Expressions of Fear from Antiquity to the Contemporary World

Expressions of Fear from Antiquity to the Contemporary World

Papers of the March 30th, 2013 National Colloquium, Department of Classical Philology, University of Bucharest, Romania

Edited by

Maria-Luiza Dumitru Oancea,
Ana-Cristina Halichias
and Nicolae-Andrei Popa

Expressions of Fear from Antiquity to the Contemporary World

Edited by Maria-Luiza Dumitru Oancea, Ana-Cristina Halichias
and Nicolae-Andrei Popa

This book first published 2016

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

Copyright © 2016 by Maria-Luiza Dumitru Oancea,
Ana-Cristina Halichias, Nicolae-Andrei Popa and contributors

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The present volume gathers a selection of papers presented at the first edition of the Colloquium entitled *Expressions of Fear from Antiquity to the Contemporary World*, which took place on March 30th, 2013 at the University of Bucharest, on the initiative of Prof. Dr. Ana-Cristina Halichias, Director of the Department of Classical and Neo-Greek Philology at the Faculty of Foreign Languages and Literatures of the aforementioned university. The extremely generous theme was chosen in such a way as to allow for a complex approach in the analysis of multiple cultures and periods.

The articles cover a broad time span, starting with the period of Archaic and Classical Antiquity (Greek and Roman), going into the period of Sixteenth Century Italian Renaissance to Romantic and Modern Époques (C18 and C19) and concluding with the Neo-modern and (Post)modern Periods (C20 and C21). Hence, the content of the volume is based on an antinomic vision – Antiquity versus Modernity and Contemporaneity – as the title suggests, and is divided into two main sections: *Archaic Period and Antiquity* and *From the Middle Ages to Contemporary Times*.

Diachronically speaking, the section *Archaic Period and Antiquity* opens with a series of papers that involve Greek Antiquity. It is here that most of the articles related to Greek literature are gathered, covering the whole of Antiquity. In this section the reader can also find an article on lexicology that focuses on semantics and Greek etymology.

Thus, the first part of the Archaic Period of Greek Literature, represented by the Archaic epos and the genealogical and didactic poetry of the C9-C8 BC is analyzed by two authors: Ioana Costa ("Romanian *Odysseys*. Instances of Reaction to Fear") and Mihail-George Hâncu ("Φόβος and Its Place in Hesiod's *Theogony*"). Ioana Costa employs translation theory in order to discuss excerpts from the Homeric *Odyssey* that deal with the feminine reaction to fear. The analysis is based both on the Homeric perspective and on linguistic equivalences proposed by Romanian translator Cezar Papacostea. On the other hand, Mihail-George Hâncu examines the Archaic Period and discusses the poems of Hesiod from the perspective of conceptual hermeneutics. Furthermore, the author approaches the issue of chaos and its adequate definition. According to professor Hâncu's article, the Hesiodic perspective portrays fear as being

inferior to other feelings. Man could be saved by the fear of the unknown, for Zeus protects him against monsters, while abstract evils could acquire a positive meaning or could even elude man, i.e. fear itself.

In his article entitled "Power, Anger and Fear. Tyrants vs. Seers in Homer and Greek Tragedy", Corneliu Clop adopts a comparative and diachronic perspective with respect to the relationship between tyrants and prophets in Homer, Sophocles and Euripides, analyzing the connection between the two categories of men in the case of certain unfavorable mantic messages for the potentates.

Articles regarding Latin language, literature and culture cover a generous sphere of linguistic, literary, philosophical, historiographical and epigraphical approaches. Mihai Grigoraș proposes an interesting article on Greek lexicology ("Why Did φόβος Mean φυγή in Homeric Greek?"), identifying, at the end of his exhaustive analysis, the existence of a common Indo-European root of the Greek vocables *φόβος* and *φυγή*.

The Classical Period of Ancient Greek Literature (C5 BC) – the most prolific theme in the volume – deals exclusively with Classical Greek Tragedy. In "Fracture and Suture: Horror, Heroic Crisis, and Reconciliation", Cătălina Popescu analyzes a few plays by Aeschylus and Euripides while considering the horror which triggers Orestes' heroic crisis, as well as his final victory through emotional rehabilitation and negotiation of the need for *logos* rendered as *situs memoriae*, the place of his final retreat.

The Alexandrine Era of Greek Literature (C4-C3 BC) is represented throughout the volume as a less known period, criticized by the literature. In "The Dialectics of Fear in Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautika*", Maria-Luiza Dumitru Oancea highlights the Alexandrine epos, proposing an anthropological and psychoanalytical interpretation of the consequences of fear, ultimately understood by means of demythization, minimalization and compromise. Moreover, the author mentions the remedies for fear in the form of sweet talk, adulation and enticement.

Articles concerning Greek testamentary and Patristic literature help broaden the volume's sphere of interest. Such articles include Isabela Stoian's "Phobos Theou from O.T. to N.T". Isabela Stoian analyzes the new meanings of the Greek term *phobos* (fear), when it is associated, in the Septuagint, to the vocable *theos*, but also the meanings of devoutness, submission, wisdom and love that the word acquires both in the Septuagint and in the New Testament.

The domain of Latin lexicology is represented by Ana-Cristina Halichias' article "The Terminology of Fear in the Sallustian Monographies *De Coniuratione Catilinæ* and *De Bello Iugurthino*". The

author closely analyzes the terminology of fear in the two Sallustian monographies and concludes that Sallustius describes the feeling of fear especially by employing narrative devices, and to a less extent, lexical devices.

From a diachronic perspective, Mariana Franga's article entitled "Amor / *Tremor in the Ovidian Elegy of Separation (*Tristia*, I, 3)" is dedicated exclusively to Latin literature. The study has the ambition of being an applied and strictly literary analysis of the ways of expression through which Ovid describes a feeling of extreme intensity, at the threshold of the perplexity, confusion and panic which overwhelms both him and those around him on hearing the news of his relegation to Tomis.

In addition, Florentina Nicolae proposes a minute analysis of the semantic field of fear and of reactions to threat in "The Conceptual Field of Fear and Anxiety in Publilius Syrus' *Sententiæ*", comparing Syrus with the Stoic perspective of Seneca Minor, and employing the parameters of Polish linguist Anna Wierzbicka.

In the paper "Fear and Irony in Petronius' *Satyricon*"*,* Florica Bechet studies the terminology of fear and describes the lexical corpus from an etymological perspective, bearing in mind multiple levels of reality and highlighting the literary and aesthetic effects obtained by bringing together the features of fear and by emphasizing the irony and self-irony assumed by the dinner guest and by Encolpius in order to take part in the game of their host, Trimalchio.

Andreea Ștefan's article "Reason, Education, and Lack of Fear in Epictetus' *Discourses*" opens another domain of research in Latinity: Stoic philosophy in the first century AD. For the Stoic philosopher Epictetus, fear is one of the most common logical errors, defined as a lack of proper knowledge.

Fourth century AD Latin historiography is represented by Elena-Emilia Ștefan's article "Expressing Fear in Ammianus Marcellinus' *Res Gestae*: The Description of Procopius' Usurpation". Based on Ammianus Marcellinus' idea that feelings determine the cause of events, the author analyzes the attitude, decisions and relationships of Procopius, who is overwhelmed by the devastating feeling of fear in the relationships established with his subjects and with the legitimate emperor.

The second section of this volume, *From the Middle Ages to Contemporary Times,* comprises articles dedicated to the Middle Ages, European Renaissance, Modern Europe (in a wide sense) and Contemporary Europe, but also U.S.A. and Canada. This section is opened by Ana-Maria Răducan's "Theios Eros and Theios Phobos in Saint Symeon The New Theologian's *Hymns of Divine Love*". In her view, holy

love and holy dread render, in Symeon the New Theologian's view, the two facets of the mystic condition, which express erotic passion in terms that belong to the semantic fields of fire, seeing and seeking.

Latin epigraphy is a fine addition to the existing articles from the domain of historiography, as proven by Doina Filimon-Doroftei's "*Memoria Calamitatum* Mentioned in the Latin Inscriptions in the Churches of Transylvania (C16 to C19)". The author analyzes a corpus of Latin inscriptions from Transylvanian Catholic and Protestant churches that tell the story of the calamities which, throughout time, have sown fear and panic in the respective communities.

In Corina Anton's article "Deadly Pranks: Fear, Authority, and Justice in Two 16th Century Italian Novelle"*,* the historical context is that of C16 Italian Renaissance. The author analyzes fear as a deadly source, the relationship between fear, authority and justice, as well as the final degeneracy of the game (*beffa*) into revenge.

European Romanticism is the context of Ruxanda Topor's approach of fear as a symptom of paranoia in the work of the English Romantic poet William Blake. In her article, "Fear as a 'Symptom' of Paranoia in William Blake's Prophetic Book *Jerusalem*"*,* Topor states that the bard's paranoid fear is a projection of his feelings and thoughts, since Blake was thought to have been troubled by mental illness.

In the article "Heinrich Heine's Fear of Racial Discrimination and Financial Uncertainty in the Context of His Time", Mihaela Hristea approaches nineteenth century German society by analyzing the feeling of fear as it reflected Heine's context, marked by religious transitions and countless compromises.

Liviu Franga's article "Hope as an Antidote to Fear in Vasile Pârvan's *Memorials*" tackles modern Romanian autobiographic literature by debating the issue of an appropriate antidote for fear, namely hope. The author expresses his intention of underlining the emotional contemporary knowledge passed on by the Romanian historian, epigraphist and essay writer Vasile Pârvan, at the dawn of the nineteenth century.

The neomodernist and (post)modernist novels (C20-C21) are both challenging subjects of analysis in current academia and represent a permanent source of inspiration for doctoral students in search of the innovative and the startling. In her article entitled "Dislocation as Catalyst and Remedy for Fear in Anzia Yezierska's 'Children of Loneliness'"*,* Andreea-Cristina Paris discusses the issue of dislocation and its potential to be a catalyst of the fear of identification with one's cultural background, as well as the fear of loneliness that triggers an existential crisis in the heroine of Anzia Yezierska's story "Children of Loneliness".

Postmodernist literature (C21) is represented through studies on prominent Canadian and American authors. Adela-Livia Catană's article "'Feel the Fear': Oppression or Resistance in *The Handmaid's Tale*", tackles the main fears of the contemporary world expressed in Canadian author Margaret Atwood's novel *The Handmaid's Tale*.

In his article entitled "Representations of Death in Don DeLillo's *White Noise* and *Cosmopolis*", Nicolae-Andrei Popa analyzes the fear of death in two of American author Don DeLillo's novels, insisting on the representations of this feeling in relationship with television and material life. In *White Noise,* the protagonists try to elude the fear of death by gathering in front of the TV every Friday night. In *Cosmopolis*, DeLillo brings together the themes of economics and thanatophobia, concluding that the end of contemporary decadence is death itself.

Lidjia Čolević also focuses on the cultural paradigm of (post)modernism by analyzing the relationship between fright and madness in the five parts of "Notes of a Madman" encountered in the novel *Hourglass* by the Serb writer Danilo Kiš. The article is entitled "Between Fright and Madness in Danilo Kiš' 'Notes of a Madman'".

The volume's participants are acclaimed professors, doctoral students and young researchers and their articles are addressed to an extremely wide readership, from philologists to literates, from linguists to psychoanalysts, from anthropologists to philosophers and from historians to specialists in rhetoric and jurisprudence.

To conclude, it is worth reminding the reader of the series of thematic colloquiums of the Classical Philology Department from the Faculty of Foreign Languages and Literatures, University of Bucharest. The present volume inaugurates a series of publications that stemmed from these academic reunions which, we hope, will shortly become tradition.

THE EDITORS

SECTION 1

ARCHAIC PERIOD AND ANTIQUITY

ROMANIAN *ODYSSEYS.*
INSTANCES OF REACTION TO FEAR

Ioana COSTA
University of Bucharest

Abstract: The Odyssey *was translated into Romanian several times. During the twentieth century there were no less than four complete translations. One also needs to mention* Odyssey I-XII *published by Cezar Papacostea in 1929, which was recently republished. A brief outlook into fragments bearing on fearful reaction in this translation, mostly as a feminine alternative, highlights both the specifically Homeric approach of fear and the linguistic equivalence chosen by Cezar Papacostea.*

Keywords: Homer; translation; Cezar Papacostea; fear; female characters

The Romanian translations of the Homeric Odyssey are both numerous and dissimilar, not only as lexical options (which is to be expected when created by different scholars), but also as a general approach: prose or verse, in iambic hendecasyllables, rhymed octaves, hexameters. Remaining within the context of the twentieth century, there were five outstanding translations, which are difficult to list in chronological order. The difficulty is due to the gap between the actual work of translation and the typographic accomplishment that sometimes occurred only several decades afterwards. Since translations become valid solely when they circulate, the chronology of the Romanian *Odysseys* is actually the chronology of their editions.

The milestones of this enterprise are the *editiones principes* of the five versions. In 1924, George Murnu's translation in iambic hendecasyllables is published (some fragments were previously published in 1906, in original metre), revised by its author in 1940. George Murnu's *Odiseea* clearly dominated the corpus of Romanian *Odyssey*s for a long time, as part of the first complete translation of the Homeric poems. Renouncing

the dactylic hexameter he used in *The Iliad* and in the first attempts to translate *The Odyssey*, before 1906, George Murnu adopted the iambic hendecasyllables (in the catalectic version). In the 1956 edition (Editura de stat pentru literatură şi artă Publishing House), Dionisie M. Pippidi, the author of the introductory study and of the commentaries, expressed his astonishment for the fortune of this text on page 26 of that edition:

> vreme de treizeci de ani traducerea Murnu n-a cunoscut un răsunet pe măsura *Iliadei* traduse de acelaşi cărturar, în ciuda indiscutabilelor ei calităţi şi în ciuda împrejurării că – până în acest moment (*id est*, 1956) e unica versiune românească în versuri completă. Faptul de a fi adoptat endecasilabul, renunţând la hexametru, nu constituie desigur o explicaţie, dat fiind că tocmai preferinţa acordată unui vers familiar cititorului modern a fost salutată de mulţi ca un exemplu vrednic de urmat şi ca o realizare marcând izbânda literară cea mai valabilă a traducătorului.[1]

> (for over thirty years, Murnu's translation has not known such a large echo as his own version of *The Iliad,* despite its incontestable qualities – until now, in 1956, this being the sole complete Romanian version in verse. Having adopted the hendecasyllable and renouncing the hexameter does not constitute an explanation, as the preference for a meter more appealing to the modern reader was saluted as an example worthy of being imitated and as an accomplishment that marked the translator's most valuable literary achievement.)

The 1956 edition was followed by the "definitive edition" (Univers Publishing House, 1971) and included the changes George Murnu made a few years before his death. By the end of the 1970s, Univers Publishing House offered a new edition, with an introductory study and notes by Adrian Pârvulescu.

In 1935, Eugen Lovinescu's prose version was published. This first edition of Eugen Lovinescu's translation was followed in 1936 by a second one and, a decade after, by a third edition (1946), posthumously published. The text was edited by Traian Costa in 1955 ("Editura Tineretului"), 1963 ("Editura pentru literatură") and 1966 ("Editura Tineretului"). These new editions (with notes, commentaries and *index nominum*) brought some novelties: a slight remodeling of the Romanian version and the corresponding Greek variants of the proper names that Lovinescu used in Latin form, in the current traditional manner: Iupiter (in Lovinescu's version, "Jupiter"), Neptun, Minerva, Zeus, Poseidon, Athena. The series of reediting Lovinescu's translation included the celebratory moment of reprinting the 1936 edition (Saeculum I.O. and

Vestala Publishing Houses), in 1995, with a postface by Traian Diaconescu.

George Coşbuc's rhymed iambic octaves were published in 1966 (the poet was still working on them just before his death, in 1918). Published approximately fifty years after the death of its author, the translation by George Coşbuc (in rhymed octaves, following the pattern ABABABCC), was edited by I. Sfetea and Ştefan Cazimir. The preface, written by Ştefan Cazimir, is followed by a "Note on the edition" that explains the editorial fate of this translation. It was in the course of being printed by Casa Şcoalelor Publishing House when Coşbuc died, leaving the final variant incomplete. The editors of the 1966 *Odyssey*, published by "Editura pentru literatură", attempted to offer a text as faithful as possible to the final desire of the poet,[2] working on the manuscript deposited at the Library of the Romanian Academy in 1941 (nr. 2924-2929). The editors compared this manuscript (including the 24 books of *The Odyssey*) to another manuscript, that of the ninth book, deposited at the Library of the Romanian Academy in 1955 (nr. 3295), with the typographical sheets of Casa Şcoalelor Publishing House (the first eight books and the beginning of the ninth, stanzas 1 to 54), property of I. Sfetea, with a galley proof of the tenth book displaying the poet's corrections up to the 69th stanza (Library of the Romanian Academy, "Coşbuc" documents), and a fragment of stanzas 70 to 85 containing the poet's *manu propria* corrections. The lines that lacked Coşbuc's translation were replaced by passages from Eugen Lovinescu's prose translation. However, the editors don't mention the edition they used, but it is certainly the 1955 one.

The series of full translations of the *Odyssey*s ends with Dan Sluşanschi's hexameter *Odyssey* published in 1997 (reprinted in 2009, Paideia Publishing House) and revised in 2012 (Humanitas Publishing House). The final years of the twentieth century brought a new Romanian variant of both Homeric epic poems, and this was accomplished by Dan Sluşanschi. The major change comes precisely from the *Odyssey* translation, which the translator decided to transpose in original metre, keeping a strict line to line equivalence with the Greek poem. Unlike Murnu's enterprise, this editorial project begins with *The Odyssey* (1997), followed without delay by *The Iliad* (1998). Both volumes were published by Paideia Publishing House and are posthumously reprinted in 2009 by the same publishing house.

The gigantic project of professor Sluşanschi was meant to embrace, *in spe*, the two volumes within a series of the three major Ancient, Greek and Latin poems in bilingual editions. In the year 2000, the volumes *Eneida* and *Aeneis* were published: the translation of Vergil's poem (in dactylic

hexameter, always in line to line equivalence with the Greek text) and the critical edition of the Latin text. A similar critical edition was supposed to conclude the Homeric volumes, together with separate volumes of commentaries. This project remained – *sic dis placuit* – unfinished. The two existing volumes were re-edited in 2012 at Humanitas Publishing House, with the necessary correction of previous typographical errors and the insertion of the untranslated passages, using the documents (mostly manuscripts *et similia*) hosted by the "Dan Sluşanschi section" of the New Europe College library; there were only four lines that needed a new translation, and these were translated by Francisca Băltăceanu: 4.132-133, 6.200, 19.59.

Among these translations, one should notice the *Odyssey* translated by Cezar Papacostea (1929), preceded by fragments published in periodicals, beginning from 1910, as the first extended attempt to use hexametric dactyls. For a period of seventy years, this version of *The Odyssey* was the only Romanian version in which the dactylic rhythm was used to describe the ordeals of the king of Ithaca on returning from Troy.

The four complete translations were (apart from several reprints) edited and reedited in a philologically significant manner. Unlike all others, Cezar Papacostea's *Odyssey* was the sole to be republished without any changes in 1946. Recently, this translation has been reedited at Muzeul Literaturii Române Publishing House, in 2013. Nevertheless, we have to acknowledge that this *Odyssey* is imperfect, as it is unfinished.

Regarding the "fear" topic in the Homeric *Odyssey*, especially considering the first twelve books of Cezar Papacostea's translation, we might attempt an assessment of both male and female symptoms of fear. Odysseus' frightful moments are numerous, as much as his adventures are intense and abundant. Some of them are natural, justifiable, while others lack any solid basis, such as his response to Calypso when she set him free and even promised him consistent help for leaving Ogygia Island. After seven years of being kept there against his will, Odysseus had good reasons to be suspicious of the proposal, which came out of the blue. In Papacostea's translation, the nymph, "zâna zânelor" ("the fairy of the fairies"), was compelled to act against her will as well, in order to submit to the decision of the Olympian gods, brought to her island by their messenger, Hermes. Calypso tried to resist it and she answered Hermes, rapidly passing from indignation against the maliciousness of the gods, who were jealous of other people's happiness (5.117), exemplifying some similar famous mythical episodes (5.118-119) that put her among other goddesses who loved mortals (5.120, 124-125), to a plea for her right to keep Odysseus for herself, as she – unaided – saved the endangered life of

the shipwrecked sailor (5.128). She highlights the inconsistent plan of the Olympian gods, who wanted to release a human who was meant to perish in their previous plans, (5.129-130), nonetheless her devotion towards the unhappy prisoner. She finally (and rather rapidly) resigns, given the implacable will of the god whom all feared, Zeus (5.133-134), Calypso knowing this fear well. This is the sole argument to compel her to renounce love. The nymph had one more slight attempt to keep Odysseus for herself, admitting that she was unable to send him home safely (5.139-140), and concluded with words of a woman in love, worried for the outcome of the lover (5.141-142). Odysseus's mistrust, expressed in the ensuing lines, is even more prominent in contrast with her tender words, traversed by admiration for a man who was suspicious towards the benevolence of the gods. When Calypso unexpectedly utters the long-desired words "you are free to go" (5.159), Odysseus responds in a manner that might be reasonable only when confronted with the changing moods of the gods who tormented him for long years: he is frightened (5.169). The two characters have a short, yet intense dialogue: Odysseus concisely states that he is being set up by the nymph (5.171), who presumably knew the dangers hidden by the sea, huge threats even for those who benefit from the good will of the gods, as the hero Poseidon (5.173-174) well knows. He is ready to leave the island only for a fair fight with the sea, with no devious divine plans: he needs Calypso to swear the great oath, on Styx (5.175-177). This is the only guarantee he has, the one and only way to lose his fear.

This is an episode of a doubtful fear, justified by the hero's long ordeal. All the other instances of fear he encountered are less intense, as they are predictable, natural, and simply human. Examples of brutal fear are those he experienced in Polyphemus' cave, in close proximity to Scylla or during the tempests. Euriloch's panic after being abruptly awoken, who falls from the roof of Circe's house is also an instance of human fear. The image of the sacrifice that the god did not want to accept, on the Island of Apollo (12.435-436), including the oxhides that crawled about and the raw meat that bellowed is probably the apex of the terrifying episodes in Odysseus's long journey, being mostly a warning for his companions that they would never see their island again. The dark omen was only understood by the hero, whose fear is multiplied by the feeling of being helpless.

The women are not supposed to face perils in some foreign and strange lands or sail dangerous waters. They remain at home, but are nonetheless exposed to fear. In a certain sense, their feelings are even more intense, being multiplied by the worries regarding not themselves, but the loved

ones. Penelope's response when finding out about the deadly danger which menaced her son is emblematic. Exhausted by anxiously waiting for her husband, surrounded by suitors, attempting to manage a household where nothing seemed to be normal any longer, she hardly noticed that her son was restless, being on the verge between adolescence and maturity, ready to assume the responsibility of a man, protecting his mother and, all at once, reproving her. Penelope seemed to accept the change, but everything is still evolving, nothing is yet settled. Finding out from Medon that the suitors were about to trap and kill Telemach (4.689-691), she simultaneously finds out that his son has left the house, trying to get some news about his father. Penelope's response displays the whole range of feelings a wounded mother could experience: her heart is broken in two ("inima ei [...] în două-i se taie", 4.694), her knees are weak ("genunchii în două-i se taie", 4.694), her voice is gone ("Mută-a rămas îndelung", 4.695), she has tears in her eyes ("ochii se umplu de lacrimi", 4.695), sighs hold back her words ("Glasul îi e năbuşit de suspinuri", 4.696). She needs time to recover her strength – and does so indeed, like a perfectly rational person, asking a precise question, interrupted by laments, but carried out with great power: why did he leave? This is the source of her pain, but also the source of evaluating the situation, as the perils seem to be much higher than the hypothetical achievement ("Spune-mi de ce a plecat şi fecioru-mi acuma?/ Ce trebuinţă era să se ducă pe luntrea cea iute,/ Luntrea... calul de apă cu care-omenirea străbate/ Nesfârşitele umede drumuri în spatele mării? ", 4.698-701). Her fear is justified and multiplied, as the long years of waiting for her husband are now deepened, as she has both loved ones far away from her. Her pain is heartbreaking (4.708) and her acts match her torment: she does not sit on a chair (4.709), but falls on the sill of her wedding chamber (4.710), and her fall is accompanied by tears, echoed by her maids (4.711-712). Her old nurse comforts her, guilty for not having told the secret of Telemach in time (4.735-737). The remedy for pain, in Homeric times, seems familiar to us: a relaxing bath and fresh clothes (4.743). A warm prayer is also mentioned as a remedy (745-746). The advice worked in the case of Penelope, who regains strength and is able to return to the palace, renouncing the solitude that had previously seemed the only remedy (4.752-753).

The tears are not unusual for Odysseus either. Actually, they are abundant in the Phaeacian episode when, finding refuge from the sea perils and all his ordeals, he listens to the songs of Demodocus; the enlarged Homeric comparison is explicitly made in a feminine context (8.526-538).

The female character of this comparison is probably meant to counterbalance the strength of Nausikaa who, alone among her maids, is fearless at the sight of the tormented shipwrecked sailor (6.145-148).

To conclude, Cezar Papacostea achieved a memorable translation of *The Odyssey*, the specific melody of which belongs not only to the seemingly unfamiliar rhythms, but also to the transposition of the Homeric story into the world of Romanian fairytales: the goddesses are fairies, the kings are "crai". The ethic dative appears to be not only an appropriate solution for the hexameter, but a totally justifiable solution as it embraces the reader with its familiar invitation to enter the story. The instances of fear, for both male and female characters, are themselves reminiscences of episodes we can easily trace from fairytales or recompose as part of a large array of human feelings.

Bibliography[3]

MURNU, George
Odisea. Bucharest: Cultura Naţională et al., 1924.
Odisea. Bucharest: Cugetarea - Georgescu Delafras et al., 1940.
Odiseea. Introductory study and commentaries by D. M. Pippidi. Bucharest: Editura de stat pentru literatură şi artă, 1956.
Odiseea. Introductory study and notes by D. M. Pippidi. Last Edition. Bucharest: Univers, 1971.
Odiseea. Introductory study and notes by Adrian Pârvulescu. Bucharest: Univers, 1979.

PAPACOSTEA, Cezar. Cărţile I-XII
Odysseia. Bucharest: Cartea Românească, 1929.
Odysseia. Bucharest: Casa Şcoalelor, et al., 1944.
Odysseia. *I-XII*. Edited by Ioana Costa. Bucharest: Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române, 2013.

LOVINESCU, Eugen
Odissea. Bucharest: Fundaţia pentru literatură şi artă "Regele Carol II", 1935.
Odissea. Second Edition. Bucharest: Fundaţia pentru literatură şi artă "Regele Carol II", 1936.
Odiseia. Third Edition. Bucharest: Fundaţia pentru literatură şi artă "Regele Carol II", 1946.

Odisseia. Bucharest: Editura Tineretului [revised by Traian Costa], 1955.

Odiseea. Revised text and notes by Traian Costa. Introductory study and index by Mihail Nasta, Bucharest: Editura pentru literatură, 1963.

Odiseea. Revised text and notes by Traian Costa. Preface by Venera Antonescu. 2 Volumes. Books I-XII; XIII-XXIV. Bucharest: Editura Tineretului, s.a., 1966.

Odiseea. Afterword by Traian Diaconescu, Bucharest: Saeculum I.O., Vestala, 1995.

COȘBUC, George

Odiseea. Edited by I. Sfetea and Șt. Cazimir. Preface by Șt. Cazimir, Bucharest: Editura pentru literatură, 2 Volumes. Books I-XII; XIII-XXIV), 1966.

SLUȘANSCHI, Dan

Odysseia. Bucharest: Paideia, 1998.

Odysseia. Second Edition. Bucharest: Paideia, 2009.

Odysseia. Translated in hexameter with aftwerword, bibliography and index by Dan Slușanschi. Illustrated by Alexandru Rădvan [revisions and additions by Octavian Gordon and Francisca Bălțăceanu], Bucharest: Humanitas, 2012.

Notes

[1] Dionisie M. Pippidi, Ed. "Studiu introductiv". Trans. by George Murnu. *Odiseea*. (Bucuresti: Editura de stat pentru literatură și artă, 1956), 26.

[2] *Odiseea*. Edited by I. Sfetea and Șt. Cazimir. Preface by Șt. Cazimir, (București: Editura pentru literatură, 2 Volumes. Books I-XII; XIII-XXIV, 1966), XXIII.

[3] This is the corpus of the Romanian translations mentioned in the paper, presented chronologically (regarding the year of the first edition), in five categories, corresponding to the five major translators of twentieth century editions.

ΦΟΒΟΣ AND ITS PLACE IN HESIOD'S *THEOGONY*

Mihail-George HÂNCU
University of Bucharest

Abstract: In order to understand Hesiod's Theogony, *it is necessary to properly define Chaos, the primordial element, while, at the same time avoiding the biased view that there is a hierarchical difference between Hesiod's thought and that of later philosophers. A closer analysis reveals that Chaos is an ancient form of ἄπειρον. This trait is inherited, in one way or another, by all of its descendants, whose limited counterparts are to be found in Gaia's lineage. The aim of this paper is to analyze the catalogue of abstract evils, which, despite its thoroughness, omits fear. Φόβος is not completely absent from the* Theogony, *as it is revealed to be the child of Ares, Gaia's great-grandson. This genealogical artifice can help shed some light on the message of Hesiod's two writings,* Theogony *and* Works and Days, *which might prove to be more optimistic than expected.*

Keywords: cosmogony; fear; Hesiod; monsters; Theogony

According to Herodotus,[1] the Greeks had no knowledge about the age and origin of the gods until around 400 years before his time – the ones who had taught them about theogonies had been Homer and Hesiod (Ἡσίοδον γὰρ καὶ Ὅμηρον ἡλικίην τετρακοσίοισι ἔτεσι δοκέω μέο πρεσβυτέρους γενέσθαι καὶ οὐ πλέοσι· οὗτοι δέ εἰσι οἱ ποιήσαντες θεογονίην Ἕλλησι). These two authors were also credited with naming the gods, establishing their functions and honors, as well as describing their shape. One can then assume that the Greeks considered Homer and Hesiod's accounts to be simply compilations, but also pieces of information about what had been revealed to them by the Muses. Hesiod's *Theogony* is an attempt to understand the cosmos, the final order of the universe, as the result of a genealogical evolution and of an individuation that reaches its τέλος under the tutelage of Zeus, lord of the ordered world, in which all powers are well balanced.[2]

Since the purpose of Hesiod's poem is to describe the process that led to Zeus and the order he brought to the world, it is of the greatest

importance to understand the primordial state of the universe. In the beginning, there was *Χάος*, which is described by just one epithet throughout the entire work, *ζοφερός* ("dark").[3] Obviously, the main issue lies in defining this term, which is made more difficult by the very diverse ways it has been illustrated in later works. The modern reader would be tempted to quote Ovid's eloquent and concise definition:

> Ante mare et terras et quod tegit omnia caelum
> unus erat toto naturae uultus in orbe,
> quem dixere Chaos: rudis indigestaque moles
> nec quicquam nisi pondus iners congestaque eodem
> non bene iunctarum discordia semina rerum.[4]

In fact, Aristotle comments that Hesiod was right in placing Chaos at the very beginning, as a space in which every item that was prone to appear was needed.[5] Robert Mondi points out that the Peripatetics had gone so far as to establish an etymological connection between *chaos* and *chōra*, while the Stoics favored a more materialistic view of Chaos, relating it to *cheesthai* and *chysis*.[6] Ovid's description was, thus, in line with the philosophic understanding of Chaos of his time. Modern translators have had the same tendency to use concrete terms for *chaos*: Mondi quotes Mazon's *abîme* and West's *chasm*.

Robert Mondi wonders why Hesiod had chosen a chasm as the very first element of the universe. If this chasm was, at first, singular, then what could possibly have surrounded it? The only contextual evidence (based on two nearly identical expressions, see Hes., *Th.* 736–739 and 807–810) for the association of Chaos and χάσμα is to be found during the battle between Zeus and the Titans, when Chaos is surrounded by the other elements of the subterranean world. This cosmic position seems more likely due to the fact that Chaos is a remnant of the primary state of the universe.[7] It has been argued that Chaos is to be found between Heaven and Earth (which would also be the edges of the primordial chasm): this theory is based on the fact that Chaos is affected by a "prodigious conflagration" (*καῦμα θεσπέσιον*) when Zeus strikes the Titans (who are on Mount Othrys) from the heavens with his lightning bolts. According to Kirk, heat could not be said to penetrate into the underworld, so "an objective judge would surely conclude that *Χάος* in line 700 describes the region between earth and sky".[8] Mondi argues that the purpose of this episode was to show the far-reaching impact of divine combat on the four quarters of the universe.[9] He then concludes that *Χάος* described the concept of "formlessness", comparing it to Homer's *ἀήρ*, a positive term that would be translated as a negative "invisibleness".[10]

In turn, Aristophanes himself mentions Chaos in two of his plays: in *The Birds* (vv. 690-699), it is described as a primordial element of the universe, next to Night, Erebus and Tartarus. Robert Mondi[11] finds several arguments for subterranean Chaos in this fragment: first of all, it is placed next to Erebos in the end of v. 691. Secondly, Chaos and Eros mate under broad Tartarus. The third argument is that Nyx, Erebus, Tartarus and Chaos are mentioned to have existed before Earth, Air and Heaven (the other three elements of the universe), making it illogical for Chaos to have been moved from his initial position. The other play that mentions it is *The Clouds*. There, Chaos is a part of the Sophist triad that Strepsiades is taught about, along with the Clouds and the Tongue. When Strepsiades leaves Socrates in despair, Chaos is among the invoked entities. What these three elements have in common is their lack of substance, which was something the sophists were accused of as well – they made good use of their tongues, after all. Chaos isn't the same thing as Air, nor is it in the same atmospheric area, but rather something that has some common traits.[12] Since these views have arguably been influenced by Hesiod's and since parodies usually tend to offer a satisfying testimony, one can rely on Aristophanes' account in order to understand Hesiod's *Χάος*.

Such an abstract image would not have been too complex for those times: in Egypt, the primordial divinity Nun was described as being "invisible, formless, empty and timeless", while the *Genesis* mentions *tohu wa bohu*, which is traditionally translated as "formlessness and void".[13] Hesiod's *Χάος* is thus meant to be in contrast with the qualities brought by the cosmogonical act: Gaia's birth also brings shape and boundaries to the universe. In the end, all evolves from a primal state of lack of differentiation to a hierarchical structure, divided in increasingly smaller fragments, down to the birth of the mountains, the rivers or the heavenly bodies.[14] When Gaia appears, so does a certain sense of direction: she is *πάντων ἕδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ*.[15] Therefore, it could be argued that *Χάος* is an early form of *ἄπειρον*.

Paul Seligman, author of a book on Anaximander's *ἄπειρον*, makes an "excursus into mythology", looking for Anaximander's potential sources in Hesiod. Unfortunately, he makes no clear attempt to connect it to Hesiod's *Χάος*. From his point of view, *chaos* still signified "a yawning abyss or gap". He too dismisses the idea of *chaos* separating Heaven and Earth, opting instead for a more "dreamlike character". Thus, "it seems to reproduce the vision of a dark abyss whose precipices remain indistinct and nebulous: the empty womb of coming-to-be, an image of the female, more elementary even than Mother Earth".[16] While this characterization implies a psychoanalytical approach, one might still note the presence of

the "nebulous" and the "indistinct" in this description. Although the connection to "chasm" seems forced, this definition is still appropriate to the shapeless primordial element.

If one accepts this interpretation of the Hesiodic term, then it is far easier to explain the presence of two parallel genealogical lines in the *Theogony*: that of Chaos' successors and that of Gaia's. Their most notable difference lies in the description of the procreative act: after Gaia creates her partner, Ouranos, every single successor is born from a couple. Conversely, there is only one couple in Chaos's line, that of Night and Erebus, who give birth to Day and Aither[17] – it should be noted, however, that each of their children are actually the luminous correspondent of each parent. Seligman's opinion concerning these couples can be found in the following excerpt:

> Here too, however, Hesiod's thought is personified and genealogical. The Chaos-Night pedigree has its due share in parallel with the Gaia-Ouranos line of descent. We may further notice, not only that Gaia, the Earth Mother is prior to Father Heaven, but also that the female *Night* and the nether regions (Erebos) are prior to bright Aither and Day. Just as man is born out of darkness into light, so Night and Earth appear here as the origin of all that is. This order of priority in the generation of the cosmos is mythical history, anthropocentrically conceived; there is nothing in nature viewed objectively that might warrant it. It was simply taken for granted, perhaps until Thales said Night was older than Day – by just one day (DK 11A1). [18]

In addition to preferring a psychoanalytical definition of the "abyss", he seems to give far more credit to Thales, considered to be the first canonical philosopher, being considered Anaximander's teacher.[19] Thus, the birth of light from darkness apparently gains scientific validity only when Thales claims that Night is older than Day by one day. It is, however, doubtful whether this minor observation from Thales truly revolutionized the way educated Greeks saw the succession of day and night. Seligman's views on Hesiod's writings seem to be limited by the necessity to establish a certain hierarchy between philosophers and other writers.

Since these two families are organized in such a distinct manner, it would seem unusual that Night and Day be separated from the Sun and the Moon (who are the children of Hyperion and Theia)[20] and the grandchildren of Gaia and Ouranos).[21] Mondi's explanation proves to be satisfactory: the Sun and the Moon are limited by a definite form in appearance, in a way that the diffusive Aither and Day are not.[22]

This parallel between limit and the lack thereof can also be found in another part of the *Theogony*. Hesiod also writes of the genealogy of negative elements:

> Night bore loathsome Doom and black Fate and Death, and she bore Sleep, and she gave birth to the tribe of Dreams. Second then, gloomy Night bore Blame and painful Distress, although she had slept with none of the gods. […] Deadly Night gave birth to Nemesis too, a woe for mortal human beings; and after her she bore Deceit and Fondness and baneful Old Age, and she bore hard-hearted Strife. And loathsome Strife bore painful Toil and Forgetfulness and Hunger and tearful Pains, and Combats and Battles and Murders and Slaughters, and Strifes and Lies and Tales and Disputes, and Lawlessness and Recklessness, much like one another, and Oath, who indeed brings most woe upon human beings on the earth, whenever someone wilfully swears a false oath. [23]

Upon reading that these negative concepts were born from Night, the reader might be tempted to dismiss Hesiod's genealogy as being dualist in that all which is bad is born from Chaos, while all good things come from Gaia (including Zeus). Jenny Strauss Clay notes that the following part of the Theogony appears to be, at first glance, "an anomaly"[24]. Hesiod goes on to make a catalogue of monstrous beings, all born from Gaia's family. The simpler explanation would be that these monsters were too well-known to be omitted, which is why commentators have not paid much attention to this part of the *Theogony*. Jenny Strauss Clay argues that "the catalogue as a whole represents an important phase in the evolution of the cosmos and can teach us a great deal about the articulation of Hesiod's cosmogonic thought".[25] By analyzing the structure of the list, one can come closer to a proper interpretation: it is not based on a rigid, chronological order, but on a teleological one. Upon describing the monster, Hesiod alludes to the way each of them is to be defeated, even though the said heroes had not been born at that point of the cosmogony. Jenny Strauss Clay then goes on to analyze each element of that catalogue, so, for the purposes of this research, I will just make use of her conclusions. Thus, due to their unnatural aspect, these monsters are opposed – in a certain way – to the order that Zeus was going to establish, either by allying himself with some of them (such as the Cyclops or the Hundred-handers) or by making sure that they get killed. One should note that the heroes are a positive example of μίξις (namely that of divine and human), the kind that is controlled by the gods. Jenny Strauss Clay concludes that the counter-cosmos represented by the monsters is an aberration that explains the need for Zeus's hegemony in the ordered universe.[26]

The catalogue of Gaia's malefic successors has a well-defined purpose in Hesiod's poem, meaning that the proximity of the list of abstract evils couldn't be coincidental. The two are, in fact, complementary. On the one hand, there are concrete beings in clearly defined places (i.e. the Lernaean Hydra, Ὕδρη Λερναίη, lines 313-314), who end up being slain by various city-founders. On the other hand, one can note the perennial character of the abstract. One could, in fact, describe them by the etymologically transparent adjective ἄπειρα.

And yet, although all these elements will have frightened Hesiod's public, the modern reader will be amazed at the absence of Fear, Φόβος, from the detailed list of Night's children. Is *fear* completely absent from *The Theogony*? No, as *fear* is a descendent of the other family as Ares and Aphrodite are the parents of Phobos and Deimos, "who rout the compact battle-lines of men in chilling war together with city-sacking Ares".[27] Why would something as well-known as Fear be born so late? It is, in fact, part of the fifth generation of gods, after Ouranos, Cronus, Zeus and Ares. As far as Phobos is concerned, his origins can be explained upon consulting both Liddell-Scott's lexicon[28] and Chantraine's etymological dictionary.[29] The first meaning of the word φόβος, as used by Homer and other epic poets, was that of "running away" due to panic. Indeed, Chantraine's etymological study reveals that the corresponding terms from other Indo-European languages lean towards the same meaning, rather than that of "fear".[30] Δεῖμος might be more problematic, as the word is only used to describe this mythological character (with a late exception, noted by Liddell – Scott). It stems, however, from the same family as δείδομαι and δέος, both of which are related to *fear*. Chantraine actually mentions φόβος and δέος in the introduction of his etymological dictionary, while explaining the difference between the two:

> Φόβος se dit de la peur qui envahit l'homme et le pousse à fuir, δέος a un sens différent de φόβος. Ce mot exprime une crainte réfléchie, une appréhension, tandis que φόβος conserve quelque chose de son sens originel "de fuite" et s'applique à une peur subite qui donne envie de fuir. Cette distinction est ainsi marquée par Ammonios: δέος πολυχρόνιος κακοῦ ὑπόνοια φόβος δὲ ἡ παραυτίκα. Il n'empêche que, soit chez Homère, soit chez les écrivains attiques, les deux termes peuvent être associés ou s'employer l'un pour l'autre. [31]

Since even Homer managed to use the two terms without a notable difference in meaning, it is equally possible for Hesiod to have done the same. The fact that Ares is the father of Phobos and Deimos should indicate that this is a particular kind of fear, one caused by war. Since both

have the same father, one might suppose that the two are very similar, thus lacking a radical distinction.

Ares' family is not the only part of the *Theogony* that describes war-related elements: as seen in the earlier quote, Combats, Battles and Murders are all born from Strife. In other words, the negative elements that have always described war have a common ancestor, Chaos, but the terror that they cause stems from Gaia. In my opinion, this is another example of the distinction Hesiod made between the limited and the unlimited – and in this system, Fear, used in the context of battles is fairly recent. When discussing the evolution of the stable universe, Vernant notes that its parts are continuously being separated, limiting each other and ordering themselves in such a way that the gods, formerly represented by vague cosmic forces, end up having particular forms and personalities, as well as possessing functions to complete each other. The one who preserves the balance between these forces is, of course, Zeus.[32] Thus, the role of fear in Hesiod's *Theogony* is that of a very specific and limited element, one that was, given its late appearance, unnecessary at first. Moreover, in Hesiod's *Works and Days*, one can find the following account: the bronze race was formed of men who "did not eat bread, but had a strong-hearted spirit of adamant"[33]. I would like to note that Lodovico Magugliani translates κρατερόφρονα as "cuore senza paura",[34] unlike Glenn Most, who opts for a more literal version. Regardless of this fact, both indicate the same idea, namely that they were fearless fighters – thus, we could place the birth of Phobos and Deimos at least after the disappearance of the bronze race.

Thus, if Phobos had appeared so recently and played a specific role that had not been necessary for the greater part of the cosmogony, one should wonder what place did fear hold in Hesiod's thought. Its absence from the otherwise very detailed list of abstract evils is not without reason: it had been willingly separated from the others by the author. One could interpret it in the following manner: man may be tormented by death, famine or old age, but fear itself is very recent, if not typical of Hesiod's race, the iron one (which is made likelier by the fact that it is separated from the bronze race by that of the fearless heroes who had slain the monsters). On the other hand, Hesiod makes it clear in v. 175 of *Works and Days* that time is cyclical by stating his wish either to have died before the Iron Age or afterwards – meaning that after troublesome times, mankind would witness a return of the Golden Age, when they were "with a spirit free from care, entirely apart from toil and distress" and "worthless old age did not oppress them"[35] and, better yet, "they died as if overpowered by sleep".[36] One may recognize the very evils that had

been born of Night and Strife. This proves that, while they are negative in nature, this does not mean they will affect men of all ages. In fact, not even the men of the iron race had been abandoned by the gods, since Hesiod mentions in the beginning of *Works and Days* that there are two kinds of Strife, one that man would praise, the other blameworthy.[37]

In my opinion, Hesiod's view of fear is optimistic: while it does exist, it is of a lower rank. Moreover, frightful entities such as monsters have perished or lack any spatial or temporal limit. Although all these evils are similar in that they surpass common man's understanding, Hesiod's poems also attempt to offer a satisfactory explanation of their role. Man would be saved from his fear of the unknown, since Zeus would always protect him from monsters as a guardian of the universe, while abstract evils could either take a more benevolent form, such as death in the Golden Age.

Bibliography

Aristofane. *Le Commedie*. Edited and translated by Benedetto Marzullo. Rome: Grandi Tascabili Economici Newton, 2003.

Aristote. *Physique (I-IV)*. Edited and translated by Henri Carteron. Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres", 1926.

Chantraine, Pierre. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Paris: Éditions Klincksieck, 1968.

Esiodo, *Le opere e i giorni*. Edited and translated by Werner Jaeger. Milan: Biblioteca Universale Rizzoli, 2006.

Freeman, Kathleen. *The Pre-Socratic Philosophers. A Companion to Diels,* Fragmente der Vorsokratiker. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959.

Herodotus. *Books I and II*. Edited and translated by G. P. Goold. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Hesiod. *Theogony, Works and Days, Testimonia*. Edited and translated by Glenn W. Most. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2006.

Kirk, G. S. and J.E. Raven. *The Presocratic Philosophers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957.

Liddell, Hendry and Robert Scott. Eds. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Mondi, Robert. "Χάος and the Hesiodic Cosmogony." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology,* no. 92 (1989): 1–41.

Ovid. *Metamorphoses*. Edited and translated by Frank Justus Miller. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Seligman, Paul. *The* Apeiron *of Anaximander. A Study in the Origin and Function of Metaphysical Ideas*. London: The Athlone Press, 1962.