷ The closest formal *comparanda* come from Greek bucolic: Theocritean idylls 3, 12, and 20 resemble the *Lydia* in being unframed monologues of bucolic lovers, featuring series of erotic *exempla* taken from mythology (3.40–51, 20.34–41).¹⁸ In some ways, however, post-Theocritean bucolic supplies more relevant models: Bion's *Lament for Adonis* and the anonymous *Lament for Bion* may have inspired the stanzaic organization of the *Lydia* and the *Dirae*, respectively.¹⁹ This shared intertextual heritage forms itself a link between the two Latin poems, as does their joint reception in subsequent poetry (see section 2).

If the *Lydia* and the *Dirae* are separate but related poems, two questions arise: whether they are by the same author, and what their chronological relationship is. Fraenkel was probably the most outspoken

¹⁵ Enk 1919, 385–95 adduces even more potential similarities, which, however, are less cogent.

¹⁶ Though note the textual uncertainty at 116 (see n.).

¹⁷ Cf. further Hubaux 1930, 54: 'Par leur fond, les *Dirae* et la *Lydia* appartiennent à ce genre de poèmes que les savants allemands appellent l'élégie subjective, c'est-à-dire que l'auteur y parle abondamment de lui, de ses sentiments, de ses amours'; 'subjective bucolic' could be a fitting generic description of the *Lydia* and the *Dirae*.

¹⁸ I owe this observation to Stephen Heyworth.

¹⁹ For the *Lydia*'s engagement with Bion's *Lament for Adonis*, see section 2; I discuss the *Dirae*'s points of contact with the *Lament for Bion* in my forthcoming commentary on that poem.

proponent of the theory of two authors: 'Metre, style, and mentality—if one can speak of mentality in that piece of smooth and shallow versification, the *Lydia*—are all entirely different.'²⁰ Fraenkel's perception of the *Lydia*'s aesthetic inferiority clearly played a crucial role in motivating its ascription to an author other than the *Dirae*'s.²¹ If, however, one puts aside subjective assessment of the poem's artistic quality, the metrical and stylistic differences between the *Lydia* and the *Dirae*, though supporting their separation, are insufficient to prove double authorship.²² While these seem real and not insignificant, there is no reason why a single author could not vary his writing mode between two compositions, different in tone and possibly distant in time.²³ Even though it cannot be demonstrated beyond doubt, in view of the poems' joint transmission and the various links discussed above, single authorship appears to be the most economic hypothesis, which can be accepted as a working assumption until proven false.

Whether or not the two poems are by the same author, in principle the *Lydia* can either pre-date or post-date the *Dirae*; if they are by the same author, they can also be contemporaneous, in the sense of being published simultaneously in a single poetic collection. The last scenario, however, appears to me unlikely, given the marked incompatibility between the *Lydia*'s and the *Dirae*'s narrative premises, and even if they were published together, the reader would be justified in wondering

²⁰ Fraenkel 1966, 151.

²¹ In this he followed Rothstein's (1888, 508–9) romantic condemnation of the *Lydia*'s artificiality: 'In *Dirarum* poeta agnoscimus nativum quendam animi irati ardorem, qui multa cum acerbitate et desiderio rerum amissarum de gravi iniuria quam accepit queritur, quam tamen modice fert et fortiter; neque minus clare in *Lydia* apparet ars longa consuetudine exculpta, suco tamen et nervis adeo carens, ut vix feramus hominem nihil maiore studio lectoribus obtrudentem quam macie se consumi et ad mortem voluntariam adigi, veri et simplicis doloris ne umbram quidem prodentem.' In response, Enk 1919, 393–4 aptly noted that others had a higher opinion of the *Lydia*.

²² Pace Luiselli 1960.

²³ Cf. Rodríguez Pantoja 2006, 591: 'Estas diferencias dan la razón a quienes piensan en dos poemas literariamente diferentes. Ahora bien, los puntos comunes (varios de tipo general) también son apreciables, lo cual permitiría al menos no rechazar de plano la hipótesis (que con los datos aquí expuestos no puede ir ás allá) de un solo autor, que influido por la corriente neotérica, los habría compuesto tratando de acentuar formalmente las diferencias temáticas entre uno y otro, o bien en dos momentos distintos'; for metrical similarities between the two poems, cf. also Duckworth 1969, 85–6. Separate authorship could only be demonstrated if formal characteristics indicated different periods of composition, but in both poems they point to a late Republican dating.