Dicite, Pierides

Dicite, Pierides:

Classical Studies in Honour of Stratis Kyriakidis

Edited by

Andreas N. Michalopoulos,
Sophia Papaioannou
and Andrew Zissos

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

Dicite, Pierides:
Classical Studies in Honour of Stratis Kyriakidis

Edited by Andreas N. Michalopoulos, Sophia Papaioannou
and Andrew Zissos

This book first published 2017

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-5275-0288-0
ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-0288-8

CONTENTS

Part II. Latin Literature

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Myrto Garani is Assistant Professor of Latin Literature at the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens. She is the author of *Empedocles Redivivus: Poetry and Analogy in Lucretius* (Routledge, 2007). Other publications include a book (co-edited with David Konstan) entitled *The Philosophizing Muse: The Influence of Greek Philosophy on Roman Poetry (3rd Cent. BC – 1st Cent. AD)* (Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014). She is particularly interested in the reception of Empedocles in Latin literature and the presence of (Neo)pythagorianism and Orphism at Rome. Current research activity includes the investigation of philosophical elements in Ovid's poetry.

Ingo Gildenhard is Reader in Classics and the Classical Tradition at the University of Cambridge and a fellow of King's College. He has published *Paideia Romana: Cicero's Tusculan Disputations* (CUP, 2007) and *Creative Eloquence: The Construction of Reality in Cicero's Speeches* (OUP, 2011) and enjoys a long-standing collaboration with Andrew Zissos on Ovid and all matters Ovidian. Recent ventures include the co-edited volume *Transformative Change in Western Thought: A History of Metamorphosis from Homer to Hollywood* (Legenda, 2013) and a text book on Ovid's Pentheus episode: *Ovid, Metamorphoses, 3.511-733: Latin Text with Introduction, Commentary, Glossary of Terms, Vocabulary Aid and Study Questions* (Open Book Publishers, 2016).

Philip R. Hardie is a Senior Research Fellow at Trinity College, Cambridge, and Honorary Professor of Latin Literature in the University of Cambridge. He is also a Fellow of the British Academy. He is the author of *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium* (OUP, 1986); *The Epic Successors of Virgil: A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition* (CUP, 1993); *Virgil: Aeneid Book IX* (CUP, 1994); *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion* (CUP, 2002); *Lucretian Receptions: History, The Sublime, Knowledge*, CUP, 2009); *Rumour and Renown: Representations of Fama in Western Literature* (CUP, 2012); *The Last Trojan Hero: A Cultural History of Virgil's Aeneid* (I. B. Tauris, 2014); and *Ovidio Metamorfosi, vol. vi, libri xiii-xv* (Mondadori, 2015). Hardie is the editor of *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid* (CUP, 2002); *Paradox and the Marvellous in*

Augustan Literature and Culture (OUP, 2009); *Augustan Poetry and the Irrational* (OUP, 2016). He is also co-editor of several volumes including (with Alessandro Barchiesi and Stephen Hinds) of *Ovidian Transformations: Essays on Ovid's Metamorphoses and its Reception* (Cambridge Philological Society, 1999); and (with Helen Moore) of *Classical Literary Careers and their Reception* (CUP, 2010). He is a General Editor of *Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics.*

Stephen J. Harrison is Professor of Latin Literature at the University of Oxford and Fellow and Tutor in Classics at Corpus Christi College. His major publications include: *A Commentary on Vergil, Aeneid 10* (OUP, 1991), *Apuleius: A Latin Sophist* (OUP, 2000), *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace* (OUP, 2007), *Framing the Ass: Literary Form in Apuleius' Metamorphoses* (OUP, 2013) and *Horace* (CUP, 2014), co-author of *Apuleius: Rhetorical Works* (OUP, 2001) [jointly with John Hilton and Vincent Hunink], *A Commentary on Apuleius Metamorphoses IV.28-VI.24* (Egbert Forsten, 2004) [jointly with the seven other members of the Groningen Apuleius Group], and *A Commentary on Apuleius Metamorphoses XI: The Isis-Book* (Brill, 2015) [jointly with the seven other members of the Groningen Apuleius Group]. He also has edited and co-edited nine volumes on Virgil, Horace, Apuleius and Latin Intertextuality, including more recently: *The Cambridge Companion to Horace* (CUP, 2007); *The Greek and the Roman Novel: Parallel Readings* (Barkhuis, 2007), joint ed. with M. Paschalis, S. Frangoulidis, and M. Zimmerman; *Classics in the Modern World: A 'Democratic Turn'?* (OUP, 2013), joint ed. with Lorna Hardwick; *Generic Interfaces in Latin Literature. Encounters, Interactions and Transformations* (De Gruyter, 2013), joint ed. with Theodoros Papanghelis and Stavros Frangoulidis.

Andromache Karanika is Associate Professor of Classics at the University of California, Irvine and the current editor of *Transactions of the American Philological Association* (*TAPhA*). She received her PhD at Princeton University and has published articles on Homer, women's oral genres, lament, and pastoral poetry. She is the author of *Voices at Work: Women, Performance and Labor* (Johns Hopkins UP, 2014), and has also co-authored a textbook on Modern Greek. Her current projects include articles on Homeric reception in Late Antiquity and Byzantium and a book on wedding songs and poetics.

George Kazantzidis is Assistant Professor of Latin Literature at the University of Patras. He has also been working as an Adjunct Lecturer in Latin at the Open University of Cyprus; and he is a Senior Research Associate at the Faculty of Humanities, University of Johannesburg, SA (Department of Greek and Latin Studies). He obtained his PhD from Oxford University (2011) with a thesis on melancholia in Hellenistic and Latin poetry. His research interests lie primarily in the intersections between ancient medicine and poetry, and the history of mental illness. Forthcoming articles include a discussion of medical language in the comedies of Menander and Plautus and a reassessment of Callimachus' Acontius and Cydippe (*Aetia* fr.75), considered through the lens of Hippocratic gynaecology.

David Konstan is Professor of Classics at New York University and Professor Emeritus of Classics and Comparative Literature at Brown University. Among his books are *Roman Comedy* (Cornell UP, 1983); *Sexual Symmetry: Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres* (PUP, 1994); *Greek Comedy and Ideology* (OUP, 1995); *Friendship in the Classical World* (CUP, 1997); *Pity Transformed* (Duckworth, 2001); *The Emotions of the Ancient Greeks: Studies in Aristotle and Classical Literature* (Univ. of Toronto Press, 2006); *"A Life Worthy of the Gods": The Materialist Psychology of Epicurus* (Parmenides Publishing, 2008); *Before Forgiveness: The Origins of a Moral Idea* (CUP, 2010); and *Beauty: The Fortunes of an Ancient Greek Idea* (OUP, 2014). He is a past president of the American Philological Association, and a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and Honorary Fellow of the Australian Academy of the Humanities.

Robert Maltby is, since 2010, Emeritus Professor of Latin Philology at the University of Leeds, where he served as Professor of Latin Philology for ten years (2000-2010). He holds undergraduate and postgraduate degrees in Classics from Cambridge. His main publications include *A Selection of Latin Love Elegy* (Bristol Classical Press, 1980), *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies* (Francis Cairns, 1991), *Tibullus Elegies: Text, Introduction and Commentary* (Francis Cairns, 2002), *Terence: Phormio* (Aris and Phillips, 2012) and most recently, in collaboration with Kenneth Belcher, a course-book entitled *Wiley's Real Latin*: *Learning Latin from the Source* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2013). Currently he is preparing *[Tibullus] Elegies III: Text, Introduction and Commentary* for the Pierides series, Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Andreas N. Michalopoulos is Professor of Latin Literature at the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens. He is the author of *Ancient Etymologies in Ovid's Metamorphoses: A Commented Lexicon* (Francis Cairns, 2001), *Ovid, Heroides 16 and 17: Introduction, Text and Commentary* (Francis Cairns, 2006), and (in Greek) *Ovid, Heroides 20 and 21: Introduction, Text and Commentary* (Papadimas, 2013). His research interests include Augustan poetry, ancient etymology, Roman drama, the Roman novel, and the modern reception of classical literature.

Charilaos N. Michalopoulos is Assistant Professor of Latin at the Department of Greek Philology of the Democritus University of Thrace. His research interests include Augustan poetry, gender studies and classics, and the modern reception of Latin literature. His recent publications include articles on Ovid, Seneca and Martial. He is the author of a monograph (in Greek) entitled *Myth, Language and Gender in the Corpus Priapeorum* (Pedio, 2014).

Sophia Papaioannou is Professor of Latin Literature at the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens. Her main research interests are the literature of the Age of Augustus, Ancient Epic and Roman Comedy. She is the author of two books on Ovid: *Epic Succession and Dissension: Ovid, Metamorphoses 13.623-14.582*, *and the Reinvention of the Aeneid* (De Gruyter, 2005); and of *Redesigning Achilles: The 'Recycling' of the Epic Cycle in Ovid, Metamorphoses 12.1-13.620* (De Gruyter, 2007). She is also editor of the volume *Terence and Interpretation* (Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014).

Antonis Petrides is Associate Professor of Greek Literature at the Open University of Cyprus. He studied Classics at the Universities of Thessaloniki and Cambridge (Trinity College). His research focuses principally on Greek and Latin theatre and its modern reception. His publications include the monograph *Menander, New Comedy, and the Visual* (CUP, 2014), the volumes *New Perspectives on Postclassical Comedy* (Cambridge Scholars Publishing 2010, co-edited with Sophia Papaioannou) and *Greek Tragedy after the Fifth Century* (CUP, forthcoming, co-edited with Vayos Liapis), as well as an *Introduction to the History of Cyprus* (Open University of Cyprus, 2013, co-edited with George Kazamias and Emmanouil Koumas).

Maria Plastira-Valkanou is Assistant Professor of Greek Literature at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. The title of her PhD thesis was *Antipater of Thessalonica. Select Epigrams. A Linguistic and Stylistic Commentary*, Ghent 1987. Her publications are principally on Hellenistic Poetry, the Greek Epigram (especially by poets of Macedonian origin) and the Ancient Greek Novel. She is currently preparing a monograph on the epigrams of Geminus.

Consuelo Ruiz-Montero is Professor of Greek Philology at the University of Murcia (Spain). She is active in three main areas of research: Greek narrative, Greek rhetoric, and the history of the Greek Language (late Greek). She has published three books: *La estructura de la novela griega. Análisis funcional* (Universidad de Salamanca, 1988); *Hermógenes, Sobre las formas de estilo, introd, trad., y notas* (Gredos, 1993); *La novela griega* (Sinthesis, 2006). She is author of more than fifty papers on different aspects of the Greek novels. Currently she is editing a book, *Orality and Greek Literature in the Roman Empire*, for Cambridge Scholars Publishing, and has a number of forthcoming papers on papyri of the Greek novel.

Evanthia Tsitsibakou-Vasalos was, until her retirement in August 2016, Associate Professor of Ancient Greek Literature at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. She holds a BA in Classical Philology from the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, and received her MA and PhD degrees from the University of Chicago. Her principal research interests are ancient epic and lyric poetry, particularly Stesichorus (her PhD thesis was entitled *Stesichorus and his Poetry*), Alcman and Pindar. She is the author of *Ancient Poetic Etymology. The Pelopids: Fathers and Sons* (Franz Steiner, 2007), and numerous articles on the above authors.

Ioannis Ziogas is presently Lecturer of Latin at the University of Durham; he was previously a lecturer of Classics at the Australian National University. He is the author of *Ovid and Hesiod: The Metamorphosis of the Catalogue of Women* (CUP, 2013) and co-editor (with Marios Skempis) of *Geography, Topography, Landscape: Configurations of Space in Greek and Roman Epic* (De Gruyter, 2013).

Andrew Zissos is Professor and Chair of Classics at the University of California, Irvine. He is the author of numerous articles on imperial Roman literature and its reception, along with a commentary on Book 1 of Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica* (OUP, 2008); he is also editor of *A*

Companion to the Flavian Age of Imperial Rome (Wiley-Blackwell, 2016). He has a long-standing Ovidian collaboration with Ingo Gildenhard, which runs to many articles (including their joint contribution to this volume), the co-edited volume *Transformative Change in Western Thought: a History of Metamorphosis from Homer to Hollywood* (Legenda, 2013), and most recently a textbook on Ovid's Pentheus episode: *Ovid, Metamorphoses, 3.511-733: Latin Text with Introduction, Commentary, Glossary of Terms, Vocabulary Aid and Study Questions* (Open Book Publishers, 2016).

ABBREVIATIONS

1. Ancient Literature

Abbreviations for Greek and Roman literature follow the conventions of the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 4th edition, with the following additions:

CP	*Corpus Priapeorum*
Dsc.	Dioscorides (Medicus)
Hsch.	Hesychius (Lexicographus)
Luc.	Lucian
Lex.	*Lexiphanes*
Tox.	*Toxaris*
Lucr.	Lucretius
DRN	*De Rerum Natura*
OA	*Orphic Argonautica*
Val. Fl.	Valerius Flaccus, *Argonautica*

2. Modern Reference Works

DNP	*Der Neue Pauly*
FGrHist	F. Jacoby, ed., *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, 15 vols. (Berlin, 1923-58)
HPNG	F. Bechtel, *Die historischen Personennamen der Griechen bis zur Kaiserzeit* (Halle, 1917)
LGPN 1, 3A, 3B, 4	P. M. Fraser and E. Matthews, eds., *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names 1* (Oxford, 1987) 3A (Oxford, 1997), 3B (Oxford, 2000), 4 (Oxford, 2005)
LGPN 2	M. Osborne and S. Byrne, eds., *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names 2* (Oxford, 1994)
LGPN 5A	T. Corsten, ed., *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* 5A (Oxford, 2010)

LIMC	*Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*, 8 vols. (Zurich and Munich, 1981-2009)
LSJ	H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, rev. H. S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th edition (with Supplement, Oxford, 1968)
OLD	P. G. W. Glare, ed., *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (Oxford, 1968-82)
PMG	D. L. Page, ed., *Poetae melici Graeci* (Oxford, 1962)
PMGF	M. Davies, ed. *Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta,* vol. I (Oxford, 1991)
RE	A.E. von Pauly, rev. G. Wissova et al., *Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertums-wissenschaft* (Stuttgart, 1893-1980)
TLG	*Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*
TrGF	B. Snell, R. Kannicht, S. Radt, eds., *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, 6 vols. (Göttingen, 1971–2004)

INTRODUCTION

ANDREAS N. MICHALOPOULOS,
SOPHIA PAPAIOANNOU AND ANDREW ZISSOS

1. Stratis Kyriakidis

Stratis Kyriakidis was born in Athens in 1944. After he finished elementary school his family moved to England, where he completed his secondary education at St Peter's Grammar School in Bournemouth. He spent the next six years in Melbourne, Australia, and during that period developed an intense interest in the ancient world. The award of a Greek state scholarship provided him with the opportunity to pursue that interest: he returned to Greece in 1970 and shortly thereafter began his studies as a mature student in the School of History and Archaeology at the University of Athens. The early seventies were a turbulent time for the Greek capital in more than one respect. Under the military junta, freedom of speech, including cultural expression of many kinds, was vigorously suppressed. Like many others, Kyriakidis found his own way to overcome the cultural barrenness imposed by the colonels. He formed a close friendship with two fellow students—Theodosis Pylarinos, later Professor of Modern Greek Literature at the Ionian University, and the poet Manos Loukakis, who passed away in 2011. The three of them created their own cultural haven, with poetry readings and intellectual discussion. Their all-night gatherings had a profound effect on Kyriakidis, opening new horizons and paving the way for his study of classical literature. It was during his studies that Kyriakidis met his future wife and lifelong collaborator, fellow classicist Eleni Peraki. After a few years teaching in secondary education (Campion School, Scuola Italiana d'Atene), Kyriakidis left for Thessaloniki with his wife and young son to take up a teaching post at the Classics Department of the Aristotle University and to write his doctoral thesis, under the supervision of Nikos Petrochilos, who was Professor of Latin there. Petrochilos' innovative approach to classical texts had a formative and enduring impact on Kyriakidis, who defended his thesis in 1986. The 1980s were turbulent years for the teaching of classical

languages and literature in Greece, as classical education came under attack from many quarters. Turmoil notwithstanding, Kyriakidis found a home amidst the community of scholars of the Department of Classics of the Aristotle University: the mentorship of Petrochilos, and, more broadly, the rich intellectual environment of the Department, helped Kyriakidis to flourish as both teacher and scholar. He retired in 2011, after a productive career of 30 years.

Kyriakidis' commitment to pedagogy, particularly at the graduate level, has been a hallmark of his career. When asked to identify his single most worthwhile accomplishment, he points without hesitation to a graduate seminar he organised and taught during the academic year 2002-3. In this course a number of distinguished scholars were invited to give lectures, including Alessandro Barchiesi, Marco Fantuzzi, Philip Hardie, Richard Hunter, and Alessandro Schiesaro.

Kyriakidis served for nearly two decades as departmental coordinator of the Erasmus exchange programme between the Thessaloniki Classics Department and the Leeds School of Classics. In recognition of his tireless service in this role, which extended well beyond administrative tasks, the University of Leeds honoured him with the title of Visiting Professor in 2008.

Following his retirement in 2011 Kyriakidis returned to settle in Athens, where his scholarly activity continues unabated. Together with Philip Hardie (one of the contributors to this volume), he is editor of the book series *Pierides, Studies in Greek and Latin literature*, published by Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

As is usually the case, particular mentors and situations played a crucial role in the development of Kyriakidis' scholarly profile. The influence of Nikos Petrochilos during the dissertation stage in Thessaloniki has already been mentioned. As an undergraduate student at Athens, Kyriakidis drew inspiration from the lessons and seminars of the late Spyros Iakovidis, Professor of Archaeology and Member of the Academy of Athens. No less formative was the training he received during three consecutive summers at the Numismatic Museum of Athens under Manto Oeconomidou, Director and Curator of the Numismatic Collection, from whom Kyriakidis acquired a keen appreciation for *minutiae*. The insight that the essence of a matter can lie hidden in a seemingly insignificant detail is one that Kyriakidis has fruitfully applied to the study of Latin literature in a variety of contexts. The tendency to focus on the visual and the iconic aspect of literary texts is perhaps another aspect of

Kyriakidis' work that reflects, whether consciously or unconsciously, his early training as an archaeologist.

In what follows an attempt will be made to outline the principal accomplishments of Kyriakidis' scholarship, while identifying critical tendencies that characterise his distinctive approach to Latin literature. This approach has often led him to challenge entrenched scholarly positions, and establish new parameters for critical discussion.

An early research interest of Kyriakidis' professional career was the Christian poetess Faltonia Betitia Proba and her *Cento Vergilianus de laudibus Christi*. In an initial pair of papers, "Eve and Mary: Proba's technique in the creation of two different figures" (A-5) and "*Pulchro pectore virgo*: Transformations of the Virgilian verses" (A-7, in Greek),[1] Kyriakidis analysed how Proba expresses her religious conception of the life of Christ through the ingenious redeployment of words, phrases and hemistichs drawn from the Virgilian oeuvre. In the first article, Kyriakidis examined the characterisation of Eve and Mary, starting from the observation that Proba allots only 36 verses to Mary compared to 152 to Eve. Rather more subtly, Kyriakidis noted that Proba's description of Mary draws upon a series of Virgilian similes—passages that lie 'outside' the narrative of the source text—so that she is, intertextually speaking, held aloof from contact with specific Virgilian female characters. As a consequence, Proba's Mary remains relatively unindividuated and becomes, as it were, a transcendental figure. Kyriakidis continued his examination of Proba in a third article ("Faltonia Betitia Proba", A-10), published in the first volume of the Italian journal *Kleos*.

Kyriakidis' alertness to the subtleties of Latin textuality is evident in an early article offering a study of syntactic elements in Cicero's *Pro Archia* ("Stylistic Remarks on Cicero's *Pro Archia Poeta*", A-2). By virtue of a careful examination of main and subordinate clauses, this article was able to identify a curious tendency of the speech to reverse the apportioning of semantic weight: it is frequently the subordinate clause that bears primary meaning, with the main clause conveying secondary content. Kyriakidis went on to suggest that this tendency might arise from the advantages it offered Cicero in dealing with anticipated objections on the part of his audience.

[1] Numbers preceded by 'A-' refer to individual articles as enumerated in the following section of the Introduction.

In his 1998 monograph *Narrative Structure and Poetics in the Aeneid: The Frame of Book 6* (B-2),[2] Kyriakidis offered a new reading of the closing lines of Book 6 and the opening verses of Book 7 of Virgil's epic. At first blush, these passages seem to offer little of significance for the enclosing narrative. But as Kyriakidis demonstrated, they take on programmatic significance through the combination of their medial position and their deployment of a series of metaliterary indices drawn from both Callimachean and subsequent Roman literature. Through this metapoetical sequence Virgil marks his own position in the epic tradition, while simultaneously signalling the transition to a new *Roman* discourse for his *maius opus* in the second half of the *Aeneid*.

A particularly provocative chapter of the monograph examines the significance of Erato, Muse of love poetry, who is invoked by the poet in the delayed medial proem at *Aen*. 7.37-41. Prior to Kyriakidis, the established view was that the invocation of this figure near the beginning of Book 7, which corresponds structurally to her invocation by Apollonius Rhodius at the opening of the third book of his epic,[3] had to do with the eventual union of Aeneas with Lavinia. Kyriakidis took an altogether different approach. First, he pointed to Diodorus Siculus' interpretation of Erato's name as denoting the love, *eros,* of culture and education, *paideia* (4.7.4 Ἐρατὼ δ᾽ἀπὸ τοῦ τοὺς παιδευθέντας ποθεινοὺς καὶ ἐπεράστους ἀποτελεῖν, 'because Erato renders the educated men desirable and lovable'), and noted that Plutarch too accepts this etymology and associates the Muse with a way of life "fit for a cultured person" (*Mor*. 746F). He then strengthened this association by pointing to the testimony of the Stoic Lucius Annaeus Cornutus, who identifies Erato with love of philosophy or, alternatively, argues for an etymology of her name from the verb ἔρεσθαι, 'to question' (and ἀποκρίνεσθαι, 'to answer'), which raises an alternative interpretative possibility via the philosophical sub-field of dialectics.[4] Finally, Kyriakidis noted that the etymological derivation of 'Erato' from the verb ἔρεσθαι (and ἀποκρίνεσθαι) is already clearly

[2] Numbers preceded by 'B-' refer to individual books as enumerated in the following section of the Introduction.

[3] Erato is invoked at Ap. Rhod. 3.1-5, that is, at the midpoint of the Hellenistic epic.

[4] ἡδὲ Ἐρατὼ πότερον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔρωτος λαβοῦσα τὴν ὀνομασίαν τὴν περὶ πᾶν εἶδος φιλοσοφίας ἐπιστροφὴν παρίστησιν ἢ τῆς περὶ τὸ ἔρεσθαι καὶ ἀποκρίνεσθαι δυνάμεως ἐπί σκοπός ἐστιν, ὡς δὴ διαλεκτικῶν ὄντων τῶν σπουδαίων ("Erato after receiving her name from love either represents the attention paid to any kind of philosophy or she is the guardian of the power of asking and answering, since all important issues belong to dialectics", Cornutus, *Theol. Graec*. 2.14 Lang).

implied in a fragment from Callimachus' *Aetia*,[5] a work that employs a question-and-answer form of dialogue between poet and the Muses in its first two books. Given the density of Callimachean signs at the start of *Aeneid* 7, clearly intended to signal a relationship to the Hellenistic tradition, Kyriakidis deemed it inherently likely that Virgil featured the Muse Erato in his proem in the middle as an *oppositio in imitando* of Apollonius' *Argonautica*, in order to claim a prominent place in this tradition and to mark his own innovation within it. "In the proem of the seventh book of the *Aeneid* there are two things that the poet wishes to make clear: first, that he takes full control of his *maius opus* and second, that the themes of this *maius opus* have nothing to do with traditional Greek epic and the subjects he is going to treat are novel" (p. 175).

This monograph garnered broadly positive critical reactions, well represented by Christine Perkell's summation in *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*: "this is an earnest study, in which K. presents his arguments with modesty and care; he aims to be clear and forthright. His reading of the 'frame' of *Aeneid* 6, in which he draws readers' attention to features of the text that do merit thoughtful consideration, is plausible in its overall argument, if not in all its component parts. It is likely that *Aeneid* readers, when they next encounter *Aen.* 7, will find themselves recalling and considering K.'s arguments".[6]

Kyriakidis' work on the middle of the *Aeneid* marked the beginning of a broad critical engagement with the question of the middle in Latin poetry. Like others working in this area, he drew inspiration from the work of Gian Biagio Conte, the justly acclaimed article "Proems in the Middle" in particular.[7] In collaboration with Francesco De Martino, Kyriakidis undertook the edited collection *Middles in Latin Poetry* **(**B-3**)**, recruiting a team of distinguished contributors to provide chapters on Roman poets from Lucretius to the Flavian epicists. This volume, which appeared in 2004, was dedicated to the memory of Don Fowler, the first scholar invited to participate in the project, but who sadly passed away before he could complete his contribution.

Kyriakidis' own contribution to the volume was "Middles in Lucretius' *DRN.* The poet and his work" (A-23). In this chapter, Kyriakidis examined the relationship between the structural components of the *DRN* and their contents, proceeding on the basis of the principle of analogy, the cornerstone of Lucretian theory. For Lucretius, although the universe itself

[5] Ἐρατὼ δ' ἀνταπάμειπτο τά[δε, "Erato gave the following answers", *SH* 328.8.
[6] *BMCR* 1999.11.10.
[7] Conte 1992.

has no middle (*DRN* 1.1070-1071, 1081-1082), each individual cosmos possesses a middle of its own and in our cosmos that position is occupied by the earth (*DRN* 5.534). By analogy to this geocentric theory, the middle of the human body is held by the *animus/mens* (*DRN* 3.139-140). Kyriakidis applied the same principle to the construction of the poetic work itself, investigating the function of the middle proem, that of Book 4, within the poem as a whole, as well as its relationship to the proems of the other books. Kyriakidis construed this proem as a privileged *locus* of authorial declaration, in which Lucretius asserts his own originality, while signalling his intention to take over, as it were, from his master Epicurus. The central position of the proem makes it the appropriate textual space for the poet to declare himself 'master' of his own work. In the proems to Books 3 and 5, which flank Book 4, prominence is given to Epicurus. Likewise, the proems to Books 2 and 6, which encompass those of Books 3 and 5, have many themes in common, while the proem-hymn to Venus in the first book is left to function as an introduction to the whole work. Schematically, therefore, leaving aside the initial proem as serving the work as a whole, the thematic arrangement of the proems follows a concentric pattern around the proem to Book 4, the proem in the middle. In this way, Kyriakidis argued, Lucretius dedicates the central poem to his own poetic self-fashioning. In this proem the Muses no longer inspire the poet but serve rather as auditors and judges, a reversal of their traditional role. An important feature of this essay is Kyriakidis' conception of the text as a quasi-architectural construct, an approach that was destined to resurface in subsequent publications.

Shortly thereafter, Kyriakidis examined the proem to Book 4 of the *DRN* from a different angle in the paper "Lucretius' *DRN* 1.926-950 and the Proem to Book 4" (A-24). Previous scholars had frequently dismissed this proem (*DRN* 4.1-25) as little more than a transposition and repetition of 1.926-950. Kyriakidis challenged this reading by taking into consideration the Philodemean principle of ἀμετάθετον and arguing that this is not an instance of *μετάθεσις*[8] (a transposition that is, of verses, often attributed to the unrevised form of the text), but rather a deliberate and subtle device on the part of the poet to highlight his own role in creating the text. In Kyriakidis' view, the category of μετάθεσις is not strictly applicable inasmuch as the two passages have different openings and conclusions. Lines 1.921-925—the opening section of the unit (*DRN* 1.921-950)—are omitted from the proem to Book 4, while the closing lines at 1.949-950 are not identical to their supposed counterparts at *DRN*

[8] Cf. D. Armstrong 1995.

4.24-25. Besides, Kyriakidis pointed out, the ἀμετάθετον is also a Lucretian tenet (*DRN* 1.800-801, 823-827) so that, for the poet, even slight changes in words and verses can affect both meaning and sound. This intervention, by raising anew the problem of this modified repetition of verses, has reopened the critical discussion, as Joseph Farrell has noted.[9]

A noteworthy omission from *Middles in Latin Poetry* was Manilius. This is perhaps unsurprising, as the *Astronomica* has suffered decades of scholarly neglect, from which it has only recently begun to reemerge. Kyriakidis, who continues to play a prominent role in Manilius' critical rehabilitation, undertook belatedly to make good this lacuna in the *Middles* volume, first, and most explicitly, in the paper "Manilian Middles" (A-29) and subsequently in "The universe as audience: Manilius' Poetic Ambitions" (A-37). In the earlier piece Kyriakidis showed how profoundly Manilius' work is influenced by his major literary predecessors, to whom he repeatedly alludes, and on whose poetic techniques he often relies. Much like Lucretius, Virgil, and Ovid in the *Fasti*, Manilius treats the medial position as a particularly fertile poetic *locus* for (meta)literary discourse. In more cosmological terms, Kyriakidis analysed the Manilian description of the universe, in which the earth holds the central position (*Astr.* 1.202-205), noting common ground between Manilius, Lucretius (*DRN* 5.534), and Ovid (*Fast.* 6.273-276). In the later piece, his own contribution to the edited volume *Libera Fama*: *an endless journey* (B-5, on which more below), Kyriakidis argued that the proem in the middle, namely that of Book 3, constitutes a privileged locus in which Manilius—like Lucretius in the *DRN* and Virgil in the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid*—signals his relationship to the tradition and looks to the future of his work and his own literary prospects. Kyriakidis noted the closeness of Manilius and Lucretius here: both poets, in highlighting the originality of their didactic epics, present the tradition as abounding in topics that are best left untreated. Unlike Lucretius, though, Manilius advocates an austere didactic approach that steers clear of *ornamenta* and *speciosae res* (*Astr.* 3.29). He prescribes simple instruction that eschews figures of speech—notwithstanding that he, like Lucretius before him, makes free use of them—and cautions the didactic poet against the pursuit of self-aggrandisement and eternal fame, on the grounds that only *natura* has a claim to eternity. Kyriakidis also examined glory and its personification (*Astr.* 2.808-819) noting that Manilian *Gloria* has traits in common with Ovidian *Fama* (*Met.* 12.39-46), but also draws upon the Callimachean

[9] Farrell 2008, n. 36: "The problem of this repetition has been considered anew from the point of view of Epicurean poetics by Kyriakidis 2006".

Zeus and, more significantly, the Zeus of Cleanthes. Like the Zeus in Cleanthes' *Hymn*, *Gloria* has a reciprocal role to play: 2.808-819 underscores the human need to come in contact with the divine and identifies the poet's supreme purpose as the pursuit of deeper knowledge of the universe. Finally, Kyriakidis adduced dense allusions to Ovid's Pythagoras episode and Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis*, and argued that these intertextual engagements in particular reveal that, precepts to the contrary notwithstanding, Manilius manifests a certain preoccupation with his own literary reputation.

Kyriakidis' critical focus on Manilius gave rise to another essay, "Rome and the *fata Asiae* (Manilius, *Astr.* 1.512)" (A-35), which investigated the concept of 'Troy' and its relationship to the idea of 'Rome'. In this paper Kyriakidis observed that Manilius' first reference to Rome comes via the metonymy *fatis Asiae*; likewise the final mention of the City, towards the end of the poem, once again eschews mention of the *urbs* by name. Kyriakidis first discussed the initial phrase, *fatis Asiae iam Graecia pressa est* ("Already Greece has been weighed down by the fate of Asia", 1.512). As both Virgil and Ovid were engaged with the question of the fate of Rome, interpretation of 1.512 of the *Astronomica* needs to consider the intertextual dialogue between Manilius and his immediate epic predecessors, as well as the contextualisation of this dialogue within an astrological framework. Although Asia is often freighted with negative connotations in Roman literature, Manilius 'absolves' it from these and instead attributes additional, positive qualities. With regard to the zodiac cycle, Asia is under the sign of Taurus (4.753); Italy, on the other hand, is under Libra, a sign representing those belonging to a better organised society and enjoying a more advanced stage of civilisation than those under Taurus. According to Kyriakidis, Asia, the place of origin of Rome's forefathers, represents for Manilius a cultural phase that predates both the culture of Europe and the foundation of Rome. The rise of Rome is a consequence of the dire fate of Asian Troy. In Manilius' day Rome was the ruler of the world: her illustrious future seemed guaranteed by her glorious past. But Manilius has reservations as to Rome's eternity, and he discloses these at the end of the work in the well-known simile whereby the firmament is compared to the social structure of Rome (*Astr.* 5.734-745): whereas a *cognatio naturalis* and a cosmic *concordia* are established in the sky above with *natura* playing its unifying and cohesive role, determining, shaping and controlling everything, in the vehicle of the simile the corresponding unifying force is missing. This is the great difference between Rome and the broader cosmos and it is through this difference that Manilius offers his view on the future of Rome. For the

poet, as Kyriakidis noted, the notion of the *urbs aeterna* is "unrealistic". "The capital of the world empire flourishes like other cities flourished in the past and it too will follow their fate in time to come" (p. 284).

In addition to the visual aspect of Latin textuality, Kyriakidis has often explored manifestations of vision and visuality in Latin literature. This line of enquiry started with his first book, *Roman Sensitivity: A Contribution to the Study of the Artistic Receptiveness and Creativity of the Romans (146-31 BC)* (B-1). A significant portion of this monograph, a revised version of the doctoral thesis, is devoted to the study of Roman artistic creativity and the influence of Greek culture thereon. The volume includes dedicated chapters on architecture and the visual arts. A critical preoccupation with the visual is also evident in Kyriakidis' *Catalogues of Proper Names in Latin Epic Poetry: Lucretius-Virgil-Ovid* (B-4, discussed more fully below), though now approached from a very different angle. A recurring focus of this study is the ability of the text to imitate extra-textual reality. More specifically, Kyriakidis observed that in numerous instances the placement of the proper names in the verses of a catalogue mirrors, as it were, the position or order of things in physical or topographical space. This tendency, Kyriakidis argued, reflects in part the influence of what the poets in question had before their eyes. This includes a number of suggestive works in which the text was so arranged as to form the shape of an object. The Hellenistic *technopaignia*, for instance, such as the *Wings of Eros* or *The Axe* and *The Egg* by Simmias, or even Theocritus' *Pipe* were certainly known to Virgil and Ovid.

In the paper "From Delos to Latium: Wandering in the Unknown" (A-31), Kyriakidis identified and analysed an intriguing instance of literary visualisation at *Aeneid* 3.124-127. In these lines, the Trojans are said to leave the island of Delos (*Ortygiae portus*) heading southward for Crete. But the enumeration of four Cycladic islands passed *en route* (125-126) indicates an erratic course:

> *linquimus* ***Ortygiae portus*** *pelagoque volamus*
> *bacchatamque iugis* ***Naxon*** *viridemque* ***Donusam***,
> ***Olearon*** *niveamque* ***Paron*** sparsas*que per aequor*
> Cycladas, *et crebris legimus freta concita terris.*

We are leaving the port of Ortygia and fly over the sea past Naxos with its bacchic ridges, green Donusa, Olearos, gleaming white Paros, the Cyclades scattered across the sea we pass and over the waves stirred up by the frequent shores of the islands.

A glance at a map suffices to reveal that the placement of the island names in the verses corresponds to their position in the Aegean Sea. All of this, Kyriakidis argued, neatly reinforces Anchises' erroneous interpretation of Apollo's instructions as to the Trojan's fated destination; *error* and *errores* are the principal matter of *Aeneid* 3.

A similarly 'topographical' analysis was proferred by Kyriakidis in a slightly earlier article, "*Heroides* 20 and 21: Motion and Emotions" (A-28), in which Kyriakidis read Ov. *Her.* 21.81-82 as a map:

> *Et iam transieram* ***Myconon****, iam* ***Tenon*** *et* ***Andron****,*
> *inque meis oculis candida* ***Delos*** *erat.*
>
> And now I had passed Myconos, now Tenos and Andros and shining Delos was before my eyes.

In this passage, Kyriakidis argued, the technique of *Aen.* 3.124-127 was picked up by Ovid, arguably Virgil's best reader in antiquity. Ovid responded with his own play on the topography of Cycladic islands, choosing to 'map out' three immediately to the north of those mentioned by Virgil.[10]

Until very recently, the structure and function of epic catalogues garnered scant critical attention. Kyriakidis' scholarship has done much to change this: his impact is neatly encapsulated in Alastair Fowler's observation that "Kyriakidis has laid the foundation for a history of name catalogues in classical epic".[11]

The pioneering character of Kyriakidis' *Catalogues* monograph (B-4) justifies a detailed presentation of its argumentation. The study is divided into two major sections. In Part I (*Structure and Contents*) Kyriakidis considered the form of catalogues in terms of the frequency of names per verse, producing the following classification: a) density in the middle, b) spacing in the middle, c) ascending/descending mode, d) internal balance, e) erratic patterning. Kyriakidis showed that these patterns affect the reading process in a number of ways. For instance, a sense of narrative acceleration or deceleration may be imparted; the structure may convey balance or, at the other end of the spectrum, a sense of the erratic (in time or space). Of the Latin poets, Virgil turns out to be regular and consistent in his development of these patterns; Ovid in his *Metamorphoses* tends to

[10] On extra-textual mirroring see also Kyriakidis' subsequent article "The text before and after" (A-33).
[11] Fowler 2012, 198.

more disruptive and irregular usage.[12] In Part II (*Catalogues in Context*) Kyriakidis investigated the relationship of the catalogue to, first, its immediate narrative frame, and then to the broader context. A catalogue sometimes ends with a pause, with closural lines, or with the addition of a simile which in a sense extends the effect of the catalogue by virtue of being closely related to it (p. 108). Quite often the framing passage includes broader aesthetic reflections.

Ovid has always ranked high among Kyriakidis' research interests and a number of his most recent papers are devoted to this poet. One of these studies, "Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: The text before and after" **(**A-33), addressed the familiar issue of the poet's anxiety over the future of his name and his work, exploring the implications of Ovid's own characterisation of his *maius opus* as 'unfinished':

> *Inspice maius opus, quod adhuc* ***sine fine*** *reliqui*
> (Ov. *Tr.* 2.63)
>
> Look into my more important work which till now I have left incomplete.

The phrase *sine fine* calls to mind Jupiter's prophecy in the opening book of the *Aeneid,* which refers to the eternity of Rome (*Aen.* 1.279). The Virgilian echo thus imparts a sense of permanence to Ovid's own epic. Kyriakidis explored closely related issues in an article published the same year, "The poet's afterlife: Ovid between epic and elegy" (A-30). This study focused on *Tristia* 1.7, considering line 22 (*vel quod adhuc crescens et rude carmen erat,* "… or because my work was still growing and remained unpolished") in relation to the closural declaration of the *Metamorphoses* (*iamque opus exegi*, "now my work is complete", *Met*. 15.871), and Hor. *C.* 3.30.6-8 (*non omnis moriar… usque ego postera crescam laude recens,* "I shall not wholly die… I shall always grow ever-renewed because of future praise), Kyriakidis observed that every interpretation "is in fact an attempt at providing closure, to give, that is, a work its final form. It is an attempt to carry the work from the process of making (*poesis*) to a 'final' form (*poema*), from *crescens* to *opus exactum*, as declared in the *sphragis* of the *Metamorphoses*. For every interpreter—like the Ovid of the exile poetry reading his earlier work—the *Metamorphoses* is still an *opus rude,* an opus *sine fine* (*Tr*. 2.63), without *finezza*" (p. 364).

[12] A very useful tool, empowering readers to reach their own conclusions, is the Appendix, in which Kyriakidis lists catalogues included in Virgil's *Aeneid* and Ovid's *Metamorphoses,* according to pattern.

In 2012 Kyriakidis made the publication of Philip Hardie's *Rumour and Renown: Representations of* Fama *in Western Literature* (Cambridge University Press) the occasion for a one-day conference at the Department of Classics of the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, to discuss the complexity of *fama* as presented in this landmark study. Hardie himself was the guest of honour, invited to present aspects of his work and comment on the conference participants' reactions to his discussion of *fama* and *gloria*. Kyriakidis undertook to edit the proceedings of the conference, producing the edited volume *Libera fama: an endless journey* (B-5).

In the volume introduction, subtitled "Speech, Fame and Glory: Connecting Past and Future" (A-36), Kyriakidis offered his own thoughts on *fama*. Taking as his point of departure the well-established view that *fama* in literary texts largely functions as a metonymy for the tradition (as Hardie and other contributors to the volume also discuss), he pointed out that the word *φήμη, φάμα* / *fama* with its ending *-μα, -μη, -ma*, designates, as grammarians would put it, "the result of an action". *Fama*, therefore, may have less to do with the spreading of the word than with the word itself. This line of thought prompted Kyriakidis to draw a distinction between the Virgilian and Ovidian personifications of *Fama*: "The mobility of the Virgilian creature… represented the continuously repeated reception of the report. Ovid, on the other hand, does quite the opposite: he shapes *Fama* as something static and abstract, without any special features or facial characteristics and without denoting her movement… Ovid's *Fama* has the quality of finality, as a creation of the past…; it is an acknowledgment that the report of the past has the power to draw to itself all the new voices which will then be filtered through the House of *Fama*".

Kyriakidis' interest in the epic catalogue remains as keen as ever. In a forthcoming paper "Looking Backwards to Posterity: Catalogues of Ancestry from Homer to Ovid" (A-38) he turned to the structure of genealogical catalogues, in order to generalise conclusions regarding catalogue structure in Latin epic, namely, that structural and narrative elements may converge in highlighting the central ideologies of each epic narrative. In the *Iliad*, for example, a hero typically emphasises his socio-cultural eminence, and justifies it through a genealogy that is often traced back to divine origins. To this end he places his name (or a related personal pronoun) at the beginning of the catalogue, close to the name of the founder (a god or another character of divine origin, such as a river) and traces a catalogue down to himself. The ring composition thus formed 'seals' the catalogue and invests the hero with prestige and glory. Other epics opt for different schemes and some, notably the *Odyssey* and Ovid's

Metamorphoses, seem to spurn the clarity of this prototypical Iliadic pattern in their striving for alternative effects.

Finally, in the article, "The patronymics *Pelides* and *Aenides*: Past, present and future in Homeric and Virgilian genealogical catalogues", (A-40), Kyriakidis examined elements of epic catalogues and their spatio-temporal impact. The patronymic, for example, shortens the textual space and reading time of a catalogue while extending its temporal reach by connecting past and present. The article makes an in-depth examination of the function of the patronymics *Pelides* and *Aenides* in the epic catalogues of Homer and Virgil.

2. Stratis Kyriakidis' Publications

Books (B)

1. (1986), *Roman Sensitivity: A Contribution to the Study of the Artistic Receptiveness and Creativity of the Romans (146-31 BC),* Thessaloniki.
2. (1998), *Narrative Structure and Poetics in the* Aeneid*: The frame of Book 6*, Bari: Levante.
3. (2004), (ed. with F. De Martino), *Middles in Latin Poetry*, Bari: Levante.
4. (2007), *Catalogues of Proper Names in Latin Epic Poetry: Lucretius, Virgil, Ovid*. Pierides I. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
5. (2016), (ed.) *Libera Fama: an endless journey*. Pierides VI. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Articles (A)

1. (1984), "Η προβολή της Ρώμης και η χρονική της διάσταση στην *Αινειάδα*" ("The image of Rome across time as recorded in the *Aeneid*") in *Literature and Politics in Augustan times. Proceedings of the First Panhellenic Symposium of Latin Studies,* 29-39, Ioannina.
2. (1987), "Υφολογικές Παρατηρήσεις στον *Pro Archia Poeta* λόγο του Κικέρωνα" ("Stylistic Remarks on Cicero's *Pro Archia Poeta*") in *The Art of Rhetoric in Latin Literature, Proceedings of the Third Panhellenic Symposium of Latin Studies*, 66-74, Thessaloniki.
3. (1988), "Quintus Lutatius Catulus: The quest of glory", in *Proceedings of the Second Panhellenic Symposium of Latin Studies, Ariadne* 4, 61-70.
4. (1992), "Aeneas' narrative and the epic reality developed during the night", *ΕΕΦΣΠΘ* [*Transactions of the School of Philosophy of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki*] 2, 19-37.
5. (1992), "Eve and Mary: Proba's technique in the creation of two different figures", *MD* 29, 121-153.
6. (1993), "*Aeneid* 6.268: *ibant obscuri sola sub nocte per umbram", PLLS* 7, 97-100.
7. (1994), "*Pulchro pectore virgo*: Μεταμορφώσεις σε στίχους του Βεργιλίου" ["*Pulchro pectore virgo*: Transformations of Virgil's verses"], in *The Woman in Latin Literature, Proceedings of the Fourth Panhellenic Symposium of Latin Studies*, 119-130. Rethymno.
8. (1994), "*Invocatio ad Musam* (*Aen.* 7.37)", *MD* 33, 197-206.