

A SHEPHERD WITH A LYRE?
RECONSIDERING *EINSIEDELN ECLOGUES* 1.18

The two bucolic poems extant in a single 10th century manuscript, *Einsiedeln* 266, and now usually known as the *Einsiedeln Eclogues* or *carmina Einsidlensia* are perhaps among the texts most damaged during transmission that have come down to us from classical antiquity; in Michael Reeve's words, "the tradition played havoc with them"¹. However, although numerous conjectures have been proposed to these poems since their first publication in 1869, few scholars disposed towards altering the text have been engaged in systematic work on them, while all the contemporary editions offer pretty conservative texts²; consequently, there are many passages in both poems which still look barely readable. According to the recent assessment by Boris Kayachev, "many textual problems have not yet found satisfactory solutions, and arguably there still remain corruptions that have not even been recognised"³. The purpose of this article is to propose a new solution to the problems connected with one of such places in the text which arguably have not been convincingly explained or corrected, viz. with line 1.18.

Scholarly attention used to be focused on the preceding line. In *Einsiedeln Eclogues* 1.15-18 Thamyras and Ladas, two shepherds who are going to compete in singing, proclaim their songs:

Thamyras

*praeda mea est, quia Caesareas me dicere laudes
mens iubet: huic semper debetur palma labori.*

* I thank A. Belousov, E. Ilyushechkina, B. Kayachev, D. Nikolaev, and A. Podossinov for their help and valuable advice.

¹ M. D. Reeve, *Carmina Einsidlensia*, in L. D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of Latin Classics*, Oxford 1983, 39.

² The most important contemporary editions are C. Giarratano, *Calpurnii et Nemesiani Bucolica*, Turin 1943, 99-107, R. Verdière, *Calpurnii Siculi De laude Pisonis, Bucolica et M. Annaei Lucani De laude Caesaris, Einsidlensia quae dicuntur carmina*, Brussels 1954, 210-219, D. Korzeniewski, *Hirtengedichte aus neronischer Zeit*, Darmstadt 1971, 75-85 and J. Amat, *Consolation à Livie; Élégies à Mécène; Bucoliques d'Einsiedeln*, Paris 1997, 156-162. One less conservative edition among those in use today is J. W. Duff and A. M. Duff, *Minor Latin Poets*, London 1934, 324-335, but it actually reproduces the text of E. Baehrens, *Poetae Latini Minores*, vol. 3, Leipzig 1881, 60-64 with some changes towards conservatism. Perhaps the situation would be different had D.R. Shackleton Bailey published the second volume of his *Anthologia Latina*.

³ B. Kayachev, *Emendations in the Einsiedeln Eclogues*, "Mnemosyne" 73, 2020, 343-350, at 343.

Ladas

*et me sidereo †corrupit† Cynthia ore
laudatamque chelyn iussit variare canendo.*

While Thamyras' words are apparently sound, *corrupit* is clearly the wrong word⁴. However, line 18 is also hardly unproblematic. Apollo obviously ordered (*iussit*) Ladas to do something with a lyre (*chelyn*), most probably to give variety to the music of this instrument by adding voice⁵.

⁴ Attempts to defend the transmitted text are clearly misguided. D. Korzeniewski, *Die 'panegyrische Tendenz' in den Carmina Einsidlensia*, "Hermes" 94, 1966, 344-360, at 350 n. 1 claimed that the word *corrumpto* could be read 'in bonam partem' and adduced Stat. *Ach.* 1.307 *ebur corrupitur* to prove this, but this example is weak (it rather means "the pure white colour of ivory is contaminated by purple"), and anyway it is unclear how to translate *corrumpto* in the *Einsiedeln Eclogues* in this case. In Korzeniewski (n. 2), 77, he translates *corrupit* as "verleitet" and adds on p. 112: "*corrupit* ist, wenn es nicht verderbt ist, ironisch zu verstehen". C. Schubert, *Studien zum Nerobild in der lateinischen Dichtung der Antike*, Stuttgart and Leipzig 1998, 143 agrees with this latter interpretation claiming that, since F. Bücheler, *Zur höfischen Poesie unter Nero*, "RhM" 26, 1871, 235-40, at 235-236 was unable to come up with a good conjecture, "paläographische 'Verbesserungsmöglichkeiten' nicht gegeben sind". This argument is an obvious *non sequitur*; as for irony, it is possible that the *Einsiedeln Eclogues* in general are to be read as ironic (cf. T. K. Hubbard, *The Pipes of Pan: Intertextuality and Literary Filiation in the Pastoral Tradition from Theocritus to Milton*, Ann Arbor 1998, 140-150; contra, B. Merfeld, *Panegyrik. Paränese. Parodie? Die Einsiedler Gedichte und Herrscherlob in neronischer Zeit*, Trier 1999, 112-160), but something like "Apollo has bribed me" (*OLD* s.v. 5a, *TLL* 4.1057.16-1058.32) or "Apollo has sexually seduced me" (*OLD* s.v. 5b, *TLL* 4.1056.35-1057.15) is more of a nonsense than irony, and *corrumpto* apparently never means "to seduce" in other senses in ancient texts (*pace* R. Verdière, *Le genre bucolique à l'époque de Néron: les 'Bucolica' de T. Calpurnius Siculus et les 'Carmina Einsidlensia'. État de la question et prospectives*, in *ANRW* 2.32.3, 1985, 1845-1924, at 1906, who interprets *corrumpto* as "séduire dans son sens d'attirer, persuader"). Amat (n. 2), 175 translates *corrupit* as "ébranle" and comments on p. 214 that the word can "exprimer une altération physique qui est l'effet de l'inspiration, comme chez la Sibylle de Cumès, *Aen.* 6.46-50"; but, as G. Liberman, *Une nouvelle édition de la Consolation à Livie, des Élégies à Mécène et des Bucoliques d'Einsiedeln*, "RPh" 71, 1997, 265-279, at 273 correctly notes, this statement is wrong and, once again, *corrumpto* never has such meaning. Neither does it have the meaning "to break forth into utterance", as suggested by E. Loew, *Über die beiden bukolischen Gedichte des codex Einsidlensis*, Vienna 1896, XIV ("Vielleicht hat das Compositum *corrumperere* hier die Bedeutung, die dem Simplex *rumpere* öfters innewohnt, nämlich hervorbrechen = ertönen = hören lassen", somehow with the accusative of the person addressed), or the meaning "to disturb", as suggested by J. Hubaux, *Les thèmes bucoliques dans la poésie latine*, Brussels 1930, 232 ("son aspect éblouissant me trouble").

⁵ See e.g. Korzeniewski (n. 2), 112, (n. 4), 345, Amat (n. 2), 214-215, Verdière (n. 4), 1893, J. B. Pearce, *The Eclogues of Nemesianus and the Einsiedeln Manuscript*, San Antonio 1992, 102; contrast the idea that some change introduced to Ladas' previous approach to singing is meant (Hubaux (n. 4), 232, A. Gercke, *Seneca-Studien*, "Jahrbücher für klass. Philologie" Suppl. 22, 1896, 1-333, at 257 n. 1, S. Lösch, *Die Einsiedler Gedichte: Eine literarhistorische Untersuchung*, Tübingen 1909, 76, W. Schmid, *Panegyrik und Bukolik in der*

The lyre is, however, clearly not an instrument one would expect a shepherd to play, and the contestants are otherwise said in *Einsiedeln Eclogue* 1 to play pan-pipe (1.4), the instrument that actually becomes Ladas' stake in the contest (1.6-12). The epithet applied to the lyre, *laudatam*, also appears to require some explanation⁶.

As regards line 1.17, I am not ready to propose a definite solution. It will, however, suffice for the purpose of the present article to point that the general sense required there is clear from the fact that it is modeled at least in part on Verg. *Ecl.* 3.60-63:⁷

Damoetas

*ab Iove principium Musae: Iovis omnia plena;
ille colit terras, illi mea carmina curae.*

Menalcas

*et me Phoebus amat; Phoebosua semper apud me
munera sunt, lauri et suave rubens hyacinthus.*

Consequently, we must expect from the corrupt word some meaning similar to "honour with attention"⁸. The conjectures proposed so far that fit this sense do not, however, allow to imagine the process of corruption easily⁹;

neronischen Epoche: Ein Beitrag zur Erklärung der Carmina Einsidlensia, "Bonner Jahrbücher" 153, 1953, 63-96, at 91, W. Theiler, *Zu den Einsiedlern Hirtengedichten*, "SIFC" 27/28, 1956, 563-577, at 572, R. J. Tarrant, *The Authenticity of the Letter of Sappho to Phaon (Heroides XV)*, "HSCPh" 85, 1981, 133-153, at 151 n. 37, E. Karakasis, *Song Exchange in Roman Pastoral*, Berlin and New York 2011, 287, and the interpretation of G. Sceda, *Eine übersehene recusatio-Form im Carmen Einsidlense I*, "MH" 24, 1967, 52-56 discussed below). It is perhaps also not impossible to understand *variare canendo* as "to adorn with variety when playing or singing to the accompaniment of", i.e. in fact simply "to play" (whether with or without singing): cf. *OLD* s.v. *vario* 1a; this meaning of *vario* is rarely applied to music or poetry, but cf. Opt. Porph. 27.8, Claud. *Carm. min.* 25.38, *Epigr. Bob.* 37.9 (intransitive), [Ven. Fort.] *App.* 19.11-12. Duff and Duff (n. 2), 327 seem to imply this latter understanding.

⁶ Both problems have been recognized by some scholars, as will be clear from the discussion of previous solutions below.

⁷ As noted already in O. Ribbeck, *Zur lateinischen Anthologie*, "RhM" 26, 1871, 406-410, at 408.

⁸ Cf. Bücheler (n. 4), 235-236. The parallel also suggests that *et* in line 17 should not be emended to e.g. *at* (proposed by D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Notes on Riese's Anthologia Latina (Vol. 2)*, "CPh" 77, 1982, 113-132, at 125); cf. Merfeld (n. 4), 117. As in Vergil's passage, the conjunction does not imply "I have also been singled out by Apollo, (as you have been)", but rather "I am also protected by a superior authority (together with my song), (as you are), in my case of Apollo" (cf. F. Leo, Review of H. Schenkl, *Calpurnii et Nemesiani Bucolica*, "Zeitschrift für die österreich. Gymnasien" 36, 1885, 611-621, at 617; A. Cucchiarelli, *Publio Vergilio Marone, Le Bucoliche*, Rome 2012, 223-224); possibly the idea "I have also received an order to sing, (like you have received one)" is also present (cf. 16 *iubet* and 18 *iussit*).

⁹ They include *commulsit* ("sanft berührt, d.h. geküsst": Ribbeck (n. 7), 408), *confovit*, (*mi...*) *colluxit*, (*mi...*) *confulsit* (Schmid (n. 5), 90), *convenit* (Theiler (n. 5), 571), *est adfatus*

possibly the right solution is still to be found¹⁰.

Let us now turn to line 1.18. One popular solution to the problems connected with both lines 1.17-18 has been proposed by Gunther Scheda¹¹. According to him, the main model of these lines is Verg. *Ecl.* 6.3-5:

*cum canerem reges et proelia, Cynthia aurem
vellit et admonuit: 'pastorem, Tityre, pinguis
pascere oportet ovis, deductum dicere carmen'.¹²*

Consequently, Ladas' phrase is also supposed to describe a similar *revocatio*, with the lyre denoting epic poetry and the word *canendo* the bucolic one, and with Apollo summoning Ladas to reject his formerly praised epic songs in favour of bucolic. To support this interpretation of the words *cano* and *chelys*, Scheda adduces a parallel from Calpurnius, Calp. *Ecl.* 4.65-67:

*ille fuit vates sacer et qui posset avena
praesonuisse chelyn, blanda cui saepe canenti
adlusere ferae, cui substitit advena quercus.*

Scheda's interpretation of this latter text is, however, quite controver-

(H. Fuchs, *Die Friede als Gefahr: Zum Zweiten Einsiedler Hirtengedichte*, "HSCPh" 63, 1958, 363-385, at 369), *conspexit* (H. Fuchs, *Zu den Hirtengedichten des Calpurnius Siculus und zu den Carmina Einsidlensia*, "MH" 30, 1973, 228-233, at 231), *compellat* (Shackleton Bailey (n. 8), 125). Other conjectures proposed so far are *corruptit* (R. Peiper, *Praefationis in Senecae tragoedias nuper editas supplementum*, Wrocław 1870, 30), *percussit* (H. Hagen, *Zur Erklärung und Kritik der beiden bukolischen Novitäten aus Einsiedeln*, "Jahrbücher für klassische Philologie" 103, 1871, 139-152, at 141), *commovit (... oestro)* (E. Baehrens, *Kritische Saturae*, "Jahrbücher für klassische Philologie" 105, 1872, 353-365, at 357), *(mi...) cor movit* (Baehrens (n. 2), 61), *concuissit* (J. Mähly, *Satura*, Basel 1886, 18), *cor urit* (J.M. Stowasser, *Controverses aus den Idyllen aus Maria-Einsiedeln*, "Zeitschrift für die österr. Gymnasien" 47, 1896, 976-984, at 977; note that the conjecture is unmetrical), *confudit* (Schmid (n. 5), 91), *convertit* (Scheda (n. 5), 53), *cor rupit* (" 'aber mich unterbrach Cynthia in meinem Herzen' (zu verstehen: 'in dieser Art des Dichtens setzte er in meinem Herzen ein Ende')"): Z. Zlatuška, *Kritische Textbemerkung zu Carmen Einsidlense I*, "Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity, E: Řada archeologicko-klasická" 13, 1968, 175-178, at 176), *cor rumpit* (R. Verdière, Review of Korzeniewski (n. 2), "Gnomon" 45, 1973, 719-721, at 720-721), *(ad me...) prorupit* (Liberman (n. 4), 273).

¹⁰ The best idea I can come up with myself is *(mi...) subrisit* (cf. Calp. *Ecl.* 4.84-86 at *mihi, qui nostras praesenti numine terras / perpetuamque regit iuvenili robore pacem, / laetus et augusto felix arrideat ore*), but it also implies a rather complicated scenario of corruption (*surrisit* > *corrisit* / *corrosit* > *corru(m)pit*?).

¹¹ Scheda (n. 5); cf. I. Lana, *Il principato di Nerone*, in I. Lana, E.V. Maltese (eds.), *Storia della civiltà letteraria greca e latina*, vol. 2, Turin 1998, 819-833, at 828, Schubert (n. 4), 143, Merfeld (n. 4), 117.

¹² Since the parallel to the order by Apollo in *Einsiedeln Eclogue* 1.18 is anyway to some extent relevant (cf. also *Cynthia* in *Einsiedeln Eclogue* 1.17 and Verg. *Ecl.* 6.3), an equivalent for *aurem vellit* might be appropriate instead of *corruptit* in line 17, whether we accept Scheda's theory or not.

sial¹³, and so Calpurnius' passage is hardly sufficient to prove that both words can have such meanings¹⁴; *cano* as "sing in a bucolic manner" is particularly unconvincing.

An alternative interpretation has been recently proposed by Justin Stover¹⁵. He suggests that the passage in the *Einsiedeln Eclogues* alludes to the names of the characters and implies the idea known from Plin. *NH* 7.204 that the legendary Thamyris was the inventor of playing cithara without voice, while singing to the accompaniment of this instrument was introduced (presumably later) by another musician (viz., Amphion or Linus)¹⁶. "The force of [Ladas'] boast", Stover claims, "only makes sense in the context" of this story in Pliny: "[u]nlike his rival's namesake, Ladas makes music with both lyre and voice"¹⁷. This interpretation might be right, but, beside implying a somewhat strained reading of Pliny's text¹⁸, it leaves *laudatam* completely unexplained.

A different solution is probably to be sought.

Now, if the lyre is not a shepherd's instrument, it is reasonable to suppose that it is mentioned in the text due to some other associations. Scholars have thought about Apollo's lyre and Nero's lyre¹⁹, but both ideas were mainly

¹³ See in particular B. Schröder, *Carmina non quae nemorale resultent: Ein Kommentar zur 4. Ekloge des Calpurnius*, Frankfurt am Main, Bern, New York and Paris 1991, 127-128.

¹⁴ Cf. Karakasis (n. 5), 287 n. 27.

¹⁵ J. Stover, *Olybrius and the Einsiedeln Eclogues*, "JRS" 105, 2015, 288-321, at 307.

¹⁶ *Cythara sine voce cecinit Thamyris primus, cum cantu Amphion, ut alii, Linus*. The shepherd contending with Ladas in the first *Einsiedeln Eclogue* is actually called Thamyras, not Thamyris (as guaranteed by the meter of line 21), but both name variants are found applied to the mythological musician in ancient texts.

¹⁷ Stover (n. 15), 307.

¹⁸ The problem is that Thamyras/Thamyris is usually described in ancient texts as a singer (cf. already *Il.* 2.595; Gr. ἀοιδή, unlike Lat. *cantus*, *OLD* s.v. 5, never means purely instrumental music; for seeming exceptions like Eur. *Med.* 425, see D.J. Mastronarde, *Euripides, Medea*, Cambridge 2002, 244) and a citharode (e.g. [Apollod.] 1.3.3), and Pliny himself refers to him elsewhere as *Thamyram citharoedum* (Plin. *NH* 35.144; the spelling of the name has of course to be unified in these two passages and a further instance in the same chapter *NH* 7.204 in prospective editions, contrary to the post-Detlefsenian vulgate reproduced by the contemporary editions, unless one supposes that Pliny distinguishes Thamyras the citharode and Thamyris the citharist). While Plin. *NH* 7.204 might seem to imply that Thamyris/Thamyras was not a citharode but only a citharist, the text does not actually say this; we can imagine, for instance, that Thamyris first invented playing cithara without voice but later learned the alternative technique of citharody from his colleagues.

¹⁹ Nero is usually supposed to be the emperor praised at least in some parts of the poem. Some scholars now express doubts about the Neronian dating of the poem: see my forthcoming discussion, where I argue that, while the traditional date can no more be qualified as uncontested, there still remain uncountered arguments in favour of it. For Nero's fondness of playing cithara and of the image of Apollo the citharode, see E. Champlin, *Nero*, Cambridge

accompanied by impossible interpretations of the expression *variare canendo*²⁰. Connecting the lyre with Apollo is particularly attractive, since it is his command that is described in line 18. A new idea is needed as to what this lyre has to do with Ladas, together with some new emendation, since the transmitted text apparently does not allow for a plausible interpretation.

Most words in line 18 hardly seem to be corrupt: *chelyn* and *variare canendo* are appropriate expressions that are unlikely to be generated by errors, while *iussit* is perhaps confirmed by Verg. *Ecl.* 6.3-4. The word that falls under suspicion is therefore *laudatam*, as was realised already by Jacob Mähly²¹. I suggest that we read *mandatam* instead of *laudatam* and explain the mention of a lyre in connection with a shepherd by the idea that Apollo gave his instrument to Ladas while ordering him to sing in a kind of poetic initiation. This emendation solves both problems pointed above in line 18. The corruption of *mandatam* to *laudatam* is easy since *n* and *u* look similar in Latin minuscule script²² and the first letter of a verse is particularly liable to corruption since scribes often omitted it leaving room for coloured initials to be added later²³. For *mando* of giving a physical object, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 8.506, Stat. *Silv.* 3.3.116-117; for a similar construction combining *mando* with *iussit*, cf. *Priap.* 24.1-2:

*hic me custodem fecundi vilicus horti
mandati curam iussit habere loci.*

A deity giving his or her instrument to a poet is also a widespread motif: among other instances, it is clearly implied in the fact that Ladas puts at stake a pan-pipe presented to him by Faunus (1.9) and also attested in a very

Ma 2003, 53-83, 112-144.

²⁰ The most common interpretation takes *variare canendo* to mean “praise”: Baehrens (n. 2), 62; Mähly (n. 9), 19; O. Crusius, *Zu den Einsiedler Bucolica*, “Philologus” 54, 1895, 380-383, at 381 (“variis carminibus celebrare”); S. Döpp, *Hic vester Apollo est. Zum ersten Einsiedler Gedicht*, “Hermes” 121, 1993, 252-254, at 254. While this reading might seem to be supported by the fact that Ladas does praise in his song either the emperor playing cithara like Apollo or Apollo himself playing cithara (1.27-34), Schubert (n. 4), 143 n. 24 appears to be right that translating *variare canendo* like this “ist schon sprachlich unmöglich”. Verdrière (n. 2), 266 n. 623 seems to suggest that *variare* is here equivalent to *superare*, if I understand him correctly; this is clearly also impossible. Pearce (n. 5), 102 imagines Ladas singing to the lyre played by Apollo; the text admits this understanding, but the situation described is in this case rather strange, and the phrasing of the poet, at least as transmitted, is hardly sufficient to make it immediately clear for the reader.

²¹ Mähly (n. 9), 19: “*laudatamque* kann freilich verdorben sein!” In particular, his idea was that an explicit reference to Nero’s lyre might be concealed by this word, but cf. n. 20 above on his interpretation.

²² The text certainly contains errors caused by misinterpretation of a minuscule source: see Lösch (n. 5), 8.

²³ See e.g. J. L. Butrica, *Editing Propertius*, “CQ” 47, 1997, 176-208, at 185.

similar context (also developing Verg. *Ecl.* 3.62-63) in Calp. *Ecl.* 2.28-29:

Idas

*me Silvanus amat, dociles mihi donat avenas
et mea frondenti circumdat tempora taeda.*

To be sure, there remain some difficulties in the text as I propose to restore it. Receiving a lyre from Apollo does not look absolutely natural in the context of the statement that both shepherds play *calami* in line 1.4, and the same Ladas turns out to have received two different instruments from two different gods: a pan-pipe from Faunus and a lyre from Apollo. But some such contradictions seem inevitable in this text (in particular, as I hope to have shown, the words *chelyn* and *variare canendo* are unlikely to be corrupt and at the same time unlikely to mean something other than that Ladas is supposed to play the lyre). It is perhaps reasonable to suppose that the poet chose to neglect minor difficulties created by his decision to introduce a bold statement about Apollo's protection of Ladas that would counterbalance Thamyras' boast even despite contradicting the traditional features of the pastoral world, otherwise respected in the poem. In other words, the reader is supposed to take separate statements separately and is not supposed to compare musical instruments associated with Ladas in different passages of the poem; on its own, however, each passage is somehow motivated.

Moscow

MIKHAIL SHUMILIN

A. M. Gorky Institute of World Literature of the Russian Academy of Sciences
Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration

ABSTRACT:

The article attempts to reconsider the problems connected with line 18 of the first *Einsiedeln Eclogue*. It is suggested that not only the notoriously problematic verb in line 17, but also the situation described in line 18 still remains unexplained: while inspiring one of the competing shepherds in a kind of poetic initiation, Apollo seems to be said to have ordered him to do something with a lyre, an obviously un-pastoral instrument in its associations. The reasons this lyre is referred to as "praised" are also not clear. The author of the article proposes to emend *laudatam* in line 18 to *mandatam*.

KEYWORDS:

Einsiedeln Eclogues, bucolic, Apollo, conjecture, poetic initiation, lyre.