

Translating and interpreting Ovid's *Heroides* in 19th century Greece: Philippus Ioannou and his *Φιλολογικά Πάρεργα*

Andreas N. Michalopoulos*

This paper seeks to explore a hitherto uncharted area, namely Ovid's impact on the intellectual and cultural milieu of 19th century Greece, in the decades following the establishment of the independent Greek state after the Revolution against the Ottoman Empire. I will discuss the work of Philippus Ioannou (1796–1880), the first Professor of Philosophy (1839) at the Ottonian University of Athens (now “National and Kapodistrian University of Athens”), mainly focusing on his translation of Penelope's letter to Odysseus (Ov. *Her.* 1). I will discuss Ioannou's language, style, and metre, his notes and comments on the letter, and I will evaluate his Greek translation and his reasons for actually doing this translation.

His full name was Φίλιππος Ιωάννου Πάντος.¹ He was born in Zagora on Mt. Pelion in 1796 (or 1800).² He attended the «Ἑλληνομουσεῖον» of Zagora and had the chance to study with Gregorios Konstantas.³ He was initiated to the «Φιλική Εταιρεία» in Konstaninople⁴ and he took part in the revolutionary struggle of 1821, fighting at Volos and Velesino.⁵ He was appointed secretary of the Admiral Andreas Miaoulis (from 1828-9) and teacher of his children, whom Ioannou accompanied to Munich, where they studied at a military school. In Munich Ioannou studied natural sciences, philosophy and classical philology, and in 1836 he obtained his doctorate of philosophy with his work on meteorites entitled “Untersuchungen von der Stein- und Staub-Niederschlägen und den damit verwandten Meteoren”. In Munich Ioannou also studied Latin, Italian and French,⁶ and taught at the Greek school; among his students were the future king of Greece, Otto, and the future king of Bavaria, Maximilian.⁷

In 1839 Ioannou was appointed full professor of Philosophy at the University of Athens. He held this post until his death in 1880, with a small interval between 1862-3, when he was fired after Otto's fall from power, because he was a well-known supporter of the king. He also became a member of the Greek Parliament representing the University (1846) and then Senator, Rector (1848-1849 and 1857-1858), Dean of the School of Philosophy, member of the University Senate, curator of the National Library and President (1859-1879) of the Athens Archaeological Society and its benefactor.

Ioannou was an ardent student of philosophy and philology. He understood philology as the study of any remarkable ancient or modern language, with particular emphasis on the study of the two classical languages of antiquity, Greek and Latin.⁸ In 1865 he published a collection entitled «Φιλολογικά Πάρεργα». The full title was: «Φιλίππου Ιωάννου, Θετταλομάγνητος, Διδάκτορος τῶν ἐπιστημῶν καὶ Καθηγητοῦ τῆς Φιλοσοφίας ἐν τῷ Ἐθνικῷ Πανεπιστημίῳ Ἀθηνῶν. Προσφωνηθέντα τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ Δημητρίῳ Ι. τῷ Γυαλαῷ». In 1874 Ioannou produced a second, revised and enhanced edition: Ἐκδοσις Β' ἐν ἣ τινὰ διώρθωται ἢ ἐπὶ τὸ κρεῖττον μεταπεποιήται, οὐκ ὀλίγα δὲ καὶ προστέθειται. Ἀθήνησιν, ἐκ τοῦ τυπογραφείου τῶν Ἀδελφῶν Περρῆ, ἐπὶ τῶν ὁδῶν Βουλῆς καὶ Μητροπόλεως.

This collection comprises an impressive variety of philological works. It is divided into two parts: the first part contains translations by Ioannou (with or without notes), while the second part,

* Dr. Andreas N. Michalopoulos, Associate Professor of Latin, School of Philosophy, Faculty of Philology, Department of Classics, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, amichalop@phil.uoa.gr.

¹ For Ioannou's biography see Πατριαρχέας (1936) 7-28; see also Παπᾶς (1930), Γλυκοφρύδη – Λεοντσίνη (1986).

² See Πατριαρχέας (1936) 7 n. 1.

³ Πατριαρχέας (1936) 9.

⁴ Πατριαρχέας (1936) 10.

⁵ Πατριαρχέας (1936) 11-14.

⁶ Πατριαρχέας (1936) 16.

⁷ Πατριαρχέας (1936) 14.

⁸ Πατριαρχέας (1936) 36-7.

under the title «ΩΙΔΑΙ ΚΑΙ ΠΟΙΚΙΛΑ ΑΛΛΑ ΠΟΙΗΜΑΤΑ ΚΑΙ ΕΠΙΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ ΠΡΩΤΟΤΥΠΙΑ», comprises original poems by Ioannou himself.

Here is a list of the volume's wide-ranging contents:

– an introductory letter to his brother

PART I

– translation and commentary of Tacitus' *Germania*

– translation of poems 64 and 66 of Catullus

– translation of the first five books of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (accompanied by introduction and commentary)

– translation of Ovid's *Heroides* 1 and 7, the letters of Penelope and Dido to Odysseus and Aeneas respectively (again accompanied by introduction and commentary)

– translation in doric dialect of Vergil's *Eclogues* 5, 7, and 8 (with commentary)

– translation and commentary of Horace's *Carmen saeculare*

– translation of Schiller's poem entitled *Οἱ θεοὶ τῆς Ἑλλάδος*

– translation into ancient Greek of the folk songs *Μάνα με τους εννιά σου γιους* and *Μάνα, σου λέγω, δεν ἔμπορώ τους Τούρκους να δουλεύω*.

PART II

– Ioannou's own poetic compositions, such as dedicatory and funerary epigrams, odes and proverbs modelled on archaic and Hellenistic poetry. Among these there are certain «Ποιήματα εἰς κλεινά τινα ἐν τῇ ῥωμαϊκῇ ἱστορίᾳ ὀνόματα καὶ ἔτι εἰς οἰκειοὺς τινὰς καὶ φίλους», dealing with Marcus Curtius, Lucretia Collatina, the consul Curius Dentatus and Marcus Horatius, which amply testify for Ioannou's vivid interest in Latin literature and Roman history.⁹

The volume opens with a letter addressed to Ioannou's brother, Dimitrios. This letter, along with the *prolegomena* to each translation, is a valuable source for Ioannou's views on the texts and for his methods of translation.

Regarding the choice of Catullus c. 64, Ioannou states that he intended the translation of this poem as a gift to his hometown, Zagora, since the myth treated therein is directly related to Thessaly: Peleus reigned in Thessaly, the Argo sailed from Iolkos, and the wedding of Peleus and Thetis took place either at Pharsalus or on Pelion. Furthermore, Achilles was raised and educated by the centaur Chiron on Pelion, and Ioannou remembers that as a little kid on the slopes of Pelion he used to imagine seeing Chiron teaching Achilles and other young heroes.

Ioannou then explains to his brother that he composed the funeral poems included in his collection out of love for those to whom they were dedicated; he further states that he translated Tacitus' *Germania* out of love and gratitude for the Germans, to whom he owed his education. As regards his choice to translate Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, this was due to the pleasure Ioannou got from reading this poem, as stated in the preface of the translation (p. 226): «Τὸ ποίημα τοῦτο ψυχαγωγίας χάριν δις καὶ τρις κατὰ σχολὴν ἀναγνοὺς καὶ τέρψιν ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἀρυσάμενος οὐ μικράν».

On the other hand, Ioannou does not mention his reasons for translating Ovid's *Heroides* and the works of Vergil and Horace. Apparently, he does not feel the need to justify his choice to translate the leading and most representative poets of Rome.

The translation of the first letter of the *Heroides* [title: Π. Ὀβιδίου Ἡρωίδων. Ἐπιστολὴ Α΄. Πηνελόπη Ὀδυσσεῖ] comes after the translation and commentary of the first five books of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, which in turn follow a brief note on Ovid's life. There are no *prolegomena* to the translation of the *Heroides*. Ioannou begins with the Ὑπόθεσις, followed by the translation (the *μεθερμηνεία*, as he calls it) and the notes.

⁹ Ioannou's preference for poetry over prose is evident both from his translations from Latin and from his original compositions. A few years prior to the second edition of his *Φιλολογικά Πάρεργα* he had stated in one of his speeches (1870, 76): «Ἡ ποίησις εἶναι θαυμασία τοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου πνεύματος πτέρωσις, δι' ἧς ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἀναπέτεται ἀπὸ τῆς φλαυρότητος καὶ ταπεινότητος τοῦ πραγματικοῦ τούτου Κόσμου εἰς τὸ αἰθέριον ὕψος Κόσμου τελειοτέρου καὶ ιδεώδους καὶ εὐρίσκει ἐν τούτῳ ὅ,τι ματαίως ποθεῖ καὶ ζητεῖ ἐν ἐκείνῳ».

In the first edition of the *Φιλολογικά Πάρεργα* (1865) there is only the translation of Penelope's letter, without the 'Υπόθεσις and without commentary. What's more, there is no translation of Dido's letter to Aeneas, which is an addition to the 2nd edition (1874). Ioannou writes nothing about his choice to translate these particular letters from the *Heroides*, Penelope's to Odysseus and Dido's to Aeneas. I would suggest that he chose Odysseus, because he was the iconic hero of one of the two great Homeric epics, and Aeneas, because he was the iconic hero of the Roman world.

For his translation of Ov. *Her.* 1 Ioannou apparently used the edition of Vitus Loers (1829-30), *P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroides et A. Sabini Epistolae*, Cologne.¹⁰ In the second edition of the *Φιλολογικά Πάρεργα* (1874) Ioannou first gives a brief account («'Υπόθεσις») of the myth following the model of Loers, who in his own edition offers a brief Latin summary of what preceded Penelope's letter. Ioannou starts from Helen's abduction by Paris, which was the cause of the Trojan war. He then refers to the victory of the Greeks and their return to their homeland, adding to Loers' summary that the return of the Greeks was hampered or prevented by Athena, who wanted to avenge the Greeks for their disrespect towards her statue at Troy. Ioannou dates the writing of Penelope's letter in the time of Odysseus' wanderings, and he claims that the central theme of the letter is Penelope's exhortation to her husband to return, now that Troy has fallen and all the other Greeks have already gone back.

The translation is not accompanied by the Latin text. Ioannou maintains in his translation the metrical form of the Latin original, i.e. the elegiac couplet. He translates in magisterial ancient Greek, interspersed with elements of the Homeric dialect. This is a select list of such examples: ἄκοιτις 1 (*Il.* 3.138, *Od.* 1.39), νηυσὶν 5 (*Il.* 1.305, 2.4, *Od.* 1.211, 2.226), ὄβριμους 13 (*Il.* 5.845, 8.473, *Od.* 9.233), πόσιος 24 (*Il.* 1.469, 7.323, *Od.* 1.150, 12.308), πινυτούς 29 (*Od.* 1.229, 4.211), δάμαρ 30 (*Il.* 3.122, 14.503, *Od.* 4.126, 20.290), νηληϊάδαο 63 (*Il.* 8.100, 15.378, *Od.* 3.465), ἐμέθεν 90 (*Il.* 1.525, 2.26, *Od.* 4.592, 6.289), κτεάτεσσι 93 (*Il.* 5.154, 6.426, *Od.* 1.218, 1.430), ἀφαιρή 97 (*Il.* 7.235, *Od.* 20.110), ἀεκαζομένων 100 (*Il.* 6.458, *Od.* 13.277, 18.135), αἴσα 101 (*Il.* 3.59, 10.445, *Od.* 5.40), συφεός 104 (*Od.* 10.238, 320, 14.13), ἔθεν 113 (*Il.* 5.56, 5.80, *Od.* 19.481, 23.304). It is clear that Ioannou's language could be understood only by highly educated readers. After all, Ioannou intended his translations and original poems to be read by foreign colleagues and scholars as well.¹¹

Ioannou's translation is accurate and successful. He writes in the preface of his Catullus translation (*Φιλολογικά Πάρεργα* 1974, p. 155) that he generally remains faithful to the text following a *verbum pro verbo* logic, yet he does not hesitate to depart from the Latin original, if and when needed, so as to give a more accurate and attractive translation: «Τὸ γὰρ κατὰ λέξιν μεθερμηνεύειν μέχρι τούτου μόνον ἔγνω ἐπιτηδεῦσαι, ἐς ὅσον εἶχον τοῖς τοῦ κειμένου ῥήμασιν ἀκριβῶς παρακολουθῶν μήτε ξενοφωνεῖν ἢ ἑλληνικῆς χάριτος ὅλως ἄμοιρα φθέγγεσθαι, μήτ' ἀσαφῆ λέγειν καὶ σκοτεινά· τούναντίον δὲ τῆς διανοίας μᾶλλον ἐφρόντισα, χαίρειν φράσας τοῖς ῥήμασιν, ὅπου γε τούτοις μοι οὐκ ἐνῆν δουλικῶς παρακολουθεῖν ἄνευ τοῦ ὀλιγορῆσαι ὑπὲρ τὸ προσήκον τῆς καθ' Ἑλληνικὰς ἀκριβείας καὶ εὐπειίας».

Along the same line, in his prolegomena to the *Metamorphoses* translation Ioannou states that he tried to render the spirit of Ovid's verses without moving away from the original. His aim was to follow the middle path between a very faithful and literal translation – which can be rough, stiff and difficult to understand – and a very free translation (226): «Ἦν γὰρ μοι κὰν ταῖς τοῦ Ὀβιδίου (227) Μεταμορφώσεσι τὸν νοῦν μόνον τῶν ἐπῶν θηρωμένῳ τὴν μετάφρασιν γλαφυρωτέραν ποιῆσαι· ἀλλ' οὐ πολὺ τι τῆς τοῦ ποιητοῦ λέξεως ἔδοξέ μοι δεῖν ἀποστήναι· μέσην δὲ τινα ὁδὸν προειλόμην βαδίσαι, οὐκ ἐν πᾶσι τῇ τοῦ κειμένου προσισχύμενος λέξει, ἐν δ' ἐκείνοις αὐτῆς ἀφιστάμενος, ἔνθα ἢ κατὰ ῥῆμα μεθερμηνεῖα τραχεῖα ἂν ἐγένετο ἢ δυσνόητος λῖαν».

¹⁰ Loers' first name was Vitus. Apparently Ioannou mistakenly thought that Loers' first name started with a "K".

¹¹ Πατριαρχέας (1936) 36.

The best proof for Ioannou's solid command of Latin was the Rector's recommendation to the Senate of the Ottonian University (19/12/1844) to assign to Ioannou the teaching of Latin as well, until another suitable Latin tutor was found.¹² Nonetheless, Ioannou turned down the offer because of his hectic schedule.

Naturally and inevitably, Ioannou's translation is not free from errors, more or less significant.¹³ Let us have a look at some symptomatic cases, which will allow us to assess Ioannou's ability as translator:

A somewhat free translation

Ov. *Her.* 1.30: narrantis coniunx pendet ab ore viri
Ioannou: ἀνδρὶ δ' ὅλη προσέχει μυθολογεῦντι δάμαρ

Ioannou's translation is free but rather uninspired and flat. He renders the phrase "she is hanging from the lips of her husband as he is narrating" with the single verb «προσέχει».

Omissions

Ov. *Her.* 1.9-10: nec mihi quaerenti spatiosam fallere noctem
 lassaret viduas pendula tela manus
Ioannou: οὐδέ κε βουλομένη δολιχὴν μάλα νύκτα βραχῦναι,
 ἴστουργεῦσα χέρας κάμνον ἐνὶ μεγάροις.

At lines 9-10 Penelope refers to the spinning of wool with which she is forced to fill the hours of loneliness. In his translation of line 10 Ioannou adds the phrase ἐνὶ μεγάροις, which has no counterpart in the Latin original, obviously wanting to clearly identify the place where Penelope works the wool, i.e. the palace. On the other hand, however, he fails to translate the adjective *viduas*, which modifies the hands of Penelope. This adjective means "empty", yet it also designates the hands of a widow (*vidua* in Latin), which is exactly how Penelope feels like with her husband constantly absent.¹⁴

Differences between the translations of the 1st and the 2nd edition

Also interesting are those cases – relatively few – where Ioannou made changes to the translation in the second edition of the *Φιλολογικά Πάρεργα*. The following cases are symptomatic:

Lines 7-8: non ego deserto iacuissem frigida lecto,
 nec quererer tardos ire relicta dies;

Ioannou (1st edition): Οὐ γὰρ ἐγὼ ψυχρὴ κ' ἐνὶ λέκτροις δηρὸν ἐκείμην,
 οὔτ' ἄρ' ἐπὶ βραδέεσσ' ἤμας' ἐδεινοπάθουν

Ioannou (2nd edition): Οὐ γὰρ ἐγὼ ψυχρὴ κ' ἐνὶ λέκτροις δηρὸν ἐκείμην,
 οὔτ' ἄρ' ἐπὶ βραδέεσσ' ἤμας' ἐδυσφόρεον

In his translation of lines 7-8 Ioannou replaces the verb «δεινοπάθουν» with the verb «ἐδυσφόρεον». There is no change in the metre, however this change of verb testifies to Ioannou's great diligence and his attention to detail, since the verb ἐδυσφόρεον is a more accurate rendering of the Latin *quererer* (*queror* = remonstrate, complain).

Line 17: sive Menoetiaden falsis cecidisse sub armis

¹² Πατριαρχέας (1936) 37.

¹³ Konstantinos Kontos published a series of detailed reviews of Ioannou's *Φιλολογικά Πάρεργα*, in which he meticulously and rigidly pointed out the mistakes of Ioannou's use of ancient Greek. See Κόντος (1879-80).

¹⁴ Instead, at line 81 Ioannou renders accurately the combination *viduo lecto* as «χηρήτα λέκτρα».

Ioannou (1st edition): εἶτε Μενοιτιάδην ἐν ψευδέσι τεθνάμεν ὄπλοις

Ioannou (2nd edition): εἶτε Μενοιτιάδην δολίοις θανέειν ἐν ὄπλοισι

Ioannou's choice in his 2nd edition to render the adjective *falsus* as «δολίοις, treacherous» and not as «ψευδέσι, false, fake», as in his 1st edition, is successful, even though both versions are correct (OLD s.v. *falsus* 3 “not genuine, sham, spurious, false” and 8 “deceitful, treacherous”). The translation “treacherous” is more fitting in a letter addressed to Odysseus, mythology's most prominent deceiver, even though here the adjective is not attributed to Odysseus himself but to Patroclus' armour which he borrowed from Achilles in order to fool the Trojans.

Line 29: mirantur iustique senes trepidaeque puellae

Ioannou (1st edition): Πρεσβῦται θαμβεῦσι, τρέουσι δὲ κοῦραι ἀκουῆ

Ioannou (2nd edition): θάμβος ἔχει κούρας δειλάς πινυτούς τε γέροντας

The translation of line 29 in the 2nd edition is more accurate and corrects the one in the 1st edition, as it renders accurately the combination *trepidaeque puellae* (κούρας δειλάς) and adds the translation of the adjective *iusti* (πινυτοί) which was missing from the 1st edition.¹⁵

Ioannou's commentary

In his commentary Ioannou converses with Loers on a variety of topics, such as the authenticity of the letter and different readings of the text. In the first part of his notes to Penelope's letter Ioannou rejects Loers' doubts about the authenticity of the letter (pp. 447-50). He calls Loers by the Hellenized form of his name, «Κ. Λήρσιος», and answers to each and every one of his arguments against the authenticity of Penelope's letter. However, it is noteworthy that after the refutation of Loers' arguments against the authenticity of the letter Ioannou¹⁶ seems puzzled about the fact that, although scholars who question the letter's authenticity have raised so many other objections and have claimed that only what is «rational, ἔλλογον» can be considered as genuine, they are not troubled by the fact that it is most unlikely and irrational («ἀπίθανον ὅλως καὶ ἄλογον») for Penelope to have written such a letter: «Ποῦ γὰρ καὶ διὰ τίνος εἶχεν ἡ ἡρώϊς τῷ ἀνδρὶ ἐπιστεῖλαι, ὅλως ἀγνοοῦσα εἰ ἔτι ἐν τοῖς ζῶσιν ἐστὶν ἐκεῖνος καὶ ὅπου μένει; Τίτι δὲ καὶ ποῦ ἀποπλέοντι ἐξ Ἰθάκης ἔδει αὐτὴν τὰ γράμματα παραδοῦναι;». Of course, Ioannou's doubts are ungrounded and unjustified. Penelope herself writes that she gives to every visitor of Ithaca a copy of her letter for them to deliver to Odysseus in case they see him somewhere (Ov. *Her.* 1.59-62): *quisquis ad haec vertit peregrinam litora puppim, / ille mihi de te multa rogatus abit, / quamque tibi reddat, si te modo viderit usquam, / traditur huic digitis charta notata meis*. This is the plausible explanation which Ovid gives in order to prevent concerns such as those expressed by Ioannou. Indeed, as noted by Duncan Kennedy¹⁷ about 110 years after the second edition of Ioannou's *Φιλολογικά Πάρεργα*, while Penelope is supposedly writing her letter, Odysseus has already returned to the palace of Ithaca disguised by Athena as a beggar.

The second part of Ioannou's notes includes comments on specific passages in Penelope's letter. These comments are not detailed nor exhaustive nor line by line. Ioannou chooses to comment on relatively few points of the letter that might trouble the average reader. He seems to know his Homer very well and he often cites the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* (19, 36, 39, 40, 88, 99).

¹⁵ In his commentary on these lines Ioannou declares his clear preference for the reading *trepidaeque puellae* instead of *trepidantque puellae*.

¹⁶ See Ιωάννου (1874) 250, at the end of the first part of his «Σημειώσεις», right before moving on to his comments on certain lines.

¹⁷ Kennedy (1984).

Besides, he used to learn the Homeric epics by heart already from the age of 13-14.¹⁸ Homer, however, is the only Greek writer mentioned in Ioannou's commentary, while on the other hand the only Roman writers mentioned are Vergil, Tibullus and Cicero. Ioannou provides information about persons mentioned in the letter (e.g. 17 Patroclus, 39 Rhesos and Dolon, 46 Ismaros) or assesses the attested Latin text (29, 40, 103) or he sometimes makes moralistic comments.

For reasons of space I have selected a couple of such typical cases, which will hopefully give us an indicative idea about Ioannou's philosophy and practice as a commentator.

Ov. *Her.* 1.5-6: ο utinam tum, cum Lacedaemona classe petebat,
obrutus insanis esset adulter aquis!

Ioannou: Δικαίως ταῦτα ἡ Πηνελόπη καταρᾶται τῷ Πάριδι.

In this old-fashioned, moralistic comment, Ioannou vindicates Penelope for cursing Paris. Ioannou makes yet another moralistic comment on line 76: *esse peregrino captus amore potes*. This time he criticizes Penelope for her unjustified, as Ioannou thinks, suspicion that Odysseus may be with another woman. Ioannou claims that Odysseus remained near Circe and Calypso against his will and that he kept wishing to return home: «Οὐ πάνυ δικαία ἡ τῆς Πηνελόπης αὕτη φαίνεται ὑποψία· κατέσχον μὲν γὰρ ἡ Κίρκη καὶ ἡ Καλυψὼ παρ' ἑαυτοῖς χρόνον μακρὸν τὸν Ὀδυσσεά, ἀλλ' ἄκοντά γε καὶ τῆς εἰς οἶκον ἐπανόδου ἀεὶ ἐφιέμενον».

To conclude: Philippos Ioannou is a characteristic representative of a generation of Greek scholars – such as E. Voulgaris (1716-1806), Sp. Vlandis (1765-1830), Al. Kasdaglis *et al.* – who struggled to set the foundations of University education in the young Greek state and who firmly believed that the texts of the classical antiquity, both Greek and Latin, were the *sine qua non* conditions for the intellectual rebirth of the Greek people. With his elaborate translations from Latin Philippos Ioannou contributed significantly to the acquaintance of his students and of every cultured reader with outstanding works of Latin literature. This was in line with the mission of the newly established University of Athens. According to its first Rector, Constantinos Schinas,¹⁹ since the University was found «μεταξὺ τῆς Ἑσπερίας καὶ τῆς Ἑῶ», its mission was «νᾱ λαμβάνη ἀφ' ἑνὸς μέρους τὰ σπέρματα τῆς σοφίας καὶ, ἀφ' οὗ τὰ ἀναπτύξη ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἰδίαν τινὰ καὶ γόνιμον ἀνάπτυξιν, νᾱ τὰ μεταδίη εἰς τὴν γείτονα Ἑῶ, νεαρὰ καὶ καρποφόρα» (“to assume on the one hand the seeds of wisdom and, after raising and developing them in itself, to transmit them to the neighboring East, young and fruitful”). Besides, Ioannou himself used to liken the University with the brain of the body of the Greeks – where ideas and intellectual forces are born and developed – which may contribute to the prosperity or misery of society, depending on their use.²⁰

Βιβλιογραφία

Γλυκοφρύδη – Λεοντσίνη, Αθανασία: «Ἰωάννου Φίλιππος», Παγκόσμιο Βιογραφικό Λεξικό, Τόμος 4. Αθήνα, Εκδοτική Αθηνών, 1986.

Ἰωάννου, Φίλιππος: *Φιλολογικά Πάρεργα*, Προσφωνηθέντα τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ Δημητρίῳ Ι. τῷ Γυαλᾷ. Αθήνα 1865.

Ἰωάννου, Φίλιππος: *Φιλολογικά Πάρεργα*, Προσφωνηθέντα τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ Δημητρίῳ Ι. τῷ Γυαλᾷ, Ἑκδοσις Β' ἐν ἣ τινὰ διώρθωται ἢ ἐπὶ τὸ κρεῖττον μεταπεποιήται, οὐκ ὀλίγα δὲ καὶ προστέθειται. Αθήνα 1874.

Ἰωάννου Φίλιππος: Λόγος Ὀλυμπιακός, συνταχθεὶς καὶ ἐκφωνηθεὶς ὑπὸ Φιλίππου Ἰωάννου ἐν τῇ β' ἑορτῇ τῶν ἰδρυθέντων Ὀλυμπίων ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀειμνήστου Εὐαγγέλου Ζάππα. Αθήνα 1870.

Kennedy, Duncan: “The epistolary mode and the first of Ovid's *Heroides*”. *CQ* 34 (1984): 413-422.

¹⁸ Πατριαρχέας (1936) 9.

¹⁹ Σφυρόερας (1987) 12f.

²⁰ Πατριαρχέας (1936) 18.

- Κόντος, Κωνσταντίνος: «Παρατηρήσεις εἰς τὰ *Φιλολογικὰ Πάρεργα* τοῦ Φιλίππου Ἰωάννου», *Ἐφημερίς τῶν Φιλομαθῶν*, Περίοδος Β΄, Τόμ. 3 (1879-80): 65-72, 81-89, 97-112, 113-121, 129-137, 145-151, 161-169, 177-183, 209-218, 257-263, 321-330.
- Παπᾶς, Π. Ν.: «Ἰωάννου Φίλιππος», Μεγάλη Ἑλληνική Ἐγκυκλοπαίδεια, Τόμος 12. Αθήνα, Πυρσός, 1930.
- Πατριαρχέας, Παναγιώτης Ν.: *Φίλιππος Ἰωάννου, ὁ ἀπὸ καθέδρας Ἑλλήν φιλόσοφος τοῦ 19^{ου} αἰῶνος*, Αθήνα 1936.
- Σφυρόερας, Βασίλης: «Ἐκατὸν πενήντα χρόνια τοῦ Πανεπιστημίου Αθηνῶν (Βραχὺ χρονικό)». Στο: Ἐθνικὸ καὶ Καποδιστριακὸ Πανεπιστήμιον Αθηνῶν, 1837-1987, Ἐκατὸν Πενήντα Χρόνια, *Κατάλογος Ἐκθεσης Ἐνθυμημάτων*, Μουσεῖο Ἱστορίας τοῦ Πανεπιστημίου Αθηνῶν, Αθήνα 1987: 12-19.