5-1-2018

Interpreting the Lemuria as Pietas

Jessica Lynn Leonard
Southern Illinois University Carbondale, jessleonard@siu.edu

INTERPRETING THE *LEMURIA* AS *PIETAS*

by

Jessica L. Leonard

B.A., Southern Illinois University, 2016

A Thesis
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Master of Arts

Department of History
in the Graduate School
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
May 2018

THESIS APPROVAL

INTERPRETING THE *LEMURIA* AS *PIETAS*

By

Jessica L. Leonard

A Thesis Submitted in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Arts

in the field of History

Approved by:

Dr. Rachel Stocking, Chair

Dr. Mont Allen

Dr. Holly Hurlburt

Graduate School
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
April 11, 2018

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

JESSICA L. LEONARD, for the MASTER OF ARTS degree in HISTORY, presented on April 11, 2018, at Southern Illinois University Carbondale.

TITLE: INTERPRETING THE *LEMURIA* AS *PIETAS*

MAJOR PROFESSOR: Dr. Rachel Stocking

The Roman idea of *pietas* was an important value during the Augustan revival of Rome in the first century. Ovid wrote about a unique ritual in the poem *Fasti* that focused on piety towards ancestors called *Lemuria.* The original meaning of the *Lemuria* ritual has changed through the centuries by the power of the Christian Church and modern Christian bias. The anachronistic language used in the translations of Ovid's *Fasti* and the choice of words that historians have used to interpret it portrays the *Lemuria* in an occult-like expulsive way. The Lemuria is not comparable to Christian ritual as some have understood it. The *Lemuria* is simply a ritual of *pietas,* and Ovid's version was to promote popular Roman moral values such as piety while gaining favor with Emperor Augustus.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thank you to my advisor, Dr. Stocking, for the amazing feedback no matter how small the paper. You have pushed me to do better since my first class with you. Enjoy your well-deserved retirement. To Dr. Hurlburt, thank you so much for your help and enthusiasm to learn more about ancient Roman rituals with me. Also, Dr. Allen, you are a gem in the classics department, and they are very lucky to have you. You were a beacon of friendship during my time at Southern Illinois University, and I hope to continue the friendship. Dr. Taoka, I owe you for where I am today. Because of you, I chose classics as my undergraduate major and fell in love with Latin. Also, Dr. Dave Johnson, thank you for your wit and humor, and for your blunt warning against a career in classics. Thank you to Dr. Charles Stein, who had to put up with teaching me ancient Greek in an abbreviated period.

I would also like to thank Special Collections Research Center at Southern Illinois University where I have had the most amazing opportunity to work as a graduate student. Their passion for preserving history and helping researchers is admirable, and I can only hope one day I am as successful as each one of them: Pam Hackbart-Dean, Jessica Zieman, Anne Marie Hamilton-Brehm, Aaron Lisec, Nicholas Guardiano, Walter Ray, Matt Gorzalski, and David Bond.

Thank you to my mother, Letty, who never doubts my passion and aim. Most of all thank you to my husband, Cleve, for pushing me above and beyond. I would not be where I am without you.

PREFACE

During my undergraduate classes in Latin, I was lucky enough to attend a class on translation theory and etymology with Dr. Yasuko Taoka. Comparing translations of the Latin classics was the focus of one class. If I came away learning anything from this, it is that no translation is ever the same. We trained ourselves to be open to diverse types of translations, whether literal or liberal. I found myself a fan of the open-ended liberal translation strategy. However, during graduate school as I trained myself how to become a better historian, I began to doubt the purpose of liberal translations. The Odyssey and the Iliad are enjoyable for casual readers when translators such as Robert Fagles use phrases such as "cramping my style," (Odyssey, 12.245) and it is understandable that a translation like this can and will encourage more readership of the classics by everyone. I agree with this (the classics discipline can use as much help as it can get). However, my view altered when I entered the Southern Illinois University Carbondale graduate history department. At this level of reading, liberal translations just will not do.

Dr. Taoka's Latin class introduced to me the historical anachronism, but it did not affect me until my graduate level introductory historiography classes. Dr. Jonathon Wiesen trained us to "do history better" and ask the right questions. At this moment, my training in translation and history merged. I was training myself to spot problematic anachronism in my Latin readings. In the fall of 2016, I took a class with Dr. Holly Hurlburt on ritual in Early Modern Europe. The research in this class led me to the *Fasti* by Ovid. It just happened to be around Halloween, and the occult-like translation I was reading was timely and fascinating. However, with my background in classics and basic knowledge of Roman religion, I was surprised to see modern Christian terms in these translations. The word choices that the translators chose seemed too

modern to me, and from there I was determined to explain why this was the wrong way to interpret Augustan literature and Ovid's *Lemuria.*

Anachronism in history writing and education is an increasingly debated topic. An anachronism is an error revolving around a past date, event, or subject. When anachronisms affect language, it affects the understanding of current concepts and perspectives that explain history. A 2011 study of Turkish textbooks revealed "that the textbooks' authors do not display a satisfactory level of awareness with respect to presenting the perspectives, the viewpoints and approaches dominant of the time they are narrating," and they "frequently use notions and toponyms belonging to the modern era." For example, the authors of the textbooks allowed a Greek philosopher to refer to a year with the suffix BC (before Christ).[1]

Some scholars believe anachronism is inevitable. According to Thomas M. Greene,[2] since the invention of anachronism in Renaissance literary criticism and the differentiation between history and literature, it becomes fate that society is trapped within the concept of the anachronism. It goes through stages such as naïve, abusive, serendipitous, and creative. Now it is so entrenched in our society that we are condemned to anachronism. Unlike Greene, I believe that it is not necessarily our job to fight fate, but to strive to make aware and point out the inconsistency in anachronism and history writing.

A translator or historian must deal with vocabulary choices and many times it is impossible to translate a word directly into the English language. This concept has been termed

[1] Öztürk, İbrahim Hakkı, "Tarih Öğretiminde Anakronizm Sorunu: Sosyal Bilgiler ve Tarih Ders Kitaplarındaki Kurgusal Metinler Üzerine Bir İnceleme," in *Journal of Social Studies Education Research* 2, no. 1 (2011): 37–58.
[2] Green, Thomas M, "History and Anachronism," in *Literature and History, Theoretical Problems and Russian Case Studies*, edited by Gary Saul Morson, (1986): 205-20.

"untranslatability" by Neville Morley.[3] The translator and historian must make decisions about anachronisms and be aware of any language that would reveal bias. Changing words from one language to another may leave out context. Some words are untranslatable, and here I point out why this is important to remember when studying the ancient Roman ritual named *Lemuria.*

Therefore, I offer my critical translation and discussion of Ovid's *Fasti* (5.419-444). I use many of my own translations for this thesis. Unless otherwise noted, all references in this thesis originating in Latin and Greek text are translated by myself, Jessica Leonard, with extensive footnotes and etymological discussions. All Greek and Latin text are in original form in Appendix B, and footnotes reflect the page numbers they are found on.

For easier reference, I have included in this preface, my translation, with footnotes of the main passage (*Fasti* 5.419-444). You can also find this translation in chapter two.

When *Hesperus*[4] reveals his beauty three times,

And three times, having been subdued by *Phoebus*[5], the stars surrender their place.

There will be an old night-time ritual, the sacred *Lemuria*:

It will offer those *manes*[6], previously silent, sacrifices.

The year was short, the pious month of February was not known,

---

[3] Morley, Neville, "'Das Altertum Das Sich Nicht Ubersetzen Lasst': Translation and Untranslatability in Ancient History," in *Translation & the Classic: Identity as Change in the History of Culture*, edited by Alexandra Lianeri and Vanda Zajko, (Oxford University Press, 2008).

[4] The planet Venus observed as an evening star. Derived from *ἕσπερος (Hesperos)*, the son of the goddess of dawn, Eos. The Roman equivalent to Hesperos is Vesper.

[5] Roman poets referred to the god Apollo as Phoebus, derived from *Φοῖβος* (*Phoebos*) meaning the radiant one.

[6] The deified dead ancestors of the Romans. It is related to the masculine plural of *manis* meaning good and the Greek *μωρος* (*moros*) meaning great. The adjective *manis* is derived from the Proto-Indo-European *$*meh_2$-* meaning to ripen or mature. For more in-depth discussion on *manes* in the *Lemuria* see Charles W. King, "The Roman Manes: The Dead as Gods," 95–114. For an etymological history of the word see Kristina P. Nielson, "Aeneas and the Demands of the Dead," 200–206.

Nor was the monthly leader, two-faced Janus[7]:

Yet they still gave gifts to the cold ashes of the dead,

And the grandchildren showed respect to their grandparent's tombs.

The month was May, declared and named after our ancestors,[8]

Which still has a part in the old ritual.

When the middle of the night gives way to silence and sleep,

And the many dogs and birds are silent,

Remembering rites of old and respecting the gods,

He rises barefoot

And gives a sign joining his fingers with his thumb,[9]

So that he does not meet a trivial *umbra*.[10]

When his hands are cleaned in clear spring water,

He turns around and takes black beans[11]

---

[7] The month of January is named after Janus, Roman god of doorways, beginnings, and transitions. According to Ovid the ritual is so ancient that when first performed, the first two months of the year (January and February) did not exist.

[8] Instead of the month being named "by our ancestors", I chose to translate that May is named "after our ancestors." The Latin word for ancestors, *maiorum,* takes the genitive case. Note the similar spelling in *Maius* (May) *and maior* (ancestor).

[9] This sign could be referring to the *manu fico* (fig hand) which was an obscene gesture used to deter harm.

[10] Line 434's *levis umbra* (trivial dead) differentiates the random meeting with an *umbra* as less important than the *manes* (dead ancestors). Ovid's *umbra* did not refer to a ghost in the modern sense, because the word ghost did not exist in Latin. In Latin *umbra* is darkness or a shadow, such as one cast from a tree in the sunlight. Therefore, the Latin *umbra* in this context means "the darkness of death." Since Roman religion did not account for an afterlife, the darkness of death overtook all of the dead. Therefore, the word umbra can be used for the mischievous dead, or the ancestral dead in the same poem. This neutral term may also explain why they had separate words for the various kinds of dead, such as *manes* and *larvae.* An explanation of the Roman words for the dead can be found in George Thaniel, "Lemures and Larvae," *The American Journal of Philology* 94, no. 2 (Summer 1973): 182–87.

[11] Offerings to the dead in return for interaction can be traced back to Odysseus in Homer's *Odyssey* 11.35-50 where the ghosts must first drink the blood offered by Odysseus to interact with the living. Even then, there was very little interaction besides conversation. I believe that the beans in the Lemuria could represent a doorway to speak to the dead, like blood does in the *Odyssey*. Once the *paterfamilias* uses the beans he can speak directly to the *manes.*

Faces away and throws them; but as he throws them says, ‘These I send,

I atone for my family and myself with these beans.’

This he says nine times without looking back: it is believed the *umbra*

Follows behind and gathers the beans unseen.

He touches the water again and beats the Temesan[12] bronze

And asks, that the *umbra* leave him.

When he has said nine times ‘paternal *manes* go forth,’

He looks back and knows the sacred ritual has clearly been finished.[13]

[12] Temesa, also Tempsa, was an ancient Greek city now extinct. It was known for having valuable copper mines as far back as the fifth century BCE. Temesa is also known as the home of a *daimon* (demon) who stalked the inhabitants of the city until they built a temple to appease it: “so they performed the commands of the god and suffered no more terrors from the ghost.” See Pausanias, *Description of Greece*, trans. W.H.S. Jones, 4 vols. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1918), 6, 6 http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0160:book=6:chapter=6&highlight=temesa.

[13] Ovid, *Fasti*, 8CE, 5.419-444. See page 64 in Appendix B for Latin text.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Modern definitions of the word "piety" usually invoke the idea of devotion to God. However, as time changes, so too do ideas. As modern readers, our impression of religion is quite different from the idea in ancient Rome. The difference is apparent in the definition of *pietas.* The modern meaning of piety is derived from the Latin *pietas.* A modern definition of the Latin word *pietas* indicates that the term denoted "dutiful conduct towards the gods, one's parents, relatives, benefactors, country, etc., sense of duty."[14] The Roman author Cicero, writing in the first century BCE, defined the term as that "which admonishes us to do our duty to our country or our parents or other blood relations."[15]

The Roman idea of *pietas* led to unique practices of ancestor veneration, such as the ritual known as the *Lemuria.* Modern translations of the ancient description of this ritual, however, have led to modern misjudgments of this ritual's meaning. Translators' anachronistic translations of Ovid's poem, *Fasti (*the major work that includes the description of the *Lemuria),* as well as the choice of words historians have used to explain it have shown the *Lemuria* in a very dark expulsive way. The *Lemuria*, however, is not a form of exorcism, as historian R. J. Littlewood calls it.[16] Rather, the *Lemuria* is a form of *pietas*.

This thesis will discuss the *Lemuria* and *pietas* from three perspectives: the nature of the ritual in its Roman context, modern translations (and mistranslations) of the *Lemuria,* and the Christianization of the key ideas involved in the ritual. These three topics did not act

---

[14] Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short, "Pietas," *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford: Trustees of Tufts University, 1879), http://perseus.uchicago.edu/cgi-bin/philologic/getobject.pl?c.14:3000.lewisandshort.

[15] Marcus Tullius Cicero, *De Inventione*, ed. Eduard Stroebel (Lipsiae: B.G. Teubneri, 1915), 2.66 http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0683%3Abook%3D2%3Asection%3D66. See page 59 in Appendix B for Latin text.

[16] R. J. Littlewood, "Ovid Among the Family Dead: The Roman Founder Legend and Augustan Iconography in Ovid's *Feralia* and *Lemuria*," *Latomus* 60, no. 4 (2001): 916–35.

independently of each other to produce what the modern perception of the *Lemuria* became. These points have come together through the last thousand years to form our current view of the ritual. Regrettably, this current view is wrong. At its root, the *Lemuria* is and always has been an expression of idealized Roman concepts based on family values.

First of all, modern concepts of piety as devotion to God do not fit with Roman views of *pietas.* Maintaining a relationship with dead ancestors—a central aspect of Cicero's definition of *pietas*—was a central element in ancient Roman conceptions of honor, morality, and virtue, especially during the Augustan revival in the late first century BCE, when Ovid wrote the *Lemuria*. The spirits represented in his description were not demons, as they are portrayed in modern translations, but ancestors with whom the humans desired positive relationships. Ovid meant the ritual as a propitiation to ensure that the family honored their ancestral spirits correctly (a concept promoted by Emperor Augustus). Ovid strived to gain the favor of Emperor Augustus with poems promoting *pietas* in the rise of morality in the time of Augustan revival.

Secondly, starting in the twentieth century, English translations of the *Fasti* have incorrectly given an occult meaning to the *Lemuria* by involving unwelcome spirits (translated as ghosts or wraiths), and the desire to expel them. These translations have led to historical analyses that attribute the same meanings to the ritual and have added elements of expulsion that are not present in the Latin text. This approach to translating and taking translations at face value have led to interpretations that frame the ritual as exorcism, consequently overtly linking the ritual to a Christian cosmology and understanding of the relationship between the dead and the living. The Christian cosmology and ideals cause the dead in the poem to be seen as evil demons that seek to possess humans or carry them back to hell. Translations of this kind have all but forgotten the background of the *Fasti*. Ovid's intentions did not involve demons or expulsion.

Instead, Ovid was promoting the morals of the Roman Empire and attempting to gain favor with the emperor. Therefore, translators and scholars should always take into account the backgrounds of the poets, the culture during the time of the writing, and any political motives the authors may have been attempting to accomplish while translating or studying Roman literature.

Finally, the process of Christianization of the polytheist deities and their relations with humans that unfolded in the centuries after Ovid and the Augustan revival have affected modern understandings of the *Lemuria*. The occult-like descriptions and the link to exorcism found in modern scholarship about the *Lemuria* result from the Christianization of polytheist gods, whereby Christian apologists tied Jewish conceptions of demons to Greco-Roman ones to explain the continuing presence of traditional polytheist divinities in a Christian cosmos. Drawing from episodes involving demons and their expulsion in the New Testament, Christian leaders in the second and third centuries incorporated the expulsion of these demons into their most fundamental ritual, baptism, by means of the ritual of exorcism. Christian exorcism was conceived of as a power struggle between the Christian authority (the priest) and the forces of Satan (the demon), whereby the priest displayed his (and the Christian god's) dominance over the cosmic fate of the baptized person, and the polytheistic "demon." As Christianity was institutionalized, the necessity of explaining and defeating the presence of polytheist "demons" waned, and the process of exorcism and the ritual of baptism were separated. These ideas and processes fundamentally changed perceptions of the relationship between the living and the dead, and had lasting affects that are still apparent in modern translations and treatments of the *Lemuria* as an exorcism.

Understanding the actual meanings of the *Lemuria* is both historically and historiographically important. The process of the Christianization of Roman cosmology and

values in the second and third centuries, and the entrenched modern biases that have influenced translation practices, specifically about the nature of relations between the dead and the living, have evolved to form opinions of the *Lemuria* that do not fit with its actual history. Taking appropriate steps to understand the background of the time and place before interpreting ancient literature can help develop more accurate understandings of Roman religion and moral values such as *pietas* in the Augustan age.

CHAPTER 2

THE ROMAN SIGNIFICANCE OF THE *LEMURIA*

The end of the Roman Republic in 27 B.C.E., which was marked by corruption and civil wars, became the start of what is now called the *Pax Romana* (Roman Peace) period of Rome. During the following 200 years, there was general peace throughout the empire. The end of the Republic also brought with it a new dictator, the first emperor of the Roman Empire, Augustus. Once Augustus established his power, the lack of war and civil strife allowed him to strengthen his position. One way that he did this was by encouraging a cultural revival. Emperor Augustus wanted peace not only on the borders of the empire, but also strived for social peace by promoting what he believed to be the ancient Roman values of peace, harmony, duty, decency, and wealth.[17] A natural at propaganda, he took advantage of the arts such as architecture, literature, and ceremonies to display his power, to coerce the population into believing he was as powerful as he said, eventually bringing them to believe he was a deity after his death. The *Pax Romana,* the rebirth of ceremony, and the Augustan revival of literature are why Ovid's *Fasti* exists.

Augustus was aware of the power and reach of Roman ceremonies and literature. He invented new public festivals and revived older ones, expanding the traditional calendar of public observances (*fasti*). Originally, oral presentations of *fasti* were popular in Rome. Over time, they came to be painted or carved into stone for the public to see. This public style of the ceremonial calendar also fit well into the emperor's new building programs. The new standards in ceremony and literature influenced Ovid to write a ceremonial calendar in the form of a poem, known as

[17] The virtues are portrayed on the *Campus Martius of the Ara Pacis Augustus* (Altar of Augustan Peace) commissioned by the Senate in July of 13 BCE after Augustus returned home from the last wars of expanding the empire in Spain and Gaul. *Ara Pacis*, 13CE, Marble, 13CE, Museum of the *Ara Pacis*, Rome.

the *Fasti*. His work was based on old ceremonies, but in creating a *fasti* in poem form, Ovid created a new genre. As a poet looking for further recognition in a culture that praised high moral literature, this literary innovation was one of Ovid's contributions.

The most important aspect of a ritual calendar was the capacity it had to project the core values the emperor wanted projected.[18] The ancient ceremonies were significant to Augustus because he was attempting to cement his legacy through means of history. The ceremonies in Ovid's *Fasti* were not liturgical and had little consequence to actual Roman religion.[19] Instead, they represented acts of Roman culture and what it meant to be Roman (*Romanitas*).

Not only did a revival of ancient festivals remind the Roman people of past piety, but Augustan age literature also connected the emperor's rule to the historical beginnings of Rome. Augustus was adamant about using literature as propaganda to shed a positive light on his rule then and in the future. Besides writing about his accomplishments in *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* (Deeds of the Divine Augustus), he wanted the accomplishments of the entire empire and the history of Rome documented in morally epic ways. Augustus was close friends with poets of his time including Propertius, Virgil, and Horace, and he convinced the poets that they could produce an age of literature to rival the Greek literature of Homer and Hesiod. In Virgil's *Aeneid*, the hero represents what it is to "embody the qualities of courage, clemency, justice, and piety that Augustus had claimed as his cardinal virtues."[20] Ovid's *Fasti* also reached into the history of Rome by reviving old rituals that relived the courage of Rome and especially with the *Lemuria* section, the *pietas* of Rome.

---

[18] Mary Beard, "A Complex of Times: No More Sheep on Romulus' Birthday," *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 33 (1987): 1–15.
[19] John Scheid, "Myth, Cult and Reality in Ovid's Fasti," *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 38 (1993): 118–31.
[20] Mathew D.H. Clark, *Augustus First Roman Emperor: Power, Propaganda and the Politics of Survival* (Exeter: Bristol Phoenix Press, 2010), 113–14.

Ovid was born of a wealthy family and started with an education in law but devoted himself instead to poetry. His career as a poet happened in two phases. His early years produced love poetry, which would later come back to haunt him. In the last part of his life, he dedicated himself to the standards of Augustan literature. The year 8 C.E. was a monumental year for Ovid's Augustan poetry. *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* were both published that year. *Metamorphoses*, his most popular poem, follows Augustan literary traditions and tells the mythical history of Rome ending with the deification of Caesar. The *Fasti* recounted the mythical and real ceremonies in the history of Rome.

Eight C.E. was also the year of Ovid's exile. For unknown reasons, Ovid's period of love poems had caught the attention of Augustus. Ovid would describe the cause of his misfortune as a poem and a mistake.[21] He believed it was the poem he wrote in 2 C.E., *Ars Amatoria* (Art of Love), which pushed the boundaries of Augustus' moral reformation and imperial policy.[22] The poem offered advice to men on how to woo women. Shortly after *Ars Amatoria,* he published another erotic poem considered a sequel, called *Remedia Amoris* (Cure for Love). His poems about love contrasted with the moral intentions of Augustan literature. Augustus had passed the *Lex Iulia de Adulteriis Coercendis (*Law concerning adultery) two decades earlier. Ovid was bold in his writing before 8 C.E., and it is uncertain if this is the only reason for his exile.[23] However, something happened between 2 and 8 C.E. that caused him to drastically change his poetic style

[21] Ovid, *Tristia* (Perseus Digital Library, 8CE), 2.1.207 http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0492. See page 65 in Appendix B for Latin text.

[22] Niall Rudd, "Ovid and the Augustan Myth," in *Lines of Enquiry: Studies in Latin Poetry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 12–17.

23 Augustus also exiled his granddaughter in 8 C.E. Some scholars hint that Ovid was knowledgeable of the affair that Augustus' granddaughter was involved in and it may have added to the reasons for Ovid's exile. See Frances Norwood, "The Riddle of Ovid's 'Relegatio,'" *Classical Philology* 58, no. 3 (1963): 150–63.

and start promoting the Augustan virtues in poetry form. Classicist Gian Biagio Conte indicates that Ovid was unique in that his poetry included a variety of genres that were not common among poets during that time, and Ovid's variation in the genres may also have reflected his changes in life choices.[24] Despite his drastic change in genre, he managed to publish *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*, two of the most important poems in the history of Augustan literature.

Ovid's exile from Rome was a rough time. He was unhappily separated from his wife knowing he would likely never see her again.[25] He also missed the libraries of Rome. His poem titled *Tristia* (Sorrows), written during his exile, includes the line, "There is no supply of books, to entertain and sustain me."[26] One might expect Ovid to be bitter towards Augustus about his exile. However, records of his writing show he was very remorseful and was prone to praising Augustus excessively to regain favor. His main goal of writing poetry in exile was to "move the powers at Rome, either by arousing their pity and ingratiating himself through flattery or by provoking a public outcry for his recall."[27] *Tristia* is a depressing collection about his exile, his regrets, and grief. In book two of *Tristia*, he pleads directly to Augustus:

> I will not beg to return. However, we believe the great gods have often granted more than that prayer. If you grant me a closer place of exile, you would ease my punishment greatly… So, as suppliant, I beg you to send me somewhere safe, so that peace, as well as my home, are not taken from me…Though two blunders, a poem, and a mistake, ruined me, I am silent about the second fault: I am not significant enough to open that wound again, Caesar, it is bad enough to be troubled once. About the first: that I am suspect of

[24] Gian Biagio Conte, *Latin Literature: A History*, trans. Joseph B. Solodow (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1994), 341.
[25] Ovid, *Tristia* 3.8.7-10. See page 67 in Appendix B for Latin text.
[26] Ovid, 3.14.37. See page 67 in Appendix B for Latin text.
[27] L.P. Wilkinson, *Ovid Recalled* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955), 336.

being an instructor of obscene adultery, by means of an appalling poem. So, it is possible somehow for divine minds to be wrong. Indeed there are many things beneath their notice.[28]

After his pleas in the *Tristia* fell on deaf ears, he attempted to revise the *Ars Amatoria* to reflect an acceptable poem for the time. Ovid's last work in exile, *Epistulae ex Ponto* (Letters from the Black Sea), was a collection of letters to friends in Rome (no doubt also meant for the emperor's eyes) complaining about and describing his life in exile. Jealous that he is not in Rome, but still in need of his friends he writes, "Many nobles desire glories in the arts: I, unfortunately, failed in my own talent."[29] His pleas did nothing to help his situation. In 18 C.E aged 60, he died an exile of Rome four years after Augustus' death.

Ovid had finished six books of the *Fasti* (January-June) by 8 C.E. Originally, he had dedicated the poem to Augustus, but after Augustus' death in 14 C.E., he started revisions on the poem and perhaps aimed to finish it. Since Ovid could no longer persuade Augustus to remove his exile, he worked to influence the son of Emperor Tiberius, Germanicus. He rewrote the dedication of Book One to Germanicus. He died before revising much else, leaving Books Two through Six still dedicated to Augustus and no drafts for the further books.[30]

The *Fasti* on its own is a true Augustan work of literature. Ovid is successfully able to incorporate Augustan values with the revival of ancient moral traditions. *Pietas* frames the entire poem and links Augustus with the Roman deities. Starting with *Metamorphoses,* "Ovid's writing is marked by deliberate, highly developed, and overt expressions of loyalism" to

[28] Ovid, *Tristia*. 2.183-214. See page 65 in Appendix B for Latin text.
[29] Ovid, *Epistulae Ex Ponto* (Perseus Digital Library, 8CE), 2.7.47-48 http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0493. See page 62 in Appendix B for Latin text.
[30] Wilkinson, *Ovid Recalled*, 241–66.

Augustus, and the *Fasti* specifically "placed the new regime laboriously in the framework of inherited cults and newly revived antiquarian learning."[31] Therefore, the *Fasti* can teach us less about ritual practice and more about Roman society in the first century C.E. Ovid's background, and the *Fasti*, in particular, illustrate that Emperor Augustus attempted to intensify the idea of *pietas* during his reign.[32] To pacify Augustus and strengthen the connection between the emperor, gods and the Roman people, Ovid purposely included in the *Fasti* the rituals that involved *pietas*.

Roman religion and society intermixed. They were one and the same, and *fasti* are proof of this. Polytheistic Romans were intended to honor their ancestors like the gods, and Emperor Augustus promoted this ideal. *Pietas* was a common element in many Greek and Roman rituals and daily life. There were various forms of Roman *pietas,* and during the time of Augustus the common rituals coincided with the ideals and virtues he promoted. For instance, one ritual, the *Parentalia*, was celebrated in February at the graves of family members with the living bringing offerings to the dead.[33] In the *Fasti*, Ovid describes the ancestors receiving the gifts of the living during the *Parentalia*: "the ancestors prefer *pietas* more than cheap gifts."[34] The idea of *pietas* was an important concept to the family structure in ancient Rome, going hand in hand with the Augustan ideals of harmony and duty.

---

[31] Fergus Millar, *The Roman Republic and the Augustan Revolution*, vol. Vol. 1, Rome, the Greek World, and the East (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2002), 332–33.
[32] Valerie M. Hope, *Roman Death: The Dying and the Dead in Ancient Rome* (London: Continuum, 2009), 99.
[33] Ovid, *Fasti* (Perseus Digital Library, 8CE), 2.533-560, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:2008.01.0547. See page 63 in Appendix B for Latin text.
[34] Ibid. Line 535. See page 63 in Appendix B for Latin text.

Pietas rituals could also take the form of promoting relationships between humans and gods.[35] The veneration of Roman emperors as gods became incorporated into conceptions of *pietas,* and Augustus was the first to initiate this practice. Some scholars also propose that Ovid's inclusion of Romulus and Remus into parts of *Fasti* was done as propaganda to connect Augustus' reign with that of his ancient ancestors.[36] In ancient Rome, having connections with famous ancestors was an important part of the social structure. It was vital for the emperor to claim and be seen to have an ancestral heritage as far back into Roman history as possible. Since *pietas* consisted of honoring the dead and their gods, everyone who died was venerated through ancestor devotion.

Another unnamed fifth century B.C.E. Greek and possibly early Roman ritual described in the *lex sacra* (sacred laws) from Selinous[37] explains a rite based on *pietas*. Performed by members of the household, and repeated annually, the family member makes sacrifices to their ancestral spirits "in the manner that one sacrifices to the heroes."[38] Translators of the *lex sacra* connect pollution and purification to the dead ancestors as the reason for the ritual:

> The ancestral spirits known as the Tritopatores[39] (*Τριτοπατορες*) could be contaminated by a death, especially a violent death, or by a homicide involving members of the group to which they were attached.[40]

---

[35] Charles W. King, "The Roman Manes: The Dead as Gods," in *Rethinking Ghosts in World Religions* (Leiden: Koninkliijke Brill NV, 2009), 108.
[36] Littlewood, "Ovid Among the Family Dead: The Roman Founder Legend and Augustan Iconography in Ovid's Feralia and Lemuria."
[37] Jameson, Michael H., et al. *A Lex Sacra from Selinous.* Duke University, 1993.
[38] Sarah Iles Johnston, *Restless Dead: Encounters Between the Living and the Dead in Ancient Greece* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1999), 49–53. See
[39] From *tria (τρία)* + *pater (πατήρ),* meaning three fathers and originally referring to the three fathers of Athens: Amaclides, Protocles, and Protocleon. The term, when used in the plural, eventually came to mean any collective group of dead ancestors, which is referred to in the *lex sacra*.
[40] Jameson, *A Lex Sacra from Selinous*, 73.

This means that if the ancestor was violently killed (or a member of their family), the ritual should take place because of loyalty and duty to family. As we have established, this duty to family is also called *pietas*.

Thus, we see that the Romans in the Augustan period had a tradition of holding the dead in high regard, which had a significant role in their religion.[41] *Pietas* defined family ties and also relationships with the gods. *Pietas* was the Roman concept of obligation to family members or those with close friendships.[42] These are the main themes of the *Lemuria* in Ovid's *Fasti.* The relationship in the *Lemuria* defined by *pietas* was that between the dead ancestors and the living *pater familias* (father of the household). According to Ovid, the *Lemuria* is a ritual held yearly in May:

> When *Hesperus*[43] reveals his beauty three times,
>
> And three times, having been subdued by *Phoebus*[44], the stars surrender their place.
>
> There will be an old night-time ritual, the sacred *Lemuria*:
>
> It will offer those *manes*[45], previously silent, sacrifices.
>
> The year was short, the pious month of February was not known,

[41] King, "The Roman Manes: The Dead as God s," 97; Hope, *Roman Death: The Dying and the Dead in Ancient Rome*, 97.
[42] King, "The Roman Manes: The Dead as Gods," 107; Kristina P. Nielson, "Aeneas and the Demands of the Dead," *The Classical Journal* 79, no. 3 (March 1984): 200–206.
[43] The planet Venus observed as an evening star. Derived from *ἕσπερος (Hesperos)*, the son of the goddess of dawn, Eos. The Roman equivalent to Hesperos is Vesper.
[44] Roman poets referred to the god Apollo as Phoebus, derived from *Φοῖβος* (*Phoebos*) meaning the radiant one.
[45] The deified dead ancestors of the Romans. It is related to the masculine plural of *manis* meaning good and the Greek *μωρος* (*moros*) meaning great. The adjective *manis* is derived from the Proto-Indo-European *$*meh_2$*- meaning to ripen or mature. For more in-depth discussion on *manes* in the *Lemuria* see Charles W. King, "The Roman Manes: The Dead as Gods," 95–114. For an etymological history of the word see Kristina P. Nielson, "Aeneas and the Demands of the Dead," 200–206.

Nor was the monthly leader, two-faced Janus[46]:

Yet they still gave gifts to the cold ashes of the dead,

And the grandchildren showed respect to their grandparent's tombs.

The month was May, declared and named after our ancestors,[47]

Which still has a part in the old ritual.

When the middle of the night gives way to silence and sleep,

And the many dogs and birds are silent,

Remembering rites of old and timid gods,

He rises barefoot

And gives a sign joining his fingers with his thumb,[48]

So that he does not meet a trivial *umbra*.[49]

When his hands are cleaned in clear spring water,

He turns around and takes black beans[50]

---

[46] The month of January is named after Janus, Roman god of doorways, beginnings, and transitions. According to Ovid the ritual is so ancient that when first performed, the first two months of the year (January and February) did not exist.

[47] Instead of the month being named "by our ancestors", I chose to translate that May is named "after our ancestors." The Latin word for ancestors, *maiorum,* takes the genitive case. Note the similar spelling in *Maius* (May) *and maior* (ancestor).

[48] This sign could be referring to the *manu fico* (fig hand) which was an obscene gesture used to deter harm.

[49] Line 434's *levis umbra* (trivial dead) differentiates the random meeting with an *umbra* as less important than the *manes* (dead ancestors). Ovid's *umbra* did not refer to a ghost in the modern sense, because the word ghost did not exist in Latin. In Latin *umbra* is darkness or a shadow, such as one cast from a tree in the sunlight. Therefore, the Latin *umbra* in this context means "the darkness of death." Since Roman religion did not account for an afterlife, the darkness of death overtook all of the dead. Therefore, the word umbra can be used for the mischievous dead, or the ancestral dead in the same poem. This neutral term may also explain why they had separate words for the various kinds of dead, such as *manes* and *larvae.* An explanation of the Roman words for the dead can be found in George Thaniel, "Lemures and Larvae," *The American Journal of Philology* 94, no. 2 (Summer 1973): 182–87.

[50] Offerings to the dead in return for interaction can be traced back to Odysseus in Homer's *Odyssey* 11.35-50 where the ghosts must first drink the blood offered by Odysseus to interact with the living. Even then, there was very little interaction besides conversation. I believe that the beans in the Lemuria could represent a doorway to speak to the dead, like blood does in the *Odyssey*. Once the *paterfamilias* uses the beans he can speak directly to the *manes.*

Faces away and throws them; but as he throws them says, 'These I send,

I atone for my family and myself with these beans.'

This he says nine times without looking back: it is believed the *umbra*

Follows behind and gathers the beans unseen.

He touches the water again and beats the Temesan[51] bronze

And asks, that the *umbra* leave him.

When he has said nine times 'paternal *manes* leave,'

He looks back and knows the sacred ritual has clearly been finished.[52]

The sources Ovid used to recreate (or create) the steps of the ritual are unknown. Ovid does not name his sources, just refers to them as "annals old."[53] Although he is particular in the written steps of the ritual, it is important to keep in mind that his version was not liturgical and the Ovidian mythology did not need to be true. Ovid interpreted the rituals as he saw fit, and in Rome, Ovid's work, like other *fasti*, was accepted as narrative exegesis, his own interpretation of past ritual.[54] The most important idea to take away from the *Lemuria* ritual is that it was used in literature to promote *pietas* in a society meant to embrace *romanitas.* Scholars have voiced concerns over taking the steps of the *Lemuria* at face value since Ovid wrote with an agenda in mind.[55] Nevertheless, this study will not analyze the specific steps of the *Lemuria* but focuses on

[51] Temesa, also Tempsa, was an ancient Greek city now extinct. It was known for having valuable copper mines as far back as the fifth century BCE. Temesa is also known as the home of a *daimon* (demon) who stalked the inhabitants of the city until they built a temple to appease it: "so they performed the commands of the god and suffered no more terrors from the ghost." See Pausanias, *Description of Greece*, trans. W.H.S. Jones, 4 vols. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1918), 6, 6 http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0160:book=6:chapter=6&highlight=temesa.

[52] Ovid, *Fasti*, 8CE, 5.419-444. See page 64 in Appendix B for Latin text.

[53] Ovid, *Fasti*, trans. James George Frazer, Loeb Classical Library 253 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931) p. xi.

[54] Scheid, "Myth, Cult and Reality in Ovid's Fasti." For more on Roman calendar exegesis see Beard, "A Complex of Times: No More Sheep on Romulus' Birthday."

[55] Philippe Buc, "Ritual and Interpretation: The Early Medieval Case," *Early Medieval Europe* 9, no. 2 (July 2000): 183–210.

the environment it was written in, the liberties taken in modern translations, and why these translations have overlooked the Roman concept of *pietas.*

CHAPTER 3

TRANSLATIONS AND THE STUDY OF THE *LEMURIA*

Between the years 18 and 500 C.E., readership and study of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* remained popular. However, the early middle ages (500 through 1000 C.E.) brought a decline of all written records, and transcription and citation of Ovid's work was rare.[56] Between the 6th through 8th centuries the Latin language started to develop into countless vernaculars, and Ovid's works were translated into French and German. Following the 11th century, the study of the classics witnessed a slow rebirth in schools and literary circles until it flourished in the Renaissance. Many of the translations were of Ovid's most popular poem, *Metamorphoses.* While *Metamorphoses* was a polytheist work, many considered it an "allegorical interpretation of the classics."[57] The *Fasti*, however, dealt in less defendable polytheist religious elements, and consequently went through a decline in readership that continued until the twentieth century. Beginning in the twentieth century, the study of classicism started to gain ground and the end of the century saw a significant increase in classical reception mostly due to classicism in the arts such as film. Therefore, we see only one major translation of the *Fasti* before 1990, and many at the very end of the twentieth and beginning of the twenty-first century.

James George Frazer was first during the twentieth century to translate the major work of the *Fasti* into English. Published in 1929, this is the most cited translation of the *Fasti* today. Many scholars base their research on his translation. Frazer, a social anthropologist, has often been thought of as the father of modern anthropology. His anthropological studies were on mythology and comparative religion, and he was the first anthropologist to equate myth and ritual. It is not surprising then that he favored the *Fasti* out of all of Ovid's work. The *Fasti* was

[56] Wilkinson, *Ovid Recalled*, 373.
[57] Wilkinson, 406.

the only translation of Ovid that Frazer published. His translation of the *Lemuria* should be noted for his choices in vocabulary:

> When midnight has come and lends silence to sleep, and the dogs and all ye varied fowls are hushed, the worshipper who bears the olden rite in mind and fears the gods arises; no knots constrict his feet; and he makes a sign with his thumb in the middle of his closed fingers, lest in his silence an unsubstantial shade should meet him. And after washing his hands clean in spring water, he turns and first he receives black beans and throws them away with face averted; but while he throws them, he says: 'These I cast: with these beans I redeem me and mine.' This he says nine times, without looking back: the shade is thought to gather the beans, and to follow unseen behind. Again he touches water, and clashes the Temesan bronze, and asks the shade to go out of his house. When he has said nine times, "Ghosts of my fathers, go forth!" he looks back, and thinks that he has duly performed the sacred rites.[58]

Regrettably, Frazer's vocabulary situates the ancient Roman rites anachronistically, and several scholars and later translations have followed this example. By translating *Manes paterni* as "ghosts of my fathers," Frazer invokes a modern image in the reader's mind of haunted places and ghost stories. Religious bias can cause major problems for scholars who study religious systems that are much different from those of their society. It can be a challenge to describe and interpret without "interjecting too much of the scholar's religious framework into the interpretation."[59]

[58] Ovid, *Fasti*, 1931, 5.429-444. See page 58 in Appendix B for Latin text.
[59] King, "The Roman Manes: The Dead as Gods," 97.

Frazier repeats these anachronistic disruptions with the translations of *umbra.*[60] In the twenty-first century, "shade" and "ghost" mean the same thing and when referring to ghosts and shades, many will give an occult meaning and associate these words with hauntings, graveyards, and ghouls. The English word "ghost" is not a derivative of the Latin *umbra.* Translators should use scrutiny when translating narratives, and scholars should also inspect the translations they use. The mistranslations of the *Lemuria* have led to misunderstandings of the ritual, making an important lesson to the historian on translation choices and source integrity. Leading Japanese historian Jeffrey P. Mass points out that during the early twentieth century there was an influx of translators and translations of narratives. Mass says that many times historians took these translations at face value and "this meant that the existence or nonexistence of a particular translation might determine how an entire period was perceived."[61] The classics did see a growth in translations during the twentieth century.[62] However, during this same time, foreign language instruction in Ancient Greek and Latin declined. The problem with this is that some scholars may become more reliant on translations. This has been the case for Ovid's lesser translated *Fasti*.

Following Frazier, Classicist Betty Rose Nagle published a translation of the *Fasti* in 1995 using modern and occult-like vocabulary:

> When night is half over and furnishes quiet for sleep,
>
> And dogs and colorful birds have grown silent,
>
> A god-fearing man who remembers the ancient observances gets up
>
> (both his feet are unconfined by shoes)

[60] See footnote 37 about *umbra*.
[61] Jeffrey P. Mass, *Antiquity and Anachronism in Japanese History* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992), 130.
[62] See page 15.

And makes the sign of the fig with his thumb and adjacent fingers

To keep from meeting a shadowy ghost in the silence.

And when he has washed his hands clean with spring water,

He turns and starts by taking black beans,

Then tosses them over his shoulder, and says as he does, "These

I let fall, with these I ransom me and mine."

He says this nine times without looking back. The ghost is thought

To pick up the beans and follow behind unseen. [63]

Nagel uses words such as shadowy, ghost, and ransom. Like Frazer, she has invoked the modern sense of ghosts. Nagle chose to add an action for the "ghost." It has kidnapped the family and demanded payment for ransom. Nagle has translated Ovid's *redimo* as "ransom," which is a poor choice for two reasons. First, nothing in the lines of the Latin suggests that the ghost is kidnapping the family. Secondly, the word is derived from *emo* with the prefix *re-*, so a literal translation could be to take back. However, like many languages that are not only translated transitively, Latin is also used figuratively. When used in a religious context, *redimo* translates "to atone." Indeed, the *paterfamilias* is more likely to be atoning to the dead than ransoming or buying something. The *Lemuria* is, of course, an ancient ritual, but Nagle overlooks that it is a religious rite promoting *pietas* to ancestors.

Some have taken the translation of *redimo* a step farther, having the "ghost" carry away a person at that present moment. In his translation of the work of French philologist Georges Dumèzil, Philip Krapp renders a section on the *Lemuria* as:

[63] Ovid, *Ovid's Fasti: Roman Holidays*, trans. Betty Rose Nagle (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995), 142. See page 58 in Appendix B for Latin text.

> The ghost if it were not gently lured toward the door by the beans to which it was partial, would carry away some living person along with him into the realm of death.[64]

Kristina Nielson then cites the passage in Krapp's translation, also claiming that the ghost will carry the living away:

> Unlike the spirits of the Parentalia, those of the *Lemuria* seem to be able to carry away a living person into the realm of death, if not appeased properly.[65]

Another Roman historian and prominent theorist of religion, Mircea Eliade, claims that

> In order to pacify them and keep them from taking some of the living away with them, the head of the family filled his mouth with black beans and, spitting them out uttered the following formula nine times: 'By these beans I redeem myself – myself and those who are mine.' Finally making a noise with some bronze object to frighten the shades.[66]

He only cites the Latin text and does not reveal where he obtained the information about "taking some of the living away." He has also managed to paint an image of the *paterfamilias* attempting to frighten the ancestor away by making noises. A ritual of *pietas* would not treat the *manes* in this way. Eliade has also added that the paterfamilias spits the black beans out of his mouth. The Latin lines 435-437[67] do not involve any verb for spitting or a noun for the mouth.

In 2000, a new translation by classical scholars A.J. Boyle and R.D. Woodard also had some unique vocabulary choices:

> The man who remembers the ancient rite and fears
>
> The gods rises up (no shoes bind his feet),

---

[64] Georges Dumezil, *Archaic Roman Religion*, trans. Philip Krapp, vol. 1 (Baltimore, London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1996), 367.
[65] Nielson, "Aeneas and the Demands of the Dead," 201. She also cites Toynbee, who is discussed on page 22.
[66] Mircea Eliade, "The Private Cult: Penates, Lares, Manes," in *History of Religious Ideas: V. 2: From Gautama Buddha to the Triumph of Christianity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011), 117–18.
[67] See page 58 in Appendix B for Latin text.

And makes a thumb sign between his closed fingers

To avoid some ghostly wraith in the quiet.

When he has washed his hands clean with fountain water,

He turns around after taking black beans,

Glances away and throws, saying: 'These I release:

I redeem me and mine with these beans,

He says this nine times and does not look back: a ghost,

They think, collects them and trails unseen.

He touches the water again, bangs the Temesan bronze,

And asks the ghosts to depart his house. [68]

Boyle and Woodard have decided to translate *umbra* in two different ways: wraith and ghost. The etymology of "wraith" is uncertain. However, "wraith" is first seen in a Middle Scots translation of *Aeneid* in 1513. A wraith could be related to the word "wrath," meaning anger, originally Old English *wrǣþþu*. This connection could be why a wraith is considered vengeful. The *Lemuria*, however, is not a ritual of vengeance, but a ritual of *pietas* and using "wraith" is anachronistic.[69]

---

[68] Ovid, *Fasti*, trans. A.J. Boyle and R.D. Woodard (London: Penguin Books, 2000), 126. See page 58 in Appendix B for Latin text.

[69] Internet publications of the *Fasti* include poet and translator A.S. Kline's digitally published translation in 2004. See Ovid, *Ovid: Fasti*, trans. A. S. Kline (Poetry in Translation, 2004), Book V: May 9: The Lemuria https://www.poetryintranslation.com/PITBR/Latin/Fastihome.php. Kline's choice of translating *umbra* to "spirit" needs further inspection. It is ironic that the Latin *spiritus* means "to breathe" and is derived from the Latin *spiro,* "to live." How then did this word come to represent not the living, but the dead? Following the trends from polytheism to a Christian society, the word was transformed by connections to the spirit of God. The holy trinity (the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit) was an early doctrine of the second century CE. and formalized in the fourth century. The first records of using "spirit" this way was in 110 C.E. by Ignatius of Antioch referring to "Christ, and to the Father, and to the Spirit" in a Greek letter to the Magnesians. See Ignatius, *Ignatius to the Magnesians*, 110CE, http://www.earlychurchtexts.com/main/ignatius/magnesians.shtml. See page 60 in Appendix B for Greek text. See also Saint Jerome, *Biblia Sacra Vulgata*, n.d., Genesis 1:2 where in 405 C. E. the Vulgate bible included *spiritus* as a new concept of God. It is possible that like the transition of the word "ghost" through time,

In 2011, classical scholars Anne and Peter Wiseman published the most literal translation, deciding to leave in one Latin word:

> The man who remembers the ancient rite and is nervous of the gods gets up (his twin feet have no bindings) and makes a sign by closing his fingers with his thumb between them, so that no insubstantial shade may meet him in the silence. When he has washed his hands clean with spring water, he turns round – he first takes some black beans – and turns his face away and throws them. But as he throws he says: 'These I send. With these beans I redeem me and mine'. Nine times he says this and does not look back. The shade is thought to collect them and follow behind him with nobody seeing. Again he touches water, and clatters Temesan bronze, and asks the shade to go out of his house. When he has said nine times, 'Go out, paternal *manes!',* he looks back, and considers the ritual properly carried out.[70]

The strategy of leaving the word *manes*[71] is a step closer to understanding the underlying meaning of the ritual and piety to ancestors. By translating directly as "paternal *manes*" the Wisemans avoid the obscure words of ghosts and allude to the ancestral quality of the ritual. However, the word "shade" still replaces the word *umbra* with no explanation of what kind of shade. Translating Latin words as "ghost" and "shade" give the words an apotropaic connotation. However, the Romans were not trying to avert the dead in the *Lemuria;* they were performing *pietas.*

"spirit" also became connected with the dead in the Early Middle Ages and is now another word for ghost. See page 61 in Appendix B for Latin text.

[70] Ovid, Anne Wiseman, and Peter Wiseman, *Times and Reasons: A New Translation of Fasti* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 97. See page 58 in Appendix B for Latin text.

[71] See footnote 33 for an explanation of *manes*.

Recent scholars have tried to connect occult meaning to the foundation of the *Lemuria*, claiming that the Roman ghosts are vengeful like their founder Remus who died in vain.[72] One of the most cited authors on Roman religion and death, J.M.C. Toynbee, covers the steps of the *Lemuria* in *Death and Burial in the Roman World*. Toynbee's take on the ancient ritual is one of the most egregiously anachronistic:

> The second festival of the dead, held on 9, 11, and 13 May, was the *Lemuria*, when the apparently kinless and hungry ghosts, the *Lemures*, and the mischievous and dangerous *Larvae*, were supposed to prowl round the house… At midnight the worshipper made a sign with his thumb in the middle of his forehead, washed his hands in clean spring water, turned, took black beans and threw them away with averted face, saying nine times: 'these I cast, with these I redeem me and mine.' The ghosts were thought to gather the beans and follow unseen behind the worshipper, who then touched water, clashed bronze, and asked the ghosts to leave the house.[73]

Toynbee's translation choices add malicious adjectives making *umbra* and *manes* unpleasant beings. Toynbee describes the dead as "apparently kinless and hungry ghosts." She not only invokes the anachronistic vocabulary of ghosts but ignores the very words of Ovid's poem in line 443: *Manes exite paterni*, the departed ancestors of the father. She refers to them as kinless, when they are obviously ancestors. According to Toynbee, these kinless ghosts also "prowled around the house."[74] By using these words, Toynbee has invoked the feelings of a modern

[72] See Timothy Peter Wiseman, *Remus: A Roman Myth* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995) on the vengeance of Remus. See also, Plutarch's take on the rituals to vengeful *daimones* Plutarch, "The Obsolescence of Oracles," in *Moralia*, 100CE, 14–15, https://www.loebclassics.com/view/plutarch-moralia_table_talk/1961/pb_LCL424.259.xml. Also, see Jack J. Lennon, *Pollution and Religion in Ancient Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 162, where he claims that the dead haunt the city during the whole month of May.

[73] J. M. C. Toynbee, *Death and Burial in the Roman World* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1971), 64.

[74] Ibid.

haunted house with a vengeful ghost. Toynbee has completely overlooked the basis of the *Lemuria* as being an act of piety to ancestral spirits.

Perhaps the most liberty taken in interpreting the *Lemuria* was in 2001 when Ovid scholar R. J. Littlewood wrote about the ritual:

> It is stranger, perhaps, that the Lemuria includes the ritual of exorcism. To exhort the dead with the help of black magic, to go forth from the habitations of the living can only mean that they are unwelcome… The practical features of this ritual belong to the practice of sympathetic magic similar to that described in the *Feralia* and common throughout the Greco-Roman world : loosing of sandal thongs, a hand gesture to ward off evil, ablution and black beans throw over the shoulder while uttering an incantation to achieve the desired exorcism…However, the circumstantial differences between the two black magic sequences are striking. The garrulous crone who brings merriment to the *Feralia* is replaced by an anonymous Roman *paterfamilias* who rises fearfully in the middle of the night.[75]

In these lines, she has called the ritual strange, writes that the Romans used black magic, suggested that the ritual is an exorcism, and claimed that the dead were unwelcome. Littlewood has brought Christianized terms into her interpretation.

Why are these scholars painting the Roman ritual as expulsive and magical? Why is Littlewood referring to a ritual about piety to the dead as an exorcism? It is because our modern view of life and death is not the view of the ancient Romans. Scholar Charles W. King explains:

[75] Littlewood, "Ovid Among the Family Dead: The Roman Founder Legend and Augustan Iconography in Ovid's Feralia and Lemuria," 925-26. Although I disagree with his labeling of exorcism, Littlewood does have a good argument connecting the *Lemuria* to the death of Remus.

> Despite the availability of evidence, however, the *manes* have received relatively little scholarly attention. In part, the reasons for this involve a conflict between ancient Roman practices and the religious categories of modern scholars, who tend to be influenced by specifically Christian models of death and the afterlife…Even when they do postulate a role for the dead in living society, scholars of Rome tend to assume that any such role could only be negative. Thus they characterize the *manes* as "ghosts" in a specifically pejorative sense of the word "ghosts," as something the living would want to avoid.[76]

Looking at polytheist ideas and their rituals through the eyes of a Christian society affects the scholarship on Roman ritual. Death in Rome did not include an afterlife. In a Christianized society, however, it is easy to forget this when studying rituals of the dead from other civilizations. In the next chapter, we look at why this Christianization of polytheist ideas occurred and its relationship to the *Lemuria.*

[76] King, "The Roman Manes: The Dead as Gods," 96.

CHAPTER 4

THE CHRISTIANIZATION OF POLYTHEIST CULTURE

Understanding the history of the word "demon" sheds light on the intricate changes in society between the power of Rome and the power of Christianity during the first three centuries. Ancient traditions of the "demon" are seen in Greek culture as far back as the fourth century B.C.E. These traditions spilled over into the syncretized religion of the Romans who also incorporated "demons" into their daily lives, including the *Lemuria* and other rituals of *pietas*. From this point, the word and its religious meaning changed further in the hands of second-century Christian apologists, who incorporated Jewish conceptions of evil demons into a new Christian cosmology where "demons" were understood as polytheist deities who were (and had always been) malevolent agents of Satan. This etymology and cultural change help explain why modern historians have misinterpreted the *Lemuria* and why Littlewood sees the *Lemuria* as exorcism.

HISTORY OF THE DEMON

References to the Greek demon start as far back as the poems of Homer. Δαίμων (*daimon*) is used throughout his work interchangeably with "god" (*θεοί*) as seen in the Iliad 1.222: "Then she went back to Olympus among the other gods [*daimones*]." In some instances, it can translate as heaven or fate as in Iliad 15.403: "if heaven [*daimoni*] so wills it."[77] In Greek mythology, the deities have good and harmful qualities depending on the situation.[78] Therefore, there was a neutral connotation with the word *daimon* in Greek. Individuals used the word in

[77] Homer, *Iliad* (Perseus Digital Library), 1.222 and 15.403, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=urn:cts:greekLit:tlg0012.tlg001.perseus-grc1:1.1-1.32. See page 60 of Appendix B for Greek text.

[78] Jeffrey Burton Russell, *The Devil, Perceptions of Evil from Antiquity to Primitive Christianity* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1977), 123-132. For more information on the duality and separation of good and evil in Greek religion see the chapter "Evil in the Classical World".

positive ways, but there were situations where it could be used to describe an mischevious emotion or action.

Hesiod, believed to be from the same century as Homer, tried to classify demons. He explained that the demons were another class of beings, a golden race of men created by the gods. When any of this golden race died, they become "pure demons living on the earth, and are kindly guardians of mortal men delivering them from harm; they roam everywhere over the earth, clothed in mist, and keep watch on judgments and cruel deeds."[79]

Homer and Hesiod may have been the earliest sources referring to demons, but much of what we know of the Greek demons is from Plutarch's writing from the first century C.E. He was born into a wealthy Greek family and later became a Roman citizen. Trained as a philosopher, he served as a priest for Apollo and worked as a magistrate and ambassador. Plutarch, a Neo-Platonist, probably derived many of his ideas about demons from Plato, the Greek philosopher from the fourth century B.C.E. In the collection of work called *Moralia,* Plutarch explains that demons are mediators between humans and the gods. He writes:

> Let us not listen to any who say that there are some oracles not divinely inspired, or religious ceremonies and mystic rites which are disregarded by the gods. On the other hand, let us not imagine that the god enters, leaves, and is present at these ceremonies and helps in conducting them. But let us commit these matters to those priests of the gods who have the right, as to servants and clerks, and let us believe that demons are guardians of sacred rites of the gods and promoters in the Mysteries, while others go about as avengers of arrogant and dangerous cases of injustice.[80]

[79] Hesiod, *Works and Days*, trans. Hugh G. Evelyn-White, Perseus Digital Library, The Homeric Hymns and Homerica (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press and William Heinemann Ltd., 1914), 110-139 http://data.perseus.org/citations/urn:cts:greekLit:tlg0020.tlg002.perseus-eng1:1-10.
[80] Plutarch, "The Obsolescence of Oracles," 417a. See page 68 of Appendix B for Greek text.

This passage indicates that Plutarch's demon could be good. He also refers to them as harmful:

> In the mind of a god-fearing man, every bodily need, missing item, death of kin, or mishaps and failures in life are either misfortunes from the gods or attacks from a harmful spirit.[81]

Plutarch agrees with Hesiod that there are distinct types of demons.[82] He also indicates that demons are human-like because they give in to temptations and could eventually turn from divine to destructive.[83] This change in the character of demons would later be instrumental to the Christian apologists in declaring them evil beings.

Littered throughout the Greek sources is the idea of good demons and bad demons with no concrete reason why some are harmful and others respectable. A guess would be that since the polytheists feared the gods, they were reluctant to blame them when terrible things happened. Therefore, the scapegoat was the demon, the intermediary between the gods and humans who had messed things up. "What is most helpful? God. What is most harmful? Demon," Plutarch writes.[84]

To conclude about Greek demons, a story from the third century can distinguish how different a Greek demon was compared to the modern Christianized version of a demon we usually refer to. Plotinus, a Greek philosopher in the middle of the third century, a Middle-Platonist, wrote:

---

[81] Plutarch, "On Superstition," in *Moralia* (Perseus Digital Library), 7.3, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0188. See page 69 of Appendix B for Greek text.
[82] Plutarch, "The Obsolescence of Oracles." 417b. See page 68 of Appendix B for Greek text.
[83] Plutarch, 417c. See page 68 of Appendix B for Greek text. These bad demons are what Ovid refers to as trivial (*levis umbra*) and proceeds to make the *manu fica* sign against them in lines 433-34 of the *Fasti*.
[84] Plutarch, "The Dinner of the Seven Wise Men," in *Moralia* (Loeb Classical Library), 528, https://www.loebclassics.com/view/plutarch-moralia_dinner_seven_wise_men/1928/pb_LCL222.349.xml.

> An Egyptian priest who came to Rome as an acquaintance through a friend wanted to display his occult wisdom and asked Plotinus to come and see a visible manifestation of his own companion spirit. Plotinus readily consented…When the spirit was summoned, there appeared a god and not a being of the spiritual order. The Egyptian said, 'Blessed are you, who have a god for your spirit and not a companion of the subordinate order'…So the companion of Plotinus was a spirit of the more god-like kind, and he continually keeps the divine eye of his soul fixed on this companion.[85]

Plotinus refers to the guardian spirit as a demon. This passage shows us that in Greece there were tiers of spirits, and that a person could have an accompanying spirit that was unseen.

DEMONS IN DAILY ROMAN LIFE

Syncretism between the religions of Greece and Rome led to the sharing of ideas about demons. The demons in Rome could serve the same purpose as Plotinus' demon, a guardian. Roman demons were also an abstract idea, the word being used as an adjective to describe madness. The word was used in daily conversation. Emperor Augustus reminded those in the empire that he was demonic,[86] meaning he was a deity.[87] A common protective household spirit was called *agatho daimon*, translated good demon. Archaeology reveals that the *agatho daimon* had a temple between Megalopolis and Maenalus in Arcadia,[88] meaning that it was a recipient to worship. In Greek and Roman art, *Agathe Tyche*, translated as good fortune, often accompanies

[85] Plotinus, *Ennead, Volume I: Porphyry on the Life of Plotinus. Ennead I.* (Loeb Classical Library, 270CE), 10.15-32 https://www.loebclassics.com/view/porphyry-life_plotinus_order_his_books/1969/pb_LCL440.3.xml. See page 67 of Appendix B for Greek text.

[86] Dio Cassius, *Roman History* (Loeb Classical Library, 233CE), https://www.loebclassics.com/view/dio_cassius-roman_history/1914/pb_LCL083.207.xml.

[87] Augustus worked hard to establish his divine ancestry, going as far as connecting himself to Aeneas, ancestor of Romulus and Remus, and son of the goddess Venus.

[88] William Smith, ed., "Agathodaemon," *A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology* (London: John Murray, 1872).

the *agatho daimon*, connecting the demon to good luck.[89] Syncretized from the Greek *agatho daimon* is the Roman *genius loci* found on *lararium* shrines in excavated Roman houses.[90] Comparing the two versions shows many similarities. It was common to see Roman wall paintings of the demon taking an offering from a raised platform. Other demons shown in *lararium* wall paintings represented another household guardian, the *lares*, who often was represented holding a horn of cornucopia like the *agatho daimon.*

With these definitions and descriptions, the paternal *manes* from the *Lemuria* could also be called demons. The connection is seen in various ways. First, since the ritual of the *Lemuria* at its base is for *pietas,* the ancestors were in a sense considered deities just like the demons discussed by Hesiod and Plotinus. Like the *agatho daimon* had its own shrine, the ancestors involved in the *Lemuria* had a shrine, the house of the family. The *Lemuria* was a way to honor these ancestors at their shrines. Secondly, the *manes* could act as guardian spirits to the family home. The yearly act of *pietas* was the family's way of thanking, atoning, and humbling the *manes* for keeping watch over the household. However, these "demonic" traits of the paternal *manes* are what connected the *Lemuria* to the cultural changes of religion in later centuries. What was a demonic guardian to the Greeks and Romans, became an evil minion of Satan for the Christians. The *Lemuria,* as a polytheist ritual, was caught up in the Christianization of the Greco-Roman demon, although the word "demon" is not existent in the passage. However, the word *manes* became attached to the apotropaic nature of the Christian dead and categorized as a Christian demon.

---

[89] Roman art represents the demon in the form of a serpent, or of a young man with a cornucopia, a bowl, and ears of corn in hand.

[90] *Bacchus and Vesuvius*, 79CE, Fresco, National Archaeological Museum of Naples, http://cir.campania.beniculturali.it/museoarcheologiconazionale/itinerari-tematici/galleria-di-immagini/RA36. The website reveals the use of the word *Agatho daimon* in the description: "in basso da un serpente agatodemone che si snoda tra i cespi di un mirto in direzione di un altare con un uovo."

THE CHRISTIANIZED DEMON

When foreign rituals and practices seem to us uncultured or strange, we often assign them an arcane or superstitious meaning. Early Christian apologetics did the same when they had to explain how the foreign rituals of the polytheists fit into a new Christian world. The syncretism between late Greco-Roman divinities and early Christian traditions is one reason why the *Lemuria* is now referred to as an exorcism. The change from Roman religion to Christianity was slow and not simple. One of the first controversies between the religions was the problem of Roman deities (both the fact of them being considered demons and their plurality). Through the second and third centuries, Church leaders and Christian apologists worked hard to undermine the polytheistic deities and promote the monotheistic version of their own God. As the apologists worked to discredit them, a new version of the Roman gods emerged.

During the second and third centuries, the Christian Church was a small illegal religion. It was in a struggle for survival, and it was crucial for the Christians to forge their identity. Christian hierarchies were just emerging and consolidating, and the polytheistic religious culture and deities were still overwhelmingly dominant. Christians had to find a way to explain their place in both the world of Jewish religion and the Roman world. Therefore, they had to explain how polytheistic deities fit into their Christian cosmology. By the second century, small communities of Christians called for more organization and distance from polytheist ideas. Their goal was to build a firm foundation that could be shared through communities and give a clear meaning of what Christianity stood for. Christian apologists were one part of this identity-forging process. Apologists were second-century educated Christians who wrote and circulated addresses and pleas to the Roman emperors and other polytheistic authorities and thinkers.[91]

[91] Richard A. Norris, "The Apologists," in *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*, ed. Francis Young (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 36–44.

They aimed to "establish the superiority of Christian faith to the polytheism and idolatry that characterized popular religious practice in the Roman Empire."[92] One of the goals of the early Church apologists was to redefine polytheist beliefs to fit their views. The fight against false gods was a major theme of some apologists. They presented the polytheistic gods in a way that made the Christian cosmos more moral and rational than the others.

Justin Martyr was the Christian apologists most credited with attempting to convince Roman society that demons were evil beings and not the helpful beings previously thought of by the polytheists. Writing during the mid-second century, Justin Martyr often addressed the emperors, trying to persuade them into accepting Christianity as a religion in Rome. His *Second Apology* and his *Dialogue with Trypho* both address the downfalls of polytheist cults compared to what he considered the moral and ethical ways of Christianity. Justin Martyr's scapegoat is the *δαίμων* (demon) of Greco-Roman religion. His source is the ancient apocryphal Jewish text *The Book of Enoch*,[93] most likely written anywhere from the fourth century B.C.E. to the first century C.E.

The Book of Enoch provides an early explanation for the origin of demons in Judaism.[94] In the origin story of Book 1, demons are beings that have evolved after a long history of reproduction. According to the story, God has children known as Angels, but the Angels are attracted to human women of the earth and have intercourse with them. This interaction results

[92] Ibid.

[93] In Psalms 36-37 we are shown the beginning of the ruined reputation for the pagan divine beings: "They worshipped their idols, which became a snare for them. They slaughtered their sons and daughters to the demons." Moreover, in Deuteronomy 32.17: "They sacrificed to demons, which have no power, deities they did not know, new things that only recently came, which your forefathers did not fear." While the Greeks and Romans sacrificed to these demons and held them in high regard, they bible displays them as evil and possessive.

[94] Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *The Myth of Rebellious Angels: Studies in Second Temple Judaism and New Testament Texts* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2014), 81.

in the birth of the race of giants. When the giants die, their spirits become demons. Book 1 tells us what the Jewish demons are capable of, thus giving Justin the idea of an evil demon:

> And now, the giants who are produced from the spirits and flesh, will be called evil spirits upon the earth, and on the earth will be their dwelling. Evil spirits proceed from their bodies… they will be evil spirits on earth and evil spirits will they be named….And the spirits of the giants afflict, oppress, destroy, attack, do battle, and work destruction on the earth, and cause trouble: they take no food, but nevertheless hunger and thirst, and cause offenses. And these spirits shall rise up against the children of men and against the women, because they have proceeded from them. (16.8-12) [95]

This origin story treats demons as an unwanted result of a bad deed.

In early Hebrew writing[96], demons are "lower-class beings" that "could be effectively dealt with or at least addressed with confidence through a series of methods such as exorcism, prayer, recitation of hymns, and other acts of piety."[97] With this tradition in mind, Justin claims that the demons have deceived everyone, enslaved the pagans, and prevented everyone from seeing the true Christian teachings:

> However, the angels transgressed and were captivated by love of women and bore children they called demons; and they afterward subdued the human race, partly by

[95] Robert Henry Charles, trans., *The Book of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1893), p. 84 https://archive.org/details/thebookofenoch00unknuoft. See page 60 of Appendix B for Greek text.

[96] There is no direct Hebrew equivalent to the Greek *daimon* and the English "demon." Most Hebrew translations into English have described the beings in question as shades, devils, and demons. The word ,שׁד or *shedim,* is in two places of the *Tanakh*. It is in the plural both times. *Shed* is the singular of *shedim,* which could be an ancestor of the English word shade. Dictionaries often consider "shade" a loan-word from Assyrian *šêdu*, a protecting spirit. However, the translations of the bible verses do not translate the word as protective, but often evil. The etymologies and translations for this are even more confusing when considering that there is an entirely different word used for the beings that physically possessed bodies. A ,דִּיבּוּק or dybbuk, is defined in the English Oxford Dictionary as "A malicious possessing spirit, believed to be the dislocated soul of a dead person." This form of demon cannot be found in writings until the sixteenth century.

[97] Stuckenbruck, *The Myth of Rebellious Angels: Studies in Second Temple Judaism and New Testament Texts*, 101.

> magical writings, and partly by fears and the punishments they elicited and also by teaching them to offer sacrifices and incense and libations. Among men, they promoted murders, wars, adulteries, and all wickedness.[98]

Justin addressed this apology to the Roman Senate. He tried to convince the Senate that the demons were tricking them into honoring the wrong deities.

According to Justin, demons were always wicked, and the pagans had been falling for the tricks of the demons. He tells how Jesus and exorcists fight the demons:

> However, "Jesus," named as man and savior, also has significance. He was made man also, as we previously said, having been conceived according to the will of God the Father, for the sake of believing men, and for the destruction of the demons. And now you can learn this from what is under your own observation. For numberless demoniacs throughout the whole world, and in your city, many of our Christian men exorcising them in the name of Jesus Christ, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, have healed and do heal, rendering helpless and driving the possessing devils out of the men, though all the other exorcists could not cure them, and those who used incantations and drugs.[99]

Thus, as Jesus heals the pagans of their demons, he also converts them to Christianity.

Another Christian apologist, Tertullian, lived and wrote during the generation after Justin Martyr, but his message about demons was the same:

> Without them [pagans] knowing when they allow these demons into their thoughts, they are invoking Satan, who is the prince of evil spirits… I say that the ruin of humanity is their whole employment; these malicious spirits were bent upon mischief from the

[98] Justin Martyr, *The Second Apology of Justin for the Christians*, 150 C.E., 5.3. See page 61 of Appendix B for Greek text.
[99] Martyr, 6.4.

> beginning, and fatally auspicious in their first attempt, in undoing man as soon as he was made… and like a contagion that walks in the darkness, so do demons and evil angels are corrupting the minds of men, and agitating them with furies…the worst of which is taking possession of a soul… and what more savory to them than to trick men about the true God by way of delusions of magic, which delusions I now reveal.[100]

For Tertullian, demons are equated both with Satan and the ability to possess a soul.

According to the apologists, the polytheists' deities were now evil demons who were possessing souls. In this Christian cosmology, the ancestors of the *Lemuria,* good "demons" worthy of pious propitiation for Ovid, would be conceived of as malevolent "demons" associated with Satan and requiring expulsion. The religious meaning and influence of this transformation grew in strength and cultural acceptance as Christianity spread, thus influencing modern assumptions about the "spirit world," and interpretations of the *Lemuria* in apotropaic terms in a Christianized world view.

[100] Tertullian, *Apologeticum* (Perseus Digital Library, 197CE), 22.1-6 http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0570. See page 69 of Appendix B for Greek text.

CHAPTER 5

EXORCISM AND THE LEMURIA

Turning the Roman deities into demons helped explain Christianity to polytheists and asserted Christian power over the polytheist deities (including the ancestors referred to in the *Lemuria*). Through this process, Christianity exerted power over polytheists and their religion. Power over the polytheists came not only from the apologists and their writings, but from the beginnings of the Church. Religious ritual was an early activity of the Church and the Church officials used it to govern their congregations. The early advent of the Eucharist and Baptism led to further rituals, such as exorcism. As Christian ritual grew in popularity parallel with the religion, the influence behind Christian ritual changed the meanings underlying Roman rituals (such as *pietas*). Past rituals, such as the *Lemuria*, became misunderstood as vocabulary changed and society was altered into a new cosmology. By the third century, the Christian ritual of exorcism became one of the most powerful rituals the Church performed, directly blaming the pagan demons and exerting power over the now evil beings.

Exorcism developed slowly in the Christian world. The ritual of exorcism as we know it now does not exist in the New Testament. Jesus did not follow a formula or perform assigned gestures.[101] However, the act of exorcism in various forms does exist in the New Testament twenty times.[102] The word "exorcism" (*ἐξορκίζειν*) only appears once. It is found in a passage used to shame the Seven sons of Sceva for using Jesus' name in their Jewish exorcisms. Acts 19:11 states:

[101] Eric Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism in the New Testament and Early Christianity*, ed. Jorg Frey, Martin Hengel, and Otfried Hofius, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe (Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 9.
[102] Stuckenbruck, *The Myth of Rebellious Angels: Studies in Second Temple Judaism and New Testament Texts*, 169.

> Some Jews who went around driving out evil spirits tried to invoke the name of the Lord Jesus over those who were demon-possessed. They would say, "In the name of Jesus whom Paul preaches about, I command you to come out." Seven sons of Sceva, a Jewish chief priest, were doing this.[103]

This passage shows that in the early centuries the Jews were practicing what New Testament writers called exorcism in Greek. It did involve demons, but apparently Christians scorned their practice. In the New Testament, Jesus is expelling demons, but the word "exorcism" is not used to describe the act.

We can be certain that in using the Greek term *ἐξορκίζειν* (exorcism), the New Testament writers were referring to Jewish, rather than polytheist, ritual. The ancient Greek *ἐξορκίζειν* (*exorkízein*, exorcism) is derived from *ὅρκος* (*hórkos*) meaning an oath in Greek. In classical Greece, it referred to making someone swear an oath, a common step in Athenian law. Evidently, the borrowing of the word for Jewish anti-demonic ritual happened sometime after this, and it evolved into the meaning now used, "to exorcise an evil spirit."[104] The 1911 *Encyclopedia Britannica* calls an exorcism an "expulsion of evil spirits from persons or places"[105] and the 1906 Jewish Encyclopedia calls it "the expulsion of evil spirits by spells."[106] The Catholic Encyclopedia of 1913 defines exorcism as "the driving out, or warding off, demons, or evil

[103] "Acts 19:11-20," in *Holy Bible*, New International Version (Biblica, Inc, 2011), https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Acts+19:11-20.
[104] Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, eds., "Ἐξορκίζω," *Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1871).
[105] "Exorcism," *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (New York: The Encyclopaedia Britannica Company, 1911).
[106] Kaufmann Kohler and Ludwig Blau, "Exorcism," *Jewish Encyclopedia* (New York and London: Funk and Wagnalls, 1906 1901), http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/5942-exorcism.

spirits, places, or things…"[107] However, this modern definition of exorcism is the result of centuries of ritual development.

During the first and second centuries, while the new religion was struggling to find a place in society while avoiding the wrath of Roman emperors, some Christian leaders found that one way to control their congregations was through ritual. The earliest rituals of the Church were baptism and the Eucharist. Through the second and third centuries, Christians continually molded and established the basic institution of baptism, which represented the entry and acceptance of an individual into the Christian community. During this period, this fundamental acknowledgement of Christian identity included a ritual exorcism.

The first records of exorcism in baptism come from Tertullian's *Treatise Concerning Baptism* and Hippolytus' *The Apostolic Tradition*[108] both written in the early third century C.E. The *Acts of Thomas*, a third-century apocryphal text,[109] also indicates that exorcism was associated with baptism during this period. In a scene of baptism for a woman possessed:

> The woman begged [Thomas], saying: Highest apostle, give me the seal, so that my enemy does not return to me. Then he brought her to him (Syrian text - went to a river which was close by there) and laid his hands upon her and sealed her in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, and many others also were sealed with her. And the apostle bade his minister (deacon) to set up a table, and he set up a stool which they found there and spread a linen cloth upon it and set the bread of blessing on it.[110]

---

[107] Patrick Joseph Toner, "Exorcism," *Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1913, https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Catholic_Encyclopedia_(1913)/Exorcism.
[108] E. C. Whitaker, *Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy*, Second Edition (London: S.P.C.K., 1970), xiii.
[109] The *apocryphal* texts are books and letters that were not included into the canonical Bible. Apocrypha in Greek means "hidden."
[110] Thomas the Apostle, *The Acts of Thomas*, trans. M. R. James (Early Christian Writings, 1924), 49 http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/actsthomas.html.

The text explains that a woman came to Thomas possessed by a demon, and baptism was used in the apotropaic way of an exorcism.

By 250 C.E., exorcism was an integral part of the baptismal rite.[111] In the late third century, Pope Cornelius reported that his staff included fifty-two exorcists.[112] Instruction on baptism from Theodore of Mopsuestia, Bishop from 392 to 428 C.E., shows the power that the Church asserted by fighting demons and the resulting need for employing exorcists:

> Because you are unable to plead by yourselves against Satan and to fight against him, the services of persons called exorcists have been found indispensable, because they act as your surety for divine help. They ask in a loud and prolonged voice that our enemy should be punished and by a verdict from the judge be ordered to retire and stand far, so that no room and no entry of any kind might be left to him from which to inflict harm on us. This is so that we might be delivered forever from his servitude, and allowed to live in perfect freedom, and enjoy the happiness of our present enrolment. [113]

The bishop is instructing the catechumens that the Church has the power to fight against Satan and they will do this with exorcists. Similarly, the Archbishop of Constantinople, John Chrysostom, lecturing in the fourth century to catechumens focused largely on renouncing and averting the devil and his demons. John instructs the catechumens:

[111] Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism in the New Testament and Early Christianity*, 29–30.
[112] Sorensen, 405.
[113] Theodore of Mopsuestia. *Commentary on the Lord's Prayer, Baptism and the Eucharist*. Translated by Alphonse Mingana, 1933, 2.31. http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/theodore_of_mopsuestia_lordsprayer_02_text.htm.

> We send you off to hear the words of the exorcists…for no demon, however fierce and harsh, after these fearful words and the invocation of the universal Lord of all things, can refrain from flight with all speed."[114]

He then instructs the catechumens to renounce Satan and to avert the evil with oil.[115]

However, by the end of the fourth century, baptism and exorcism may have started to become separate rituals. We can see the beginnings of this change in *The Apostolic Constitutions*, a collection of eight treatises of the Church Orders (early Church literature that guided conduct, liturgy, and organization), believed to be written around 375 C.E. One constitution explains the rites of baptism without the inclusion of exorcism:

> This baptism, therefore, is given by the death of Jesus: The water imitates the burial, and the oil imitates the Holy Ghost; the seal imitates the cross; the chrism is the confirmation of the confession…the descent into the water the dying together with Christ; the ascent out of the water the rising again with him.[116]

The following chapter explains that the person being baptized has already been freed from evil and has renounced Satan:

> But let those baptized be free from all iniquity; one that has left off to work sin, the friend of God, the enemy of the devil…one that has renounced Satan and his demons and deceits…[117]

---

[114] Bart D. Ehrman, *After the New Testament: A Reader in Early Christianity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 125.

[115] Ehrman, 126–27. For a more in depth discussion of the fourth century baptismal rights see Josef A. Jungmann, *The Early Liturgy To the Time of Gregory the Great*, Liturgical Studies (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1959), 74–86. For a more critical look at the primary sources see Hippolytus, *The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome, Bishop and Martyr*, ed. Gregory Dix and Henry Chadwick (London and New York: Routledge, 1992). Full text from Hippolytus and Tertullian can be found in E. C. Whitaker, *Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy*, Second Edition (London: S.P.C.K., 1970).

[116] Whitaker, *Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy*, 31.

[117] Ibid.

We can decipher from these quotes that the order of the Church at this time was aiming for a baptism ritual that did not include an actual exorcism. The baptism itself became a nice tidy package that implied that one was already free of evil and the influence of demons.

By 375, baptism had become a purely positive ritual of initiation, while exorcism, and the battle against evil demons it represented, had begun to gain new, separate, meanings. The step-by-step liturgy of the separate exorcism first appears in the Gregorian Sacramentary derived from the 7th canon of the fourth Council of Carthage in 398.[118] In 417 C.E., performing the job of an exorcist was extended to any Church authority.[119]

By the fifth century, Church propaganda about demons and their evil habits had spread greatly. Polytheism was now dying out, and so was the idea of a good demon. Within centuries demons had turned into Satan's minions, and exorcism had become an independent ritual of power over the demons for the Church. This development in the meaning and practice of exorcism underlies modern conceptions of exorcism as an apotropaic process of conflict between an authority figure with special powers and an evil representative of the "spirit world." The Christian ritual of exorcism, which originated from condemning the pagan demons, grew to be the exorcism of today and the exorcism that Littlewood wrongly sees in the *Lemuria*, where the *paterfamilias* plays the role of the authority figure with special powers, and the *manes* are seen as malevolent "ghosts," "shades," "wraiths," and/or "spirits."

THE PROCEDURES OF EXORCISM

The performance of exorcism is on the living, and this is what sets it apart the most from the *Lemuria.* In the New Testament, a living body is the essential nesting ground for evil spirits. Unlike exorcism, the *Lemuria* involves the dead, not the living. Secondly, the *Lemuria* is not a

[118] Young, Francis. *History of Exorcism in Catholic Christianity.* Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016, 44.
[119] Ibid.

ritual performed on something. The performance of the *Lemuria* is for something. Therefore, the *Lemuria* is not performed *on* a living being, nor *on* the dead, but *for* the dead in the act of piety.

The staging of the ritual adds another element of difference between exorcism and the *Lemuria*. Peter Brown explains the act of exorcism as a staged act in his study of the late antique Christian holy man. This act, consisting of violent tendencies, involved two beings: the exorcist and the demonized.[120] Multiple people are not present in the *Lemuria*. The *Lemuria* consists of one person's monologue against a spirit that is not seen and does not answer or become violent, according to the *Fasti*.

According to scholar Henry Ansgar Kelly, there are three procedures that exorcists use in the New Testament to remove demons.[121] These three are expulsion, renunciation, and repulsion. If one is to call the *Lemuria* a form of exorcism, it too should at least follow one of these procedures. Comparing the two rituals within these three forms will show us how ultimately different the two are.

The first procedure, the act of expulsion is seen through Jesus and his disciples. Jesus forces the demons out of people with mere words:

> The demons pleaded to him, saying, 'If you are going to cast us out, send us into the herd of swine.' So, he said to them, 'Go!' And they came out and went into the swine, and the whole herd rushed down the steep bank into the sea and perished in the waters.[122]

Moreover, his disciples do the same:

---

[120] Peter Brown, "The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity," *The Journal of Roman Studies* 61 (1971): 88–89.
[121] Henry Ansgar Kelly, *The Devil at Baptism* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1985), 20–23.
[122] Mathew 8:30-34. See page 62 of Appendix B for Greek text. See also Mark 5:1-17; 9:25, Mathew 8-16, Luke 4:35.

> One day Jesus called together his twelve disciples and gave them power and authority to cast out all demons and to heal all diseases.[123]

Therefore, in the New Testament expulsion consisted of words toward the evil spirit telling it to go elsewhere.[124] The *Lemuria,* on the other hand, does not involve expulsion. When the *paterfamilias* says, "paternal *manes* leave," it is a form of propitiation. This is apparent in the word choices "*manes*" and "paternal." Though the *manes* are dead, it is no threat; it is a family member that visits every year so that the *paterfamilias* can perform his sacred duties.

The second procedure found in the New Testament is the process of renunciation. Early Christian apologists were inclined to differentiate their God from the polytheists' gods, and so were Jesus and his disciples. They did this by renouncing polytheist deities and demons. Our example from the New Testament is Mathew 4:10 when Jesus passes the test in the wilderness, saying "Away from me, Satan! For it is written: 'Worship the Lord your God and serve him only." In this verse, Satan is the leader of all demons, and Jesus renounces all gods except his God. Since the *Lemuria* is a form of *pietas,* the *paterfamilias* is not renouncing the dead ancestor, but pleasing them until they meet again. On the other hand, the performance of exorcism is done in the hopes that the demon is never seen or heard from again.

Repulsion, or apotropaism, the third process found in the New Testament, is a means taken by the individual to discourage the evil spirit from possessing a person. In the New Testament, this could be any prayer, gesture, or object that keeps away evil or keeps the individual from temptation. Ancient Greece and Rome also boast apotropaic images. It was

---

[123] Luke 9.1. See page 61 of Appendix B for Greek text. See also Mark 3:14-15; 6:13; 16:17, Mathew 10:5-8, Acts 16:18.

[124] It is unclear whether at first, if it was only disciples who had the authority to exorcise demons. In Mark 9:38-40, Jesus tells his disciples that others are also free to expel under Jesus' name. However, the Seven Sons of Sceva were overcome by the evil spirit when they attempted to expel it using the name of Jesus.

common to see statues, paintings, talismans, and even architecture made to keep evil away. Indeed, a line in the *Lemuria* claims to make a gesture against the harmful ("And gives a sign joining his fingers with his thumb"). However, this line is spoken to an outside malevolence, not the main subject of the ritual. The main subject is the paternal *manes*, and the gesture is for any external harm that may interrupt the ritual. There is no sign that the *paterfamilias* would use repulsive means against the ancestor that he pays tribute to annually.

The *Lemuria* does not follow the three procedures of Christian exorcism: expulsion, renunciation, and repulsion. The paternal *manes* are not being expelled from the house (they are the guardians of it), the *paterfamilias* is not negatively addressing the ancestors (he is pleasing them), and any signs of repulsion in the *Lemuria* are being used for outside malevolent beings (not the dead ancestors). Any connections that the *Lemuria* now has to exorcism is due to the ever-changing culture of Christian ritual as seen in the development of baptism and exorcism. As exorcism developed, and the vocabulary changed along with it, the *Lemuria* was misinterpreted.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

Clearly, the modern interpretations of the *Lemuria* are influenced by Christianity. Roman cosmology and society, however, must be taken into account when studying Roman religious ritual. Society in Rome was vastly different from what we are accustomed to in modern life and in death. "*Non fui, fui, non sum, non curo*" states Epicurus, a Greek philosopher from the third century B.C. E. "I was not, I was, I am not, I do not care"; many gravestones in Rome included this phrase. Epicurus founded the Epicureanism school of philosophy, the purpose of which was promoting living life to the fullest and not fearing death, because when the body dies, so does the soul. This vision of life and death was widespread, as can be seen in the gravestones. There was no heaven or hell, and no eternal battle between Satan and God. Those Christian ideas developed over time, centuries after Ovid's writings.

Furthermore, Romans were not meant to perform the *Lemuria* for religion's sake or a higher power; they performed ritual in the name of their ancestors and tradition. There were no outsiders such as priests or oracles present to exert power over the household, or over the paternal *manes*. The Roman *paterfamilias* did not perform the ritual each May because the dead did not belong inside the home, but because it was a duty of the family member to the familial bond between the dead and the living.

Overall, being able to recognize the differences in Roman cosmology and Christian cosmology deepens our knowledge of both cultures and the history pertaining to them. From this study, we have learned that *pietas* was a moral and traditional celebration for Romans, and the Christian apologists conveniently discarded this concept in order to further their influence and their own ritual presence.

Recognizing the distortions in modern scholarship of the *Lemuria* is also significant for the discipline of history. Acknowledgment of mistranslations is a start to a better understanding of past civilizations and religious difference in the modern world. Identifying the ways scholars use translations can raise the bar for better scholarly work. It is my hope that my translation of the *Lemuria* and analysis can contribute to this broader goal. A more literal translation of the *Lemuria* or any Roman ritual, not based in a Christianized context, can teach us more about Roman religious culture, values and morals, and the role in the wider context of the Augustan revival.

Besides finding new sources for the *Lemuria,* further investigation of the *Lemuria* could happen in numerous ways. This thesis only explores one Roman ritual involving *pietas*. The examination of other backgrounds of the *Lemuria,* such as Romulus and Remus, may add insight into the value of *pietas*. Many sources call the ghost of Remus vengeful, but is this ritual also a form of *pietas*? Other rituals such as the *Parentalia* may be able to shed more light on familial piety in Rome. Furthermore, the differences in the definitions of *manes, umbra, lemures*, and *larvae* could shed light on the *Lemuria* and Roman beliefs about the dead. Should any of these words be related to ghosts? Do they indicate which are good and harmful? How did the Christian authorities explain these terms, and did they use this vocabulary against the polytheists? It would also be advantageous to see a study on the general decrease of *pietas* as a Roman ideal while exploring any familial-centric attitudes as Christianity evolved. In other words, does Christianity have its form of paternal piety and does it relate to Roman *pietas*? Finally, scholars need a translation of Ovid's full *Fasti* completely based on Roman cosmology without Christian or syncretized ideas.

REFERENCES

"Acts 19:11-20." In *Holy Bible*, New International Version. Biblica, Inc, 2011. https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Acts+19:11-20.

Ara Pacis. 13CE. Marble. Museum of the Ara Pacis, Rome.

Aristophanes. "Birds." Perseus Digital Library, 414 B.C.E. http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0025.

Asmis, Elizabeth. "Psychagogoia in Plato's Phaedrus." *Illinois Classical Studies*, no. 11 (1986): 153–72.

Bacchus and Vesuvius. 79. Fresco. National Archaeological Museum of Naples. http://cir.campania.beniculturali.it/museoarcheologiconazionale/itinerari-tematici/galleria-di-immagini/RA36.

Beard, Mary. "A Complex of Times: No More Sheep on Romulus' Birthday." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 33 (1987): 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0068673500004892.

Brown, Peter. "The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 61 (1971): 80–101.

Buc, Philippe. "Ritual and Interpretation: The Early Medieval Case," *Early Medieval Europe* 9, no. 2 (July 2000): 183–210.

Cassius, Dio. *Roman History*. Loeb Classical Library, 233CE. https://www.loebclassics.com/view/dio_cassius-roman_history/1914/pb_LCL083.207.xml.

Charles, Robert Henry, trans. *The Book of Enoch*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1893. https://archive.org/details/thebookofenoch00unknuoft.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *De Inventione*. Loeb Classical Library, 85 B.C.E. http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0683.

Clark, Mathew D.H. *Augustus First Roman Emperor: Power, Propaganda and the Politics of Survival*. Exeter: Bristol Phoenix Press, 2010.

Conte, Gian Biagio. *Latin Literature: A History*. Translated by Joseph B. Solodow. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1994.

Dumezil, Georges. *Archaic Roman Religion*. Translated by Philip Krapp. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Baltimore, London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1996. https://ia600201.us.archive.org/13/items/ArchaicRomanReligion/080185482208018548 30Roman.pdf.

Edwards, Kathryn A. "The History of Ghosts in Early Modern Europe: Recent Research and Future Trajectories," *History Compass* 10, no. 4 (2012): 358.

Ehrman, Bart D. *After the New Testament: A Reader in Early Christianity*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Eliade, Mircea. "The Private Cult: Penates, Lares, Manes." In *History of Religious Ideas: Vol. 2: From Gautama Buddha to the Triumph of Christianity*, 116–18. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011.

Evangelidis, D. "Ηπειρωτικαὶ Ἔρευναι: I. Ἡ Ἀνασκαφὴ Τῆς Δωδώνης, II. Ἀνασκαφὴ Παρὰ Τὸ Ραδοτόβι." *Ἠπειρωτικὰ Χρονικά*, no. 10 (1935): 193–264.

"Exorcism." *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. New York: The Encyclopaedia Britannica Company, 1911.

"Ghost," *Merriam-Webster.com*, 2011, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ghost.

Greene, Thomas M. “History and Anachronism.” In *Literature and History, Theoretical Problems and Russian Case Studies*, edited by Gary Saul Morson, 205–20. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1986.

Hesiod. *Works and Days*. Translated by Hugh G. Evelyn-White. Perseus Digital Library. The Homeric Hymns and Homerica. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press and William Heinemann Ltd., 1914. http://data.perseus.org/citations/urn:cts:greekLit:tlg0020.tlg002.perseus-eng1:1-10.

Hippolytus. *The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome, Bishop and Martyr*. Edited by Gregory Dix and Henry Chadwick. London and New York: Routledge, 1992.

Homer. *Iliad*. Perseus Digital Library. Accessed February 3, 2017. http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=urn:cts:greekLit:tlg0012.tlg001.perseus-grc1:1.1-1.32.

Hope, Valerie M. *Roman Death: The Dying and the Dead in Ancient Rome*. London: Continuum, 2009.

Ignatius. *Ignatius to the Magnesians*, 110CE. http://www.earlychurchtexts.com/main/ignatius/magnesians.shtml.

Jameson, Michael H., David R. Jordan, and Roy D. Kotansky. *A Lex Sacra from Selinous*. Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Monographs 11. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University, 1993.

Johnston, Sarah Iles. *Restless Dead: Encounters Between the Living and the Dead in Ancient Greece*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1999.

Jungmann, Josef A. *The Early Liturgy To the Time of Gregory the Great*. Liturgical Studies. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1959.

Kelly, Henry Ansgar. *The Devil at Baptism*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1985.

King, Charles W. "The Roman Manes: The Dead as Gods." In *Rethinking Ghosts in World Religions*, 95–114. Leiden: Koninkliijke Brill NV, 2009.

Kohler, Kaufmann, and Ludwig Blau. "Exorcism." *Jewish Encyclopedia*. New York and London: Funk and Wagnalls, 1906. http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/5942-exorcism.

Lennon, Jack J. *Pollution and Religion in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Lewis, Charlton T, and Charles Short. "Pietas." *A Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Trustees of Tufts University, 1879. http://perseus.uchicago.edu/cgi-bin/philologic/getobject.pl?c.14:3000.lewisandshort.

Liddell, Henry George, and Robert Scott, eds. "Ἐξορκίζω." *Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1871.

———, eds. "Ψυχαγωγία." *Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1871.

Littlewood, R. J. "Ovid Among the Family Dead: The Roman Founder Legend and Augustan Iconography in Ovid's Feralia and Lemuria." *Latomus* 60, no. 4 (2001): 916–35.

Martyr, Justin. *The Second Apology of Justin for the Christians*, 150CE.

Mass, Jeffrey P. *Antiquity and Anachronism in Japanese History*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992.

Millar, Fergus. *The Roman Republic and the Augustan Revolution*. Vol. 1. Rome, the Greek World, and the East. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2002.

Morley, Neville. "'Das Altertum Das Sich Nicht Ubersetzen Lasst': Translation and Untranslatability in Ancient History." In *Translation & the Classic: Identity as Change in the History of Culture*, edited by Alexandra Lianeri and Vanda Zajko. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Nielson, Kristina P. "Aeneas and the Demands of the Dead." *The Classical Journal* 79, no. 3 (March 1984): 200–206.

Norris, Richard A. "The Apologists." In *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*, edited by Francis Young, 36–44. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Norwood, Frances. "The Riddle of Ovid's 'Relegatio.'" *Classical Philology* 58, no. 3 (1963): 150–63.

Ovid. *Epistulae Ex Ponto*. Perseus Digital Library, 8CE. http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0493.

———. *Fasti*. Perseus Digital Library, 8CE. http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:2008.01.0547.

———. *Fasti*. Translated by A.J. Boyle and R.D. Woodard. London: Penguin Books, 2000.

———. *Fasti*. Translated by James George Frazer. Loeb Classical Library 253. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931.

———. *Ovid: Fasti*. Translated by A. S. Kline. Poetry In Translation, 2004. https://www.poetryintranslation.com/PITBR/Latin/Fastihome.php.

———. *Ovid's Fasti: Roman Holidays*. Translated by Betty Rose Nagle. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995.

———. *Times and Reasons: A New Translation of Fasti*. Translated by Anne Wiseman and Peter Wiseman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

———. *Tristia*. Perseus Digital Library, 8CE. http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0492.

Öztürk, İbrahim Hakkı. “Tarih Öğretiminde Anakronizm Sorunu: Sosyal Bilgiler ve Tarih Ders Kitaplarındaki Kurgusal Metinler Üzerine Bir İnceleme.” *Journal of Social Studies Education Research* 2, no. 1 (2011): 37–58.

Pausanias. *Description of Greece*. Translated by W.H.S. Jones. 4 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1918. http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0160:book=6:chapter=6&highlight=temesa.

Plato. “Phaedrus.” In *Platonis Opera*. Perseus Digital Library, 370 B.C.E. http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0173%3Atext%3DPhaedrus.

Plotinus. *Ennead, Volume I: Porphyry on the Life of Plotinus. Ennead I.* Loeb Classical Library, 270CE. https://www.loebclassics.com/view/porphyry-life_plotinus_order_his_books/1969/pb_LCL440.3.xml.

Plutarch. “Marcellus.” In *Lives*. Loeb Classical Library, 125CE. http://www.loebclassics.com.proxy.lib.siu.edu/view/plutarch-lives_marcellus/1917/pb_LCL087.437.xml.

———. “On Superstition.” In *Moralia*. Perseus Digital Library. Accessed March 12, 2017. http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0188

———. “The Dinner of the Seven Wise Men.” In *Moralia*. Loeb Classical Library. Accessed March 12, 2017. https://www.loebclassics.com/view/plutarch-moralia_dinner_seven_wise_men/1928/pb_LCL222.349.xml.

———. “The Obsolescence of Oracles.” In *Moralia*, 100CE. https://www.loebclassics.com/view/plutarch-moralia_table_talk/1961/pb_LCL424.259.xml.

Rudd, Niall. “Ovid and the Augustan Myth.” In *Lines of Enquiry: Studies in Latin Poetry*, 217. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Russell, Jeffrey Burton. *The Devil, Perceptions of Evil from Antiquity to Primitive Christianity*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1977.

Saint Jerome. *Biblia Sacra Vulgata*, n.d.

Scheid, John. “Myth, Cult and Reality in Ovid’s Fasti.” *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 38 (1993): 118–31. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0068673500001644.

Smith, William, ed. “Agathodaemon.” *A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*. London: John Murray, 1872.

Sorensen, Eric. *Possession and Exorcism in the New Testament and Early Christianity*. Edited by Jorg Frey, Martin Hengel, and Otfried Hofius. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe. Mohr Siebeck, 2002.

Stuckenbruck, Loren T. *The Myth of Rebellious Angels: Studies in Second Temple Judaism and New Testament Texts*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2014.

Tertullian. *Apologeticum*. Perseus Digital Library, 197CE. http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0570.

Theodore of Mopsuestia. *Commentary on the Lord’s Prayer, Baptism and the Eucharist*. Translated by Alphonse Mingana, 1933. http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/theodore_of_mopsuestia_lordsprayer_02_text.htm.

Thomas the Apostle. *The Acts of Thomas*. Translated by M. R. James. Early Christian Writings, 1924. http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/actsthomas.html.

Toner, Patrick Joseph. "Exorcism." *Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1913. https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Catholic_Encyclopedia_(1913)/Exorcism.

Toynbee, J. M. C. *Death and Burial in the Roman World*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1971.

Thaniel, George. "Lemures and Larvae," *The American Journal of Philology* 94, no. 2 (Summer 1973): 182–87.

Whitaker, E. C. *Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy*. Second Edition. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1970.

Wilkinson, L.P. *Ovid Recalled*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955.

Wiseman, Timothy Peter. *Remus: A Roman Myth*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Xenophon. *Memorabilia*. Loeb Classical Library, 371 B.C.E. https://www.loebclassics.com/view/xenophon_athens-memorablia_2013/2013/pb_LCL168.9.xml.

Young, Francis. *History of Exorcism in Catholic Christianity*. Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

MENTAL ILLNESS AND *PSYCHAGOGIA*

The concept of possession did not exist in the polytheistic Greek and Roman world. However, *daimonon* could be the cause of madness and confusion in people. Mental illness in the ancient world of the New Testament was not labeled as such. Mental illness was attributed to the otherworldly forces of evil and specifically demons of which Jesus and his disciples were apt to heal. Today there are psychotherapists and in the New Testament there were professional exorcists. The difference between Greek mental illness and Christian mental illness is that the Christians employed exorcism to solve the problem. The Greeks used a variation of the word *daimon* to describe one's mindset. [125]

In 371 B.C.E, the Greek philosopher and historian Xenophon wrote about reason and the irrational in a passage about how his teacher Socrates interacted with the gods:

> Whomever thinks that [the minds of gods] are wholly within the grasp of the human mind and nothing in them is beyond our reason (*daimonion*), are the irrational (*daimonan*) ones.[126]

This use of the word *daimon* to describe the irrational persisted into the first century C.E. Plutarch's most known work in the first century C.E., *Parallel Lives,* describes a madman:

---

[125] For more on mental illness and symptoms attributed to demons in the New Testament see Stuckenbruck, *The Myth of Rebellious Angels: Studies in Second Temple Judaism and New Testament Texts*.

[126] Xenophon, *Memorabilia* (Loeb Classical Library, 371CE), 1.1.9 https://www.loebclassics.com/view/xenophon_athens-memorablia_2013/2013/pb_LCL168.9.xml. See page 70 in Appendix B for Greek text.

> No man ventured to touch him or even to come near him, out of superstitious fear. All avoided him, and he ran out to the gate of the city, freely crying and gesturing like a man possessed (*daimononti)* and crazed. [127]

Instead of an object or thing, the meaning is intangible, referring to a state of mind or even an abstract idea. The translator chose to translate *daimononti* as "possessed," a misleading choice. Plutarch is using an adjective related to demons to describe mental illness. Therefore, Romans did account for mental illness, but was it caused by a demon?

One way to detect if physical possession by demon existed in ancient Greece and Rome is to study the past vocabulary and discover whether the occupation of exorcist existed. Did occupations exist in ancient Greece that specifically dealt with demons or possession? Though it is rarely present in existing literature, one possibility is the word *psychagogoi,* which can be translated as "soul-leader." A variant of the word, *psychostasia* is the act of weighing of souls.

A fourth century B.C.E. tablet is the first instance of the word *psychagogoi*, where it appears once. Translating the phrase results in, "Shall we hire Dorius the *psychagogos* or not?" which Johnston argues does not assume the role of the *psychagogoi* as either an exorcist or invoker.[128] In a lost play by Aeschylus also called *Psychostasia,* the Loeb Library uses the English title "Ghost-Raisers." The translated title is misleading, because the appropriate translation of *psychostasia* as a word is "the weighing of souls." In the play, Zeus uses a scale to weigh the souls of two men in order to determine their fate. In another play called *Birds*,

[127] Plutarch, "Marcellus," in *Lives* (Loeb Classical Library, 125CE), 21.6 http://www.loebclassics.com.proxy.lib.siu.edu/view/plutarch-lives_marcellus/1917/pb_LCL087.437.xml. See page 68 in Appendix B for Greek text.

[128] Johnston, *Restless Dead: Encounters Between the Living and the Dead in Ancient Greece*, 62. For the Greek text and fragment information see D. Evangelidis, "Ἠπειρωτικαὶ Ἔρευναι: Ι. Ἡ Ἀνασκαφὴ Τῆς Δωδώνης, ΙΙ. Ἀνασκαφὴ Παρὰ Τὸ Ραδοτόβι," *Ἠπειρωτικὰ Χρονικά*, no. 10 (1935): 193–264.

Aristophanes puts Socrates into the role of a *psychagogoi* by having Socrates perform a blood ritual to speak to the dead:

> Socrates evokes the souls of men. Pisander came one day to see his soul, which he had left there when still alive. He offered a little victim, a camel, slit his throat and, following the example of Odysseus, stepped one pace backward. Then that batty Chaerephon came up from hell to drink the camel's blood.[129]

If *psychostasia* is the act, were the *psychagogoi* the actors who weighed the souls? My thoughts are that *psychagogoi* was originally a title given to the god Hermes. Who, being the messenger god, was also responsible for transporting souls to the underworld after death. A *psychagogoi* would be anyone working with souls in order to determine their fate.

Until this point, we have no vocabulary that suggests an occupation such as an exorcist existed in polytheist Rome. Through the centuries, the word *psychagogoi*, like all words, evolved. In the fourth century B.C.E., a *psychagogoi* influenced living souls through rhetoric. In 370 B.C.E., Plato's dialogue called *Phaedrus,* Socrates asks:

> Is not rhetoric in its entire nature an art which leads the soul by using words (*psychagogia*), not only in law courts and the various other public assemblages…[130]

Moreover, Socrates tells Phaedrus the art of speech is "*psychagogia*."[131] Therefore, before and during Plato's life, the *psychagogoi* are not connected to exorcism nor appeasement of the dead,

---

[129] Aristophanes, "Birds" (Perseus Digital Library, 414 B.C.E.), 1555-64 http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0025. See page 59 in Appendix B for Greek text.

[130] Plato, "Phaedrus," in *Platonis Opera* (Perseus Digital Library, 370CE), 261a http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0173%3Atext%3DPhaedrus. See page 67 in Appendix B for Greek text.

[131] Plato, 271. For more insight on Plato's *psychagogia* see Elizabeth Asmis, "Psychagogoia in Plato's Phaedrus," *Illinois Classical Studies*, no. 11 (1986): 153–72.

but a way to make a case in court. The modern Greek-English lexicon gives both definitions for *psychagogia*: "an evoking of souls from the netherworld" and metaphorically "a winning of men's souls, persuasion."[132]

[132] Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, eds., "Ψυχαγωγία," *Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1871).

APPENDIX B

GREEK AND LATIN TEXTS

Aristophanes, "Birds," 1555-1564.[133]

πρὸς δὲ τοῖς Σκιάποσιν λίμνη

τις ἔστ᾽ ἄλουτος οὗ

ψυχαγωγεῖ Σωκράτης:

ἔνθα καὶ Πείσανδρος ἦλθε

δεόμενος ψυχὴν ἰδεῖν ἢ

ζῶντ᾽ ἐκεῖνον προὔλιπε,

σφάγι᾽ ἔχων κάμηλον ἀμνόν

τιν᾽, ἧς λαιμοὺς τεμὼν ὥσπερ

ποθ᾽ οὐδυσσεὺς ἀπῆλθε,

κᾆτ᾽ ἀνῆλθ᾽ αὐτῷ κάτωθεν

πρὸς τὸ λαῖτμα τῆς καμήλου

Χαιρεφῶν ἡ νυκτερίς.

Cicero, *De Inventione*, 2.66.[134]

pietatem, quae erga patriam aut parentes aut alios sanguine coniunctos officium conservare moneat.

[133] Referenced on page 57 in Appendix A.
[134] Referenced on page 1 of Chapter 1.

Enoch, Book 1, 15.8-12.[135]

και νυν οι γιγαντες οι γεννηθεντες απο την πνευματων και σαρκος πνευματα ισχυρα κληθησονται επι της γης και εν τη γη η κατοικησις αυτων εσται. πνευματα πονηρα εξηλθον απο του σωματος αυτων, διοτι απο των ανωτερων εγενοντο, και εκ των αγιων εγρηγορων η αρχη της κτισεως αυτων και αρχη θελημιου πνευματα πονηρα κληθησεται. πνευματα ουρανου, εν τω ουρανω η κατοικησις αυτων εσται, και τα πνευματα επι της γης τα γεννηθεντα, επι της γης η κατοικησις αυτων εσται. και τα πνευματα των γιγαντων νεφελας αδικουντα, αφανιζοντα και εμπιπτοντα και συμπαλαιοντα και συνριπτοντα επι της γης πνευματα σκληρα γιγαντων και δρομους ποιουντα και μηδεν εσθιοντα, αλλ ασιτουντα και διψωντα και προσκοπτοντα. και εξαναστησει ταυτα τα πνευματα εις τους υιους των ανθρωπων και των γυναικων, οτι εξεληλυθασιν απ αυτων…

Homer, Iliad, 1.222.[136]

ἣ δ᾽ Οὔλυμπον δὲ βεβήκει δώματ᾽ ἐς αἰγιόχοιο Διὸς μετὰ δαίμονας ἄλλους

Homer, Iliad, 15.403.[137]

σὺν δαίμονι

Ignatius, *Ignatius to the Magnesians*, 13.[138]

Σπουδαζετε ουν βεβαιωθηναι εν τοις δογμασιν του κυριου και των αποστολων, ινα παντα οσα ποιειτε, κατευοδωθητε σαρκι και πνευματι, πιστει και αγαπη, εν υιω και πατρι και εν πνευματι,

[135] Referenced on page 33 of Chapter 4.
[136] Referenced on page 26 of Chapter 4.
[137] Referenced on page 26 of Chapter 4.
[138] Referenced on page 21 in footnote 69 of Chapter 3.

εν αρχη και εν τελει, μετα του αξιοπρεπεστατου επισκοπου υμων και αξιοπλοκου πνευματικου στεφανου του πρεσβυτεριου υμων και των κατα θεον διακονων. υποταγητε τω επισκοπω και αλληλοις, ως Ιησους Χριστος τω πατρι κατα σαρκα και οι αποστολοι τω Χριστω και τω πατρι, ινα ενωσις η σαρκικη τε και πνευματικη.

Jerome, *Biblia Sacra Vulgata*, Genesis 1.2.[139]

Terra autem erat inanis et vacua, et tenebrae erant super faciem abyssi: et spiritus Dei ferebatur super aquas.

Justin Martyr, *Second Apology*, 5.3.[140]

΄Οθεν και ποιηται και μυθολογοι, αγνοουντες τους αγγελους και τους εξ αυτων γεννηθεντας δαιμονας ταυτα πραξαι εις αρρενας και θηλειας και πολεις και εθνη, απερ συνεγραψαν, εις αυτον τον θεον και τους ως απω αυτου σπορα γενομενους υιους και των λεχθεντων εκεινου αδελφων [και τεκνων ομοιως των απω εκεινων] Ποσειδωνος και Πλουτωνος, ανηνεγκαν. ΄Ονοματι γαρ εκαστον, οπερ εκαστος εαυτω των αγγελων και τοις τεκνοις εθετο, προσηγορευσαν.

Luke, 9.1.[141]

Συγκαλεσάμενος δὲ τοὺς δώδεκα ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς δύναμιν καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ δαιμόνια καὶ νόσους θεραπεύειν…

[139] Referenced on page 22 in footnote 69 of Chapter 3.
[140] Referenced on page 34 of Chapter 4.
[141] Referenced on page 43 of Chapter 5.

Mathew, 8.30-34.[142]

ἦν δὲ μακρὰν ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν ἀγέλη χοίρων πολλῶν βοσκομένη. οἱ δὲ δαίμονες παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν λέγοντες · Εἰ ἐκβάλλεις ἡμᾶς, ἀπόστειλον ἡμᾶς ᾽ εἰς τὴν ἀγέλην τῶν χοίρων. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς · Ὑπάγετε. οἱ δὲ ἐξελθόντες ἀπῆλθον εἰς τοὺς χοίρους ᾽· καὶ ἰδοὺ ὥρμησεν πᾶσα ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ ἀπέθανον ἐν τοῖς ὕδασιν. οἱ δὲ βόσκοντες ἔφυγον, καὶ ἀπελθόντες εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἀπήγγειλαν πάντα καὶ τὰ τῶν δαιμονιζομένων. καὶ ἰδοὺ πᾶσα ἡ πόλις ἐξῆλθεν εἰς ὑπάντησιν τῷ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν παρεκάλεσαν ὅπως μεταβῇ ἀπὸ τῶν ὁρίων αὐτῶν.

Ovid, *Ex Ponto*, 2.7.47-48.[143]

Artibus ingenuis quaesita est gloria multis: infelix perii dotibus ipse meis.

Ovid, *Fasti*, 2.533-560.[144]

Est honor et tumulis. Animas placate paternas
parvaque in extinctas munera ferte pyras.
parva petunt manes, pietas pro divite grata est
munere: non avidos Styx habet ima deos,
tegula porrectis satis est velata coronis
et sparsae fruges parcaque mica salis
inque mero mollita Ceres violaeque solutae:
haec habeat media testa relicta via.

[142] Referenced on page 42 of Chapter 5.
[143] Referenced on page 9 of Chapter 2.
[144] Referenced on page 10 of Chapter 2.

nec maiora veto, sed et his placabilis umbra est

adde preces positis et sua verba focis,

hunc morem Aeneas, pietatis idoneus auctor,

attulit in terras, iuste Latine, tuas;

ille patris Genio sollemnia dona ferebat:

hinc populi ritus edidicere pios.

at quondam, dum longa gerunt pugnacibus armis

bella, Parentales deseruere dies.

non impune fuit; nam dicitur omine ab isto

Roma suburbanis incaluisse rogis.

vix equidem credo: bustis exisse feruntur

et tacitae questi tempore noctis avi,

perque vias urbis latosque ululasse per agros

deformes animas, volgus inane, ferunt.

post ea praeteriti tumulis redduntur honores,

prodigiisque venit funeribusque modus,

dum tamen haec fiunt, viduae cessate puellae:

expectet puros pinea taeda dies,

nec tibi, quae cupidae matura videbere matri,

comat virgineas hasta recurva comas.

Ovid, *Fasti*, 5.419-44.[145]

Hinc ubi protulerit formosa ter Hesperus ora,
ter dederint Phoebo sidera victa locum,
ritus erit veteris, nocturna Lemuria, sacri:
inferias tacitis manibus illa dabunt,
annus erat brevior, nec adhuc pia februa norant,
nec tu dux mensum, Iane biformis, eras:
iam tamen extincto cineri sua dona ferebant,
compositique nepos busta piabat avi.
mensis erat Maius, maiorum nomine dictus,
qui partem prisci nunc quoque moris habet,
nox ubi iam media est somnoque silentia praebet,
et canis et variae conticuistis aves,
ille memor veteris ritus timidusque deorum
surgit (habent gemini vincula nulla pedes)
signaque dat digitis medio cum pollice iunctis,
occurrat tacito ne levis umbra sibi.
cumque manus puras fontana perluit unda,
vertitur et nigras accipit ante fabas
aversusque iacit; sed dum iacit, 'haec ego mitto,
his' inquit 'redimo meque meosque fabis.'
hoc novies dicit nec respicit: umbra putatur

[145] Referenced on page vii of the Preface and page 14 of Chapter 2.

colligere et nullo terga vidente sequi.

rursus aquam tangit Temesacaque concrepat aera

et rogat, ut tectis exeat umbra suis.

cum dixit novies ‘Manes exite paterni,’

respicit et pure sacra peracta putat.

Ovid, *Tristia,* 2.1.207.[146]

perdiderint cum me duo crimina, carmen et error,

alterius facti culpa silenda milli'.

Ovid, *Tristia, 2*.183-214.[147]

non precor ut redeam, quamvis maiora petitis

credibile est magnos saepe dedisse deos;

mitius exilium si das propiusque roganti,

pars erit ex poena magna levata mea.

ultima perpetior medios eiectus in hostes,

nec quisquam patria longius exul abest,

solus ad egressus missus septemplicis Histri

Parrhasiae gelido virginis axe premor—

Ciziges et Colchi Tereteaque turba Getaeque

Danuvii mediis vix prohibentur aquis—

cumque alii causa tibi sint graviore fugati,

[146] Referenced on page 7 of Chapter 2.
[147] Referenced on page 9 of Chapter 2.

ulterior nulli, quam mihi, terra data est.

longius hac nihil est, nisi tantum frigus

et hostes, et maris adstricto quae coit unda gelu.

hactenus Euxini pars est Romana sinistri:

proxima Basternae Sauromataeque tenent.

haec est Ausonio sub iure novissima vixque

haeret in imperii margine terra tui.

unde precor supplex ut nos in tuta releges,

ne sit cum patria pax quoque adempta mihi,

ne timeam gentes, quas non bene summovet Hister,

neve tuus possim civis ab hoste capi.

fas prohibet Latio quemquam de sanguinenatum

Caesaribus salvis barbara vincla pati.

perdiderint cum me duo crimina, carmen et error,

alterius facti culpa silenda milli'.

nam non sum tanti, renovem ut tua vulnera. Caesar,

quem nimio plus est indoluisse semel.

altera pars superest, qua turpi carmine factus

arguor obsceni doctor adulterii,

fas ergo est aliqua caelestia pectora falli,

et sunt notitia multa minora tua;

Ovid, *Tristia,* 3.14.37.[148]

Non hic librorum, per quos inviter alerque copia.

Ovid, *Tristia,*. 3.8.7-10.[149]

ut tenera nostris cedente volatibus aura

aspicerem patriae dulce repente solum,

desertaeque domus vultus, memoresque sodales,

caraque praecipue coniugis ora meae.

Plato, "Phaedrus," in *Platonis Opera,* 261a and 271.[150]

ἆρ᾽ οὖν οὐ τὸ μὲν ὅλον ἡ ῥητορικὴ ἂν εἴη τέχνη ψυχαγωγία τις διὰ λόγων, οὐ μόνον ἐνδικαστηρί οις καὶ ὅσοι ἄλλοι δημόσιοι σύλλογοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν ἰδίοις, ἡ αὐτὴ σμικρῶν…

ἐπειδὴ λόγου δύναμις τυγχάνει ψυχαγωγία οὖσα…

Plotinus, *Ennead,* Volume I: 10.15–32.[151]

Αἰγύπτιος γάρ τις ἱερεὺς ἀνελθὼν εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην καὶ διά τινος φίλου αὐτῷ γνωρισθεὶς θέλων τε τῆς ἑαυτοῦ σοφίας ἀπόδειξιν δοῦναι ἠξίωσε τὸν Πλωτῖνον ἐπὶ θέαν ἀφικέσθαι τοῦ συνόντος αὐτῷ οἰκείου δαίμονος καλουμένου. Τοῦ δὲ ἑτοίμως ὑπακούσαντος γίνεται μὲν ἐν τῷ Ἰσίῳ ἡ κλῆσις· μόνον γὰρ ἐκεῖνον τὸν τόπον καθαρὸν φῆσαι εὑρεῖν ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ τὸν Αἰγύπτιον. Κληθέντα δὲ εἰς αὐτοψίαν τὸν δαίμονα θεὸν ἐλθεῖν καὶ μὴ τοῦ δαιμόνων εἶναι γένους· ὅθεν τὸν Αἰγύπτιον εἰπεῖν· "μακάριος εἶ θεὸν ἔχων τὸν δαίμονα καὶ οὐ τοῦ ὑφειμένου γένους τὸν

[148] Referenced on page 8 of Chapter 2.
[149] Referenced on page 8 of Chapter 2.
[150] Referenced on page 57 of Appendix A.
[151] Referenced on page 29 of Chapter 4.

συνόντα.” Μήτε δὲ ἐρέσθαι τι ἐκγενέσθαι μήτε ἐπιπλέον ἰδεῖν παρόντα τοῦ συνθεωροῦντος φίλου τὰς ὄρνεις, ἃς κατεῖχε φυλακῆς ἕνεκα, πνίξαντος εἴτε διὰ φθόνον εἴτε καὶ διὰ φόβον τινά. Τῶν οὖν θειοτέρων δαιμόνων ἔχων τὸν συνόντα καὶ αὐτὸς διετέλει ἀνάγων αὐτοῦ τὸ θεῖον ὄμμα πρὸς ἐκεῖνον

Plutarch, “Marcellus,” in *Lives,* 22.6.[152]
μηδενὸς δὲ τολμῶντος ἅψασθαι μηδὲ ἀπαντῆσαι διὰ δεισιδαιμονίαν, ἀλλ᾽ ἐκτρεπομένων, ἐπὶ τὰς πύλας ἐξέδραμεν, οὔτε φωνῆς τινος οὔτε κινήσεως πρεπούσης δαιμονῶντι καὶ παραφρονοῦντι φεισάμενος.

Plutarch, “The Obsolescence of Oracles,”in *Moralia,* 417a-c.[153]
ἡμεῖς δὲ μήτε μαντείας τινὰς ἀθειάστους εἶναι λεγόντων1 ἢ τελετὰς καὶ ὀργιασμοὺς ἀμελουμένους ὑπὸ θεῶν ἀκούωμεν· μήτ᾽ αὖ πάλιν τὸν θεὸν ἐν τούτοις ἀναστρέφεσθαι καὶ παρεῖναι καὶ συμπραγματεύεσθαι δοξάζωμεν, ἀλλ᾽ οἷς δίκαιόν ἐστι ταῦτα λειτουργοῖς θεῶν ἀνατιθέντες ὥσπερ ὑπηρέταις καὶ γραμματεῦσι,2 δαίμονας νομίζωμεν ἐπισκόπους θεῶν3 ἱερῶν καὶ μυστηρίων ὀργιαστάς, Βᾶλλους δὲ τῶν ὑπερηφάνων καὶ μεγάλων τιμωροὺς ἀδικιῶν περιπολεῖν.
τοὺς δὲ πάνυ σεμνῶς ὁ Ἡσίοδος ‘ἀγνούς’ προσεῖπε‘πλουτοδότας, καὶ τοῦτο γέρας βασιλήιον ἔχοντας,’ὡς βασιλικοῦ τοῦ εὖ ποιεῖν ὄντος. εἰσὶ γάρ, ὡς ἐν ἀνθρώποις, καὶ δαίμοσιν ἀρετῆς διαφοραὶ καὶ τοῦ παθητικοῦ καὶ ἀλόγου τοῖς μὲν ἀσθενὲς καὶ ἀμαυρὸν ἔτι λείψανον ὥσπερ περίττωμα, τοῖς δὲ πολὺ καὶ δυσκατάσβεστον ἔνεστιν, ὧν ἴχνη καὶ σύμβολα πολλαχοῦ θυσίαι καὶ τελεταὶ καὶ μυθολογίαι σῴζουσι καὶ διαφυλάττουσιν ἐνδιεσπαρμένα.

[152] Referenced on page 56 in Appendix A.
[153] Referenced on page 27 and 28 of Chapter 4.

“Περὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν μυστικῶν, ἐν οἷς τὰς Cμεγίστας ἐμφάσεις καὶ διαφάσεις λαβεῖν ἔστι τῆς περὶ δαιμόνων ἀληθείας, ‘εὖστομά μοι κείσθω,’ καθ᾽ Ἡρόδοτον· ἑορτὰς δὲ καὶ θυσίας, ὥσπερ ἡμέρας ἀποφράδας καὶ σκυθρωπάς, ἐν αἷς ὠμοφαγίαι καὶ διασπασμοὶ νηστεῖαί τε καὶ κοπετοί, πολλαχοῦ δὲ πάλιν αἰσχρολογίαι πρὸς ἱεροῖς μανίαι τ᾽ ἀλαλαί τ᾽ ὀρινομένωνῥιψαύχενι σὺν κλόνῳ, θεῶν μὲν οὐδενὶ δαιμόνων δὲ φαύλων ἀποτροπῆς ἕνεκα φήσαιμ᾽ ἂν τελεῖσθαι μειλίχια καὶ παραμύθια.

Plutarch, *De superstition,* 7.3.[154]

τῷ δὲ δεισιδαίμονι καὶ σώματος ἀρρωστία πᾶσα καὶ χρημάτων ἀποβολὴ καὶ τέκνων θάνατοι καὶ περὶπολιτικὰς πράξεις δυσημερίαι καὶ ἀποτεύξεις πληγαὶ θεοῦ καὶ προσβολαὶ δαίμονος λέγονται.

Tertullian, *Apologeticum,* 22.1-6.[155]

Atque adeo dicimus esse substantias quasdam spiritales. Nec novum nomen est. Sciunt daemones philosophi, Socrate ipso ad daemonii arbitrium expectante. Quidni? Cum et ipsi daemonium a pueritia adhaesisse dicatur, dehortatorium plane a bono. Omnes sciunt poetae; etiam vulgus indoctum in usum maledicti frequentat. Nam et Satanan, principem huius mali generis, proinde de propria conscientia animae eadem execramenti voce pronuntiat. Angelos quoque etiam Plato non negavit. Utriusque nominis testes esse vel magi adsunt. Sed quomodo de angelis quibusdam sua sponte corruptis corruptior gens daemonum evaserit, damnata a deo cum generis auctoribus et cum eo quem diximus principe, apud litteras sanctas ordo cognoscitur. Nunc de operatione eorum satis erit exponere. Operatio eorum est hominis eversion. Sic militia spiritalis a primordio auspicata est in hominis adeundam subtilitas et tenuitas sua. Multum spiritalibus viribus licet, ut invisibiles et insensibiles in effectu potius quam in actu suo appareant, si poma, si fruges nescio

[154] Referenced on page 28 of Chapter 4.
[155] Referenced on page 35 of Chapter 4.

quod aurae latens vitium in flore praecipitat, in germine exanimat, in pubertate convulnerat, ac si caeca ratione temptatus aer pestilentes haustus suos offundit. Eadem igitur obscuritate contagionis adspiratio daemonum et angelorum mentis quoque corruptelas agit furoribus et amentiis foedis aut saevis libidinibus cum erroribus variis, quorum iste potissimus quo deos istos captis et circumscriptis hominum mentibus commendat, ut et sibi pabula propria nidoris et sanguinis procuret simulacris imaginibus oblata.

Xenophon, *Memorabilia,* 1.1.9.[156]

τοὺς δὲ μηδὲν τῶν τοιούτων οἰομένους εἶναι δαιμόνιον, ἀλλὰ πάντα τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης γνώμης δαιμονᾶν ἔφη· δαιμονᾶν δὲ καὶ τοὺς μαντευομένους ἃ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἔδωκαν οἱ θεοὶ μαθοῦσι διακρίνειν, οἷον εἴ τις ἐπερωτῴη, πότερον ἐπιστάμενον ἡνιοχεῖν ἐπὶ ζεῦγος λαβεῖν κρεῖττον ἢ μὴ ἐπιστάμενον ἢ πότερον ἐπιστάμενον κυβερνᾶν ἐπὶ τὴν ναῦν κρεῖττον λαβεῖν ἢ μὴ ἐπιστάμενον ἢ ἃ ἔξεστιν ἀριθμήσαντας ἢ μετρήσαντας ἢ στήσαντας εἰδέναι, τοὺς τὰ τοιαῦτα παρὰ τῶν θεῶν πυνθανομένους ἀθέμιτα ποιεῖν ἡγεῖτο.

[156] Referenced on page 55 in Appendix A.

VITA

Graduate School
Southern Illinois University

Jessica L. Leonard
jessicalynn84@gmail.com

West Kentucky Community and Technical College
Associate of Art, May 2014

West Kentucky Community and Technical College
Associate of Science, May 2014

Southern Illinois University Carbondale
Bachelor of Art, Classics, May 2016

Special Honors and Awards:

- Women's Club Joyce Guyon Scholarship
- Margaret C. Griffin Scholarship
- Nat Dortch, Sr. Scholarship
- Phi Theta Kappa Honors Graduate

Thesis Title:

Interpreting the *Lemuria* as *Pietas*

Major Professor: Dr. Rachel Stocking