humanitas
supplementum

Visitors from beyond the Grave

Ghosts in World Literature

Dámaris Romero-González, Israel Muñoz-Gallarte, Gabriel Laguna-Mariscal (eds.)

Apresentação: esta série destina-se a publicar estudos de fundo sobre um leque variado de temas e perspetivas de abordagem (literatura, cultura, história antiga, arqueologia, história da arte, filosofia, língua e linguística), mantendo embora como denominador comum os Estudos Clássicos e sua projeção na Idade Média, Renascimento e receção na atualidade.

Breve nota curricular sobre os coordenadores do volume

Dámaris Romero-González, Ph.D. in Classical Philology (2007), is a Lecturer of Greek Philology at the University of Córdoba (Spain). She has published several articles and chapters on Plutarch, women in Antiquity and semantics of the New Testament.

Israel Muñoz-Gallarte, Ph.D. in Classics (2008), is an Associate Professor of Classics at the University of Córdoba. He has published extensively on classics, imperial Greek literature: Plutarch, Early Christian Apocrypha, and Semantics. He is the author of *Los sustantivos-Hecho en el Nuevo Testamento* (UCM, Madrid 2008) and co-author of *Plutarch in the Religious and Philosophical Discourse of Late Antiquity* (Brill, Leiden-Boston 2013).

Gabriel Laguna-Mariscal, Professor of Latin Philology at the University of Córdoba (Spain). He got his B.A. and Ph.D. in the Universities of Córdoba and Seville. He has been a visiting scholar in Cornell, Harvard and Indiana universities, and Lecturer in the Universities of Extremadura and Córdoba. He has published in the fields of Latin poetry and the Classical Tradition.

Visitors from beyond the Grave

Ghosts in World Literature

Dámaris Romero-González, Israel Muñoz-Gallarte, Gabriel Laguna-Mariscal (eds.)
University of Córdoba

Visitors from beyond the Grave: Ghosts in World Literature

EDITORS
Dámaris Romero-González, Israel Muñoz-Gallarte, Gabriel Laguna-Mariscal

AFFILIATION
University of Córdoba

ABSTRACT
The monograph deals with the topic of ghosts in universal literature from a polyhedral perspective, making use of different perspectives, all of which highlight the resilience of these figures from the very beginning of literature up to the present day. Therefore, the aim of this volume is to focus on how ghosts have been translated and transformed over the years within literature written in the following languages: Classical Greek and Latin, Spanish, Italian, and English.

KEYWORDS
Ghost, Greek Literature, Roman Literature, Hispanic Literature, Italian Literature, English Literature.

Editors

Dámaris Romero-González, Ph.D. in Classical Philology (2007), is an Assistant Professor of Classics at the University of Córdoba (Spain). She has published several articles and chapters on Plutarch, women in Antiquity and semantics of the New Testament.
Orcid ID: 0000-0001-6234-9687 (ca2rogod@uco.es)

Israel Muñoz-Gallarte, Ph.D. in Classics (2008), is an Assistant Professor of Classics at the University of Córdoba. He has published extensively on classics, imperial Greek literature: Plutarch, Early Christian Apocrypha, and Semantics. He is the author of *Los sustantivos-Hecho en el Nuevo Testamento* (UCM, Madrid 2008) and co-author of *Plutarch in the Religious and Philosophical Discourse of Late Antiquity* (Brill, Leiden-Boston 2013).
Orcid ID: 0000-0002-6916-6004 (fg2mugai@uco.es)

Gabriel Laguna-Mariscal, a Professor of Latin Philology at the University of Córdoba (Spain). He got his B.A. and Ph.D. in the Universities of Córdoba and Seville. He has been a visiting scholar in Cornell, Harvard and Indiana universities, and Lecturer in the Universities of Extremadura and Córdoba. He has published in the fields of Latin poetry and the Classical Tradition.
Orcid ID: 0000-0001-5554-3473 (glaguna@uco.es)

Sumário

Abbreviations

	Worlds
PG	*Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Graeca.* J.P. Migne (ed.) 1857-1904
PL	*Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Latina.* J.P. Migne (ed.) 1884-1904
RE	*Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft.* Stuttgart 1893-1980

Others

AIH	Asociación Internacional de Hispanistas
AISPI	Associazione Ispanisti Italiani

> - Perhaps they are ghosts who lived in this house before and who... I've already told you (…) ghosts go about in white sheets and carry chains and go...
> - Anne, why do you make up such stories?
> - I don't. I read them in books.
> *The Others* (2001)

It was not until as recently as 1972, in Toronto (Ontario), that the so-called "Philip experiment" would cast serious doubts regarding our whole knowledge of phantasmagorical entities. Under the direction of the mathematician A.R.G. Owen and the supervision of the psychologist J. Whitton, a small diverse group of people were brought together for no reason other than to father a ghost. From lines written by the Irish partakers and chroniclers M. Owen and Margaret Sparrow in *Conjuring up Philip: An Adventure in Psychokinesis* (New York 1976), we know that the experiment began in a childish way, when the research group made up the story of the fictional Philip Aylesford. His background, in spite of some incongruities and historical mistakes, reflects the creativity of the group when it came to plausibility. The story went that Philip was originally a young Cavalier during the English Civil War, born in Warwickshire in 1624, married twice, once in his twenties to Dorothea, and then again in his thirties to Margo. He finally died in the year 1654 (see also, Colombo [4]2002: 122-127).

From this basic framework, the members of the group devised the rest of Philip's details in order to construct a realistic figure. After the first meetings, each member was individually called into a sealed room in order to try and communicate with Philip. Evidently, these early weeks did not yield any results, so the supervisors decided to change the decoration of the usual rooms accustomed to the *séances* of the day, and bring all the members together. Now the group communicated with the invented ghost of Philip through scratches and raps in the table, and enjoyed conversations with him such as the following:

> Group: "Did you ever get drunk?"
> Philip: (Rap) "Yes."
> G.: "But not too often?"
> Ph.: (Rap, rap) "No."

All in all, notwithstanding the weight of the members' subconscious influencing these conversations, which may have accounted for everything, the group finished by constructing the story of a young Philip who joined the army at sixteen, was married first to the cold Dorothea because his parents obliged, and then fell in love with the gypsy Margo who, having been accused of

witchcraft, was burned at the stake. Philip, then, committed suicide at the young age of thirty.

The conclusions of the so-called "Philip Experiment" keep in limbo questions such as whether ghosts exist or not, but at least provide an example of a pseudo-scientific conception of an invented and literary phantom, which serves as the main topic of the pages that follow.

The next seventeen chapters deal with the topic of ghosts in universal literature from a polyhedral perspective, making use of different perspectives, all of which highlight the resilience of these figures from the very beginning of literature up to the present day. Therefore, the aim of this volume is to focus on how ghosts have been translated and transformed over the years within literature written in the following languages: classical Greek and Latin, Spanish, Italian, and English.

The source of these tributaries in the long river of literature is well known. The ghost of Enkidu, who died in the prime of his youth, in the *Poem of Gilgamesh* (2500-2000 BC), comes back from the hereafter to visit his friend and the main protagonist of the saga, the king of Uruk, Gilgamesh, to inform him of afterlife in the underworld. Later on in the occidental literature of the 8th century BC, the Homeric *Iliad* features the spectre of Patroclus, who appeared to Achilles in dreams to ask that his corpse should be buried in the proper way. Since this scene, phantasmagorical entities have not been absent from Hellenic literature from any literary genre or historical age.

With the aim of inquiring into these origins, Consuelo Ruiz-Montero (University of Murcia), in "Ghosts Stories in the Greek Novel: a Typology Attempt", focuses on the use of ghosts in the Greek novel of the Hellenistic ages. Ruiz-Montero analyses nine episodes transmitted by papyrus under the titles of *Ephesiaca* by Xenophon of Ephesus, *Callirhoe* by Chariton, and *Babyloniaca* by Iamblichus. The author classifies these passages depending on whether the stories are related in the first person to the ghost, or in the third person by another feature. She then evaluates several of the text's qualities, such as the grade of credibility of falsehood given to the story, the nomenclature of the spirits, their appearance and common motifs – such as the feminine guile to solve situations, the eroticism of the ghost's presence, the conversation between two ghosts, etc. Finally, the interesting conclusions to the chapter open up the field of study by breaking the fictitious boundaries between Greek and Latin literatures.

Dámaris Romero (University of Córdoba), in her own way, focuses her chapter "The Function of Dream-Stories in Plutarch's *Lives*" on Imperial Greek literature, specifically on the apparition of ghosts in three dreams narrated by Plutarch in the *Vitae* of Caesar-Brutus, Caius Gracchus, and Cimon. The researcher divides her chapter into two clear sections: a) an analysis of the literary form of ghostly dreams; and b) a development of the proper analysis of the passages, goals and intentions of these dreams in Plutarch's narrative, and

the different elements used by the Chaeronean to accomplish them.

The third chapter, "Menippus, a Truly Live Ghost in Lucian's *Necromancy*", by Pilar Gómez (University of Barcelona), provides an interesting analysis into the figure of the philosopher Mennipus and his travel to the hereafter in the works of Lucian. In her view, the passage provides a path to observance of the meaning of human life, as well as the doctrines of philosophers, which have failed in the age of the Second Sophistic. Thus, through parody and humour, the motif of Menippus's journey to Hades allowed Lucian not only to entertain his audience, but also to enquire about ethical and philosophical issues.

Daniel Ogden (University of Exeter) in "Lies Too Good to Lay to Rest: The Survival of Pagan Ghost Stories in Early Christian Literature" breaks down the boundaries between Christian and pagan literature to deal with the transmission of three ghost stories from Greek and Latin literature to the early Christian corpus, in order to evaluate how the Christian authors re-create and adapt these stories in order to christianise them. In doing so, the author focuses his chapter on several traditional and typical scenes, to wit, 'the haunted house', 'the ghost who locates a lost deposit', and 'the mistaken underworld escort'.

Finally, Manuel Bermúdez Vázquez (University of Córdoba) with "Demons, Ghosts and Spirits in the Philosophical Tradition" ends this section regarding Greek literature by linking the views of three philosophers on a common topic in their philosophical works: the *daimones,* or spirits. Indeed, Socrates, Descartes, and Hegel all resort to the figure of the daemon in order to illustrate their philosophical concepts. Thus, according to the author, these three philosophers used the *daimon* as a force that put them "in the path of the search for truth and philosophical inquiry" (p. 84) by combining irrational magical-religious aspects with philosophical reason.

From these first literary motifs, that show the evolution, dispersion, and influence of the concept of ghosts across diverse literary genres and fields, Latin literature then developed the topic by creating some of the most interesting scenes in the occidental cultural tradition. The use of ghosts as a concept in arguments between philosophical schools is beyond any kind of doubt: the phantom was not only a reality in irrational Greek folklore – to use Dodds's terminology – but was also a philosophical entity worthy of rational speculation. This development was evident since the Hellenistic ages, with a special peak in interest during the Second Sophistic age in Greek and Latin literature.

Following this stream of philosophical interpretations of ghost stories, Ángel J. Traver Vera (independente research), in "The Atomistic Denial of Ghosts: From Democritus to Lucretius", discusses the atomistic premises against the existence of ghosts. In dealing with this topic, Traver Vera first establishes the philosophical principles of the atomistic philosophers, in order to argue the inexistence of ghosts from an atomistic point of view, as merely "printed images". Indeed, the physical proposals of Leucippus that

were allegedly qualified by Democritus suggest, although in a veiled manner, that atoms, by "falling", were able to create images by keeping themselves ingrained in the eyes and minds of individuals. Consequently, due to the fact that these images could remain in the observer even when the object had died and decomposed, paranormal phenomena received an almost-plausible explanation. Following a similar path, Lucretius also resorted in his *Rerum Natura* (1. 127-135; 4. 26-109; 724-822) to the proposals of Democritus and Leucippus to explain the same problems.

In order to apply different angles to the Roman *corpora*, the next chapter by Miguel Rodríguez-Pantoja (University of Córdoba), "The Role of the Ghosts in Seneca's Tragedies", begins with a brief characterisation, on the one hand, of Seneca's tragedies, and, on the other, of the phantasmagorical apparitions that come from Hades, or from the other side, in those tragedies. Once the researcher has framed his main topic, he attends to the heart of his investigation, namely, the typology of apparitions among the numerous examples extracted from the plays of the Cordovan tragedian. The interesting conclusions of this chapter show the value of these apparitions beyond their origins in Seneca's *corpus*.

A diachronic overview of a wide range of cultures, from Roman ages to current occidental, is provided by Gabriel Laguna Mariscal (University of Córdoba) in "Ghosts of Girlfriends Past: Development of a Literary Episode", in which the researcher analyses the main reasons for the return of the ghost to his lover, be it for asking something about the past, giving advice, or instructing about the future. To do so, Laguna Mariscal begins his chapter with the aforementioned Greek passage of Patroclus and Achilles (*Iliad* 23), and continues with Latin sources, in particular the elegies of Propertius to the already-dead Cynthia. To conclude, the author looks forward to the current Spanish literature by observing how essential elements of the topic live on safe and sound in some important poets, such as Petrarch, Luis Martín de Plaza, Jaime Gil de Biedma, and Luis Alberto de Cuenca.

It seems clear that up to this moment that there are two main lines of thought with respect to the topic that overwhelm occidental culture: one folkloric, whose sources are difficult to define, and a second literary-rationalistic one, having evident common points with the first, but keeping several constant elements that can be summed up as follows:

a) Spectres appear unexpectedly to individuals in high-stress situations, whether after a beloved's death, before a battle, or just because they find themselves in an alien place.

b) The ghost tends to materialise in a precise moment, in the peacefulness of the hours from twilight to deepest night.

c) As far as the seer is concerned, there are two possibilities:

1) The seer was known to the ghost in life. Consequently, recognition takes place during the scene.

2) The seer can be a wise philosopher who, by means of a message from the other side, achieves a knowledge veiled from the majority.

As for the other character in the scene, the ghost, it is remarkable that his appearance is difficult to determine due to his versatility. We observe in the precedent papers that a ghost's aspect depends on the various conditions of the deceased, that is, whether they died young or old, the kind of life they lived, and especially the circumstances of their death; in particular, whether they died violently or not. In this respect, it must be emphasised that a good number of phantoms maintain their living appearance, although they still keep their wounds, burns, or even bandages. Likewise, most of the ghosts are not free from another human feature: their memory. This is implied in their professed purpose for visiting the living, be it to protect or to advise someone about an imminent danger, to avenge someone or himself, to conclude some activity that his sudden passing left as a pending matter, or to ask for a worthy burial. In any case, the spectre seems to be poised between two sides, life and death, and thereby has the ability to know the past, the present, and the future, as he confirms through his message.

This literary conception of phantasmagorical entities permeates deeply through the next occidental literature to be examined, even if each author adapts the motifs for his own time and to his own agenda. From the authors that are taken into account in the following pages it is worthwhile to mention Shakespeare in *Hamlet*, *Macbeth,* and *Richard III,* and in the Hispanic letters *El burlador de Sevilla* attributed to Tirso de Molina. Likewise, the topic of terror as a basic playful element is analysed in the chapter that regards *The Castle of Otranto* by Horace Walpole.

Consequently, these topics will eventually constitute the most common characteristics of ghost stories, by fixing in the imagination some common elements, such as the scene of an ancient place outside of civilisation; a medieval castle, or later an inhospitable house; a location with a sterile and nebulous ambience; being in a current moment but stagnated by the past; features that are not really what they seem to be given their obscure and traumatic backgrounds; and, of course, ghosts that appear as visions or dreams to remember that their presence is a guaranteed sign of an accursed place.

These characteristics can all be traced in the works of Boccaccio, who comes to the fore in the third section of this volume.

Francisco José Rodríguez Mesa (University of Córdoba) starts his chapter entitled "On Women's Faithfulness and Ghosts: About *Decameron* 7.1" with a brief analysis of the Italian terms 'fantasma' and 'fantasima', *ghost,* in medieval Italian literature, to bring to light the importance of Boccaccio for a discussion of

this topic. Boccaccio established in his works a curious relationship, in a comic context, between 'fantasima' and the tricky conduct of women. The researcher inquires into the reasons behind the feminine conduct by taking into account not only the roles that both male and female characters play in the *Decameron,* but also the roles they have in the real world.

The next section, dealing with Spanish literature, focuses on two authors from the 15th and 17th centuries, Lope de Barrientos and Calderón de la Barca.

In "'Ghost' in the Magic Treatises of Lope de Barrientos", Antonia Rísquez Madrid with (University of Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona) deals with the interesting and almost-unknown figure of the bishop Barrientos (1382-1469), a prominent figure in the intellectual life of his age. Rísquez Madrid focuses her attention on the concept of 'fantasma', *ghost,* in the scholastic and didactic works of the Spanish writer. As a result, the chapter moves from an analysis of the phantom to a reflection regarding the tradition of Aristotelian gnosiology and the theories about the external and internal senses in Barrientos, whose theological meaning is unavoidable.

Ane Zapatero Molinuevo (University of Vitoria), in "'Phantom Ladies' and 'Ghost Gallants': The Motif of Supernatural Lovers in the Spanish Golden Age Theatre", analyses the variations of the concept of the ghost, specifically the 'phantom lady' on the one hand and the 'ghost gallant' on the other, as recurrent motifs in the comedies of the Golden Age of Spanish literature. Here the goal of this motif was to allow for a meeting between lovers overcoming the boundaries of death. The researcher also focuses on the Calderonian treatment of these invented male and female ghosts, and bases her arguments on *La dama duende* and *El galán fantasma*. Right after the analysis of both plays, Zapatero Molinero concludes her chapter by establishing the theoretical framework in which these *loci comunes* are used in comedy.

Evidently, ghost stories are not restricted to Romanic literature; German and English literature is where most of the popular current topics flourish. The researchers will continue to find examples of ghosts in the classical sense, but given metaphorical meaning, with such features defined by Peeren as the "lack of social visibility, unobtrusiveness, enigmatic abilities or uncertain status between life and death" (Peeren 2014: 5). In order to deal with both meanings, the classical one and the new defined by Peeren, the rich Anglo-Saxon literature is the focus for the fifth section of the volume. Four of the most prominent authors from all ages are examined from different angles: the plays of Shakespeare; the influence of the gothic novel on H.P. Lovecraft and another modern author, Stephen King; and, finally, postcolonial literature is analysed through the figure of Jean Rhys.

To begin with, Mónica M. Martínez Sariego (University of Las Palmas), saddled between English and Spanish literatures, provides the next chapter, "'Tomorrow in the Battle Think on Me': Haunting Ghosts, Remorse and Guilt

in Shakespeare's *Richard III* and Javier Marías". Here, the researcher focuses on the ghosts that torment Richard III in Shakespeare's tragedy, which, in Martínez Sariego's view, are plausibly the subtext and the source of the novel *Mañana en la batalla piensa en mí* by Javier Marías. In her view, these ghosts allow the Spanish writer to reflect on culpability and remorse, essential topics in his novels.

Juan L. Pérez-de-Luque (University of Córdoba) takes into account the traditional gothic novel in "Ghostly Presences in H.P. Lovecraft's 'Cool Air' and *The Case of Charles Dexter Ward*". In his analysis, the researcher takes as a theoretical framework the works of Derrida, Brogan, and Hogle, to establish a clear relationship between Lovecraft's narrative features and traditional gothic ghosts.

In her own way, Cristina A. Huertas Abril (University of Córdoba), in "The Influence of *The Castle of Otranto* in *The Shining*, or the Reception of the Eighteenth-Century Gothic in Stephen King's Literature", continues with gothic literature, but now focused on a current and modern classical author of the terror genre, Stephen King. The researcher begins with a short overview of the work that opens the doors to American gothic literature, *The Castle of Otranto* by Walpole, and offers parameters for regarding the evolution of the genre, before consequently analysing the cinematic novel of Stephen King, *The Shining*.

Different approaches are proposed by María J. López (University of Córdoba) in "The Ghostly, the Uncanny and the Abject in Jean Rhys's *After Leaving Mr Mackenzie*", who focuses her study on postcolonial literature. Here, the researcher enquires into the meaning of the characters' search for their own identity, in a way that we can consider those characters as real and 'living ghosts'. In doing so, López takes account of elements within the gothic genre, such as the use of the ghost, and Freud's notions related to the uncanny and the abject.

Finally, the last chapter of the section, by María Porras Sánchez (Complutense University of Madrid), "The Moroccan *Jinn* in the Anglo-American Literary and Ethnographic Tradition" widens the scope of study in this volume by attending to the figure of the Islamic *jinn* in Moroccan culture as a basis for showing its ethnographical influence on Anglo-American authors from Morocco, such as Paul Bowles and Tahir Shah, among others.

The last chapter of the book offers a fresh anthropological inquiry into some traditional songs whose origins are unknown, but are still nowadays sung in some small villages in the north of Andalusia. "The Purgatory in Los Pedroches: Anthropological Approach and Ethnographic Analysis on the Ceremony *Ánimas Benditas* in Dos Torres (Córdoba)", by Ignacio Alcaide (University of Córdoba), provides an analysis into the idea of purgatory and the souls linked to it, through ethnographic research focused on a local ceremony in the little village of Andalusia, Dos Torres. To do so, the researcher focuses his attention on ritual as a tool for social cohesion and the mirror of a group's cultural and religious values.

Thanks are due to all the authors that contributed to this volume for their interest, enthusiasm, and support. Likewise, we would like to thank the reviewers, who anonymously carried out the arduous task of reviewing each paper, in order to achieve the necessary academic and formal quality the volume can now boast. And last but not least, we wish to acknowledge our appreciation for the patience of those that, during the preparation of this book, felt that the editors and authors were but ghosts in their homes.

Ghosts Stories in the Greek Novel: A Typology Attempt

Consuelo Ruiz Montero
University of Murcia
(orcid.org/0000-0001-8790-1896)

Abstract: This chapter offers a collection of texts belonging to ancient Greek novels dealing with ghosts, either in embedded tales or in episodes, both in extant complete novels and in papyri fragments. We will analyse nine texts and quote other parallels from both contemporary Greek and Latin literature. In our conclusions we will try to distinguish some of their types according to categories such as: tale enunciation, authentic and false ghosts, terminology, and physical description. Finally, we will remark on the rhetorical character of these stories.

Keywords: Ancient Greek narrative, ghost, typology, rhetoric character.

It is well known that one of the typical features of the Imperial Age is the triumph of the irrational elements, as it is demonstrated by the faith in magic and all kinds of superstition and the rise of mystery religions. These features are well documented in magic papyri, inscriptions and literature. In the latter it should be noted that fiction permeates every literary genre of the period, and it manifests itself in genres such as paradoxography and novel, the genre of fiction par excellence, even though both genres have demonstrable interrelations. Thus, it seems interesting as well as relevant to explore the texts that deal with ghosts in the different types of Greek novel[1]. We will study both the stories and their diverse references to ghosts, and we will try to establish a typology, although it is a difficult task due to the fragmentary state of most of the texts we will analyse[2].

1. Among the extant novels, the only complete story about the apparition of a ghost is found in Xenophon of Ephesus' *Ephesiaca*, a novel dated in the second

---

[1] For a diachronic outlook of this genre see Ruiz-Montero 2006, and, for an international volume about novel in the ancient world, see Schmeling 2003. For essential collections of papyri fragments of novels, see López Martínez 1998 and Stephens and Winkler 1995, with very few differences between the papyri quoted here. My texts follow those editions, although the translations are my own. The most recent volume edited by Bastianini and Casanova 2010 is also very useful, and there are occasional editions of later papyri, but not related to our topic. I also wish to thank the anonymous readers for their observations and the editors for their extraordinary kindness.

[2] In relation to this type of literature Stramaglia 1999 is essential, his collection of texts being accompanied by a profuse philological commentary, though he does not include any of the papyri commented on here. Ogden 2002: 146 classifies ghosts in four types: *aôroi*, "those who have died prematurely", *bi(ai)othanatoi* "those who have died violently", *agamoi*, "those who have died before their marriage", and *ataphoi* "those who were without funeral rites". These categories are not exclusive. On the topic see also Johnston 1999, who focuses on archaic and classical periods.

century AD. Indeed, the heroine, Anthia, is forced to exhibit herself in a brothel, and in order to run from her situation, fakes an epileptic fit. She does this to preserve her chastity, following the compulsory standards of the Greek novels, which Xenophon takes to the highest paroxysm. Let us see the context of this story:

Ἡ δὲ ἐν ἀμηχάνῳ γενομένη κακῷ εὑρίσκει τέχνην ἀποφυγῆς· πίπτει μὲν γὰρ εἰς γῆν καὶ παρεῖται τὸ σῶμα καὶ ἐμιμεῖτο τοὺς νοσοῦντας τὴν ἐκ θεῶν καλουμένην νόσον.

She, being in a desperate situation, finds a trick to escape: thus, she falls to the ground and relaxes her body, imitating those who suffer the illness called sacred (5. 7. 4).

Immediately afterwards, Anthia tells a fictitious story to the procurer:

Παῖς ἔτι οὖσα ἐν ἑορτῇ καὶ παννυχίδι ἀποπλανηθεῖσα τῶν ἐμαυτῆς ἧκον πρός τινα τάφον ἀνδρὸς νεωστὶ τεθνηκότος· κἀνταῦθα ἐφάνη μοί τις ἀναθορὼν ἐκ τοῦ τάφου καὶ κατέχειν ἐπειρᾶτο· ἐγὼ δ' ἀπέφυγον καὶ ἐβόων· ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος ἦν μὲν ὀφθῆναι φοβερός, φωνὴν δὲ πολλῷ εἶχε χαλεπωτέραν· καὶ τέλος ἡμέρα μὲν ἤδη ἐγίνετο, ἀφεὶς δέ με ἔπληξέ τε κατὰ τοῦ στήθους καὶ νόσον ταύτην ἔλεγεν ἐμβεβληκέναι. Ἐκεῖθεν ἀρξαμένη ἄλλοτε ἄλλως ὑπὸ τῆς συμφορᾶς κατέχομαι. Ἀλλὰ δέομαί σου, δέσποτα, μηδέν μοι χαλεπήνῃς· οὐ γὰρ ἐγὼ τούτων αἰτία

When I was still a little girl, I got away from my family during a night party and arrived to a certain grave of a recently dead man; and at that very moment someone, who was running out from the grave and tried to seize me, appeared to me. I took to flight and began to shout; the appearance of the man was horrible, and his voice was even more than terrible; and finally the dawn had already broken, and he released me after beating me in the chest, and he told me he had infected me with that illness. From that moment I am overcome by that illness in different ways. But I beg you, master, do not get angry with me, because I am not guilty of it (5. 7. 7-9).

As it can be seen, Anthia pretends to suffer epilepsy in an aetiological narrative, which is an example of female cleverness of a folkloric nature. This type of episode is characteristic of the composition of this novel[3]. The story is

---

[3] For a study of this type of episode in Xenophon, see Ruiz-Montero 1998: 147. Plato (*Phaed.* 81d 2-3) has told already "ghosts, like shadows of souls, spectres like those who provide such souls" (ψυχῶν σκιοειδῆ φαντάσματα, οἷα παρέχονται αἱ τοιαῦται ψυχαὶ εἴδωλα), that prowl around the graves, and Athen. 9. 461c, concerning with the apparition of *daimones*, says that "they consider the *heroes* (are) cruel and violent, and even more at night than in the morning" (χαλεποὺς γὰρ καὶ πλήκτας τοὺς ἥρωας νομίζουσι καὶ μᾶλλον νύκτωρ ἢ μεθ' ἡμέραν), in line with the story narrated by Anthia.

also proof of the general belief in this type of apparition. Otherwise, we do not know whether the ghost has run after Anthia or whether something more has happened during the night. It should be pointed out that the topic of the night party is very frequent in both New and Middle Comedy, in which many young girls are told to have been raped and became pregnant against their will. This is the plot of *Phasma*, that is, *Ghost,* by Menander, a play to which I will refer later[4].

2. In Chariton's *Callirhoe* (probably written near the end of the first century AD), we find another story about apparitions. The episode of the trial at Babylon deals with the decision about who the true husband of the heroine Callirhoe is, her first husband Chaereas, considered to be dead, or her new husband Dionysius. It is here where we find a scene in which Chaereas is apparently evoked. Mithridates, the Persian satrap, has prepared the scene, and the following occurs:

> ὁ Μιθριδάτης φωνὴν ἐπῆρε καὶ ὥσπερ ἐπὶ θειασμοῦ "θεοὶ" φησὶ "βασίλειοι ἐπουράνιοί τε καὶ ὑποχθόνιοι, βοηθήσατε ἀνδρὶ ἀγαθῷ, (...) χρήσατέ μοι κᾶν εἰς τὴν δίκην Χαιρέαν. φάνηθι, δαῖμον ἀγαθέ· καλεῖ σε ἡ σὴ Καλλιρόη. (…) Ἔτι δὲ λέγοντος (οὕτω γὰρ ἦν διατεταγμένον) προῆλθε Χαιρέας αὐτός. ἰδοῦσα δὲ ἡ Καλλιρόη ἀνέκραγε "Χαιρέα, ζῇς;"

> Mithridates raised his voice and, as being inspired by the divinity, said: "Heavenly and underground supreme gods, help a good man (…) lend me Chaereas, even if it is only for his trial. Appear, good spirit; your Callirhoe calls you"; (…) and while he was still speaking (because it was agreed to be so), Chaereas himself moved forward. When Callirhoe saw him, she cried out: "Chaereas, are you alive?" (5. 7. 10 - 8. 1).

The apparition of Chaereas' supposed ghost is part of the main plot. He is called a "good spirit", and he comes to see his wife out of love. The scene is presented and commented on by the author with words that fit dramatic plays very well: *paradoxon mython* (5. 8. 2)[5]. Keep in mind that in Greek literature ghosts appear since *Il.* 23. 65ff., where the ghost, here "soul" (*psychē*), of Patroclus, appeared to Achilles, is referred as ψυχὴ καὶ εἴδωλον in v. 104, in the famous episode in Hades in *Odyssey* 11[6], and as *daimones* with the meaning of protective "spirits" are mentioned in Hes. *Theog.* 122 .

3. The *Babyloniaca,* by Iamblichus, is a novel whose plot we know thanks to Photius' abstract, *Bib. cod.* 94, according to which the novel can be dated

---

[4] About this play, see Barbieri 2001: 4-11, 123ff.
[5] In *Charit*. 5. 9. 4-5 Callirhoe asks herself whether Chaereas would not be an *eidolon* sent to the trial by Mithridates thanks to the Persian magic. Concerning this point, see the commentary by Plepelits 1976: 179 n. 125.
[6] See Ogden 2002: 146-147.

around 170 AD. This novel presents a scene in which the house of a killer and bandit is burnt by the soldiers of an evil king[7]. In this case, the heroes, pursued by the king, elude the danger by pretending to be ghosts (This constitutes another example of cleverness, similar to that of *Ephesiaca* quoted before.) The text is as follows:

> 3.1. Καθορῶνται νύκτωρ ὑπὸ τῶν τὸ πῦρ ἐμβαλόντων, καὶ ἐπερωτηθέντες τίνες εἶεν, εἴδωλα τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ λῃστοῦ ἀναιρεθέντων ἀποκρίνονται, καὶ τῇ ὠχρότητι καὶ λεπτότητι τῆς ὄψεως καὶ τῇ ἀτονίᾳ τῆς φωνῆς ἔπεισάν τε τοὺς στρατιώτας καὶ ἐδειμάτωσαν. Καὶ φεύγουσι πάλιν ἐκεῖθεν…

> They are discovered at night by those who had thrown them in the fire, and when they were asked who they were, they answer "the ghosts of those murdered by the bandit", and because of their pale and skinny aspect and the weakness of their voices, they convinced the soldiers and terrorised them. And thus they escaped from there again… (74b37- 42).

In this occasion the term used to name the ghosts is *eidōla*, meaning "images" or "spectres".

The topic of the ghost is repeated in this novel, as it is demonstrated by a quote in the lexicon *Suda* (11th century AD) which explains the meaning of the term *phasma*:

> 3.2. Φάσμα· ὁ δὲ ἕτερος ταῦρος ἐμυκήσατο, κακὸν φώνημα Γάρμῳ. καὶ ἔδοξε τράγος εἶναι μὴ ταῦρος ἐκεῖνο τὸ φάσμα.

> Phasma: "The other bull bellowed, a terrible sound for Garmus; and that ghost seemed to be a he-goat, not a bull" (4. 703. 20).

We know that Garmus is the evil king to whom we have referred to previously, and who plays the villain's role against the protagonists in the compositional structure of this novel. What we do not know is the context where the mentioned text is inserted, nor exactly to whom those ghostly bellows are referring to. Nevertheless, ghosts with animal shapes are also well documented in other Greek texts[8].

Up to this point, we have examined novels narrated in the third person. Next, we will look at a papyrus that belongs to Antonius Diogenes' *The incredible things beyond Thule*. It is a novel that is narrated in the first person (according to the abstract kept by Photius, *Bibl.cod.* 166) and that has a chronology that

---

[7] For a study of fragments and testimonies I refer to Stephens and Winkler 1995: 79-245.
[8] Stramaglia 1999: 40 referred to them among the seven possible aspects of ghosts.

seems to correspond to the final years of the first century AD. In the plot of the aforementioned novel, two compositional main ideas are combined, one that belongs to the novels and, on the other hand, the scheme of the fictional journey, that includes plentiful paradoxographical material. Likewise, the structure of a "Chinese box" is characteristic of this novel, that is, the usual embedding of a story inside another. The abstract by Photius presents a large biographical frame of the main character, Dinias, to whom another narrator, Dercyllis, relates her story in turn. Photius expresses it in this way:

καὶ ὡς τὰ ἐν Ἅιδου παρ' αὐτοῖς ἴδοι καὶ πολλὰ τῶν ἐκεῖσε μάθοι, διδασκάλῳ χρωμένη Μύρτῳ θεραπαινίδι οἰκείᾳ, πάλαι τὸν βίον ἀπολιπούσῃ καὶ ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν τὴν δέσποιναν ἀναδιδασκούσῃ.

...and how she saw Hades' world among them (the Cimmerians) and she learnt many of the things from there, using her maidservant Myrto as her teacher, who died some time ago and instructed her mistress from the dead ones (109a 39 - 109b 2).

Luckily, a papyrus of this novel from the 2nd century AD is related to this same episode, and says the following:

4. *PSI* 1177:
```
………ἐσιώπα γὰρ ἀχρε[ίως· ἄκουσον]
οὖν, ὅπερ τότε ἐπὶ νοῦ[ν ἦλθέ μοι· γραμ-]
ματεῖον δίθυρον τῶν [τοιούτων, οἷα ἐς]
διδασκάλου ἐπεφερόμεθα, ἀπ[ολαβοῦσα]          8
δίδωμι τῇ Μυρτοῖ· "κεἰ σὺ ἄλλ' ἔ[τι μοι μὴ]
δύνασαι λαλεῖν," ἔφην, "ἄλλ' ἔν [γε τούτῳ χά-]
ραξον ὅσα εἰπεῖν ἐθέλεις. ἐγὼ δ[ὲ ἀναγνοῦ-]
σα εἴσομαι." ἥσθη τὸ θεραπαιν[ίδιον· δήλη]          12
γὰρ διὰ τῆς ὄψεως ὡς αὐτίκα [μάλα ἐκδι-]
κίας ἐφ' οἷς πέπονθε καὶ θεραπ[είας τευ-]
ξομένη. λαβοῦσα οὖν τὸ γραμμα[τεῖον καὶ]
τῷ λύχνῳ προσελθοῦσα χαράτ[τει τῷ γρα-]          16
φείῳ πάνυ σπουδῇ ὅσα ἠβούλε[το ἐν μι-]
κροῖς πάνυ γράμμασι τ[ο]ῦ πλέο[ν ἐγγρά-]
ψαι, καί μοι δίδωσιν ἅμ[α] διανεύ[ουσα τῇ χει-]
ρὶ ἐξιέναι. ἐγὼ δὲ λαβοῦ[σ]α ἐξῆλθ[ον μὲν εὐ-]          20
θὺς οὐδαμῶς, πρότερ[ο]ν δὲ ἀν[έγνων αὐτὸ]
καὶ ἐδήλ[ο]υ τάδε· "ἄπιθι, ὦ δέσπο[ινα, αὐτί-]
κα πρὸς τὴν τροφόν, καὶ ἀκουού[σης ἀνά-]
γνωθι τὰ λοιπά, ὡς ἂν κἀκείνη [μάθοι τὰ]          24
ἑαυτῆς κακὰ μηδὲ ἐς τὸν πάντ[α χρόνον]
ἀγνοοῦσα ἥδοιτο, ὡς ἂν καὶ τὰ ἐμ[ὰ γνοίη-]
```

τε. ἄπιθι, ἤδη, πρὶν φοιτῆσαι π[αρὰ ···]
τὸν συγκοιμώμενον μὴ καὶ α[ὐτὴ δαίμο-]   28
νος ἀπολαύσης χαλεποῦ.” ταῦτα [δὲ ὡς ἀνέ-]
γνων, ἐβουλόμην μὲν ἐπισκ[·······]

…she, indeed, kept silent pointlessly. So, listen what came to my mind in that moment: taking a small tablet of two sheets from those we carried to school, I gave it to Myrto. "If you cannot tell me anything more" – I said to her- "at least write here whatever you want to tell me. When I have read it, I will know it". My maidservant was pleased, as it was evident by her face that she wanted to get revenge immediately and recover from what she had suffered. So, she seized the small tablet and, bringing it closer to the light, she wrote with the punch in a great hurry whatever she wanted in small letters because there would be more room for more letters, and she gave it to me at the same time as she gestures to me with her hand to go. But, grabbing it, I went in no way immediately, but I read it first, and it said the following: "Go immediately, mistress, beside your nurse, and when she could hear it, read the rest, so she will find out her own misfortunes too and she will not be happy in her ignorance in the future, and you will also know mine. Go now, before I come together with… he who lies with me, so you can also enjoy a cruel ghost". When I read these things, I wanted…

It is interesting to highlight that this novel includes a first-person oral narrative of Dercyllis, where it is insinuated in this narrative written by a ghost, (apparently in Hades) the presence of another possible ghost[9]. The narrator/author of the written narrative is now the maidservant of the main character, Myrto, to whom a villain, the Egyptian magus Paapis, has left mute as a result of a spell, according to Photius. It seems that he has also casted a spell on Dercyllis' nurse, among other misdeeds against the protagonist's family, which are significant misdeeds to the plot (as we infer from Photius' abstract). Here we see the erotic motif joined to the ghost one. The word *daimonos* (28-29), which is the most probable reading, appears to be interpreted as "spirit" or "ghost" in this context, although, joined to the adjective *khalepós*, its meaning is "cruel destiny" following Homer[10]. The verbs φοιτῆσαι (27) and ἀπολαύσης (29) frequently have erotic connotations, according to the Liddell-Scott-Jones' lexicon. These undertones very well may be applicable here. Thus, the sexual threatening will also be spread to Dercyllis, who is the oral narrator of the story that her maidservant has made her to read. On the other hand, the nurse and the family that are noted in this novel are typical of the New Comedy, and maybe of the Middle Comedy too. We might add that the motif

---

[9] For the study of the fragment see Stephens and Winkler 1995: 150-153.

[10] So in *Od.* 19. 201: χαλεπὸς δέ τις ὤρορε δαίμων. For the meaning of "ghost", I refer to n. 3.

of the young man (*neanías*) that guides the narrator to Hades appears in Luc., *Philops*. 25. 10[11].

5. A family intrigue is noted as well in another papyrus, dated back to the middle of the second century AD, in which a magus talks to the parents of a girl who is visited by a ghost and, after describing all his powers, he recognizes that the only thing he cannot take under his control is love. Next the magus says the following:

> P.*Mich*. inv. 5. 18-23
> …..φαίνεσθαι σου τῇ θυ-
> γατρι καλὸν εἴδωλον λέ-
> γεις καὶ τοῦτό σοι παράδο-   (20)
> ξον εἶναί δοκεῖ. πόσοι δὲ
> ἄλλοι παραλόγων ἠράσθη-
> [σ]αν σωμάτων [····] ….

> You say that a handsome image is appearing to your daughter and it seems to you that it is a wonderful thing. But, how many others have fallen in love with extraordinary creatures…?

We cannot say for sure that this "handsome image" (*kalon eidōlon*) corresponds to a real ghost. In the *Phasma* by Menander, referred above, a young man is also in love with a supposed ghost of a beautiful girl. But it could be a similar case to the well-known story that Phlegon of Tralles, *Book of Marvels* 1, narrates about the young Philinnion, dead shortly after her wedding, who returns to life and has sex with Machates, a guest of her parents[12]. Here the ghost, or *revenant*, of the girl is called by the terms *anthrōpos* (1; 3), *opsis,* (11), *theama* (12), and *phasma* (18). In any case, the rhetorical level of the text is very high, and it should be noticed that these words are said through a magus, who enumerates all his powers, but he recognizes that he does not have a remedy against love, and in turn he asks for a remedy for himself, if it exists (15-18). It is another example of magus in love, as the magus referred by Antonius Diogenes in the previous papyrus seems to be[13]. It is interesting to compare these magi with the Hiperborean magus mentioned by Luc., *Philops*. 13-14, where his powers are described as: to send love, to rise ghosts, to make rotten corpses return to

---

[11] Ogden 2007: 183ff comments on it. Of course the oldest source is the Nekyia, in *Odyssey* 11, which we mentioned above.

[12] The story, in which a nurse is also present, is inserted in a letter sent by the governor of Amphipolis to a character close to Philip II, according to Proclus (5th century AD). The text is translated and commented by Stramaglia 1999: 223-253, Ogden 2002: 159-161.

[13] Stephens and Winkler 1995: 178 consider other possibilities for this apparition, not only the ghostly one. See the long commentary by Stramaglia 1999: 258-265. There is no proof that this fragment belongs to Antonius Diogenes' novel as well, as it was thought in previous studies.

life, to make Hecate appear with clarity, and to make the moon come down (ἔρωτας ἐπιπέμπων καὶ δαίμονας ἀνάγων καὶ νεκροὺς ἑώλους ἀνακαλῶν καὶ τὴν Ἑκάτην αὐτὴν ἐναργῆ παριστὰς καὶ τὴν Σελήνην καθαιρῶν).

We can add that Ach. Tat. 2. 25 puts in the mouth of the heroine the mention of a "spirit, either a *hero*, or a bandit" (εἴτε δαίμων, εἴτε ἥρως, εἴτε λῃστής) as an excuse to justify the visit of a possible nocturnal lover in front of her mother: we will find these three types of possible ghosts in other texts. Achilles has read many tales of ghosts.

6. The motif of the ghost who speaks about another ghost in a first-person narrative appears in papyrus fragments from the second half of the second century AD, that seem to correspond to a comic novel, and its content reminds one of the tales that the main characters of Lucian's *Lover of Lies* relate. Let us see the text:

> P.Mich.inv. 3378, 8-16
> [   ]λα[....]   (1)
> [   ]αυτῳ ου[...]
> [   ].σας ἀλλο[..]
> [   ]ἡμέραν [..]
> [   ]ως τότε ε[..]   (5)
> [   ]ονιως .[]
> [.....]απ[.]. [ἐ]μαυτοῦ [..]
> [..] τὸ ξίφος. διένευεν [δὲ]
> κα[ὶ] τὸ εἴδωλον ὠθεῖν κα[ὶ]   (9)
> προτρέποντι ἐῴκει. φα[ι-]
> δρὸς οὖν καὶ γεγηθώς, ὥσ-
> περ πολέμιον κτείνων,
> ἐμαυτὸν ἀποσφάττω.
> ἐπεὶ δὲ ἔπεσον καὶ ἀπέ-   (13)
> θανον, γνωρίζω τὸ εἴδω-
> λον, Σευῆρις ἦν καὶ παρα

> … the sword. The spectre also gestured to me to stick it into myself, and seemed to be encouraging me to do so. Accordingly then, cheerfully and contented, as if I were proceeding to slay an enemy, I cut my own throat. When I fell to the ground and I died, I recognized the spectre: it was Severis and close to…

In this case, the story could correspond to an inserted narrative or a second-level narrative. In spite of its brevity, the text presents itself in a highly stylistic level[14]. It should be highlighted that the verb used to "gesture" (*dieneuen*, 8) matches the one we have read in *PSI* 1177, 19, relating to Antonius Diogenes.

---

[14] This is something noted by Stephens and Winkler 1995: 428 and Stramaglia 1999: 95 and 152 n. 12, where our text is compared with Plin., *Ep.* 7. 27. 5-11.

7. The next two texts we will quote belong to Lollianus' *Phoenicia*, a novel dated in the second century AD, and of which some papyri remain[15]. One contains some scenes of sexual orgies, an apparent ritual of canibalism and every type of bizarre behaviours practiced by some bandits. Let us take a look at the relevant papyrus, which has been dated towards the end of the second century AD[16]:

7.1. *PColon.inv.* 3328, B.1 verso, 21-30:

………………………………………………...οἱ μ]ὲν καθεῦδον ἀπαγορεύ-
σαντες, οἱ δ᾽ ἐπ[ὶ τῶ]ν νεκρῶν [ταχθέντες ἕ]ν̣δεκα οὐ πολὺ μὲν ἔπιον,
ἀλλὰ ὅσον ἀποθ[ερ]μανθῆναι [⋯⋯⋯ ἐπ]εὶ δὲ νύκτες μέσαι ἦσαν, πρῶ-
τον μὲν τὰ σώμ[α]τα τῶν ἀποτε̣[θνηκότων ἀ]πέδυσαν μ[η]δὲ τὴν ταινίαν   (24)
ἐν ἧι ἡ κόρη τοὺς μαστοὺς ἐδέδετ̣[ο παρέντες,] ἔπειτα ἀνελόμενοι ὑπὲρ
τὰς θυρίδας ἀφῆκαν κάτω εἰς το·[⋯⋯⋯]·· καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα χιτῶνας ἐν-
δύονται οἱ μὲν λευκούς, οἱ δὲ μέλα[νας τελ]αμῶσιν ὁμοίως τὰς κεφαλὰς
περιειλήσαντες· καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα [οἱ μὲν τὰ] μέλανα ἔχοντες ἀσβόληι, οἱ δὲ   (28)
[τὰ λε]υκὰ ψιμυθίωι ἐχρείοντο. καὶ οὕ[τως αὐτοὺ]ς κοσμήσαντες ἐξῆεσαν ἔξω.
<οἱ> μὲν τὰ λευκὰ ἔχοντες διὰ τοῦ ⋯[⋯⋯⋯ οἱ δὲ τὰ μ]έλανα διὰ τῆς σε-
λήνης ἐπορεύοντο.

some of them slept exhausted, but the eleven that were [in charge] of the corpses, did not drink very much, but only what was necessary to get warm [⋯⋯⋯ Wh]en it was midnight, in first place, they disrobed the bodies of the dead, not even leaving the ribbon with which the young girl bound her breasts; then, lifting them as far as the window, they threw them downwards, towards the ·[⋯⋯⋯]·· and after this, they got dressed in tunics, some white, others black, and likewise they covered their heads with bandages; and the ones who wore the black tunics painted their faces with soot, and those with the white, with white lead. And after making up in this way, they went out. The ones who wore the white walked under the ⋯[⋯⋯⋯ those who wore the] black, under the moon.

We know that the main characters are bandits. Obviously, this is another case of false ghosts that want to scare the village. The motif can be compared with the one narrated by Lucian, *Lover of Lies* 32, where Democritus writes that

---

[15] See the study by Winkler 1980, and the edition and commentary by López Martínez 1998: 183-185, and Stephens and Winkler 1995: 342ff.

[16] The *editio princeps* is still useful with a very valuable commentary by Henrichs 1972: 96 and 122ff. We have followed his translation in the less clear passages. I wonder if the previous scene to the mutilation of the bodies by the bandits might be served as an example of the *maschalismós* mentioned by Ogden 2002: 162 to other texts in which it is tried to avoid the revenge of the dead with their mutilation. These bodies could be considered as possible ghosts, and this belief can be seen underlying some of the examples presented here.

some young (*neaniskoi*) wearing black dresses and masks want to scare him. Apuleius, *Met.* 4. 22, tells a story of some thieves dressed up as ghosts ("the thieves, ones armed with swords, others dressed up as ghosts -*lemures*- moved away quickly"), which indicates that the audience enjoyed the topic, which is frequent in the contemporary narrative.

Another papyrus belonging to the same novel is preserved, also from the end of the second century AD, relating to the apparition of a new ghost:

> 7.2. *P.Oxy. XI*.1368, col. II, 1-15
>]νι εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν θαψα[···]
> μικρὸν ἀπὸ τῆς ὁδοῦ ἐκ[τρα-]
> πείς. κεῖμαι δὴ ὑπὸ τῇ π[λα-
> τανίστῳ ἐκείνῃ καὶ μετ᾽ ἐ-   (4)
> μοῦ κόρη καλή, ἄμφω ἀνῃρη-
> μένοι." ὁ δὲ Γλαυκέτης ἐκ-
> πλαγείς, ὥσπερ εἰκός, ἐφθέγ-
> ξατο μὲν οὐδὲν πρὸς ταῦ-   (8)
> τα, ἐπένευεν δὲ μόνον καὶ
> [ἅμ]α ἤλαυνεν. ὁ δὲ νεάνι-
> [σκος] ἠφανίσθη ἐπινεύσαν-
> [τος, ὁ] δὲ Γλαυκέτης κατὰ κρά-   (12)
> [τ]ος ἤλαυνεν καὶ ἅμα ἐπε-
> στρέφετο, εἴ που αὖθις ἴδοι
> ἐκεῖνον, ἀλλ᾽ οὐκέτι ἔβλεπεν.

…getting away from the path just a bit, bury us… in the same (grave?)… I lie under that plane tree, and with me a beautiful girl, both of us murdered". Glaucetes, astonished, as one would expect, did not answer, but just nodded his head as he spurred his horse on. The young man disappeared as Glaucetes nodded to him. Glaucetes urged on his horse hard, and at the same time turned his head, just in case he might see him again in some way, but he could not see him anymore.

In this case it seems to be a ghost that reports the crime perpetrated against him and a beautiful girl with whom he would have a love story, so he can be an example of *ataphos*, the dead deprived of burial, which we have pointed out among the categories referred by Ogden[17]. Here a certain Glaucetes is the one who is left speechless because of the scare, only able to nod in agreement. The ghost also gestures, as in previous occasions, but this time by means of the verbal form ἐπινεύσαν-[τος…], 11-12[18]. The novel has a parodic-comic nature. The

---

[17] Supra n. 2.
[18] In the scene of necromancy in Heliodorus, *Aethiopica* 6. 14. 6, a corpse appears uttering

motif of the ghost that returns to inform him that he has been murdered is also present in Apul. *Met.* 8. 7. 4, in the story of disconsolate Charite, who honours the *imagines* of her dead husband every night, while presenting him as Bacchus.

Conclusions

In three of the nine texts studied, ghost stories are narrated in the first person: they are the texts numbered 1, 4 and 6. The texts quoted in 1, 2, 3.1 and 7.1 present a fake ghost for sure. And it is possible that the narratives grouped in numbers 4 and 5 also have the same character. That is, most of our ghosts have false deaths or fake deaths. The ghosts of the texts numbered 4 and 7.2 could be real ghosts, and this is also possible in text number 5. In the numbers 4, 6, 7.1 and 7.2 we have comic novels or comic-parodic novels, that emphasise in this way the fictional and paradoxographical character of their plot. Ghosts that speak about other ghosts appear in numbers 4 and 6. Numbers 1 and 6 deal with ghosts of recently dead, while number 7.2 is about an *ataphos*. The ghost of the text number 6 speaks to report his own death. And we do not know to what extent it is the same in the text number 4.

To name the ghost the following substantives are used: *anthrōpos* (1), *eidōlon* (3.1, 5, and 6), *daimōn* (2 and 4), *neani-*(*scos*) (7.2) and *phasma* (3.2). We have seen that these designations are similar to the ones that appear in the contemporary literature. This text by Lucian, *Philops.* 29. 16-20, is especially interesting on that subject:

> "Τί δ' ἄλλο," εἶπεν ὁ Εὐκράτης, "ἢ τουτονὶ τὸν ἀδαμάντινον πείθομεν" — δείξας ἐμέ—"ἡγεῖσθαι δαίμονάς τινας εἶναι καὶ φάσματα καὶ νεκρῶν ψυχὰς περιπολεῖν ὑπὲρ γῆς καὶ φαίνεσθαι οἷς ἂν ἐθέλωσιν."

> "What else, Eucrates said, except that we are trying to persuade this man of adamantine (pointing to me) to believe that spirits and ghosts exist, and that the souls of the dead go for a stroll in the living world and they appear whoever they want?"

Lucian is denouncing the credulity of his time in such apparitions, and he introduces the rich, cultured people of the Empire, that is, the *pepaideumenoi*.

---

no words, only making signs. This time Heliodorus also employs the participle of this verb, *epineusas*, and later the infinitive without preposition, *neuein* (6. 15. 2). For more on this scene and the magic in Greek novels see Ruiz-Montero 2007. Also see the story narrated by Apul. *Met.* 2. 28-29 and the notes of Ogden 2002: 136-140. For more on the referred papyrus see also the commentaries by López Martínez 1998: 190-196, Stephens and Winkler 1995: 325-327, Stramaglia 1999: 332-337, who thinks that this scene can belong to the main plot, and Henrichs 2010: 76-77.

That public is the addresses of his *True stories*, according to his own words (*preface*, 1-2). And such fictional and learned novel as Antonius Diogenes' *The incredible things beyond Thule* is dedicated by the author to his learned (*polymathes*) sister Isidora and to a certain Faustinus whose personality is not clear[19].

In Imperial literature the term preferred to designate the ghost, according to the data of TLG, is *phasma*, reaching its larger number of uses in the second century AD. Plutarch is the Greek author that exhibits more of these occurrences. The novel, the same as in papyri and contemporary literature, distinguishes between two types of *daimōn*: the good and the evil, although such characteristic is not always clear in our fragmented texts. These are ghosts that confine themselves to scaring, as the bandits of the text number 7.1. But there can be beautiful ghosts too, as the one in the text number 5[20].

The appearance of the ghosts is described in texts number 1.2, 3.1 and 7.1[21]. Let us add the descriptions which Lucian and Pausanias provide. Lucian's *Lover of Lies* presents some examples, the first of them corresponding to a possessed[22]:

> ὁ μὲν νοσῶν αὐτὸς σιωπᾷ, ὁ δαίμων δὲ ἀποκρίνεται, ἑλληνίζων ἢ βαρβαρίζων ὁπόθεν ἂν αὐτὸς ᾖ, ὅπως τε καὶ ὅθεν εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον· ὁ δὲ ὅρκους ἐπάγων, εἰ δὲ μὴ πεισθείη, καὶ ἀπειλῶν ἐξελαύνει τὸν δαίμονα. ἐγὼ γοῦν καὶ εἶδον ἐξιόντα μέλανα καὶ καπνώδη τὴν χρόαν

> The ill person himself keeps silent, but the spirit answers, either in Greek language or in a foreign one, depending on its origin, how he has possessed that person; he, uttering oaths just in case he does not obey and threating, wards off the ghost. Indeed, I also saw the ghost leaving, his skin being black and burnt (16. 12-17).

In other case we read the story of the house uninhabited because of fear to the ghost staying in it: ἐκδιωχθεὶς ὑπό τινος φοβεροῦ καὶ ταραχώδους φάσματος ("haunted by a certain horrible and terrifying ghost", Luc. *Philops*. 31. 4-5). In this case the ghost was the inhabitant of the house. The end of the story goes as follows:

---

[19] It could be the character sometimes referred to by Martial. Stephens and Winkler 1995: 101ff offer a good introduction to this novel.

[20] In Ach. Tat. 6. 4. 4 Leucippe's beauty is compared to the one of a beautiful ghost (*phantasma*) appearing in dreams.

[21] Stramaglia 1999: 36-40 distinguishes seven possible appearances of ghosts in literary and iconographic sources.

[22] For this and the rest of the narratives from the mentioned work by Lucian, I refer to the study by Ogden 2007: 131-136, which gives interesting intercultural parallels.

ἐφίσταται δὲ ὁ δαίμων ἐπί τινα τῶν πολλῶν ἥκειν νομίζων καὶ δεδίξεσθαι κἀμὲ ἐλπίζων ὥσπερ τοὺς ἄλλους, αὐχμηρὸς καὶ κομήτης καὶ μελάντερος τοῦ ζόφου

The spirit appears thinking that he went before a normal man, and being reckless I was also going to fill me with scare, as the others: disgusting, long hair, and darker than darkness (31. 16-19).

Pausanias presents the story of Hero, a ghost dead by the hand of Euthymos in Elide, among his stories:

ἐν δέ σφισι καὶ δαίμων ὅντινα ἐξέβαλεν ὁ Εὔθυμος, χρόαν τε δεινῶς μέλας καὶ τὸ εἶδος ἅπαν ἐς τὰ μάλιστα φοβερός, λύκου δὲ ἀμπίσχετο δέρμα ἐσθῆτα

In these places there was also a spirit of whom Euthymos succeeded to ward off: the colour of his skin was terribly dark, and all his appearance was awful, and he was covered with a wolf skin (6. 6. 11).

We have seen that contemporary Latin narrative offers parallels to these narratives, and we have quoted some examples from Apuleius' *Metamorphosis*. We add *Met.* 9. 29-33 to them, where it is told the story of a wife who looks for a witch that can introduce into the house some spectre (*larva*) or some dreadful divinity (*divo numine*) in order to make her husband die with violent death[23]. The crime will be committed by the ghost (*umbra*) of a woman who has been condemned to a violent death. Her appearance is described as deathly pale, her face is disfigured, she is barefoot and horribly thin, and her hair is messy, dirty and whitish, and with a layer of ash hanging down over her face, and it covers the largest part of her face (*discerptae comae semicanae sordentes inspersu cineris pleramque eius anteuentulae contegebant faciem*).

The adjective *aukhmeros*, which we have mentioned in previous texts, seems to be a *topos* to make reference to the awful appearance of a ghost, or to his hair, especially messy and dirty, and in fact the ghost of Hector also appears to Andromacha "covered by a messy hair" (*squalida obtectus coma*) in Sen. *Tro.* 450[24]. In the same way, it is worthy to emphasise the assimilation between the physical descriptions of the ghost and the bandit in this type of fictional literature. Thus, in *Ephes.* 1. 13. 2 we read the description of a commander of pirates, which follows a pattern very similar to the ones of the aforesaid ghosts: νεανίας ὀφθῆναι μέγας, φοβερὸς τὸ βλέμμα· κόμη ἦν αὐτῷ αὐχμηρὰ καθειμένη "a young of a big

---

[23] See the useful commentaries by Hijmans Jr. *et al.* 1995, and Ogden 2002: 152-154.
[24] Other texts are Sen. *Oed.* 608: *squalidam obtentus comam*; *Med.* 740: *squalidae Mortis specus*.

size, horrible glance; his long hair was hanging down messy"[25]. It seems to be a rhetorical cliché.

Let us finish reminding that among the *progymnasmata,* particularly in the treatment of the *ethopoïía* or *prosopopoïía*, it exists the called *eidolopoïía*, the creation of a discourse spoken by a spectre; there are examples of the *eidolopoïía* in Hermogenes and Aphthonius, as Stramaglia emphasises, and some papyri of them remain[26]. The circulation of these stories are double, oral and written, and when we say "oral", we refer not only to the way of transmission of these fictional narratives, but to the fact that their enunciation are usually framed in an oral context, both in the here analysed novels and in Lucian. His play *Lover of Lies*, referred to many times in this chapter, it is one and the same as the genre which we have studied[27]. It is evident to conclude that the repetitions appearing in its narrative patterns confirm this is a well-typified genre in the rhetoric schools. The fact that there was also a pedagogic utility is evident from texts such as Plut., *Aud.poet.* 1. 14E, in which it is mentioned the pleasure of the young students in the reading of texts that have to do with the "doctrines about the soul mixed with the fictional narratives"[28].

Regarding to the currency and the trendiness of the topic, I quote two texts: I read the first one in the epitaph of the poet Miguel Hernández in the cemetery in Alicante: "Aunque mi amante cuerpo bajo la tierra esté / escríbeme a la tierra, y yo te escribiré" ("Although my loving body would be under the ground / write to me to the ground, and I shall write to you"). The second one is a fairly recent film, *Ghost*, absolutely real and well-documented, according to the experts on the subject, because *haberlos, haylos* ("that there are ghosts, there are"). They are as important in the classic world as in our own days, because they are inseparable from the human being, as they are both life and death, which is the step to "another life".

---

[25] More information in Stramaglia 1999: 41. It should be also noted the expression ἐμφανίζων αὐχμηρὸν ὄψιν in *P.Oxy.* III. 416. 13 that could be making reference to the apparition of a god in dreams; about its possible fictional character see López Martínez 1998: 347-352 and Stephens and Winkler 1995: 409. Menelaus applies this adjective to the awful appearance of Orestes, which is alive, but with the appearance of a savage in Eur. *Or.* 387 (ὡς ἠγρίωσαι πλόκαμον αὐχμηρόν, τάλας). And Arist. *Rh.* 1413a 10 also uses it to refer to the rhapsode Niceratos, whose long hair and disgusting appearance (κομῶντα δὲ καὶ αὐχμηρὸν ἔτι) are compared with the one of the Trojan hero Philoctetes. Pl., *Symp.* 203d uses the adjective to refer to the appearance of Eros as contrary to "beautiful" (*kalós*).

[26] Stramaglia 1999: 87-91 refers appropriately to Cribiore 1996.

[27] See my forthcoming article "Oral tales and Greek fictional narrative in Roman imperial prose", and Stramaglia 1999: 82-87.

[28] Stramaglia 1999: 90.

The Function of Dream-Stories in Plutarch's *Lives*

Dámaris Romero-González
University of Córdoba
(orcid.org/0000-0001-6234-9687)

"oftentimes to win us to our harm,
The Instruments of darkness tells us truths,
Win us with honest trifles, to betray's
In deepest consequence"
(W. Shakespeare, *Macbeth* A1 S3 123-126)

Abstract: In his *Lives* Plutarch relates many dreams that can be considered as oracular or symbolic dreams. Some of them have a ghost as the main character, a ghost who comes from beyond to warn the dreamers about the closeness of their death. This chapter will analyse both the function of these dreams in three lives and how they are connected to the biography of the protagonist.

Keywords: Plutarch, dreams, ghosts, Cleonice - Pausanias, Caesar – Cinna, Gaius – Tiberius Gracchus.

There is a considerable number of dreams narrated in Plutarch, especially in his *Lives*, probably because of his conception of them as prophetic. The dream is the moment when the soul "is relaxed and released from their present state as they range amid the irrational and imaginative realms of the future" (*De defectu oraculorum* 432C)[1]. Another reason to introduce the dreams would be that gods could use them as a direct way to mingle with humans. It seems to be surprising the number of dreams in Plutarch through which a god speaks directly to the human to reprimand their intentions, to reassure them or to change their fate.

Most of the dreams are prophetic, and they are dreamt by main characters prior to an important event, such as the birth[2] or the death[3] of the protagonist,

---

[1] As Brenk 1987: 260 explains, it is possible to find two visions in Plutarch about dreaming: there is one related to the superstitious person, whose dreams are ridiculed, and a second one, collected in *Amat.* 764F, which describes the dream world as "that in which we are closest to a vision of the Forms, the true period of consciousness". It does not mean that he considers all dreams as truthful; he quotes, for instance, the dream of Lysander (*Lys.* 20. 5) about the end of the siege of Aphytis, ordered by Zeus Ammon, as an excuse for leaving Sparta after Pharnabazus' denunciations of Lysander's pillage of the Persian territory.

[2] *Alex.* 2. 3, 4-5; *Per.* 3. 2; *Cic.* 2. 1-2; *Rom.* 2. 6.

[3] *Alc.* 39. 2-3; *Alex.* 50. 6; *Arist.* 19. 2; *Brut.* 20. 5-6; *Caes.* 63. 9, 68. 3; *Cim.* 18. 2; *Dem.* 29. 2; *Mar.* 45. 6*; Sull.* 37. 4.

or a crucial battle[4], whose result is predicted in the dream. Gods[5], heroes[6] or animals[7] usually star in these dreams, and all of them interact with the dreamer. As well as these characters, it is also possible to find ghosts of the recently deceased[8].

However, despite the large number of dreams in Plutarch, they have been usually studied alongside the dreams narrated by other authors[9], as examples of the type of dreams (symbolic dream, *hórama* or vision, and *khrematismós* or oracle); the role played by the dreamer (active or passive); the origin of the dream (from within or beyond the dreamer) or the attitude of the philosophers towards them[10]. It was not until the studies of F.E. Brenk about the use of dreams in the *Lives* that this type of narration received attention solely in Plutarch[11]. He paid special attention to the Plutarchean concern for inserting dreams in the narration, that is, to the significance or purpose of the dream (prophetic, biographical or motivating dream) and, especially, to the psychological moment it takes place (anxiety or crisis), as well as the type of dream and its techniques (visual symbolism or/and spoken parts).

Following the purposes stated by Brenk, our aim is to develop how Plutarch either illuminates the character of the hero or offers reason for the following action(s) of the protagonist. Therefore, we will analyse, on the one hand, the dreams, taking into account the immediate and broader context of the passages and the dreams themselves, and we will expose how Plutarch connects them to achieve his objective; on the other hand, we will observe the links between the dreams and the literary tradition, especially those related to the tragedy[12]. To this end, the dreams of the strategos Pausanias, the poet Cinna and the tribune Gaius Gracchus will be considered.

So, in the first place, we will analyse the literary form of these dreams; secondly, we will explain the biographical or motivating functions of these

---

[4] *Ages.* 6. 5; *Alex.* 18. 6-8, 24. 5; *Arist.* 11. 5; *Caes.* 32. 9, 42. 1; *Demetr.* 29. 2; *Eum.* 6. 8; *Pel.* 21. 1; *Pomp.* 32. 8, 68. 3; *Pyrrh.* 11. 3, 29. 2-4; *Sull.* 9. 6; *Timol.* 8. 1.

[5] *Arist.* 11. 5-6 (Zeus); *Lys.* 20. 5 (Zeus Ammon); *Cor.* 24. 2 (Iuppiter); *Luc.* 10. 3 (Athena and Persephone), *Per.* 13. 8 (Athena); *Luc.* 12. 1 (Aphrodite); *Them.* 30. 1 (Mother of Gods); *Rom.* 2. 5 (Cybele); *Tim.* 8. 1 (Demeter and Persephone); *Sull.* 9. 4 (Bellona).

[6] *Alex.* 24. 5 (Heracles); *Luc.* 23. 3 (Autolycus).

[7] *Cim.* 18. 2-3 (bitch); *Them.* 26. 2-3 (snail + eagle). It is even possible to find natural phenomena as protagonists of the dreams: *Alex.* 3. 3; *Ant.* 16. 4; *Pyrrh.* 29. 1.

[8] *Brut.* 20. 5-6; *Caes.* 68. 3; *Pomp* 73. 3; *CG* 1. 7; *Sull.* 37. 4.

[9] There are studies dedicated to the presence of the dreams in the tragedy, as the classic one of Devereux 1976; or in the novel, Macalister 2013.

[10] Probably influenced by Dodds 1997: 103-131. One of the most recent studies about the dream in general is Harris 2009.

[11] Brenk 1975: 336-349 (= 1998: 336-349); Brenk 1977: 214-235.

[12] Brenk 1998: 344. The scheme of the literary form is taken from Hanson 1989: 1405-1414 with variations.

dreams and pay attention to some elements of these dreams, and, finally, we will offer some final conclusions.

Literary form of the dreams of Pausanias, Cinna and Gaius Gracchus

The dreams mentioned above share a literary form, which "does not significantly change from the Homeric poets to the end of late antiquity"[13]. This literary form is divided into three sections, related to the moments of the narration: first, the beginning or scene-setting, in which the dream is contextualized; second, the development of the dream or the dream-vision proper, and, third, the conclusion of the dream-story[14].

1. Scene-setting

Within this section, Plutarch contextualizes the dream: He identifies the dreamer, the place where the dream takes place and the time when it is set. Moreover, he adds information in relation to the ghost (dream figure), especially the identification of the ghost (it could be considered as its description) and the relationship it has with the dreamer[15].

First, the dreamer is identified by name, as it happens in the case of Cinna and Pausanias; however, this is not the case with Gaius, as this identification is not necessary considering that he is the protagonist of the *Life*. Relating to the ghosts, Plutarch does not describe them. It seems that they would look alike as when they were alive, because they are recognized by the dreamers[16]. Next, both the dreamer and the ghost are also identified by their relationship[17]. Thus, Cinna is a friend of Caesar (*Caes.* 68. 3; *Brut.* 21. 8) in the same way as Gaius is the brother of Tiberius (*CG* 1. 6), whereas Pausanias is the killer of Cleonice (*Cim.* 6. 4).

---

[13] Hanson 1980: 1396.

[14] The dream-story and the ghost story share a quite similar literary form (both have the scene-setting, the development of the scene and the conclusion) and one of the functions of their main character -dream figure or ghost- is to predict the future to others. Due to these similarities, we will make use of the terminology associated to the ghosts stories whenever necessary.

[15] Hanson 1980: 1410 inserts this information later, in the "dream-vision proper" group. For this section, I will borrow the structure developed by Hanson but with variations.

[16] In Plutarch the appearance of humans (dead or alive) is usually alike in the world of livings, so *Alc.* 39. 1-2; *Alex.* 18. 6-7, 50. 6; *Arist.* 19. 2; *Demetr.* 4. 2, 29. 1-2, 29. 1; *Demetr* 29. 2; *Eum.* 6. 6; *Pyrrh.* 11. 2; *Caes.* 32. 9, 63. 9-10; *Pomp.* 32. 3, 68. 2, 73. 3; *Sull.* 28. 4, 37. 2. For the different "physical" appearances of ghosts, see Winkler 1980: 159; Felton 1999: 17-18; Stramaglia 1999: 36-41 and Ogden 2001: 221-225 (in a necromantic context).

[17] These ghosts remember their past life and their relation with the living. They can also impart information about the future of the dreamer, cf. Ogden 2001: 242, Muñoz 2010: 309.

Second, the time when the dream occurs is at night. While in the case of the dreams of Pausanias and Cinna is said explicitly that the dream occurs at night (*nuktôr*, *Cim.* 6. 5; *nuktos, Caes*. 68. 3), in the dream of Gaius any indication is given. Nonetheless, it is more interesting the psychological time when the dream takes place: it corresponds to a moment of emotional or physical crisis for the dreamer, who is normally surrounded by anxiety. Thus, Pausanias is sure that his ending as strategos is soon after his betrayal of the allies to the Persians (*Cim.* 6. 3), Gaius has retired of the public life due to his brother's recent death (*CG* 1. 1) and Cinna is suffering from high temperature (*Caes.* 68. 4; *Brut.* 20. 10). It is noteworthy that this anxious time serves as intensifier of the fateful prediction given by the ghost to the dreamer, that is, the close death in the three dreams. Because of this, and not without reason, it was thought that the contact with the ghost, no matter what it was, would bring a sure death to whom the ghost has appeared[18].

Third, the place where the dream occurs is usually said in the dreams. However, Plutarch only gives the place in the Pausanias' dream (Byzantium), while in the other two it could be deduced from the close context (Rome in both dreams).

Finally, another possible manner to mark the scene as a dream is through the dream-vision terminology, the idiomatic expressions for the origin of the dream and its introduction, and the term(s) for the dream or vision.

Plutarch insists on the origin of the stories from the tradition or other authors in order to make his reader be sure the dream is true, though he only specifies the name of one of them (Cicero). For that purpose, the Chaeronean introduces idiomatic expressions or sentences as ὡς λέγεται (*Cim.* 6. 5), ὥς φασι (*Caes.* 68. 3) or ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ὑπὸ πολλῶν ἱστόρηται (*Cim.* 6. 6)[19]. Also, he usually makes use of the idiomatic expression *edokei* to mark the beginning of the narration of the dream and to indicate that a dream is narrated[20].

In relation to the terminology for referring to the dream, vision or ghost, Plutarch uses *eidolon* and *opsis* to make their presence note: he calls Cleonice *eidolon,* and *opsis* both Tiberius and Caesar. Though both words can be used synonymously[21], *eidolon* seems to point to the ghost itself and *opsis* to the content of the dream (as a predictive content)[22].

---

[18] Cf. Ogden 2002a: 157.

[19] For Pausanias' dream, his source may be Nymphis of Heraclea, because of the location of the consultation (Heraclea instead of Phigalia, cf. Paus. 3. 19. 7), cf. Ogden 2002b: 117. For Cinna's dream, his source could be Pollio, cf. Zadorojnyi 1997: 500-502. For Gaius' dream, the source is explicitly mentioned: Cicero, who collected it from Coelius Antipater (fr. 49), as the same as Valerius Maximus 1. 7 did.

[20] Cf. Hanson 1980: 1409. Though this idiomatic expression only appears in one of the three dreams analysed here (*Caes.* 68. 3), the presence in other *Lives* can be verified. For instance, in the *Life of Alexander*, the life that contains more dreams (8), it occurs seven times.

[21] Cf. Stramaglia 1999: 29.

[22] *Eidolon*, cf. Stramaglia 1999: 36-37; *opsis,* cf. Durán Mañas 2010: 240-244.

2. The dream-vision proper

This section is referred to the message itself and the way it is said, if it is indicated by words (auditory dream-vision), by visual means (visual dream-vision) or both at the same time -although one or the other may dominate (audio-visual dream-vision). In the three dreams we have chosen, we only find the audio-visual and visual dream-visions[23].

The language employed in both cases is enigmatic or at least fairly enigmatic, which means that the message would require some interpretation[24], as in the case of Cleonice's ghost, who recited insistently to Pausanias some verses about the punishment and the end of the evildoers (*Cim.* 6. 4: "Draw you nigh to your doom; 'tis evil for men to be wanton"). Not all the messages are so obscure, as the dream of Gaius suggests: Tiberius, more clearly than Cleonice, predicts his brother's end (*CG* 1. 6: "Why, pray, do you hesitate, Gaius? There is no escape; one life is fated for us both, and one death as champions of the people").

Yet there is another language, also enigmatic, recited by the ghost through symbolic actions as Caesar does when he drags Cinna by the hand to a dark place to dine with him[25].

3. The conclusion of the dream-vision

We could suppose that the narration of the dream would conclude with the fulfilment of the prediction told in it, and indeed that happens frequently[26]. Both Pausanias and Cinna died shortly after the predicted message (*Cim.* 6. 6; *Caes.* 68. 7-*Brut.* 20. 6). However, there are dreams for whose fulfilment we must wait[27], like Gaius' dream: his political career is described through all the life (chapters 2-16) and his death is narrated in chapter 17.

---

[23] As Hanson explains, 1980: 1411, "(i)n the seemingly contradictory expression 'auditory dream-vision', a dream-vision occurs in which something is heard only, usually the identified voice of the dream figure", as in *Ages.* 6. 5, *Cleom.* 7. 2. I would add the instances when this voice is represented by the pronoun *tis*, as in *Luc.* 23. 4 and *Mar.* 45. 3-4.

[24] In some dreams their interpretation is given shortly after, as for instance *Alex.* 2. 4-5, 24. 8; *Cor.* 24. 3 or *Luc.* 10. 2.

[25] Cf. Brenk 1998: 339-341. In other occasions, it could be a mixture of both. This complexity could be increased and it is possible to find symbolic dreams with oracular characters, although they do not speak: *Cic.* 44 (Jupiter), *Pomp.* 73 (pilot), *Sull.* 9 (Selene), cf. Brenk 1977: 216-217.

[26] Some of them are, for instance, *Alc.* 3. 1-2; *Alex.* 18. 6-7, 24. 4-8; *Arist.* 11. 5-6; *Cim.* 18. 2-3; *Dem.* 29. 1; *Eum.* 6. 6; *Pyrrh.* 11. 2; *Them.* 30. 1-2; *Caes.* 63. 9-10; *Luc.* 10. 2-3, 12. 1-2. All these dreams have their fulfilment either immediately or a few lines further on.

[27] We will find, obviously, the same wait in the dreams that predict great and important deeds before someone's birth (cf. *Alex.* 2. 3-5; *Per.* 3. 2; *Cic.* 2. 1-2; *Rom.* 2. 6).

The function of the dreams

As Hanson writes[28], "the dream-visions are not merely decorative, but often function to direct or redirect the movement of the narrative"; Plutarch, being conscious of the possibilities of the dream, inserts the dream with a main function: to predict the fate of the dreamer, and this function is without variation in the three dreams. But, at the same time, he uses the dream either to illuminate the character of the hero or to offer motivation or reason for the following action(s) of the protagonist or some characters.

1. The dream of Pausanias: biographical function

The dream that exemplifies the biographical function is Pausanias'. Plutarch turns to this story not only as a means to dramatically predict the death of the character, but also as a portrait of Pausanias. This story has two parallel texts in *Moralia* 555C and in Pausanias 3. 17, to that we will turn to complete the portrait that Plutarch gives of Pausanias in the *Life*.

Some lines before the dream, Plutarch has drawn the personality of Pausanias: he has betrayed his comrades in arms after having formed a secret alliance with the Persian for his own benefit (*Cim.* 6. 2)[29]; his way of treating the allies was tyrannical and offensive due to his rudeness of giving orders, and, as the epitome of his portrayal, his lack of control of his desires, exemplified by the story of Cleonice.

Cleonice was a young Byzantine girl demanded by Pausanias to be dishonoured. Unfortunately, on her way to bed (the lights of the room were put out by her request), the Spartan general, believing she was an enemy, murdered her by mistake. After her death, as a result of the wound, she gave Pausanias no peace. She kept coming into his sleep by night as a phantom, wrathfully uttering these verses referred to the retribution for the excess:

στεῖχε δίκης ἆσσον: μάλα τοι κακὸν ἀνδράσιν ὕβρις.

ὁ δ᾽ ἐκπεσὼν τοῦ Βυζαντίου καὶ τῷ φάσματι ταραττόμενος, ὡς λέγεται, κατέφυγε πρὸς τὸ νεκυομαντεῖον εἰς Ἡράκλειαν, καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἀνακαλούμενος τῆς Κλεονίκης παρῃτεῖτο τὴν ὀργήν. ἡ δ᾽ εἰς ὄψιν ἐλθοῦσα ταχέως ἔφη παύσεσθαι τῶν κακῶν αὐτὸν ἐν Σπάρτῃ γενόμενον, αἰνιττομένη, ὡς ἔοικε, τὴν μέλλουσαν αὐτῷ τελευτήν.

---

[28] Cf. Hanson 1980: 1413.
[29] Cf. Hdt 5. 32, Th. 1. 95, 128-131, where his huge ambition for exercising control over all Greece is present. Gómez Espelosín 2013: 187 adds that this pro-Persian tendency was sought for Pausanias himself because he wanted to be part of the Persian politics.

''Draw thou nigh to thy doom; 'tis evil for men to be wanton."

(...) Driven from Byzantium, and still harassed by the phantom, as the story goes, he had recourse to the ghost-oracle of Heracleia, and summoning up the spirit of Cleonice, besought her to forgo her wrath. She came into his presence and said that he would soon cease from his troubles on coming to Sparta, thus darkly intimating, as it seems, his impending death (*Cim.* 6. 5-6).

We notice that Plutarch insists on the negative portrait of Pausanias with this episode[30], turning firstly to the virtue of Cleonice: she asks the guards to take away the lights of the bedroom before she enters, which contrasts with the depravation of Pausanias[31]: Plutarch explicitly highlights that he wants to disgrace her (ἐπ᾿αἰσχύνῃ). This detail, the request for taking away the lights of the bedroom, is not present in the parallel text of Pausanias (3. 17. 8), in which the candle of the room is alight, so it would reinforce the idea that Plutarch is using the narration of a dream with both a biographical and moral purposes.

Moreover, the fear of the parents of Cleonice[32] emphasizes the tyrannical behaviour of Pausanias[33], mentioned before in relation to his behaviour with the allies (*hubrizontos*, 6. 2). This fear provokes the abandonment of the daughter to her fate when she was required in Pausanias' presence. Likewise, this behaviour is also highlighted in *Moralia* 555C, where Plutarch writes that the Spartan made her require his presence with arrogance (*hubrei*). Thus, the lust and the tyranny of Pausanias make him continue with the Herodotean portrait of a tyrant[34].

There are two aspects in this story related to Cleonice and the plot that it would be worthwhile to point out. It is not a coincidence that Cleonice is a *biaiothanatos*, the ghost of a person who has died violently, as they were the ideal to perform a necromantic ritual[35]. These ghosts remember their past lives and their relation with the living, and they can impart information about the future of the dreamer[36]. Thus, Cleonice is able to predict the death of Pausanias in such enigmatic way: "he would soon cease from his troubles on coming to Sparta" (*Cim.* 6. 8).

---

[30] Also, the episode marks the different fates of the protagonists, Pausanias and Cimon. After the murder of Cleonice, the fall of Pausanias begins, as the allies could not bear his tyrannical behaviour and join Cimon to throw out Pausanias from the city, while the rise of Cimon starts out by leading the allies to Thrace as strategos (*Cim.* 7. 1), cf. Amendola 2007: 239-240.

[31] Cf. Amendola 2007: 239.

[32] Neither in the parallel text of Pausanias or in *Moralia* do the parents of Cleonice appear.

[33] This tyrannical behaviour could be read in *Arist.* 23. 2-3; D.S. 11. 46. 4-5; Th. 1. 95, 130; Nepos *Ar.* 2. 3.

[34] Cf. Stadter 1995: 227.

[35] Cf. Ogden 2001: 226.

[36] Cf. Ogden 2001: 242, Muñoz 2010: 309. The ghosts of Caesar and Tiberius are also *biaiothanatoi*.

In relation to the plot, the story of Pausanias and Cleonice seems to be a synthesis of different traditions. The main story has parallel themes in the episode of Periander and Melissa narrated by Herodotus (5. 92): the sentimental attachment without measure to a girl, the murder of her and the necromantic invocation of her ghost. Periander was the tyrant of Corinth who desired intensively his wife, Melissa (he committed necrophilia with her dead corpse) and also killed her by accident (he killed her after the slanders about her of her maidservants)[37]. Shortly after, he went to a *nekuomanteion* to placate her and called up the ghost of Melissa to ask what he wanted to know[38].

At the same time, the Plutarchean story collects the oldest tradition of the ghost who returns to haunt who has wronged him or her. The first ghost who returns from Hades to haunt someone appears in tragedy, in the Aeschylian *The Eumenides*: the ghost of Clytemnestra harasses Orestes because he killed her, and she harasses him through the Erinyes[39], and, just as Cleonice, with wrath.

2. The dreams of Cinna and Gaius Gracchus: motivational function

Besides the biographical function, another reason to insert a dream in the narration is the motivational: the dream is used to explain the actions of a character. The dreams of Cinna and Gaius Gracchus are clear examples of it.

Let us start with the apparition of Caesar to Cinna[40], his poet friend, in his dream. Caesar has died recently, and the streets of Rome are burnt as people have been profoundly moved after the reading of Caesar's will. Due to this fact, they, burning with fury, cried out to kill Caesar's murderers. In such an environment, Cinna dreamt that

> ἐδόκει γὰρ ὑπὸ Καίσαρος ἐπὶ δεῖπνον καλεῖσθαι, παραιτούμενος δὲ ἄγεσθαι τῆς χειρὸς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ μὴ βουλόμενος, ἀλλ' ἀντιτείνων (…) τέλος δ' ἄγειν λαβόμενον τῆς χειρὸς εἰς ἀχανῆ τόπον καὶ σκοτεινόν, αὐτὸν δ' ἄκοντα καὶ τεθαμβημένον ἕπεσθαι.

> he was invited to supper by Caesar, and that when he excused himself, Caesar led him along by the hand, although he did not wish to go, but resisted (…)

---

[37] The accidental death of Melissa is told by D.L. 1. 94 and Paus. 2. 28. 8; Herodotus only gathers that he killed Melissa (Hdt. 3. 50. 1)

[38] The main difference between the ghost of Melissa and the ghost of Cleonice is the reason why they haunted their male partners: Melissa, in contrast to Cleonice, does not hunt Periander because he killed her but because of an improper burial. For a comparison between the three parallel texts, cf. Ogden 2002b.

[39] cf. Devereux 1976: 155.

[40] Cf. Plu., *Caes.* 68. 3; *Brut.* 20. 5-6; cf. V.Max. 9. 9. 1; Suet., *Iul.* 85; App., *BC* 2. 20. 147; D.C. 44. 50; Zonar. 10. 1. The sources identify him with C. Helvius Cinna, poet and friend of Catullus, but also with the tribune of 44 BC, cf. Zadorojnyi 1997: 500-502. For a biography of Cinna and his poetic context, cf. Wiseman 1974: 44-58.

and finally took him by the hand and led him into a yawning and darksome place, whither he followed unwilling and bewildered (*Caes.* 68. 3; *Brut.* 20. 5-6).

This dream is only narrated in the *Lives* of Caesar and Brutus[41] –no other source does (though they add gorier details, like the head of Cinna stuck in a spear [Valerius Maximus and Suetonius] or his body torn in so many pieces that it was impossible to find them and bury the body [Appian]). But, once more, it would be due to the type of history Plutarch writes. In this occasion, he adds the dream as a motivation for the escape of Caesar's murderers[42].

Besides detailing the death of Cinna, Plutarch inserts this dream when the tension in Rome is critical after the murder of Caesar. So, on the one hand, the mistaken death of Cinna is used to dramatically exemplify the moment. Once Caesar's will has been read –he bequeathed his properties and money to the people- and his robe (broken by the daggers and stained by his own blood) has been shown, the furious crowd is anxious for avenging Caesar no matter what it takes (*Caes.* 68. 7; *Brut.* 20. 6), even if it means killing the murderers[43]. On the other hand, it serves Plutarch to explain the rushed decision of Brutus and Cassius to leave the city immediately (the motivating function[44]) and wait for coming back to Rome until the fury has calmed down (*Caes.* 68. 7; *Brut.* 21. 1).

As we said, Plutarch inserts the dream for two functions: the obvious premonitory function and the motivating function, as seen previously. The premonitory function of the dream is emphasised by the eschatological language chosen by Plutarch to describe the dark and narrow place (εἰς ἀχανῆ τόπον καὶ σκοτεινὸν) where Cinna is leading by Caesar, as well as the terrified resistance of Cinna[45]. Furthermore, the invitation for dinner symbolises a warning from Caesar to Cinna about the similar fate they share. Likewise Caesar in respect to Calpurnia's premonitory dream, the poet does not take it into account and goes to Caesar's funeral despite being feverish. Consequently, he finds his death,

---

[41] According to Brenk 1977: 222, the story of the dream might come from L. Crassicius of Tarentum, who published a commentary on Cinna's *Zmyrna*.

[42] Cf. Brenk 1977: 346.

[43] Shakespeare exemplifies in a masterful way the blind rage of the mob, when he makes Cinna introduce himself to them firstly with his name and later with his profession. They could not care less about his answers, as they wanted to kill him just because of his name (*Julius Caesar* A3 S3 vv. 26-34): "Third Citizen: Your name, sir, truly. / Cinna the Poet: Truly, my name is Cinna. / First Citizen: Tear him to pieces; he's a conspirator. / Cinna the Poet: I am Cinna the poet, I am Cinna the poet. / Fourth Citizen: Tear him for his bad verses, tear him for his bad verses. / Cinna the Poet: I am not Cinna the conspirator. / Fourth Citizen: It is no matter, his name's Cinna; pluck but his / name out of his heart, and turn him going".

[44] Cf. Brenk 1998: 346.

[45] Cf. Brenk 1977: 222.

because the funeral attendees mistook his name for one of the assassins of Caesar, Cornelius Cinna, and they tore Cinna in pieces.

Though the dream is focused on Cinna, it passes the premonitory advice to the killers of Caesar, as is read in the following chapters of both *Lives* of Caesar and Brutus[46]. However, it might be worthy to go a step further and wonder whether the dream might also be considered as a reversed mirror of Caesar's death. Caesar, thus, would not only show Cinna his fate[47] and the fate of his assassins but also the way they would die: The same manner as Caesar was bidding to go to the Senate and was led to his death by them, Caesar would lead his assassins to their deaths. Before the decisive battle in Philippi, Brutus is said to have seen in Philippi the good *daimon* that accompanied Caesar during his life (*Caes.* 69. 2, 6-13)[48], and if we take into account the note of Valerius Maximus 1. 8. 8, Cassius also saw the ghost of Caesar before the same battle ("majestic beyond human aspect, robed in a purple commander's cloak, charging at him with threatening countenance"). Furthermore, same gestures and same deadly instruments were present in their deaths. Cassius killed himself with the same dagger he had used to murder Caesar (*Caes.* 69. 3[49]) and repeated the same gesture that Caesar had done on the Ides: he drew his cloak over his head (*Caes.* 66. 12, *Brut.* 17. 6). In turn, Brutus forced his breast against his naked blade (*Caes.* 69. 14), as the same manner he brandished his naked blade against Caesar on the Ides (*Caes.* 66. 10)[50].

Finally, the last dream we will analyse is narrated in *Gaius Gracchus* 1. 6 and their protagonists are Tiberius and Gaius Gracchus. After the violent death of Tiberius (*TG* 19. 6), Gaius abandons public life, although he does not become an idle, but dedicates himself to oratory and the military. Previously to his departure to Sardinia, his brother appears to him in his dream and addresses him, saying:

'Τάιε, βραδύνεις; οὐκ ἔστιν ἀπόδρασις, ἀλλ᾽ εἷς μὲν ἡμῖν ἀμφοτέροις βίος, εἷς δὲ θάνατος ὑπὲρ τοῦ δήμου πολιτευομένοις πέπρωται'

'Why, pray, dost thou hesitate, Gaius? There is no escape; one life is fated for us both, and one death as champions of the people' (*CG* 1. 6)

---

[46] Cf. Pelling 1997: 228.

[47] Pelling 2010: 326 goes beyond the similar fate of Caesar and Cinna and notices the similarity of both deaths even in the gestures: the gesture of taking Cinna by the hand is the same as Decius Brutus when he took Caesar by the hand to the Senate the day when he was murdered.

[48] About this *daimon*, cf. Brenk 1977: 49-64 and 84-112.

[49] Suetonius adds the same detail in *Iul.* 89.

[50] Cf. Pelling 2011: 481, 500.

The primordial purpose of the ghostly manifestation is similar to the others mentioned above: to disclose the eminent death of Gaius and to accept that his fate is linked to politics, similarly to what happened to Tiberius[51].

By asking why Gaius is delayed, the ghost encourages him to return to public life. This delay might be due to the violent ending of Tiberius, not only in the politics, but also in his death, and so Gaius holds up his *cursus honorum* in order to avoid the same fate.

> Γάιος δὲ Γράγχος ὑπεξέστη τε τῆς ἀγορᾶς καὶ καθ᾽ ἑαυτὸν ἡσυχίαν ἔχων διέτριβεν, ὡς ἄν τις ἔν τε τῷ παρόντι ταπεινὰ πράττων καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν οὕτως ἀπραγμόνως βιωσόμενος

> Gaius Gracchus (…) withdrew from the forum and lived quietly by himself, like one who was humbled for the present and for the future intended to live the same inactive life (ἀπραγμόνως) (*CG* 1. 1)

However, his decision is ruined and "he was led by a certain necessity rather than by his own choice to engage in public matters" (*CG* 1. 5). It is in this precise moment when Plutarch introduces the dream of Gaius with the apparition of Tiberius, in order to add the reason or necessity that obliges Gaius to change his decision. Thus, firstly, Plutarch justifies the change of mood of Gaius with the dream and his return to politics as tribune, which can be seen in *CG* 3. 1.

Second, the dream predicts the same political career of Gaius as Tiberius developed: to defend the interest of the people. While Tiberius has given back part of the *ager publicus* to the people, Gaius will add new members to the Senate from the equestrian order (*TG* 8. 7, *CG* 5. 2, *Comp. Ag., Cleom. et Gracch.* 2. 1). Moreover, it predicts the same way to die as Tiberius: to be murdered. Whereas Tiberius died as a result of being beaten by Publius Satureius and Lucius Rufus, Gaius will be murdered by his slave Philocrates (Gaius ordered his slave to do it), and both will be thrown to the Tiber (*TG* 20. 2, *CG* 17. 5) [52].

Even so, the dream is also motivational, as it explains what Gaius will do next: "to avenge his brother, who had been slain without justice or senatorial decree and without the concurrence even of a magistrate" (*Comp. Ag., Cleom. et Gracch.* 5. 5)[53]. In the last chapter of *TG* Plutarch has described an ill-willing city looking for the proper time for avenging the death. A similar picture is presented in the first chapter of *CG*, as Gaius feels an increasing fury for the murders of his brother during his momentary retirement. After the dream and

---

[51] Cf. Pelling 1986: 169-170; Pelling 2010: 35, for seeing the parallel between both lives.

[52] Cf. Vell.Pat. 2. 6.

[53] Cicero himself, although he is known for disagreeing with the Gracchi, justifies the vengeance of Gaius because of *pietas fraterna* (Cic. *Rab.Perd.* 14-15).

his election as tribune, Gaius begins to attack his enemies, with his discourses remembering the unfair death of Tiberius and his friends, and with two laws that take aim at Octavius and Popilius[54]. His desire of vengeance was so intense that his mother herself intercedes on the repeal of the law against Octavius and asks him to abandon his vengeance, realizing the fatal consequences of it to the Roman Republic (Nepos, *Fr.* 1)[55].

Taking into account this vindictive desire, it seems that Gaius would be playing the role of the Erinyes and, in some way, Tiberius Clitemnestra's. Like the Erinyes, Gaius is ready to avenge his brother after the dream, harassing the killers of his brother, while Tiberius performs Clitemnestra. He has been killed violently –thus both are *biaiothánatoi*, while his death was still without revenge and he encouraged his brother to act in a dream. Both Clitemnestra and Tiberius complain about the delay of the Erinyes and Gaius respectively ("will you not arise at one?" (*Eu.* 124) / "why do you delay?" (*CG* 1. 6)), and they both expose plainly that there is no possibility to avoid their fate ("What task has been fated (πέπρωται) for you except causing ill" (*Eu.* 125) / "there is no escape, but one life is fated (πέπρωται) for us both, and one death as champions of the people" (*CG* 1. 6)). The only difference between Clitemnestra and Tiberius is the initial aim of their apparition: Clitemnestra seeks revenge while Tiberius does not: he only tries to obtain the fulfilment of his brother's destiny.

Conclusions

Through the literary framework, we have briefly exposed the sections that define a dream: the scene-setting, the dream-vision proper and the conclusion of the dream-vision. The latter section introduces the reason why Plutarch inserts dreams in his *Lives*: it is to foretell the death of the dreamer, but also to make the portrayal of a character or to give reasons for a character's behaviours in a certain manner.

However, Plutarch has not inserted the dreams without careful thought, and with great skill he interweaves the dream within the context in order to fulfil his aims. Thus, the last action of Pausanias –the murder of Cleonice– is the last stroke of a portrait described previously. Nevertheless, he goes beyond this and

---

[54] Thus Mommsen 2003: 126, and Roldán Hervás 2005: 178, although he refers to it in a soft way: "un primer paquete de medidas, inspiradas en el trágico fin de su hermano". *Contra* cf. Stockton 1979: 116-117. Once his revenge has finished, he begins to undertake his agrarian, military, federal, frumentary and judicial laws favourable to the people (*CG* 5), cf. Ward - Heichelheim & Yeo 2016: 161.

[55] According to López López 1991: 171, Cornelia does not disagree with the vengeance of Gaius, but she is trying to make him think about the consequences for him and for the Republic. Cornelia will become a less successful Volumnia, as she tries to warn him but fails in the attempt, cf. Nixon 2007: 27.

re-enacts the previous context in the dream and in the following context. The dream of Gaius summarizes the life and the death of his brother and presages his own life and death. Moreover, the death of Caesar is repeated inside out in the dream of Cinna and in the deaths of Brutus and Cassius.

So, Plutarch makes us notice that the dream is not a mere anecdote in his works but it is at his service to enrich the moral purpose of his works. Even more, he makes us realize that the elements present in the dream are not accidental, but they are related to the dream figure and the dreamer within their stories.

(Página deixada propositadamente em branco)

Menippus, a truly living ghost in Lucian's *Necromancy*

Pilar Gómez Cardó
University of Barcelona
(orcid.org/0000-0001-6560-2836)

Abstract: The cynic philosopher Menippus is a standard character in Lucian's works. In *Menippus or Necromancy*, Lucian tells the story of the philosopher's *katabasis* which he undertakes to consult the seer Tiresias about true wisdom and the best way to lead one's life. Menippus has been unable to solve the question of the meaning of human life from the precepts of the different philosophical schools and the conduct of the philosophers themselves, who are often the butt of Lucian's criticism. Menippus narrates this voyage after his return to Earth. The philosopher has not died but has become a ghostly apparition to men still alive. The message that he brings with him from the world of the dead is none other than an exaltation of common sense and the value of humour as a universal pattern of behaviour for an authentic life. The aim of this chapter is to analyse some of the formal resources and themes that Lucian uses to achieve his goal through parody and, at the same time, to highlight his ability to create surprising narrative frameworks in which the contents of his writings always acquire a new perspective.

Keywords: Lucian, Menippus, Hades, Tiresias, ghost, necromancy, *katabasis*.

Lucian's critical gaze

Son of Laertes, sprung from Zeus, Odysseus of many devices, abide ye now no longer in my house against your will; but you must first complete another journey, and come to the house of Hades and dread Persephone, to seek soothsaying of the spirit of Theban Teiresias, the blind seer, whose mind abides steadfast. To him even in death Persephone has granted reason, that he alone should have understanding; but the others flit about as shadows. (Hom. *Od*. 10. 488-495)[1]

Circe replies to Odysseus in these terms when the king of Ithaca begs the goddess of magic to keep her promise to send him home, now that the time he was destined to stay with her has come to an end. The words of the goddess bring profound grief to the hero, who is well aware that nobody has yet been able to reach Hades alive. Still, Circe urges him to go; only Tiresias can show him the way home and tell him how long it will take.

---

[1] Translation by Murray 1984: 379-381.

By means of these lines in the *Odyssey* and their subsequent development, Homer establishes the *katabasis* as a mythical category in the classical world[2]. The voyage to the underworld thus becomes a recurrent episode in the biography of heroes from both myths and epic legends – who, thanks to the infernal journey, acquire a kind of knowledge about their own life or about death, or are simply put to the test. In this way, searching (in the cases of Odysseus and Aeneas), physical conflict (in the cases of Heracles and Theseus), and even verbal conflict (in the cases of Pollux, Orpheus and Persephone) represent different variations and motivations of the *descensus ad inferos*, which is also linked to certain ritual practices[3]. Thus, Odysseus must travel to Hades in order to learn of the circumstances of his return to his beloved homeland of Ithaca, from the mouth of someone who had the gift of prophecy and mediated between gods and men as a spokesman of the divine word. For mortals, divination is a passive way of accessing knowledge that is in possession of the gods. It embraces everything that humankind cannot know – especially the future, which is beyond the realm of rational foresight. In this way, the word of the gods becomes a way of expressing human decisions, imbuing them with authority and legitimacy[4].

The Greek writer of the Roman Imperial era, Lucian of Samosata, is an acute, critical observer of his world and of the tradition in which he was educated and which provides a context for his works. In order to structure his critical vision, the author uses a variety of formal and scenographic resources and a wide range of characters. For example, Lucian made dialogue his own literary genre and adapted it: originally used to express philosophical ideals, Lucian moved dialogue into a new dimension and converted it into the necessary vehicle for comedy, as he himself explains in the work *Prometheus es in verbis*[5]. Lucian often lets his voice be heard through the characters who recur in his writings and behind whom he likes to hide: Lycinus, a name phonetically very close to his own; Parrhesiades, recalling the word *parrhesia*, or freedom of speech, which the philosophers and cynic sages so often use; and Syrius, referring by means of this gentile noun to his homeland, for Lucian was born in Syria, in the Roman province of Commagene[6].

The point of view of the author, the narrator and the characters represent an essential formal element in satirical literary creation. In consequence, otherness in general – whatever its manifestation – is no doubt one of the most privileged vantage points for expressing criticism and building a satire. Fables and animal

---

[2] The most ancient occurrence so far known of this 'archetypical' pattern is in the Akkadian epic poem, where Gilgamesh descends to the Underworld to rescue his servant and friend Enkidu.

[3] Morales Harley 2012: 127-138 studies various mythical themes in relation to ritual practices.

[4] Cf. Dowden 2007: 220-235.

[5] Cf. Mestre - Gómez 2001: 111-122.

[6] Cf. Dubel 1994: 19-26.

metamorphoses are good examples of this, as well as the figure of the traveller or the foreigner[7] – The *Golden Ass* by Apuleius is a clear example. Similarly, in Lucian's corpus, in *Anacharsis or Athletics* Lucian uses a conversation between the Scythian Anacharsis (a model of the barbarian from a Greek perspective)[8] and Solon the Athenian (the very essence of Hellenism) to reproduce all aspects of the political and legislative systems of the *polis* and of athletics competitions, which are genuinely Greek achievements[9].

Lucian and the realm of death

Lucian deals with otherness in a number of works to generate a critical portrait of his society, of power, of culture, of religion, of literary tradition, of men's vices and their deepest-rooted customs. He situates this otherness in the area of death and the underworld. According to Greek tradition, Death (*thanatos*), who was the brother of sleep (*hypnos*) and, like him, the child of the night (*nyx*), is identified with Hades, the underworld, where all the deceased end up without exception. This infernal realm of foggy darkness is governed by Hades-Pluto with his wife Persephone; he received it as his inheritance when Cronos was overthrown and the world was distributed between his male descendants[10].

In Lucian's work, the presence of Hades is visible merely as an allusion, in the form of brief descriptions or references of various kinds, but also in a narrative space in which some of the author's most famous texts occur in their entirety, like the *Dialogues of the Dead*[11]. These short pieces have been the inspiration of many authors in the European literary tradition – Fénelon, Fontenelle and Quevedo, among others – ever since the Byzantine age, as proved by the satire *Timarion*[12].

Through death, Lucian offers us a space which is unreachable in our everyday experience, and the construction of a utopian world which is, in the etymological

---

[7] Cf. Camerotto 2012: 224-236.

[8] Cf. Mestre 2003: 303-317.

[9] In a similar way, see also *The Scythian or the Consul*.

[10] Hom. *Il.* 14. 187-193; Apollod. 1. 2. 1. Lucian places three of the four groups of his *dialogi minores* in one of these three environments in which, according to the mythical tradition, the world was shared out between the sons of Cronos: the *Dialogues of the Dead* in Hades, the *Marine Dialogues* in the domains of Poseidon and the *Dialogues of the Gods*, in which neither Hades nor Poseidon appear, are all set in Olympus. Cf. Gómez 2014: 313-316.

[11] Hades, the god, participates in only four of the thirty dialogues that take place in his domain (*DMort.* 3, 14, 16, 28), and always with the ritual nickname of Πλούτων 'Rich'. According to Plato, this name is particularly apt for the god of the Underworld, for wealth comes from the earth, from underneath it (ἐκ τῆς γῆς κάτωθεν ἀνίεται ὁ πλοῦτος, *Cra.* 403 a). Lucian, from a comical perspective, makes use of this to refer to the deity in charge of "treasuring the dead", precisely to draw attention to human vanity and to the ephemerality of material goods. Cf. Gómez 2012b: 126-128.

[12] This work is included in one of Lucian's manuscripts (*Vaticanus Graecus* 87A) but dates from the twelfth century. Cf. Mestre 2013: 61-72.

sense, "out of place"[13]. In it, the author, or his "spokesman-character", can give voice to his criticism and satire, because the description of the realm of the dead reflects a conception of the realm the living, locating the narrator within this world as he sees it. The works of Lucian in which the world of *thanatos* have an important role are usually included – and for a good reason – among the writings with a cynical trend, or are even classified as Menippean.

The cynical philosopher Menippus appears in several works by Lucian. He fits the role of a satirical hero perfectly[14], and plays a special part in the *Dialogues of the Dead*, in which he appears in ten out of the thirty pieces of the work. In the narrative sequence of these short dialogues[15], Menippus and Diogenes of Sinope are the only characters among the souls in hell who smile. Menippus laughs at the other dead; he mocks their laments, and his cruel but entirely accurate words show all too clearly what has now become of the power, glory, beauty and possessions – things that the shadows pine for without exception from the very moment of their death, either on the crossing to Hades[16] or during their eternal wandering in the underworld.

It goes without saying that in Lucian's satire, the greater the privileges, wealth and tangible or intangible goods the deceased had possessed, the more intense, profound and constant are their laments. The tyrant Megapenthes even tries to bribe Clotho to allow him to take care of his worldly duties such as public works, his will, and the administration of his family[17]:

> ΜΕΓ. Ἄκουσον, ὦ Κλωθοῖ, ἅ σοι ἰδίᾳ μηδενὸς ἀκούοντος εἰπεῖν βούλομαι· ὑμεῖς δὲ ἀπόστητε πρὸς ὀλίγον. ἄν με ἀφῆς ἀποδρᾶναι, χίλιά σοι τάλαντα χρυσίου ἐπισήμου δώσειν ὑπισχνοῦμαι τήμερον.
> ΚΛΩ. Ἔτι γὰρ χρυσόν, ὦ γελοῖε, καὶ τάλαντα διὰ μνήμης ἔχεις;
> ΜΕΓ. Καὶ τοὺς δύο δὲ κρατῆρας, εἰ βούλει, προσθήσω οὓς ἔλαβον ἀποκτείνας Κλεόκριτον, ἕλκοντας ἑκάτερον χρυσοῦ ἀπέφθου τάλαντα ἑκατόν. (*Cat.* 9)

> MEGAPENTHES- Listen, Clotho, to something that I have to say to you in private, with nobody else listening. You people stand aside a moment. If you let me run away, I promise to give you a thousand talents of coined gold today.

---

[13] The same utopia is the setting for the fantastical journey that the author undertakes in his *True Stories*. Cf. Georgiadou - Larmour 1998: 17-48.

[14] Cf. Camerotto 2014: 63-83; Deriu 2017: 37-50.

[15] On the unity of these dialogues, see Gonzàlez Julià 2011: 357-379.

[16] Cf. Luc. *Cat.* 3. 17; *DMort.* 3.

[17] The Moira does not allow Megapenthes any special privilege. On the contrary, she reveals to him how the lives of those he left in the world of the living are proceeding since his death: his wife, children, servants, friends… All of them, in spite of crying for him a great deal, have already forgotten him and his fortune is now in someone else's hands. On the possible identification of Megapenthes with Herodes Atticus, see Mestre - Gómez 2009: 93-107.

Clotho- What, you ridiculous creature, have you gold and talents still on the brain?

Megapenthes- And I'll give you also, if you wish, the two wine-bowls that I got when I put Cleocritus to death, they are of refined gold and weigh a hundred talents each[18].

This is why the instructions of the helmsman Charon are so precise when he sees how much useless cargo his passengers try to bring on board his boat, and he instructs Hermes (the god who accompanies the souls on their way to the afterlife) to make sure that they embark on the voyage naked and without luggage, because the boat is small and cannot carry an excessively heavy load[19].

To this effect, the tyrant of Gela Lampicus tries to keep his diadem, and is forced also to discard his cruelty, his ignorance, his pride and his wrath; the athlete Damasias has to give up his crowns, the public tributes and even his beautiful muscles before he can start on the final journey; and an anonymous orator is not allowed on board Charon's boat with his "unending verbosity, antitheses, parallelisms, clauses and foreign words" (*DMort.* 20. 10). In contrast, Cyniscus –a cynic philosopher (as his name suggests)[20] – and Micyllus see death as a kind of liberation and long for their arrival in Hades. Even Hermes is surprised that a humble man like the cobbler Mycillus[21] does not lament his situation:

ΕΡΜ. Μίκυλλε, σὺ δ᾽ οὐδὲν οἰμώζεις; καὶ μὴν οὐ θέμις ἀδακρυτὶ διαπλεῦσαί τινα.
ΜΙΚ. Ἄπαγε· οὐδέν ἐστιν ἐφ᾽ ὅτῳ ἂν οἰμώξομαι εὐπλοῶν.
ΕΡΜ. Ὅμως κἂν μικρόν τι ἐς τὸ ἔθος ἐπιστέναξον.
ΜΙΚ. Οἰμώξομαι τοίνυν, ἐπειδή, ὦ Ἑρμῆ, σοὶ δοκεῖ. οἴμοι τῶν καττυμάτων· οἴμοι τῶν κρηπίδων τῶν παλαιῶν· ὀττοτοῖ τῶν σαθρῶν ὑποδημάτων. οὐκέτι ὁ κακοδαίμων ἔωθεν εἰς ἑσπέραν ἄσιτος διαμενῶ, οὐδὲ τοῦ χειμῶνος ἀνυπόδητός τε καὶ ἡμίγυμνος περινοστήσω τοὺς ὀδόντας ὑπὸ τοῦ κρύους συγκροτῶν. τίς ἄρα μου τὴν σμίλην ἕξει καὶ τὸ κεντητήριον; (*Cat.* 20)

Hermes- Micyllus, you are not lamenting at all, are you? Nobody may cross without a tear.

---

[18] Translation by Harmon 1968: 19.
[19] Cf. Luc. *DMort.* 20. 1.
[20] Cyniscus is one of Lucian's recurrent characters, and he usually acts as a spokesman of the author himself. Cf. Luc. *J Conf.*
[21] Micyllus appears again in *The Dream or the Cock*, in which a cock, the property of the cobbler and the alleged reincarnation of the philosopher Pythagoras, speaks with his owner to show him what true happiness is. The animal reasons that happiness does not depend on riches or on unmeasured lust for material goods.

MICYLLUS- Get out with you! I have no reason to lament while the wind is fair.

HERMES- Do cry, however, even if only a little for custom's sake.

MICYLLUS- Well, I'll lament, then, since you wish it, Hermes. Alas, my scraps of leather! Alas, my old shoes! Alackaday, my rotten sandals! Unlucky man that I am, never again will I go hungry from morning to night or wander about in winter barefooted and halfnaked, with my teeth chattering for cold! Who is to get my knife and my awl?[22]

Thus, this absence of lamentation is found only in those who have nothing to lose through their death and their crossing to Hades, where neither worldly things nor the longing for glory, riches, treasures, or the various honours that men so tirelessly seek in life have any value. They – the humble people – had nothing while they lived, and they are fully convinced that in the eternal dwelling they will undergo none of the suffering they endured when they were alive[23]. This latter consideration refers to the cynical vision of death as a levelling of everyone and everything; so the cynic philosopher Menippus is also happy, smiling, and well prepared when he meets Charon, carrying only his staff and his bag after deciding to throw his worn-out tunic into the lake[24].

MENIPPUS VISITS HADES: A RETURN TRIP

As we have already pointed out, the spectre of the dead Menippus is also fundamental to the narrative construction of the *Dialogues of the Dead*. It clearly acts as the voice of the author's conscience, in order to draw attention to the ignorance, fatuity and pretensions of poor mortals: all those who, even as but shadows after their death, refuse to accept their own ephemeral condition. This sole fact reveals the profound ignorance that reigns among humans, an ignorance that was such a frequent target of Lucian's. To express his disapproval, in some of his works the author makes use of an observer who is alien to the everyday lives of men, contemplating from a distance the sad spectacle that they offer.

Thus, in *Charon or The Inspectors*, the infernal boatman temporarily abandons the underworld with the intention of seeing life on earth for himself and, thus, to understand once and for all why men are so unwilling to leave it[25].

---

[22] Translation by Harmon 1968: 41.

[23] In *Luct*. 16-17, Lucian depicts the ghost of a young man who, now dead, reproaches his old father for the laments that he utters over his corpse. Instead, the boy thinks himself fortunate because he will now no longer suffer cold, hunger or thirst; nor will he have to fight in the army or live in fear of a tyrant; and, above all, because he has escaped dreadful old age.

[24] Cf. Luc. *DMort*. 20. 2.

[25] Helm 1906: 56-61 regards this work as one of the best examples of Menippus of Gadara's decisive influence on the Lucianic corpus. As a reflection of this Menippean filiation he notes that in this work Lucian refers to historical events which all occurred prior to the fourth century BC. However, this chronological argument is refuted by Hall 1985: 82-94, who, like

Similarly, in *Icaromenippus or The Sky-man*[26], the cynic philosopher Menippus, now equipped with wings like a new Icarus, goes on an airborne journey which takes him to Olympus and even as far as the Moon, and introduces him to the characteristics of the world and the cosmos, its manifestations, and even how the gods live.

In these two examples, *Charon* and *Icaromenippus*, the literary observer ascends and contemplates the scene from a new vantage point. He is, therefore, an *episkopos*, and the scene is the object of his thoughts, criticisms or questions, all of them presented in the form of a dialogue (*Charon* is a conversation that takes place on Earth between the ferryman and the god Hermes[27]) or in the form of a narration, albeit framed in an apparent dialogue, as is the *Icaromenippus*.

Clearly, Lucian is particularly adept at creating complex (and often surprising) narrative frames. In these environments the content of his works, and especially the themes that were dear to him[28], always acquires a renewed relief; very similar issues are articulated in very different presentations. Lucian's *modus operandi* becomes evident in the way in which he treats death as a ghostly image of humankind's earthly existence. Thus, in *Menippus or The Descent into Hades*, the author narrates the cynic philosopher's *katabasis* on which he embarked in order to discover authentic wisdom and to understand the ways of human life. Just as in *Charon* or in *Icaromenippus*, in this work, too, it is the motif of travelling that allows the protagonist-observer once more to become a critic of the inconsistency of human affairs. Menippus wishes to achieve true knowledge and legitimate wisdom which have so far not been offered to him by those who are considered wise and also by those who pretend to be so with no reason, especially poets and philosophers. Moved by his desire for knowledge Menippus becomes a *kataskopos* on this occasion, and must descend into the gloomy world of Hades in order to contemplate the truth. However, the story, the *diegema*[29], takes place on earth, in the form of a dialogue between the philosopher and an anonymous character identified solely as a friend, since his name is Philos.

Thus, if a ghost is the image of a dead person that appears to the living, or a person who goes about in disguise at night and frightens people, then Menippus in this work could well be a ghost on both counts: the ghost of a human among

---

Bompaire 1958: 335-378 before him, does not believe that the cynic philosopher was Lucian's only source.

[26] Cf. Camerotto 2009: 24-47.

[27] Favreau-Linder 2015: 197-209 explores the proximity of this dialogue with the *Dialogues of Dead*.

[28] Anderson 1976.

[29] Cf. Theon *Prog.* 78. 15 Patillon: Διήγημά ἐστι λόγος ἐκθετικὸς πραγμάτων γεγονότων ἢ ὡς γεγονότων ("Narrative is language descriptive of things that have happened or as though they had happened").

the dead, and a true apparition which disconcerts the living because of his attire and because of the message he brings with him from the underworld[30]. Menippus wears a woollen hat and a lion skin, and carries a lyre[31], accoutrements associated with the traditional heroes who descended into Hades such as Odysseus, Orpheus and Heracles[32]. In fact, the philosopher's artifice is not just physical but affects his speech as well: in his first interventions, he is only able to speak in verse, to the surprise of his friend. Menippus explains this odd mode of expression as follows:

> νεωστὶ γὰρ Εὐριπίδῃ καὶ Ὁμήρῳ συγγενόμενος οὐκ οἶδ᾽ ὅπως ἀνεπλήσθην τῶν ἐπῶν καὶ αὐτόματά μοι τὰ μέτρα ἐπὶ τὸ στόμα ἔρχεται. (*Nec.* 1)[33]

> I have just been in the company of Euripides and Homer, so that somehow or other I have become filled with poetry, and verses come unbidden to my lips.

These are not just any verses; they have been carefully selected by Lucian to contextualise his story not as a serious imitation but as a satire[34]. In this way, by means of four quotes from Euripidean tragedies[35], and one from the *Odyssey*, Lucian announces that Menippus is now returning from the kingdom where Hades lives apart from all other gods[36] ("All hail, ye halls and portals of my home! What joy you give mine eyes, to light returned"[37]). He was taken there by a youthful impulse rather than by reason[38], so that, without being dead ("Nay, I

---

[30] Aguirre 2009: 179-189 explores the topic of ghosts in ancient Greece presenting the continuity of this theme in Greek literature from Homer to Lucian, also on the basis of the information provided by iconographical representations.

[31] Cf. Luc. *Nec.* 1.

[32] This constitutes a very typical reference in Lucian. It reflects how the author often enjoys the art of allusion in order to challenge his audience of *pepaidemenoi*, with whom he shares the knowledge of a literary tradition.

[33] Gómez 2012a: 13-29 analyses how Charon, upon ascending to the earth, also speaks poetically, contaminated by Homer, who during the infernal journey never stopped reciting even when "he became seasick and jettisoned most of his lays, including Scylla and Charybdis and the Cyclops" (Luc. *Cont.* 7). Elsewhere, Aeschylus' ghost claims that his poetry is still alive and did not die with him (ἡ πόησις οὐχὶ συντέθνηκέ μοι, Ar. *Ran.* 868); cf. Planchas Gallarte 2014: 8-17 on the agonic confrontation in Hades between Aeschylus and Euripides.

[34] Cf. Camerotto 1998: 213-215.

[35] Cf. Macías Otero 2015: 137-153 on the poignant references to Euripides, tragedy and theatre which are pervasively made in Lucian's *Necromancy*. In general, Euripides is the most quoted, paraphrased or alluded tragic poet in Lucian's works, as Karavas 2005: 175-182 pointed out.

[36] E. *Hec.* 1-2: Ἥκω νεκρῶν κευθμῶνα καὶ σκότου πύλας / λιπών, ἵν᾽ Ἄιδης χωρὶς ᾤκισται θεῶν, "I have come from the hiding place of the dead and the gates of darkness / where Hades dwells apart from the other gods", translation by Kovacs 1995: 401.

[37] E. *H.F.* 523-524: Ὦ χαῖρε μέλαθρον πρόπυλά θ᾽ ἑστίας ἐμῆς, / ὡς ἄσμενός σ᾽ ἐσεῖδον ἐς φάος μολών.

[38] Cf. E. *Fr.* 149 Kannicht: Νεότης μ᾽ ἐπῆρε καὶ θράσος τοῦ νοῦ πλέον.

was living when I went to Hell"[39]), he could ask the soul of the Theban Tiresias to make a prophecy. Tiresias was, no doubt, a renowned soothsayer in life; in addition, since Homer's times, knowledge of the past, the present and the future is an inherent attribute of the souls of the dead[40].

The disguise, another motif with Homeric roots[41], is used here as a device that guarantees the loss of identity. This loss is only apparent, but necessary in order to ensure a distancing that is essential for the adoption of the critical point of view. On the other hand, the mix and alternation of prose and verse – the *prosimetrum* – is a formal element that characterises texts with a parodic and satiric intention[42]. However, the change in Menippus' speech after his stay in the underworld is merely provisional, and the philosopher once again speaks normally when he turns his attention to the real, every-day world and questions his friend about events on earth and the activities of his fellow citizens during his absence. "Nothing new;" Philos replies, "just what they did before – stealing, lying under oath, extorting usury, and weighing pennies" (Καινὸν οὐδέν, ἀλλ᾽ οἷα καὶ πρὸ τοῦ· ἁρπάζουσιν, ἐπιορκοῦσιν, τοκογλυφοῦσιν, ὀβολοστατοῦσιν, *Nec.* 2). Receiving such a negative answer, Menippus feels that his journey has not been in vain because, unlike the rest of the living, he now knows the fate that awaits them. He considers them to be unfortunate because they are still mired in profound ignorance:

> ΜΕΝ. Ἄθλιοι καὶ κακοδαίμονες· οὐ γὰρ ἴσασιν οἷα ἔναγχος κεκύρωται παρὰ τοῖς κάτω καὶ οἷα κεχειροτόνηται τὰ ψηφίσματα κατὰ τῶν πλουσίων, ἃ μὰ τὸν Κέρβερον οὐδεμίᾳ μηχανῇ διαφεύγειν αὐτούς. (*Nec.* 2)

> Menippus- Poor wretches! They do not know what decisions have been made of late in the lower world, and what ordinances have been enacted against the rich; by Cerberus, they cannot possibly evade them!

Nevertheless, for the time being Lucian does not explain the contents of these ordinances: he only does so almost at the end of the work, just before Menippus can question Tiresias. It is Philos who creates the narrative suspense by interrupting him when he, very reluctantly, was about to reveal the secret. Instead, Philos prefers to know:

---

[39] E. *Fr.* 936 Kannicht: Οὔκ, ἀλλ᾽ ἔτ᾽ ἔμπνουν ᾽Αΐδης μ᾽ ἐδέξατο.

[40] So Odysseus admits explicitly to his mother in Hades: ψυχῇ χρησόμενον Θηβαίου Τειρεσίαο (Hom. *Od.* 11. 165).

[41] Athena instructs Odysseus to alter his appearance so that he will look abject to the wooers – and will thus be able to deceive and kill them (Hom. *Od.* 13. 397-403).

[42] Carmignani 2009 studies the significance and use of the *prosimetrum* in narrative works such as Petronius' *Satyricon* in relation to the Menippean satire. This combination of prose and verse allows a literary echo which is made far wider by the interaction of the different stylistic registers.

τίς ἡ ἐπίνοιά σου τῆς καθόδου ἐγένετο, τίς δ᾽ ὁ τῆς πορείας ἡγεμών, εἶθ᾽ ἑξῆς ἅ τε εἶδες ἅ τε ἤκουσας παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς· εἰκὸς γὰρ δὴ φιλόκαλον ὄντα σε μηδὲν τῶν ἀξίων θέας ἢ ἀκοῆς παραλιπεῖν. (*Nec.* 2)

What was the purpose of your going down, who was your guide for the journey, and then, in due order, what you saw and heard there; for it is to be expected, of course, that as a man of taste you did not overlook anything worth seeing or hearing.

Lucian uses these questions to structure his chronicle of Menippus' descent into Hades. The story is organised as an orderly response to each of the questions: the reasons for his descent (§§ 3-5), the guide (§§ 6-9), the underworld and the characters there (§§ 10-14), and the life of the dead (§§ 15-18). The story ends with the decree enacted against the rich and the words of Tiresias (§§ 19-21). Menippus then very briefly summarises his return to life (§ 22).

The aim of his journey is to find out some truth about the life of humankind. Menippus feels unable to obtain this truth because of the dilemma in which he finds himself[43]: on the one side, the verses of the poets – and he explicitly quotes Homer and Hesiod – in which he was instructed in his infancy and youth, describe facts and praise actions condemned by human laws: wars, adultery, abuse, incest, treason... and on the other, the philosophers, to whom he turned in search of an easy, safe way through life, express entirely contradictory opinions in relation to one and the same thing. Menippus confesses his disappointment:

ὥστε μήτε τῷ θερμὸν τὸ αὐτὸ πρᾶγμα λέγοντι μήτε τῷ ψυχρὸν ἀντιλέγειν ἔχειν, καὶ ταῦτ᾽ εἰδότα σαφῶς ὡς οὐκ ἄν ποτε θερμόν τι εἴη καὶ ψυχρὸν ἐν ταὐτῷ χρόνῳ. ἀτεχνῶς οὖν ἔπασχον τοῖς νυστάζουσι τούτοις ὅμοιον, ἄρτι μὲν ἐπινεύων, ἄρτι δὲ ἀνανεύων ἔμπαλιν. (*Nec.* 4)

When the selfsame thing was called hot by one and cold by another, it was impossible for me to controvert either of them, though I knew right well that nothing could ever be hot and cold at the same time. So in good earnest I acted like a drowsy nan, nodding now this way and now that.

However, Menippus admits that his greatest perplexity emerges when he sees that all these people that are called philosophers only coincide – as Lucian so often denounces – in preaching in their discourse and teaching the very

---

[43] Camerotto 2014: 180 believes that, although the initial reason for Menippus' journey may respond to a search for knowledge or scientific questions, he soon identifies with an ethic aporia.

opposite of what they themselves do[44]:

> τοὺς γοῦν καταφρονεῖν παραινοῦντας χρημάτων ἑώρων ἀπρὶξ ἐχομένους
> αὐτῶν καὶ περὶ τόκων διαφερομένους καὶ ἐπὶ μισθῷ παιδεύοντας καὶ πάντα
> ἕνεκα τούτων ὑπομένοντας, τούς τε τὴν δόξαν ἀποβαλλομένους αὐτῆς ταύτης
> ἕνεκα πάντα ἐπιτηδεύοντας ἡδονῆς τε αὖ σχεδὸν ἅπαντας κατηγοροῦντας,
> ἰδίᾳ δὲ μόνῃ ταύτῃ προσηρτημένους. (*Nec.* 5)

> For instance, I perceived that those who recommended scorning money clove
> to it tooth and nail, bickered about interest, taught for pay, and underwent
> everything for the sake of money; and that those who were for rejecting public
> opinion aimed at that very thing not only in all that they did, but in all that
> they said. Also that while almost all of them inveighed against pleasure, they
> privately devoted themselves to that alone.

As for his guide on this eccentric journey, Menippus justifies with some
resignation his decision to entrust himself to a Babylonian magician, with long
white hair and a venerable long beard, because he had heard that the disciples
and heirs of Zoroaster:

> ἐπῳδαῖς τε καὶ τελεταῖς τισιν ἀνοίγειν τε τοῦ Ἅιδου τὰς πύλας καὶ κατάγειν
> ὃν ἂν βούλωνται ἀσφαλῶς καὶ ὀπίσω αὖθις ἀναπέμπειν. (*Nec.* 6)

> With certain charms and ceremonials could open the gates of Hades, taking
> down in safety anyone they would and guiding him back again.

Menippus is well aware that Hades is off limits to the living and that the
dead cannot return from it[45]. The philosopher narrates in full detail the charms,
the baths and even the diet that he was obliged to follow during twenty-nine days
before descending via the Euphrates to the place where, after digging a hole and
carrying out the due blood sacrifice (like a new Odysseus)[46] – and invoking the
Furies, the Erinyes, the nocturnal Hecate and the terrible goddess Persephone,
he was able to enter Hades[47].

---

[44] This is a constant reproach (e.g. *Pisc.* 34; *Tim.* 54-55; *Herm.* 11-12; *VH* 2. 18; *Symp.* 34) that
Lucian directs against the false and hypocritical behaviour of philosophers. This does not mean,
though, that the author criticises the ideologies of the different philosophical schools or that he
is disrespectful to the philosophical tradition. Cf. Mestre 2012-2013: 72.

[45] Johnston 1999: 127ff. describes the cases in which, according to Greek beliefs, the dead
were able to return to earth and appear to the living: premature deaths (*aoroi*), violent deaths
(*biaiothanatoi*) or those who have not received due burial (*ataphoi*), like Patroclus when he
demands Achilles to fulfil his need to be buried (Hom. *Il.* 23. 71-74).

[46] Hom. *Od.* 11. 23-36.

[47] This ritual of purity evokes some instructions that can also be found in the so-called
Orphic gold tablets, which contain a narrative of the deceased's journey to the underworld and

Lucian thus draws on geographical distance as the vehicle for his critical gaze and his acerbic words which he also addresses to the ritual practices that characterise every people and every belief, and thus have no absolute value in themselves[48]. At the same time, the figure of the stranger as the initiatory guide accentuates the extraordinary nature of Menippus' journey to a place of no return, but from which he will be able to come back precisely because he has renounced his own identity[49]. Only by impersonating Orpheus and Heracles and taking on their attributes is he able to make a return journey that is prohibited on two counts – his condition as a man who is still alive, and his mortality. In this way, as a living creature, as long as he remains among the dead he must be only an apparition, a ghost wearing the disguise of other characters – demigods and mythical heroes – who also descended alive into Hades and were able to cross the gates of the underworld (in both directions). No one with the appearance of these individuals would raise suspicion among the terrible guards of hell, as the philosopher explains to his perplexed friend:

> αὐτὸς μὲν οὖν μαγικήν τινα ἐνέδυ στολὴν τὰ πολλὰ ἐοικυῖαν τῇ Μηδικῇ, ἐμὲ δὲ τουτοισὶ φέρων ἐνεσκεύασε, τῷ πίλῳ καὶ τῇ λεοντῇ καὶ προσέτι τῇ λύρᾳ, καὶ παρεκελεύσατο, ἤν τις ἔρηταί με τοὔνομα, Μένιππον μὲν μὴ λέγειν, Ἡρακλέα δὲ ἢ Ὀδυσσέα ἢ Ὀρφέα. (*Nec.* 8)

> He himself put on a magician's gown very like the Median dress, and speedily costumed me in these things which you see – the cap, the lion's skin, and the lyre besides; and he urged me, if anyone should ask my name, not to say Menippus, but Heracles or Odysseus or Orpheus.

This description of Hades presents all the standard features that had accumulated in the literary tradition in relation to the landscape and the characters who dwell there. The place is deep, with a river, a lake and the boatman. When he sees the lion's skin, Charon makes room for Menippus even though his boat is full, for he believes that once more he is carrying Heracles among his passengers[50]. There is also Pluto's palace and the asphodel meadows, and the ferocious Cerberus. Like a new Orpheus, Menippus tames the animal with his lyre[51]. Menippus also sees the judge Minos in full sway, and the punishment

---

their encounter with the powers in there; cf. Edmonds 2004: 46-82.

[48] Menippus' scepticism reminds us, in a way, of Heraclitus' criticisms of certain religious and cult practices. The Ephesian believed that to take part in practices that men consider mysteries is to initiate oneself in impiety: τὰ γὰρ νομιζόμενα κατὰ ἀνθρώπους μυστήρια ἀνιερωστὶ μυοῦνται (fr. 22B 14DK = Clem. Al. *Protr.* 20. 2).

[49] Cf. Bremmer 2015: 126ff. for Persians and Magi as necromancers.

[50] Luc. *Nec.* 8.

[51] Thus, like Dionysos in the Aristophanes' *Frogs* or the soul in Plato's *Phaedo*, before reaching the realm of the dead, Menippus has to face the obstacles that obstruct the traveler's path in the

of the impious souls – some anonymous, others mythical characters[52] – and, of course, the laments. Death makes them all equal; and because of this, the philosopher feels happy when he sees those who used to live full of pride and surrounded by wealth and power arriving naked and crestfallen at the tribunal of Minos; he says that even in Hades "they almost expected to be shown submission" (καὶ προσκυνεῖσθαι περιμενόντων, *Nec.* 12). In contrast, Menippus notes the goodwill of the judge towards the poor because "they received only half as much torture and were allowed to rest at intervals before being punished again" (τοῖς μέντοι πένησιν ἡμιτέλεια τῶν κακῶν ἐδίδοτο, καὶ διαναπαυόμενοι πάλιν ἐκολάζοντο, *Nec.* 14). Death also makes humans equals in their physical aspect; in the underworld it is difficult to distinguish the heroes from the common dead, some of whom (especially the elderly) are already mouldy, and others in a better state such as the Egyptians "thanks to the durability of their embalming process" (διὰ τὸ πολυαρκὲς τῆς ταριχείας, *Nec.* 15). Still, they are all just naked bones piled up, with a terrible, empty gaze and fleshless teeth. On seeing such a disheartening vision, Menippus wonders:

> ᾧτινι διακρίναιμι τὸν Θερσίτην ἀπὸ τοῦ καλοῦ Νιρέως ἢ τὸν μεταίτην Ἶρον ἀπὸ τοῦ Φαιάκων βασιλέως ἢ Πυρρίαν τὸν μάγειρον ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος. οὐδὲν γὰρ ἔτι τῶν παλαιῶν γνωρισμάτων αὐτοῖς παρέμενεν, ἀλλ᾽ ὅμοια τὰ ὀστᾶ ἦν, ἄδηλα καὶ ἀνεπίγραφα καὶ ὑπ᾽ οὐδενὸς ἔτι διακρίνεσθαι δυνάμενα. (*Nec.* 15)

> How I could distinguish Thersites from handsome Nireus, or the mendicant Iros from the King of the Phaeacians, or the cook Pyrrhias from Agamemnon; for none of their former means of identification abode with them, but their bones were all alike, undefined, unlabelled, and unable ever again to be distinguished by anyone.

---

narrative of the journey to the other world; cf. Edmonds 2004: 222-227.

  [52] In *Nec.* 14 Lucian mentions several mythical characters who were famous in particular because of the eternal punishment to which they were condemned. The punishment of the impious souls after death is a theme that this author also recreates in *VH* 2. 31, where the narrator states that those who had often lied in life were suffering the greatest punishments, among them Ctesias of Cnidus, Herodotus, and many others.

Knowing life through death

The scenes contemplated in Hades briefly take Menippus away from the narrative structure. Now, back to Earth in the presence of his friend, he reflects on real human life. The philosopher can only equate it with a stage play in which humans, as mere actors, perform the role that has been assigned to each of them by the goddess Fortune at a particular moment and only for a limited time – after which they all lose their costume and disguise. Humankind, however, ignores this:

> ἐπειδ᾽ἂν ἀπαιτῇ τὸν κόσμον ἐπιστᾶσα ἡ Τύχη, ἄχθονταί τε καὶ ἀγανακτοῦσιν ὥσπερ οἰκείων τινῶν στερισκόμενοι καὶ οὐχ ἃ πρὸς ὀλίγον ἐχρήσαντο ἀποδιδόντες. (*Nec*. 16)

> Some, however, are so ungrateful that when Fortune appears to them and asks for her trappings back, they are vexed and indignant, as if they were being robbed of their own property, instead of giving back what they had borrowed for a little time[53].

Therefore, the conclusion is simple: in the underworld, earthly goods are of no value. The power King Philip had on earth is worth nothing; in Hades he is but a humble tinker. Nor do worldly riches help Mausolus, who in fact is crushed by his magnificent tomb[54]. With Menippus' thoughts and the sentence with which they finish ("That is what human affairs are like, it seemed to me as I looked", ἐκεῖνα ὁρῶντί μοι ἐδόκει ὁ τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίος, *Nec*. 16), Lucian is now ready to reveal the contents of the motion announced at the beginning. The enactment of this motion allows the author to present the paradox that the existence of the dead goes by in the same manner as life on earth, as if in a mirror, at least regarding their organization: for the dead have their assembly as well, their magistrates and their proposals to be discussed and voted upon, all adapted, of course, to the conditions of the underworld[55]:

> Εἶπε τὴν γνώμην Κρανίων Σκελετίωνος Νεκυσιεὺς φυλῆς Ἀλιβαντίδος. Τούτου ἀναγνωσθέντος τοῦ ψηφίσματος ἐπεψήφισαν μὲν αἱ ἀρχαί,

---

[53] On the use of theatrical metaphors in Lucian's works, see Jufresa 2003: 171-186.

[54] Cf. Luc. *DMort*. 29, where Diogenes asks the Carian king Mausolus in what way the possession of his magnificent tomb is beneficial to him in Hades.

[55] In a similar way, despite the alternative scenario of Olympus, the gods also take their decisions according to the parameters that direct the earthly communal living of humankind. Momus, for example, himself an "eroe de la satira tra gli dei" (Camerotto 2014: 79), regrets the disadvantageous situation of the ancestral divinities after the arrival of the new ones, and proposes a decree which corresponds in its formulae to the Athenian decrees of the fifth and fourth centuries BC (cf. Luc. *Deor. Conc*. 14-18).

ἐπεχειροτόνησε δὲ τὸ πλῆθος καὶ ἐνεβριμήσατο ἡ Βριμὼ καὶ ὑλάκτησεν ὁ Κέρβερος· οὕτω γὰρ ἐντελῆ γίγνεται καὶ κύρια τὰ ἐγνωσμένα. (*Nec.* 20)

On motion of Scully Fitzbones of Corpsebury, Cadavershire. After this motion had been read, the officials put it to the vote, the majority indicated assent by the usual sign, Brimo brayed and Cerberus howled. That is the way in which their motions are enacted and ratified[56].

The motion admonishes the rich for their unjust acts against the poor during their lifetimes. This behaviour is unacceptable in a place like Hades, where all inhabitants shall receive the same equal treatment for eternity:

ΨΗΦ. Ἐπειδὴ πολλὰ καὶ παράνομα οἱ πλούσιοι δρῶσι παρὰ τὸν βίον ἁρπάζοντες καὶ βιαζόμενοι καὶ πάντα τρόπον τῶν πενήτων καταφρονοῦντες, δέδοκται τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ, ἐπειδὰν ἀποθάνωσι, τὰ μὲν σώματα αὐτῶν κολάζεσθαι καθάπερ καὶ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων πονηρῶν, τὰς δὲ ψυχὰς ἀναπεμφθείσας ἄνω εἰς τὸν βίον καταδύεσθαι εἰς τοὺς ὄνους, ἄχρις ἂν ἐν τῷ τοιούτῳ διαγάγωσι μυριάδας ἐτῶν πέντε καὶ εἴκοσιν, ὄνοι ἐξ ὄνων γιγνόμενοι καὶ ἀχθοφοροῦντες καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν πενήτων ἐλαυνόμενοι, τοὐντεῦθεν δὲ λοιπὸν ἐξεῖναι αὐτοῖς ἀποθανεῖν. (*Nec.* 20)

Motion- Whereas many lawless deeds are done in life by the rich, who plunder and oppress and in every way humiliate the poor,
Be it resolved by the senate and the people, that when they die their bodies be punished like those of the other malefactors, but their souls be sent back up into life and enter into donkeys until they shall have passed two hundred and fifty thousand years in the said condition, transmigrating from donkey to donkey, bearing burdens, and being driven by the poor; and that thereafter it be permitted them to die.

Nevertheless, the decision taken in Hades about the rich cannot affect them, for they are dead; thanks to the *isotimia* of the underworld, all the creatures that once lived are now equal[57]. Indeed, the decree is only valid while they are alive, and because of this the infernal assembly plans a new life for the souls of the rich, doomed to be reincarnated as donkeys for "two-hundred fifty thousand

---

[56] In one of his festive *premáticas* (*Pregmática que han de guardar las hermanas comunes o Premáticas contra las cotorreras*), Quevedo, too, names the competent authority from whom he obtained his juridical ordination. His text begins as follows: "Nos, el hermano mayor del Regodeo, unánime y conforme con los cofrades de la Carcajada y Risa, salud, dineros y bobos", and it ends: "Regente Trapala Trapala. Doctor Barajúnda. El licenciado Bulla. Doctor Chacota. Por mandado de sus señorías, Secretario Arborbola." (García-Valdés 1993: 330 and 342).

[57] Diogenes entrusts Pollux with the following task: while he is on earth, in his alternation between life and death with his twin brother Castor, he must explain to the poor that the rich are nothing in Hades (*DMort.* 1. 4).

years", and to be denied the condition of pure shadow residing in the asphodel meadows, where they can finally be released from all necessities. From the point of view of those who understand death as a liberation, or those who acknowledge the scarce value of mundane goods, paradoxical as it may seem, this is the worst punishment that one might receive: the impossibility of being definitively dead.

Lucian's joke, apart from the implicit satire on the transmigration of souls with its Pythagorean connotations[58], once more targets the ignorance of humans as the sole cause of their ills, and in particular the ignorance of the rich, as they live their lives fooled by the belief that possessions are the most important thing. Hence the advice of Tiresias: "a blind little old gentleman, pale, with a piping voice" (τυφλόν τι γερόντιον καὶ ὠχρὸν καὶ λεπτόφωνον, *Nec.* 21)[59] to Menippus when the visitor eventually finds him:

> Ο τῶν ἰδιωτῶν ἄριστος βίος καὶ σωφρονέστερος· παυσάμενος τοῦ μετεωρολογεῖν καὶ τέλη καὶ ἀρχὰς ἐπισκοπεῖν καὶ καταπτύσας τῶν σοφῶν τούτων συλλογισμῶν καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα λῆρον ἡγησάμενος τοῦτο μόνον ἐξ ἅπαντος θηράσῃ, ὅπως τὸ παρὸν εὖ θέμενος παραδράμῃς γελῶν τὰ πολλὰ καὶ περὶ μηδὲν ἐσπουδακώς. (*Nec.* 21)

> The life of the common sort is best and wiser: if you stop speculating about heavenly bodies and discussing final causes and first causes, spit your scorn at those clever syllogisms, and count all that sort of thing nonsense, make it always your sole object to put the present to good use and to hasten on your way, laughing at most things and taking nothing seriously.

The kind of life that Tiresias describes as positive and reasonable is that of the *idiotai*, a term that Lucian also uses on other occasions when he wants to unmask the supposed wisdom of the false sages or the arrogant erudition of certain characters. Thus, Lycinus declares himself an *idiotes* in front of the wise Hermotimus, as he appeals to the Socratic recognition of one's own ignorance as the only way to achieve knowledge of any kind:

---

[58] In *The Dream or The Cock*, by means of the questions that Micyllus addresses to the cock-Pythagoras, Lucian ridicules the theory of metempsychosis and other absurd beliefs and precepts of this philosophical sect. In Hades, Lucian presents Pythagoras asking Menippus for something to eat and, although the latter can only offer beans, he is ready to eat them when he firmly states: ἀλλὰ παρὰ νεκροῖς δόγματα ("the precepts are others among the dead", *DMort*. 6. 3). Cf. Grau 2015: 171-178 on the comic tradition of deriding philosophical asceticism.

[59] Lucian's irony is evident: in the darkness of Hades, the fact that Tiresias is blind is irrelevant. In addition, Menippus has just referred to the empty gaze of the skulls, as also in *DMort*. 9. 1. However, Ogden 2001: 221 points out that the image of the ghost as he was in life is already present in Homer, and so the ghost usually appears with his characteristic features.

ΕΡΜ. Μόνος δὲ σὺ τἀληθὲς κατεῖδες, οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι ἀνόητοι ἅπαντες ὅσοι φιλοσοφοῦσιν.
ΛΥΚ. Καταψεύδῃ μου, ὦ Ἑρμότιμε, λέγων ὡς ἐγὼ προτίθημί πῃ ἐμαυτὸν τῶν ἄλλων ἢ τάττω ὅλως ἐν τοῖς εἰδόσι, καὶ οὐ μνημονεύεις ὧν ἔφην, οὐκ αὐτὸς εἰδέναι τἀληθὲς ὑπὲρ τοὺς ἄλλους διατεινόμενος ἀλλὰ μετὰ πάντων αὐτὸ ἀγνοεῖν ὁμολογῶν. (*Herm.* 53)

HERMOTIMUS- You alone have seen the truth, all the others who study philosophy are fools.
LYCINUS- You wrong me, Hermotimus, when you say that I somehow put myself before other people or in general rank myself in some way with those who know. You do not remember what I said. I did not maintain that I knew the truth more than other people. No, I admitted that like all men I was ignorant of it[60].

BY WAY OF AN EPILOGUE

The exhortation to common sense and the importance of humour as a universal guide of conduct in the life of humankind are not motifs invented by Lucian; nor are they exclusive to this work in the ensemble of the Lucianic corpus. Once more, Lucian's skill lies in re-taking a Homeric literary motif (the questioning of the dead)[61] and building his own story from it (the descent of Menippus) while creating and re-creating the narrative stage (Hades). The parodic formulation of themes and traditional characters found in this scene entertains and amuses the audience, but by means of it the author provides material for a serious reflection. It is the same satirical intention that centuries later will move the sharp attack of a writer such as Quevedo on the social, political and religious values of his time. Quevedo writes from the unreal space of his *Sueños* ("Dreams"). Note especially the *Sueño de la Muerte* ("the Dream of Death"), whose main character reasons as follows on waking up:

> Con esto me hallé en mi aposento, tan cansado y tan colérico como si la pendencia hubiera sido verdad y la peregrinación no hubiera sido sueño. Con todo eso, me pareció no despreciar del todo esta visión, y darle algún crédito, pareciéndome que los muertos pocas veces se burlan, y que gente sin pretensión y desengañada más atiende a enseñar que a entretener[62].

---

[60] Translation by Kilburn 1968: 361.
[61] The literary summoning of the dead is documented since Homer (*Od.* 10. 467-12. 7), but it may reflect a traditional practice among the Greeks. Cf. Bremmer 2002: 71-76.
[62] Arellano 2010: 405.

The traditional tale of the journey to the underworld in Greek literature is indeed neither simple nor singular, but each telling reveals a different perspective on the cosmos, a reflection of the order of this world through the image of the other. Once more, in the work of Lucian, too, the mixture between the serious and the comical – the *spoudogeloion*[63] – is incarnated in the cynic philosopher Menippus. In this particular necromancy, though, the cynic philosopher plays a dual role: that of the wise living man among the dead and, at the same time, the voice from the afterlife among the living, both informative and prophetic, as its knowledge is beyond that of any mortal[64]. The satirical hero is, in short, a ghostly image of Lucian himself. It only frightens because it invites the audience to discover human existence by means of their reasoning, an existence whose naked reality is only perceptible through death, as Quevedo admonishes:

> Estos son gente que están en el otro mundo y aún no se persuaden a que son difuntos. Maravillóme esta visión, y dije herido del dolor y conocimiento:
> –Dionos Dios una vida sola y tantas muertes; de una manera se nace y de otra se muere; si vuelvo arriba, yo procuraré empezar a vivir bien por la muerte[65].

---

[63] Cf. Camerotto 1998: 120-129, on Lucian's use of the serious-comical μῖξις as a parodic artistic expression.

[64] The ghost of Polydorus in Euripides' *Hecuba* also informs about the dead and foretells what is to happen. Cf. Aguirre 2006: 115-117.

[65] Arellano 2010: 338.

Lies too good to lay to rest: The survival of pagan ghost stories in early Christian literature

Daniel Ogden
University of Exeter and UNISA
(orcid.org/0000-0002-1076-9804)

Abstract: Consideration is given to three traditional ghost stories that thrived in both pagan and early Christian literature: 'The Haunted House', 'A Ghost Locates a Lost Deposit' and 'The Mistaken Underworld Escort.' All three stories appear both in Lucian's *Philopseudes* on the pagan side and in the works of Augustine on the Christian side, and additionally in further works on both sides of the religious divide. As various passages in the New Testament and the works of the early Fathers make clear, the concept of the ghost was incompatible with Christian belief. Accordingly, we ask why such stories continued to thrive, nonetheless, in Christian writings. We advance a tentative two-part answer: first, the stories were just too deeply ingrained in popular culture, and indeed just too entertaining, to be relinquished; secondly, the stories served surreptitiously but reassuringly to confirm belief in the soul's survival of death even as, at explicit level, their Christian re-tellers tried, in different ways, to argue the ghosts out of them. We proceed to investigate the various sorts of theological accommodation made.

Keywords: Lucian, *Philopseudes,* New Testament, early Fathers, tradition.

Introduction

This chapter looks at three well loved, traditional ghost stories from the ancient world. Their distinctive motifs-set aside, the three story-types in question have several things in common with each other: they are all found in at least two pagan examples and two early Christian ones; and in each case we owe one of the pagan examples to Lucian's *Philopseudes* or *Lover of Lies* and one of the Christian ones to St Augustine[1]. That these stories should appear in Christian texts at all is initially surprising in itself. According to Christian tenets, the manifestation of ghosts on the surface of the world and in the realm of the living should have been an impossibility, since the souls of the dead were all supposed to be fully confined within the underworld until the Day of Resurrection. The traditional ghost stories that had thrived in pagan culture should accordingly have had no currency in this new religious context. But they were just too good, too ingrained in popular lore and in popular imagination to let go. And so they continued

---

[1] For Lucian's *Philopseudes* see Müller 1932, Schwartz 1951, Ebner *et al.* 2001, Ogden 2007.

to be told, with Christian authors making a range of variously strained theological accommodations for them[2].

The notion that the souls of the dead should be confined, or imprisoned, in the underworld (sometimes in their tombs, or the sea) until the Day of Resurrection, whereupon they are to be aroused by a clarion call, is adverted to several times across the New Testament, for example in Luke, John, 1Corinthians, 1Thessalonians, 1Peter and Revelation. Admittedly, the emphasis in these passages tends to be on the eventual point of release rather than on the provisional confinement itself[3].

More lucid expressions of the notion are found in a pair of contemporary Church Fathers, Hippolytus of Rome and Tertullian, both of whose careers spanned the late second and early third centuries AD. Writing in Greek, Hippolytus gives us a vivid image of Hades as a dark, sunless place in which the souls of the righteous and the unrighteous alike are detained until the time that God will determine. It is a guardhouse for souls, and angels (supplanting Cerberus, we may think) serve as its guards[4]. Tertullian too, writing in Latin, discusses the apparent manifestations of ghosts in the world of the living at some length in his *On the Soul* of ca. AD 200. These are not the souls of the dead themselves but demons, and those demons specifically that had been responsible for the deaths of the individuals concerned in the first place. They masquerade as their souls, as sometimes becomes explicit when a possessing demon is interrogated during exorcism, and it claims to be the soul of its host's ancestor, or of a gladiator. And just why does a demon do this?

> In doing this it makes it its chief concern to exclude the truth we declare, so that we may not find it easy to believe that all souls are gathered into the underworld, and so that they may interfere with our belief in the day of judgement and the resurrection… Moreover the Lord, speaking through Abraham, established it well enough that the way out of the underworld lies open for no soul at all, in the parable of the poor man at peace and the rich man in lamentation. He said that no messenger could be dispatched back from there to tell us about the organization of the underworld[5]. On this occasion at

---

[2] For ancient ghosts in general, see Headlam 1902, Wendland 1911, Collison-Morley 1912, Jobbé-Duval 1924, Bevan 1926, Dingwall 1930, Preisendanz 1935, Hickman 1938, Cumont 1945, 1949, Waszink 1954, Nardi 1960, Vrugt-Lentz 1960, Hansen 1980, Russel 1981, Kytzler 1989, Gager 1992, Felton 1999a, Ogden 1999, 2001, 2008, 2009, 2014, Stramaglia 1999, Nagy 2004, Luck 2006, Lugli 2008.

[3] Lk. 16. 19-31 (the parable of Lazarus and the rich man), Jo. 5. 28-29, 11. 24, 1Cor. 15. 52, 1Thess. 4. 13-17, 1Pet. 3. 19, Rev. 20. 5, 11-13.

[4] Hippol. *Contra Platonem de causa universi, PG* 10. 796.

[5] Lk. 16. 26.

any rate one might have thought that it could have been allowed to bring about belief in Moses and the prophets (Tertullian, *De an.* 57 = *MWG* no. 112)[6].

Of course, this tenet discomfited the Fathers when they had to account for the Witch of Endor's apparent success in raising the ghost of Samuel, as endorsed by the first Book of Samuel[7].

The Haunted House

Let us turn to the first of our traditional stories, 'The Haunted House', the parallel and related motifs of which are laid out in Table 1 (there is not the opportunity to advert to them all in the following discussion). The earliest extant full telling of the story is found in a letter of the younger Pliny, of ca. AD 107. Here a derelict and abandoned house in Athens was haunted by a ghost in the form of a filthy and emaciated old man, with hair and beard unkempt. His appearance was preceded by the sound of the clanking of the chains on his hands and feet. The house's former occupants had been deprived of sleep and brought to sickness and death by fear of the ghost. Upon arriving in Athens the philosopher Athenodorus was attracted by the cheapness of the rent being sought for the property, and then intrigued by the explanation for it, and so keenly took the house on. He determined to spend the night alone in the house, working with his writing tablets and a lamp. In due course the rattling of the chains was heard and the apparition manifested itself before him. It beckoned him with its finger, as if summoning him (this is a nice narrative misdirection on Pliny's part: readers are surely intended to imagine that the ghost is summoning Athenodorus to join it in death). Unruffled, Athenodorus eventually followed the ghost, taking his lamp with him. It escorted him to the house's inner courtyard and disappeared. Athenodorus marked the spot of its disappearance with grass and leaves. The next day he advised the city magistrates to dig at the point indicated, and a rotting skeleton bound in chains was found beneath. The bones were gathered and given due burial by the state, and henceforth the house was liberated of its ghost[8].

---

[6] Cf. Waszink 1947 *ad loc.* and Nock 1950.

[7] 1 Sam. [= Septuagint 1 *Reg.*] 28. 3-25 (cf. J. *AJ* 6. 327-42). See, for example, the agonies at Just. Mart. *Dial. Tryph.* 105 Marcovich = *PG* 6. 721 and at Jo. Chrys. *In epistolam ad Titum commentarius* 3.2 = *PG* 62. 678. Christian responses to the Endor episode are reviewed at Smelik 1979 and Greer and Mitchell 2007.

[8] Plin. *Ep.* 7. 27. 5-11 = *MWG* no. 320. For discussions of this story-type see above all Felton 1999a, Stramaglia 1999: 120-169 and Ogden 2007: 205-224. See also Radermacher 1902: 205-207, Wendland 1911, Müller 1932: 93-98, Herzig 1940: 26-27, Schwartz 1951: 53-54, 1960: 80-118, 1975/6a, 1975/6b, Sherwin-White 1966 on Pliny *ad loc.*, Schwartz 1969, Römer 1987, Ebner *et al.* 2001: 44-5, 178-9, Nagy 2004. For the central motif cf. Thompson 1932-1936 no. E235.2.

The tale-type was flourishing in both the Greek and Roman worlds from long before Pliny wrote, for it underpins the central and eponymous piece of comic business in Plautus' *Mostellaria* ('The Haunted House'). Plautus' Latin comedy, ca. 200 BC, was a loose adaptation of a lost Greek original, *Phasma* ('Ghost'), composed in the late fourth or early third century BC by Philemon. In the scene in question the tricky slave Tranio tries to keep his master Theopropides, who has returned unexpectedly after a long absence, from entering his house, to save the skin of the young master, who is carousing with prostitutes within. Tranio tells Theopropides that his family abandoned the house seven months before. One night he had left the lamp burning, and the young master had cried out after a dead man visited him in his sleep. The ghost explained that it was Diapontius, a guest 'from across the sea' (this is in fact the meaning of his name). Some sixty years previously Diapontius had visited the house's former owner only to be murdered by him in it, for his gold. The host had then stuck his body in the ground without due burial inside the house itself. The ghost had been compelled to dwell on in the house, instead of in the underworld: Orcus had refused to admit it, because Diapontius had died before his time. The ghost then declared that the house was consequently cursed and unholy, and bade the occupants depart. Tranio goes on to suggest that Theopropides may have doomed himself simply by touching the house while knocking on the door, and thereby, it is implied, contracting the contagion of death. Theopropides cries out in alarm that the dead are calling him to Acheron alive. And when a voice calls for Tranio from inside the house the slave too pretends to be terrified that the dead man wants his own soul: conceits that help us to understand the supposed initial significance of the gesture made by Pliny's ghost[9].

The most elaborate pagan account of the tale is found in Lucian's satirical *Philopseudes* ('Lover of Lies') of the ca. AD 170s. The overall action is much the same as with Pliny's tale, but the location of the action has now moved to Corinth. Here the Pythagorean philosopher Arignotus tells how he learned of a long abandoned and derelict house, from which a terrifying ghost was chasing away any occupant. At once he took up his Egyptian spell books, picked up a lamp, and ventured into the house on his own by night. As he read, the ghost materialised. In appearance it was evidently much like Pliny's: it was squalid, had long hair and was 'blacker than the dark.' The ghost attacked Arignotus from all sides, even deploying a series of animal transformations, turning into a dog, a bull and a lion (the reincarnation-minded Pythagorean might well have appreciated the soul's ability to this). But Arignotus gained mastery over the ghost by uttering one of his Egyptian spells and drove it down into the ground in the corner of the room, taking a note of the place of its disappearance. The

---

[9] Plaut. *Most.* 446-531 = *MWG* no. 116.

next morning Arignotus brought a team of diggers to the house, who duly found a mangled corpse beneath. It was given due burial, and the house ceased to be troubled[10].

We pass into the Christian era now for our next telling of the tale, which we find in Constantius of Lyon's AD 480 *Life of St Germanus*. After a long day's travel (region unspecified) the priest Germanus and his entourage looked for a place to spend the night and came across an abandoned house with a ruined roof in which they proposed to stay. Two old locals tried to discourage them by warning them that the house was haunted in terrible fashion, but the warning had the opposite effect to that intended and rather enthused Germanus for the project. The house was duly occupied, and a clerk engaged in reading out scripture for the party, when Germanus fell asleep. Thereupon the clerk saw a ghost rise up before him, whilst the walls of the house were beaten upon by stones raining down. He called to Germanus, who woke at once and called upon the ghost to confess its identity and the reason for its presence, invoking the name of Christ. Thereupon the ghost laid aside its terrifying appearance and spoke with humble voice. It explained that its person and his companion had been responsible for many crimes. They now lay unburied and had taken to disturbing people, because they themselves could not find rest. The ghost asked Germanus to pray to God for the two men, so that they might be received and be given peace. Germanus took pity and commanded the ghost to show him the place where the two bodies lay. As Germanus carried a candle, the ghost led him to the most inaccessible part of the ruined house, and showed him where they were (apparently under collapsed debris, rather than in the ground). The following morning Germanus called in the locals, and they pulled the debris away to reveal two mangled bodies bound in iron chains. The limbs were unchained, clothed in linen and given due burial. A prayer of intercession was made, and rest was secured for the dead. Thenceforth the house was re-occupied without any trace of its former terrors[11].

The role of the ghost-delivering hero of moral and intellectual conviction has passed effortlessly and unsurprisingly from the philosopher appropriate to pagan times to the priest (and indeed saint) appropriate to Christian ones. But otherwise there is a sense that Constantius is playing with the elements of the pagan story-type without being fully sure what to do with them: we have someone reading (as in Pliny and Lucian), but the reading fails to fortify them against the terror of the ghost; we have the hero falling asleep, which leads us to expect that he will experience the ghost as a dream vision (as in Plautus), but no, he has to wake up before he can perceive it. And this lack of sureness extends, of course, to the handling of the ghost itself. In regard to this the key motifs of the pagan

---

[10] Luc. *Philops.* 30-31 = *MWG* no. 115.
[11] Constantius *V. Germ.* 2. 10 = *MWG* no. 321.

story remain in place: the bodies are restless because they lie unburied within the house they haunt, and due burial is once more the solution. But Constantius' unease with the theology of all this is palpable in his rather awkward attempt to overlay a second explanatory model for the manifestation of the ghosts: they were sinners in life and continued to be sinners in death too, and it was this fact that, for some reason, was keeping them out of the underworld. This explanation does not make any better sense in Christian theological terms than the original pagan one does, but it at least has a more Christian feel, if only by virtue of invoking the concept of sin and by virtue of calquing the notion that sinners should ultimately be excluded from Heaven itself after Resurrection.

In the late sixth century AD Gregory the Great was rather more determined to render his own version of the tale more compatible with Christian tenets. His hero is now a prince of the Church, Datius, bishop of Milan, who, whilst en route to Constantinople with his retinue, stopped off at Corinth (a venue shared with Lucian's tale). Initially having difficulty in finding a house to accommodate them all, he eventually located a large and long-empty one that seemed suitable. The locals tried to deter him from it on the basis that a devil (*diabolus*) was living in it. This of course gave Datius all the more incentive to take up residence. As he was duly taking his rest in it in the dead of night, the 'ancient enemy' made his attack, imitating, with loud voice, the roars of lions, the bleating of sheep, the braying of asses, the hissing of snakes and the squealing of pigs and shrew-mice. Datius roused himself and rebuked the devil, shaming it with the point that it was reduced to imitating pigs and shrew-mice, whereas it had once sought to imitate God. The devil withdrew from the house in its embarrassment, leaving it free from horrors[12].

Thus Gregory is able to keep his theology intact by removing the ghost (and consequently its corresponding corpse) from its own ghost story. But the replacement devil retains the original ghost in gratifyingly close embrace, when we bear in mind Tertullian's contention that apparent ghosts are in fact demons, and too often the demons responsible for the death of the person concerned in the first place. Furthermore, whilst the supplanting devil is given no physical description (indeed it is not actually specified that it manifests itself visually), its mode of attack by means of a succession of animal noises surely reaches back into the pagan past of the suppressed ghost, as can be seen when we compare the series of animal transformations by Lucian's ghost (which, were it not for the comparative evidence of Gregory's tale, we might have dismissed as a mere satirical embellishment on Lucian's part). Gregory's readers could remain doctrinally pure, but their enjoyment of his story surely continued to depend upon their awareness of the ghost in it.

---

[12] Greg. Mag. *Dial.* 3. 4. 1-3 = *MWG* no. 322; cf. Petersen 1984: 175-177.

Before we leave this particular story-type, let us look at a partial refraction of its motifs in the tradition of St Ambrose of Milan and the brother martyrs Gervasius and Protasius (the Milanese connection is suggestive, given that Gregory's Datius too was bishop of Milan). In his *City of God* of AD 426 Augustine indirectly mentions that Bishop Ambrose discovered the bodies of the martyrs by means of a dream. Crowds gathered, the emperor himself coming too, and all were then able to witness a miracle when a blind man touched the martyrs' (shared) coffin and recovered his sight. At first sight there is no hint of our story-type in Augustine's brief words, but the more elaborate account of the discovery of the martyrs' bodies in Jacobus de Voragine's *Golden Legend* of AD 1263-1267 may lead us to look at them again[13].

Jacobus' *Lives of Gervasius and Protasius* (a single narrative) tells how the brothers had been martyred at Milan by Count Atasius in the Neronian era for refusing to sacrifice. Philip had secretly recovered their bodies and buried them in their house in a stone coffin, together with an account of their martyrdom. More than three centuries later St Ambrose was praying in the church of Sts. Nabor and Felix when two handsome youths, dressed in white, manifested themselves and prayed with him. Ambrose prayed that, should this be a true vision, he should see it again. And he did so twice more. On the third occasion St Paul also manifested himself and told Ambrose that he would find the two bodies if he dug down beneath the place he currently stood, together with the account of their martyrdom. The bodies were duly discovered in perfect condition, and exuding a sweet odour. A blind man who touched their coffin recovered his sight. Jacobus specifies that Ambrose was between sleep and wakefulness when he saw the first vision, but was very much awake for the second two. Here, to all intents and purposes, we have our ghosts, but the narrative rides roughshod over theological concerns by simply asserting that the vision of the martyrs was a 'true' one[14].

Has the Jacobus version taken the etiolated elements of Augustine's account and synthesized them with motifs borrowed from our story-type, which was evidently still very meaningful almost a millennium later? Or did the tale of Gervasius and Protasius boast these motifs (and perhaps more of them) from the story-type almost from the first, and were they consequently already known to Augustine? In the latter case, Augustine will have bowdlerised the tale and effectively purged it of its ghosts. There are two reasons for thinking the latter may be the case: first, as we shall see, Augustine has been known to neutralize pagan ghost stories. Secondly, it may well be that we see refractions of an original Gervasius and Protasius ghost story in both Gregory's and Constantius' versions

---

[13] Aug. *Civ. Dei* 22. 8.
[14] Jac. de Vor. 85. For the text see Graesse 1850, and for an English trans., Ryan 1993.

of our story-type. Gregory gives us a Milanese connection in choosing a bishop of Milan for his hero, whilst Constantius, somewhat pointlessly, awkwardly and puzzlingly, presents us with a pair of ghosts and a pair of bodies, albeit ones that belong to individuals of a more reprehensible nature than the two martyrs. The tales of Gervasius and Protasius become strikingly immediate for those visiting the Church of St Ambrose in Milan today, for the eponymous saint's own body is on open display beneath the church's altar, where it is flanked by the (uncoffined) bodies of Gervasius and Protasius.

Of course, the story-type continues to flourish in the modern era, in which (a sign of the times, no doubt) it gives rise to not the merest anxiety for its challenge to Christian tenets: we think, for example, of Oscar Wilde's *Canterville Ghost* (1887) and Bram Stoker's *The Judge's House* (1891).

Table 1: The motifs of the traditional Haunted House story

	Plautus	Pliny	Lucian	Constantius	Gregory
TEXT	*Mostellaria* 446-531 (*MWG* 116)	*Letters* 7. 27. 5-11 (*MWG* 320)	*Philopseudes* 30-31 (*MWG* 115)	*Life of St Germanus* 2. 10 (*MWG* 321)	*Dialogues* 3. 4. 1-3 (*MWG* 322)
DATE	ca. 200 BC (Plautus); IV-III BC (Philemon)	ca. AD 107	ca. AD 170s	AD 480	late VI AD
City	Athens	Athens	Corinth	--	Corinth
Long-deserted and/or derelict house	deserted for 7 months	unoccupied house, advertised for rent	long uninhabited, roof in disrepair	abandoned and decaying house	empty for many years
Effects of house's terrors	Theopropides scuttles away	ghost keeps people awake, induces sickness and death	ghost drives people from house in terror	--	--
Hero of oral and intellectual conviction	--	Athenodorus, philosopher (Stoic)?	Arignotus, Pythagorean philosopher	Bishop Germanus	Bishop Datius
Hero's nameless entourage	--	vague entourage	--	several men, including a clerk	vague entourage
Hero motivated by challenge	--	Athenodorus welcomes challenge	(motif latent in Arignotus' eagerness)	Germanus welcomes challenge, as if the house is charming	Datius does duty

Hero proposes to encounter the ghost alone in the house by night	--	Yes	Yes	Germanus goes in with very few men (*paucissimi*), including clerk	Yes
People attempt to restrain hero from reckless project	(Tranio attempts to dissuade Theopropides)	--	Arignotus' host	--	locals
Hero reads or writes	--	Athenodorus writes	Arignotus reads from Egyptian books (uses spell from them against ghost)	Constantius has his clerk-companion read from scripture	--
Hero uses a lamp	(ghost appears after Tranio leaves lamp burning)	Athenodorus writes by lamp, which he then carries to follow ghost	Arignotus reads by lamp	Germanus follows ghost with candle (or ghost leads way with candle?)	--
Description of the ghost	(named Diapontius)	old, emaciated, filthy, long beard, unkempt hair, chains and fetters	squalid, long hair, blacker than the dark	of terrifying appearance	(demon identified with the Devil)
Aural nature of terrors	(creaking door)	ghost clanks chains (repeatedly)	(ghost transforms self into dog, bull, lion)	ghost rains down stones on wall of house	demon produces animal noises (lion, sheep, ass, snake, pig shrew)
Ghost threatens to take hero down to Hades	'The dead are calling me to Acheron alive'	the ghost's beckoning finger (narrative misdirection)	--	--	--
Hero faces ghost down	--	Yes	Yes	Yes, with exorcistic technique	Yes
Hero marks the spot where the ghost goes down	--	Yes	Yes	Yes	--
Next morning hole is dug, remains discovered	(Diapontius' body is there to be found)	Yes	Yes	Yes	

A Ghost Locates a Lost Deposit

We pass on to our second traditional story-type, which we might entitle 'A Ghost Locates a Lost Deposit'. This is found first in Herodotus' well known story of Periander and Melissa (ca. 425 BC). Herodotus tells how Periander, the tyrant of Corinth (the historical figure ruled ca. 627-587), needed to return a deposit to a guest-friend that his wife had buried before he had accidentally killed her. To find its location he sent a messenger to the Oracle of the Dead (*nekuomanteion*) at the Acheron to call up her ghost and ask it where she had put it. The ghost duly appeared but refused to divulge where the deposit lay on the basis that it was cold, for the clothes with which Melissa had been buried had not been burned properly, so that it could not have the use of them in the underworld. Periander accordingly tricked all the women of Corinth into parading out for a festival at the sanctuary of Hera in their finest clothes, but had his guards ambush them and strip them, whereupon he burned the clothing in a pit with a prayer to Melissa. The ghost was satisfied with this lavish replacement offering, and revealed the location of the deposit when consulted a second time. (The tale notoriously contains some further lurid details, which need not concern us here[15]).

Here there are essentially two tale-types in one: one in which a dead person is recalled to life (or returns to life of their own accord) to find for the living a precious object only they had known the location of (the deposit story-type); and one in which a ghost makes appeal for a precious item of clothing that has somehow failed to accompany it to the underworld. It is the former tale-type that concerns us here, though, as it happens, the second pagan narrative of interest, Lucian's, also combines both types, albeit in a different configuration. Again, in the *Philopseudes*, Lucian has Eucrates tell how he had been comforting himself by reading Plato's book on the soul (i.e. the *Phaedo*) on the couch seven days after the death of his wife Demaenete. As he did this he realised that Demaenete was sitting on the couch next to him. He embraced her and started to weep, but she stopped him and reproached him because, whilst otherwise completing her funeral perfectly, he had failed to burn one of her golden sandals for her. He had not been able to find it, and the ghost now told him that it was lying hidden under a chest, where Demaenete had thrown it off. As they continued to talk, their Maltese lapdog barked from underneath the couch, and the ghost disappeared at once. The sandal was subsequently retrieved from under the chest and duly burned. In this story the themes of the recovery of the lost item

---

[15] Hdt. 5. 92 = *MWG* no. 150; cf. Hornblower 2013 *ad loc*. For the accidental killing, see Hdt. 3. 50-53. For discussions of this story-type see Müller 1932: 91-93, Schwartz 1951: 52, Stern 1989, Ebner *et al.* 2001: 57-59, Ogden 2001: 54-60, 2004, 2007: 195-204. For the central motif cf. Thompson 1932-1936 no. E451.2.

and the rectification of inadequate burial are rolled into one rather more neatly than they are in Herodotus[16].

Let us turn now to the Christian reflexes of the deposit story-type, and first to that found in the fourth-century AD *Apophthegms of St Macarius.* This tells how at Scetis St Macarius had come across a woman weeping because her husband had died unexpectedly whilst holding a deposit, and without telling anyone where he had put it. The owner of the deposit was now taking the woman and her children as his slaves as recompense for his lost money. Macarius asked the woman to escort him and his retinue of brothers to her husband's tomb. Once she had done so, he sent her home. As the brothers prayed, Macarius summoned up the ghost of the husband and asked it where he had put the money: 'Under the leg of the bed', came the reply. Macarius then demanded of the ghost, 'Go back to sleep again now until the day of the Resurrection'. He then turned to the brothers and averred to them that it was not he that had performed this miracle for his own sake, but God that had done the deed for the sake of the widow and the orphans. He then sent the brothers back to the woman to tell her where the deposit lay, and she was able to liberate herself and her children from her creditor[17].

So, a Christian sage is seen to flout the fundamental tenet of his faith in calling up a ghost in pagan fashion. The author's guilty anxiety about this shows through in the fact that he has the woman removed from the scene of the summoning, for all that she might have drawn solace from encountering her husband's ghost: it would not do to have lay people exposed to such heretical activities. And it shows through of course also in Macarius' wholly hypocritical demand to the ghost that it will not rise again until the day of Resurrection.

No less than four texts recount a version of this story-type featuring St Spyridon, who, historically, was Bishop of Trimithus in Cyprus, and took part in the council of Nicaea (AD 325). Three of these texts run along identical lines: Rufinus' *Ecclesiastical History* of ca. AD 402-403; Sozomenos' *Ecclesiastical History* of ca. AD 440-443; and the *Acts of Metrophanes and Alexander* of perhaps the seventh century AD, which is summarised for us by Photius. These tell how Spyridon's virgin daughter Eirene had been keeping a deposit for an acquaintance but had died, leaving Spyridon with no knowledge of it. After her death the distraught creditor laid siege to him, begging for his money back. Eventually Spyridon went to his daughter's grave and called to her in her grave, asking where the deposit was. She replied from the grave, telling him where, and the money was duly found and returned to its owner. Here

---

[16] Luc. *Philops.* 27 = *MWG* no. 326.
[17] *Apoph. S. Mac., PG* 34. 244-245 = *MWG* no. 327.

the tiniest tweak has made the traditional ghost story acceptable for Christian ears: the ghost is addressed and replies, but it does not rise and appear. The girl's soul remains firmly in its tomb, in its personal bit of the underworld, and speaks from there[18].

The fourth Spyridon text, Socrates' *Ecclesiastical History* of ca. AD 440, broadly resembles the other three in its set-up, whilst specifying that the deposit was actually an item of jewellery, but it differs markedly in its handling of the problem of the ghost. Here we are told that Spyridon approached his daughter's tomb and called upon God to show him her promised resurrection in advance of the proper time, which He duly did, allowing the daughter to return to life and reveal the location of the deposit. So here Socrates has saved the ghost of the pagan story-type by the momentous feat of advancing the Day of Resurrection for her alone: the mountain is brought to Mohammed[19].

Finally, Augustine too gives us a version of the story-type. In his *De cura pro mortuis gerenda* of ca. AD 422 he recounts a tale he heard in Milan (that city again!) of a man who was being maliciously persued for his dead father's debt, although he had in fact paid it off without his son being aware of it. But his dead father appeared to him in a dream and told him where to find the receipt for the paying of the debt. There is no escaping the ghost here, even if it is dream-bound. However, Augustine tells the story not to endorse it but in order to debunk it: it decorates his argument that visions of dead people in dreams should no more be interpreted to constitute ghostly visitations than should visions of living people. And I say 'decorates' advisedly: the tale is hardly needed to prove the point, and it is evidently carried over for its own engaging nature and entertainment value[20].

The Mistaken Underworld Escort

Our final story-type might be entitled 'The Mistaken underworld Escort' (its motifs are laid out in Table 2). The first manifestation of it is found in a fragment of Plutarch's *On the Soul* (ca. AD 100) preserved by Eusebius and Theodoret. This tells how one Antyllus, recovering from a faint on what was supposed to be his deathbed, declared that he was not destined to die from his present illness after all. His soul had been taken down to the underworld by 'escorts', but upon arrival they had been rebuked by their master: they had brought the wrong man, Antyllus, instead of the neighbouring cobbler Nicandas. Antyllus did indeed

---

[18] Ruf. *HE* 10. 5; Soz. *HE* 1. 11. 4-5; Phot. *Bibl.*cod. 256 Henry = *PG* 104. 112, summarising the *Acta Metrophanis et Alexandri.*
[19] Soc. *HE* 1. 12.
[20] Aug. *De cur. pro mort. ger.* 13.

survive, but Nicandas soon contracted a fever and died on the third day of it[21].

Lucian's version of the tale in his *Philopseudes* is more elaborate and more satisfactory, for all its satirical nature. His Cleodemus tells how he lay abed on the seventh day of a fever, when a young man in white stood before him and escorted him down to Hades through a chasm. There he had a tour of the punishments of Hades' famous great criminals, Tantalus, Tityus and Sisiphus, before being brought to a courthouse. Pluto, presiding, and reviewing the names of those destined to die, flew into a rage with the escort: 'His life-thread is not yet complete, so off with him! Bring me Demylus the smith! For he is living past his spindle'. (There is a suggestion that the escort had misheard a name, Cleodemus and Demylus both sharing the *dēm* syllable). Cleodemus joyfully ran up back to the world of the living and announced to all that the neighbouring smith Demylus would die, and soon after the mourners were heard wailing for him[22].

One might wonder whether this particular story-type constituted the same kind of challenge to Christian tenets as the two previous ones we have considered: it might be thought that the ghosts observed remain where they should be, in the underworld, and are merely the recipients of a visit from the land of the living. And indeed in 2Corinthians Paul himself speaks of a man in Christ that had been snatched away to paradise fourteen years ago, 'whether in his body or without his body', where he had been given a secret message[23]. However, the restoration of the sick man to life does entail the return of his soul or, in effect, ghost from the underworld. There was enough ambiguity here to license different responses amongst Christian thinkers. Augustine offers his own reflection on the story-type in the *De cura pro mortuis gerenda*. He tells the tale of a reasonably well-off landowner called Curma, who lived on the outskirts of his own Hippo. He fell sick and became catatonic, being preserved from burial by only the gentlest breeze in his nose. When he finally awoke, he said at once, 'Someone should go to Curma the blacksmith's and see what's going on there'. The blacksmith was found to have died at the moment at which he had awoken. The landowner explained that whilst below he had heard the order being clarified, that it should rather be Curma the blacksmith that should be brought. During his brief sojourn in the underworld, he recognised some people he had known whilst they were alive, and he now saw them being treated in accordance with their just deserts. He was also shown paradise, and before he was dismissed back to the

---

[21] Plu. fr. 176 Sandbach (περὶ ψυχῆς Book 1), *apud* Eus. *PE* 11. 36. 1 and, in part, Theodor. *Graec. affect. cur.* 11. 46; trans. at Ogden 2007: 172-173. For discussion of this story-type see Müller 1932: 88-91, Schwartz 1951: 49, Ebner *et al.* 2001: 48-49, 176-177, Ogden 2007: 171-194. For the central motif cf., broadly, Thompson 1932-1936 no. F102.

[22] Luc. *Philops.* 25, trans. at Ogden 2007: 56-57.

[23] 2Cor. 12. 2-4.

world of the living he was told, 'Go, have yourself baptized… if you wish to be in that place of the blessed'. Augustine's objection is the same again: he might have been tempted to believe in the journey of Curma's soul to the underworld and back to meet the ghosts, had Curma not also reported parallel dreams in which he had encountered people still alive, including members of the local clergy and even Augustine himself[24].

By contrast Gregory the Great, in his *Dialogues*, felt able to endorse the general possibility of premature visits to and returns from the underworld and refers to a number of cases known to him. He could not, however, contemplate the possibility of God presiding over errors in his management of the afterlife. Such anticipatory visits by souls, he contends, are rather deliberately contrived by God in his compassion, so that those doubting the torments of Hell can be brought to a delivering state of belief in timely fashion. He proceeds to record the experiences of a distinguished man name Stephanus, as reported to him, supposedly, by the man himself. He had died whilst staying in Constantinople, and was taken down to Hell, where he saw the torments for himself. He was brought before a judge, but the judge protested that the wrong Stephanus had been brought: he had required rather Stephanus the blacksmith, who lived next door to him. His soul was restored to his body, and the blacksmith died in the same hour. It is noteworthy that, despite Augustine's introductory protestations about God's infallibility, the motif of the mistaken escort proudly remains in his Stephanus story, and receives no qualification there. Why spoil a well-established and much-loved tale?[25]

Conclusion

Our conclusion is announced in our title and has been repeatedly adverted to along the way: these ghost stories continued to thrive in the Christian era, despite their religious unacceptability, by virtue of the fact that they were just too good to let go[26]. And so a varied range of accommodations was made for them, with the ghosts effectively being written out of their own stories in different ways. But we can hardly doubt that even the most pious of Christian consumers knew full well that they were still reading and enjoying ghost stories. And perhaps it was the message ostensibly denied that continued to be the important one. After all, the most crucial claim of all to establish was the soul's actual survival of death, and this is something that the good old-fashioned ghost story did rather well. We might bear in mind that in the mid second century AD one of the very earliest

---

[24] Aug. *De cur. pro mort. ger.* 12. 15 Zycha = *PL* 40. 602, trans. at Ogden 2007: 173-174.

[25] Greg. Mag. *Dial.* 4. 36 de Vogüé = *PL* 77. 382-384, trans. at Ogden 2007: 174-175.

[26] And indeed such ghost stories continued to thrive throughout the medieval era: see, e.g., Schmitt 1994 and, for a convenient collection, Joynes 2001.

Fathers of the Church, Justin Martyr, had appealed to what was for him the reality of the manifestation of ghosts in the realm of the living as proof not only of the soul's continued existence, but also of its continuing perceptual abilities: 'Necromancies, divinatory observations effected through uncorrupted boys, the evocations of human souls, the so-called dream-senders, together with the mages and assistants [*paredroi*] and all that is done by people that know about these things – all this should persuade you that souls enjoy perceptual abilities after death too'[27]. The point is well made too by the fourth-century AD *Homilies* attributed to Clement of Rome. Here Clement supposedly tells how in his youthful desperation to be reassured of the soul's survival of death he planned to travel to Egypt and find a mage there upon whom he could prevail, with a great deal of money, to evocate a soul for him in an act of necromancy, on the pretence that he wanted to consult it on business. But the real purpose would have been simply to learn whether the soul was immortal by his observation of it. He was, however, deterred from such a course of action by a philosopher friend who warned him that a life of guilt and impiety would lie ahead for him, whether or not he was successful in his enterprise: 'For they say that God is hostile to those that disturb souls after their dissolution from the body'[28].

Table 2: The motifs of the Mistaken Underworld Escort story

	Plutarch	Lucian	Augustine	Gregory
TEXT	**F176 Sandbach (περὶ ψυχῆς book 1), apud Eusebius Praeparatio Evangelica 11. 36. 1 and Theodoret Graecarum affectionum curatio 11. 46**	*Philopseudes* 25	*De cura pro mortuis gerenda* 12. 15 Zycha = *PL* 40. 602	*Dialogi* 4. 36 de Vogüé = *PL* 77. 382-384
DATE	**ca. AD 100**	**ca. AD 170s**	**ca. AD 422**	**late VI AD**
Narrator specifies his close relationship with the victim of the mistake	Antyllus, the speaker's present host	the speaker Cleodemus himself	Curma, a man baptised by Augustine	Stephanus, a distinguished friend
Victim's illness	illness (with Nicandas dying of fever)	fever	illness	illness

---

[27] Just. Mart. *Apol.* 1. 18 = *MWG* no. 323.
[28] [Clem. Rom.] *Hom.* 1. 5 = *MWG* no. 325.

	Plutarch	Lucian	Augustine	Gregory
TEXT	**F176 Sandbach (περὶ ψυχῆς book 1), *apud* Eusebius *Praeparatio Evangelica* 11. 36. 1 and Theodoret *Graecarum affectionum curatio* 11. 46**	*Philopseudes* 25	*De cura pro mortuis gerenda* 12. 15 Zycha = *PL* 40. 602	*Dialogi* 4. 36 de Vogüé = *PL* 77. 382-384
DATE	**ca. AD 100**	ca. AD 170s	ca. AD 422	late VI AD
Victim's body appears to be (almost) dead and is threat of cremation or burial			Curma preserved from burial merely by the light breeze in his nose	Stephanus preserved for want of an available undertaker
Victim recognizes individual dead people or witnesses their punishments		Cleodemus sees the punishments of the great criminals Tantalus, Tityus and Sisyphus	Curma observes the appropriate fates of dead people he had previously known	Stephanus sees the torments of the dead in which he had previously failed to believe
Escort brings the victim before a king or judge figure, who orders the mistake corrected	a master (*kyrios*)	Pluto (?), a king-figure presiding over a court	(a vague interlocutor only is mentioned)	a judge (*iudex*)
Error due to a confusion between individuals of similar names	*Ant*yllus and Nic*and*as	Cleo*dem*us and *Dem*ylus	Curma and Curma	Stephanus and Stephanus
Victim is a man of wealth and dignity	Antyllus, the wealthy host of a dinner party	Cleodemus, the leisured associate of the rich Eucrates	Curma, a reasonably well-off landowner	Stephanus a distinguished man
Person truly destined to die is a hammering craftsman	Nicandas the cobbler	Demylus the smith	Curma the smith	Stephanus the smith
Victim returns to life just in time to predict the death of person truly destined to die	Antyllus predicts the death of Nicandas	Cleodemus predicts the death of Demylus	Curma predicts the death of his namesake, effectively	Stephanus predicts the death of his namesake, effectively

Demons, ghosts and spirits in the philosophical tradition

Manuel Bermúdez Vázquez
University of Córdoba
(orcid.org/0000-0001-6117-2138)

Abstract: It is widely accepted that philosophy started in the VI century BC as a transition from irrational thinking to the rational or philosophical thinking. This transition, however, did not take place overnight, but just the opposite. In the same way that Parmenides was a philosopher even though we only have a poem written by him, Plato used myths as a part of his explanations of several philosophical points. These situations already show what we try to demonstrate here: the so-called rational thinking –which usually belongs to philosophy - is not so pure nor rational. There are several important cases in which irrational concepts, such as demons, ghosts and spirits, were used in order to create philosophical arguments. The main figures of the philosophical panorama (i.e. Socrates, Descartes and Hegel) used these concepts that seem to belong to a different context rather than to philosophy. There is a pattern that repeats in these three philosophers –all of them lived in a period of transition. Perhaps these periods needed this kind of "out of the way" concepts to allow thinkers to face the new challenges they had to encounter.

Keywords: *Daimon*, spirit, philosophy, Socrates, Descartes, Hegel, philosophical tradition.

Apparently, things like demons, ghosts and spirits should not be very common in the philosophical tradition. A discipline like philosophy, a paradigm of rationality and the effort of thought, hardly appears to be the best environment to support these kinds of topics. But, contrary to popular belief, these topics do appear recurrently throughout the history of philosophy. These concepts, most of the time, were used to describe different questions metaphorically that could be hard to understand or just plainly tricky. And we must confess that, in those occasions, a ghost can be very useful. We can see that usefulness in the enormous success of these beings, since they are still being used to explain several philosophical questions of the utmost importance today.

It is quite paradoxical that philosophy, which prefers questions rather than answers and uses reasoning rather than the acceptance of conventional authority or tradition, sometimes turns to ghosts, demons, and spirits to enrich the discussion or the analysis and to guide toward a clearer examination of problems.

It is our purpose here to point out some of the philosophical moments in which these types of beings were used, from Socrates to Hegel, in order

to analyse the role of ghosts and spirits in the building of philosophical thought.

Socrates and his *daimon*

Socrates is the archetypical philosopher and his influence in the world of philosophy is huge. His method is still used in our classrooms and his legacy lays in the very roots of our thought. Socrates is the paradigm of philosophy but, despite that, he used the figure of *daimon* to explain some of his philosophical conceptions.

A *daimon* or demon was a concept from the Greek mythology whose meaning changed according to the different contexts in which it appeared. In its early period it was a very vague word[1]. It was identified with "fate", but later on, since it was a concept whose origin went back to the primitive gods, it was demoted to a lower rank. *Daimones* were depicted as half human and half beast and they used to fight for darkness. Despite this, Homer already rebelled against this tradition[2] and by the times of Socrates the concept of *daimon* had lost part of its force and was driven toward a stronger rationalization (although it is important to emphasize that this rationalization was still ambiguous in the period of the birth of philosophy).

In the fifth century BC, the concept of *daimon* was suffering an evolution, all the while still "polluted" by most of its primitive and irrational features. According to Pausanias, in his *Description of Greece*, he saw a painting of a *daimon* made by Polignoto and he described it as follows: "[the *daimon*] eats the flesh of the dead, leaving only their bones… Its colour is between black and blue, like the meat flies, it shows the teeth and it is seated on the skin of a lynx" (Paus. 10. 28. 7). A nice image.

On the other hand, for Plato[3], who followed on this issue Hesiod and his *Works and Days*[4], the *daimon* represented the souls of the wiser dead who deserve a special place in the other world. Plato defined a *daimon* as a being situated among mortals and immortals, since it was intended to convey human affairs to the gods and the divine matters to men.

Meanwhile, for the Pythagoreans, the *daimones* represented the souls of the dead who fly around in the air. They were something between gods and humans, and also served as a link between men and gods[5]. All of this shows that, in times of Socrates, the Greeks had the concept of *daimon,* although it

---

[1] See the entry in DGE on line (consulted in July 2018): http://dge.cchs.csic.es/xdge/δαίμων
[2] For example, in the fragments in which Homer uses the form *daimoni isos,* that is, godlike: Hom., *Il.* 5. 438, 16. 705, 20. 447, 21. 18.
[3] Pl., *Smp.* 202 d-e.
[4] Hes., *Op.* 122, 314.
[5] Bermejo *et al.* 1996: 193.

was still ambiguous and imprecise. The evolution of the notion would lead to an identification of the idea with the "genius" that each person seems to possess in an individual level. In this context, one person can talk with his or her *daimon* as synonymous of talking with his or her own self and different from the *daimon* of the others.

Heraclitus pointed out "man's character is his *daimon*"[6] and, as such, it can be good or evil. According to Democritus, "Happiness does not dwell in flocks or in gold; it is in the soul which is the home of a person's *daimon*"[7]. We can see how the concept of *daimon* was getting bigger and bigger in the description of the inner and spiritual elements of human beings. In *Timaeus*, Plato followed the same idea and said that the *daimon* that dwells within each one of us is the supreme and directive authority of our moods[8].

But we must, finally, arrive to Socrates and his view of the *daimon*. First of all, let us start with the conclusion. The Socratic *daimon* represents a synthesis of all the previous representations and conceptualizations of the word. All the previously indicated ideas of the Greek *daimon* arrived to Socrates in a way that allowed the master of Plato to attribute to himself his own *daimon*. So, Socrates said that he had a personal *daimon* or spirit who whispered words in his ear. It is important to stress here that Socrates did not identify his personal character with the one of his *daimon*, but kept his religious outlook on this spirit, saying that such spirit was independent from his character and possessed supernatural powers.

Anyway, Socrates said that the *daimon* was not a new god invented by him. On the contrary, Socrates sustained that this *daimon* or spirit was identified with the gods to whom the priests turn to when they wanted to tell their prophesies, the same way the Pythia of the Delphic Oracle did.

Socrates placed his *daimon* inside him, allowing him to get in contact directly with the divinity. And, in a completely new way, challenging the previous tradition on *daimones*, Socrates defended the religious character of this new inner strength. This inner religious strength, although it seems to have some irrational features, is domesticated by reason. Hence the attitude, also novel in Socrates, towards the *daimon*: he did not deny the force nor the divinity of the *daimon*, but he did not slavishly worship it either. In this sense, we can say that Socrates neither ignored nor turned himself in to the *daimon*. For Socrates it represented a synthesis between popular religion and the rationalization of philosophy.

Socrates understands the *daimon* as essentially negative. This does not mean to deny it, but that the *daimon* is something that deters him from doing

---

[6] Heraclit, fr. 119.
[7] Democritus, fr. 171, cf. Kristovic 2001: 327.
[8] Pl., *Ti.* 90 c.

something, although it never gives him orders[9]. This attitude allowed Socrates to stay away from the fanaticism or the idea that someone could possess the absolute truth. And, ultimately, it was the Socratic *daimon* that was the force that put him in the path of the search for truth and the philosophical inquire.

In short, the relationship of Socrates with his *daimon* reflected both sides: the rational character of the philosopher, and his respect for the irrational that was present in the religious mysteries of the Greek culture. Such mysteries, as we can see, were very much respected by Socrates and he tried to understand them, even though he never gave himself completely to them. Through the *daimon*, Socrates seemed that he was convinced that the oldest, deepest and darkest Greek religious tradition was talking to him. It is here, in this situation, where we find the biggest paradox of all, at least considering the origin of the philosophical tradition. On the one hand, to combine the tradition from which the *daimon* came, with its magical and religious experience, and the reason of the philosopher, which was Socrates' main focus. On the other hand, to do so dialectically is a very difficult task, but we have to make an attempt in order to honour the irrational origins of the rational thinking[10].

Descartes and *Le Malin Génie*

The description of the origin of this concept is similar to a tale. It is a cold and snowy winter night, the whole world seems mired in the silence and torpor. Descartes, despite his rationalism, begins to doubt everything that surrounds him: Is it possible that 2+2 is not 4 anymore? Is it possible that all there is around the house, the fire in the chimney, is merely a dream? What if an evil genius is fooling me?[11]

It is surprisingly easy to arrive to these hypotheses even though its origin is the rational thinking imposed by this philosopher. The evil genius or evil

---

[9] The Socratic *daimon* deters the philosopher in several occasions. For example: - It prevents him from leaving a place until repairing a fault (*Phdr.* 242 b-c). / - It deters him from talking to certain people (*Tht.* 151 b) /- The *daimon* prevents Socrates from getting up to have certain intellectual encounter (*Euthd.* 272 e) / - It tries to convince Socrates to not inform Alcibiades of his hobby (*Alc.1* 103, 105 d, this dialogue has been attributed to Plato, but there are still discussions on the question of its authenticity) / - It deters him from intervening in politics (*Ap.* 31 d) / - The *daimon* tries to convince Socrates to ask his friend Timarcus to stay at home and to not leave the house, but Timarcus, ignoring him, gets out and commits a murder (*Thg.* 129 a-c). / - Socrates is also asked to dissuade the Athenians to initiate the expedition to Sicily (*Thg.* 129 d). It is important to stress here that the *Theages* presents several problems that make difficult to acknowledge its authenticity. For example, Lamb considered that Plato was not the author because the dialogue was inferior and with a faint un-Socratic atmosphere (even though in antiquity was regarded as a Platonic work). See Lamb 1927: ix-xxi.

[10] Further reasoning on this issue can be seen in Kingsley 1999: 118-132.

[11] See Mongin 2013: 9-10.

demon was a resource used by Descartes in order to radicalize the search for a clear and evident knowledge. The idea consisted in building the hypothesis that perhaps we were created by a God who sought deluding us, even in the knowledge that seemed obvious. A God that made us in a way that, when we think that we are living in a true reality, we are, in fact, wrong. According to this philosophical approach, we could be living in error, since this evil genius might be toying with us. This issue threw a torpedo into the seas of reality. How can we be sure of reality if there is a possibility that we are being misled? And then, we should not forget, how can philosophy, the mother of critical thinking, offer such a solution to the understanding of reality when *le malin génie* seems related to superstition?

So, let us explain how it works. Descartes wrote in his *Discourse on Method* and *Meditations of First Philosophy* that he was going to use the methodical doubt as the very first tool in his pursuit of an epistemic method. He went from the universal doubt to seek an unquestionable first truth upon which to lean all of his system. We can roughly describe the process. There were three levels of doubt in Descartes' philosophical proposal: the senses, dreams and the devil genius.

First, the senses may deceive us in many occasions and they can induce us the error, so, there is no other alternative than doubting the external experience.

Second, the dreams show us a false reality and we believe them while we are sleeping. There is no other way than believing them and without waking up we would never know what is true and what is false.

Third, the evil genius or evil demon, this character that can make us doubt the evidence of mathematics or the experience of the evidence itself. The whole world might be a huge scene were unreal situations are being faked.

It is well known that long before Descartes these themes had already been used. The question of dreaming needed to be answered. Philosophy needed some indisputable evidence to substantiate the rational thinking here. For example, in *Theaetetus* Plato had already proposed the dream argument[12]. In this dialogue, *Theaetetus* agrees with Socrates that what appears to a dreamer is not real[13]. As a consequence, it is likely that there is no reality and everything is a phantasmagoria. This topic was particularly spread in the Baroque period, as we can also see in Shakespeare or Pedro Calderón de la Barca.

The problem here is that now we have a very difficult task to overcome. How can one be sure that there is no real devil genius? Descartes tried to answer that question by saying that God, in his power, would never allow such thing to happen. But there is always the issue that, once created the idea, is not so easy

---

[12] See, for example, Suter 1976.
[13] Pl., *Tht.* 158 b-d.

to rule it out. Is there a devil genius? Are we living in the *Matrix?* Are we just brains in a vat?[14]

The only purpose of this evil genius is misleading us. He has a superhuman power over us, he can make us sleep, or dream, as vividly as if we were actually awake. The devil genius can make us believe that 2+2 is 5. Even the fundamentals of logic are under his attack. It is here, at this point of no return, at the height of this doubt induced by this weird spirit, where everything around us may be false. It is here where we need something that has to be absolutely certain. Descartes took us from this situation and said: I know that I am some kind of being that exists, I am aware of myself. I can ignore my own nature; in fact, I can be completely wrong about what I am, but I am completely true and indubitable; and even more, I know with absolute certainty that I am a being who, at the very least, has experience of his conscience[15]. This is the famous Cartesian *"cogito ergo sum"* –I think, therefore I am.

The evil genius is one of the cornerstones of Modernity and once it was brought into life by Descartes, the necessity of expelling it from the castle of reason grew in importance. It appeared like a contradiction because, on the one hand, we had reason and philosophy, and, on the other hand, we had faith and the concepts of the realm of the fantastic and wonderful, such as the devil demon. Why did Descartes decide to unsettle us bringing about such a character? Perhaps the right answer is that what Descartes really did was to announce the death of the devil genius. That is, perhaps he removed all sense to the presence of an imaginary and mythical element, more proper from the superstition rather than the philosophical thought[16]. This concept needed to be overcome in order to get over the medieval reasoning that was still going on in Descartes' time. The devil genius was the announcement that to achieve a real philosophical and scientific rationality we had to get rid of this kind of concepts that were more typical of the superstition than the philosophical thought.

As we have seen, with the Cartesian devil genius happened the same as with the Socratic *daimon*. It seems that in the periods in which there is a clash of paradigms, philosophy tends to use these kind of fantastic ideas or concepts which are so strange to the rational tradition that is the gem of philosophical thought. This is one of our explanations of the presence of devils, ghosts and spirits in the philosophical tradition[17].

---

[14] For further readings on this amazing topic, see Putnam 1981: 1-3. The "Brains in a vat" theory is the first chapter. See also the online chapter http://www.iep.utm.edu/brainvat/ (consulted September 2018).

[15] Descartes, *Meditations of First Philosophy*, first meditation.

[16] Velázquez Delgado 2005: 162.

[17] See, for example, the chapter devoted to Descartes in Bermúdez 2012: 95-101.

This clash of paradigms was represented by the irrational tradition, on the one hand, and the philosophical and scientific thought, on the other. The irrational has the ability to use the symbolic, the fantasy, the use of metaphors, certain rhetorical turns, the imagination, etc. All these tools are part of the panoply at hand for the irrational thought. However, for the philosophical thought, the main instrument is always reason.

Hegel and the absolute Spirit

Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel was a late thinker who needed time and maturity to give shape to his philosophical doctrine. It took him a while to find the concept of the Spirit that later on was the very fulcrum of his thought. He believed that could reveal the ultimate truth of reality and of all human history. Hegelian philosophy is overwhelmingly comprehensive and was a huge effort made to try to give an explanation to all reality. His books were written in a complex and abstract jargon which made them very difficult to understand. Hegel was an idealist and a monist: he was an idealist because he believed that reality was, ultimately, something not material (what he would call eventually "Spirit"). And he was a monist because he believed that all things from reality were aspects of a single thing (also the Spirit in its development as we will see).

When this German philosopher died in 1831, he left such apotheosis in the philosophical panorama that inevitably a period of depression or crisis could not be helped. His figure was so outstanding that no other philosopher after him could avoid thinking or rethinking his theories[18].

The main philosophy that comes from Hegel was that all phenomena from our reality, all of them (from our own consciousness to even the metaphysical foundations of politics or science), are just aspects of a single Spirit. This concept, the Spirit, which has drawn our attention in these pages, is quite complex, since it includes the concepts of "mind" and "idea" in the same thought. This term comes from the German word "Geist", that is aptly translated as "spirit"[19]. It was important, within the framework of idealism represented by Hegel, on the one hand, the idea of a contrast between Spirit and Nature and, on the other hand, the idea of a reconciliation of both, or absorption of the tension we mentioned through the spirit[20].

---

[18] Cf. D'Agostini 2009: 13ff.

[19] Traditionally, *Geist* has been translated as "spirit", however, this word does not do justice to the full meaning of the German concept. *Geist* is halfway between spirit and mind. Its connotations are much more mental than the word "spirit" and, as well, more spiritual than the term "mind". It is difficult to understand the term in its fullest sense. It is even more difficult to explain it.

[20] Cf. Ferrater 1988: 1016-1018.

Hegel used the concepts "idea" or "absolute idea" as if they meant the same than "Spirit" (*Geist*). In some sense they are the same with the minor difference that the Idea is the abstract aspect of a concrete and living reality of the Spirit[21]. The main difficulty we face here in order to analyze the concept is the definition of Spirit, since, in a certain way, the Spirit is everything. Better said, it is not only "everything", but also "the truth about everything". The Spirit begins its philosophical journey as a partial truth that needs to be completed.

We can offer here several statements in order to try to clarify the meaning of the concept of Spirit in the Hegelian tradition:

The Spirit appears as the object and the subject of the self-conscience. The Spirit is also a Universal that unfolds itself. The phenomenology of the Spirit (which is also the title of the most important of Hegel writings) is the description of the history of that self-unfolding. For Hegel, the Spirit is the very core of existence, the icing of the cake, the quintessence of being, the ultimate essence of being.

The whole historical process that constitutes reality is the development of this Spirit towards the self-awareness. When this state is finally reached, all that exists, everything that participates in the being, will be in harmony with itself. Hegel used the term "absolute" to name this state of self-consciousness of everything[22].

This process we are trying to describe here, which would form an inherent part of reality itself, was not covered by Hegel as a material process of change. It would be beyond the material. Hegel did not think that the mind or spirit had appeared from an inanimate nature, but as something that pre-existed, which was the subject of the historical process that was the reality.

Let us think again about the concept we are analyzing –the "Spirit". According to the Hegelian tradition, there were two structures: mind and reality. We should not assume that change did not affect both structures: in other words, change seems to be the only perennial thing in our world. We should not assume either that reality must be divided into thoughts and objects of thought. So, if the structures of mind were aspects of the Spirit, and thoughts and objects were also aspects of Spirit, we must conclude that all reality is Spirit.

We can see here that in the very core of the Hegelian metaphysics we found a concept as abstract and almost magical as Spirit. Undergoing the historical development of reality this concept is lying there, showing us that all reality is a historical process. If philosophy were a castle, the Hegelian Spirit would be its tower, understanding this concept as the innermost and strongest structure of a castle.

---

[21] Cf. Ferrater 1988: 1017.
[22] Cf. Bermúdez 2012: 192ff.

Conclusions

In conclusion, the Hegelian notion of Spirit has influenced many different philosophical traditions. If we add this idea to the previous concepts of *daimon* and *le malin genie,* we can see that inside the philosophical thought there is a strong current of irrational thinking. We must assume that these concepts used by such an important group of philosophers belong to a different tradition: the tradition of the irrational. We could say that perhaps these were only words, but in philosophy nothing is left by chance. Every word is used with a purpose, and there could have been very different concepts using different terms. But Socrates, Descartes and Hegel chose these ideas: *daimones, geniuses* and *spirits.* The very roots of philosophy perhaps are deeply sunk in the language of magic, in the epic poetry, in the powers of the shamans[23]. Perhaps there is another reality behind the racks of philosophy. Perhaps we cannot continue judging things by their appearance. We can begin to see the underlying philosophical principles behind the philosophical tissue, the basic patterns that are repeated throughout the history of philosophy, and all of these point to an idea, that the rational and the irrational are strongly interconnected.

---

[23] Cf. Kingsley 1999: 118.

(Página deixada propositadamente em branco)

The atomistic denial of ghosts: from Democritus to Lucretius[1]

Ángel Jacinto Traver Vera
IES Zurbarán (Badajoz)
(orcid.org/0000-0001-9734-8094)

ABSTRACT: This chapter discusses the atomistic premises against the existence of ghosts. According to the traditional Graeco-Roman religion and other philosophical doctrines, such as the Pythagorean, the Platonic, and the Stoic, ghosts do exist and serve as *medium* between the living world and the afterlife. Against this widespread belief, the first Atomists, Leucippus and Democritus, and their followers, Epicurus and Lucretius, argued that ghosts are not the dead who return from beyond, but physical and material emissions (*simulacra*) of people which persisted in the outside world and sometimes inside the mind, having been previously printed on it. This interpretation fits into the broader context of their philosophical system, which aims at delivering men from fear of the gods, of death and of the afterlife, with the eudemonistic purpose of achieving emotional peace.

KEYWORDS: Atomists, *simulacra*, Leucippus, Democritus, Epicurus, Lucretius.

The ghosts in the first Atomists, Leucippus and Democritus

According to an account transmitted by Lucian in his *Philopseudes* 32, Democritus, father of Atomism, spent several nights beside a grave, whether to be quiet or to carry out any (para)psychic inquiry is not known. Some youths, disguised as ghosts, tried to scare him, but the philosopher of Abdera, undaunted, told them to stop fooling around[2]. Here is the passage:

"Νὴ Δί", ἦν δ'ἐγώ, "μάλα θαυμαστὸν ἄνδρα τὸν Ἀβδηρόθεν ἐκεῖνον Δημόκριτον, ὃς οὕτως ἄρα ἐπέπειστο μηδὲν οἶόν τε εἶναι συστῆναι τοιοῦτον ὥστε, ἐπειδὴ καθείρξας ἑαυτὸν εἰς μνῆμα ἔξω πυλῶν ἐνταῦθα διετέλει γράφων καὶ συντάττων καὶ νύκτωρ καὶ μεθ' ἡμέραν, καί τινες τῶν νεανίσκων ἐρεσχελεῖν αὐτὸν βουλόμενοι καὶ δειματοῦν στειλάμενοι νεκρικῶς ἐσθῆτι μελαίνῃ καὶ προσωπείοις εἰς τὰ κρανία μεμιμημένοις περιστάντες αὐτὸν περιεχόρευον ὑπὸ πυκνῇ τῇ βάσει ἀναπηδῶντες, ὁ δὲ οὔτε ἔδεισεν τὴν προσποίησιν αὐτῶν οὔτε ὅλως ἀνέβλεψεν πρὸς αὐτούς, ἀλλὰ μεταξὺ γράφων, "Παύσασθε", ἔφη, "παίζοντες"· οὕτω βεβαίως ἐπίστευε μηδὲν εἶναι τὰς ψυχὰς ἔτι ἔξω γενομένας τῶν σωμάτων".

---

[1] I am grateful to the two referees for their critical suggestions.
[2] Cf. Felton 1999a: 15.

"Yes, by Zeus", I said, "a truly remarkable man that Democritus of Abdera, who was indeed so convinced that something like that could not happen that, after having locked in a mausoleum, he spent some time there, outside the gates, writing and composing day and night, and some youngsters who wanted to mock him and scare him, disguised as the dead with black suit and skull masks on their heads, surrounding him, danced around him, jumping with rhythmic foot. But he was not afraid of their appearance, not even he raised his eyes to look at them, but, as he wrote, he said: 'Stop playing the fool'. So much he was convinced that souls are nothing when they are out of the bodies".

The story, even spurious, illustrates the atomistic view that ghosts do not exist. This question seems to have interested enough the ancient philosophers, hence they imagined some hypotheses[3]. And, specifically, Leucippus, founder of Atomism, said that a subtle molecular film, copy of the original figure, was stripped of objects, inert or alive, and this was perceived by the eyes and the mind. This theory of vision, applied by Democritus to the phenomenon of sleep, explains the false belief of many men in ghosts, for the mind would capture images of human beings even dead[4]. As a result, these blurry and dreamlike visions would constitute a persuasive argument for the existence of the beyond and they would arouse among the gullible all kinds of fears.

---

[3] We find a paradigmatic text in the letter 7. 27 of Pliny the Younger, where the Roman writer addresses the question of whether ghosts exist, recalling the anecdote that happened to the Stoic philosopher Athenodorus Cananites (74 BC – 7 AD), when renting a supposed haunted house in Athens, Cf. Felton 1999a: 65-66.

[4] Cf. Felton 1999a: 20.

"Democritus in meditation" (1662. The Metropolitan Museum of Art. Accession Number: 2012.136.848) by Salvator Rosa. It dramatizes *Naturalis Historia* 7. 55.

The philosophical doctrines of the Classical Antiquity were based on the study of nature (Physics) and, after establishing some scientific principles, they raised Ethics and Metaphysics. However, prior to the consideration of nature, they fixed the canon or the method of knowledge, called Epistemology. In the case of Leucippus and Democritus, these research criteria are particularly interesting, especially with regard to the feeling and the thought, to assess their opinion about the existence of ghosts. Here are some interesting premises[5]:

In the field of Physics, these philosophers think that the atoms and the vacuum are the principles of all things. Everything else is opinion. Only atoms and vacuum exist in nature [D. A. 1 (D.L. 9. 44-45)]. The universe is infinite and immutable [D. A. 39 (Ps.-Plu. *Strom.* 7)].

With regard to Theology, the universe has been shaped by a god [D. A. 39 (Ps.-Plu. *Strom.* 7)], but it is not governed by any providence [D. A. 22 (Aët. 2. 3. 2)].

As far as Psychology is concerned, the soul is a grouping of spherical atoms, which easily penetrate all things [D. A. 28 (Arist. *de An.* 1. 2. 404a)]. It has two parts: a rational, located in chest, and other irrational, spread throughout the body [D. A. 105 (Aët. 4. 4. 6)]. The soul and intellect are the same thing, since both consist of mobile and small atoms [D. A. 101 (Arist. *de An.* 1. 2. 405a)]. The soul dies with the body [D. A. 109 (Aët. 4. 7. 4)].

In matters of Aesthetics and Epistemology, the feeling and the thought are produced by the introduction of external images into us [D. A. 30 (Aët. 4. 8. 10)][6]. We can see thanks to the penetration of these images into us [D. A. 1 (D.L. 9. 44) and 29 (Aët. 4. 13. 1)]. Certain images flow from objects, maintaining a similar shape to them. These images enter the eyes and cause vision [D. A. 29 (Alex. Aphr. *in Sens.* 24)][7]. Dreams occur because images activate them [D. A. 136 (Aët. 5. 2. 1)]. The spirit of the sleeper is moved by external vision [D. A. 137 (Cic. *Div.* 2. 58. 120)]. When images occurs during sleep, they reproduce the lifestyle of whom they were detached [D. A. 77 (Plu. *Quaest. conviv.* 8. 734F)]. Moreover, the air is filled with images of the gods [D. A. 78 and 79 (Hermipp., *de Astrol.* 1. 16, 122 and Clem.Al., *Strom.* 5. 88)]. Some men think that certain images have

---

[5] I quote the texts according to the following editions: for the ancient atomistics, Diels (1906) with the abbreviation D. plus A. ("Doctrine") or B. ("Fragments"); for Epicurus, Arrighetti (1973) with the abbreviation Arrigh., and occasionally Usener (1966) with the common abbreviation Us.; for Lucretius, Bailey (1998).

[6] According to Theophrastus in his *De sensibus* 50-55 (D. A. 135), Democritus wrote a treatise on the forms which some critics, as Alfieri 1936: 144 n. 362, identified with his work on the images. Despite having written this monograph on the subject, Theophrastus says that, although he wanted to explain the phenomenon as best as could, he left many points unresolved.

[7] Apparently, Empedocles had also argued this explanation [D. B. 84 (Arist. *Sens.* 2. 437b-438a)]. Cf. Cordero *et al.* 2015: 412 n. 238.

something divine, particularly those that are large and utter voices, because, in their opinion, they bring good omens [D. B. 166 (S.E., *M.* 9. 19)][8].

In Ethics, for Democritus happiness or "welfare" consists of the serene and balanced state of the soul, which is not disturbed by anything, not even the fear of the gods [D. A. 1 (D.L. 9. 45)].

The ghosts in Epicurus and Lucretius

It is in the Hellenistic successor of the pre-Socratic Atomism, Epicurus[9], and, above all, in his apostle, Lucretius, where we find a more complete, further explanation of the denial of the existence of ghosts. This refutation serves as a postulate more to weaken the fear of the gods and death and, therefore, to deny the afterlife. We have selected below some of the Epicurean premises that can clarify our study.

Regarding Physics, Epicurus, as Democritus' follower, thinks that nothing comes from nothing and disappears into nothing, so the universe (*summum*) is eternal and unchanging, neither increases nor decreases [2 (38-39) Arrigh. (D.L. 10. 38-39)]. Besides, the ultimate constituents of the universe are atoms and the vacuum. Both are permanent and infinite in extent, and the atoms travel through the vacuum [2 (39-40) Arrigh. (D.L. 10. 39-40)]. About atoms, he also thinks that they are invisible, indivisible, immutable and in constant motion. There is a finite number of atomic forms, but each form has an infinite number of atoms. The bodies, that is, the matter of the universe, or are atoms, its simplest form, or aggregates of atoms [2 (40-43) Arrigh. (D.L. 10. 40-43)].

In the field of the Theology, Epicurus believes that the gods live in the *intermundia* completely happy and unconcerned of the humans [2 (76-77) and 4 (123-24) Arrigh. (D.L. 10. 76-77 and 10. 123-124)]. Admittedly, the gods exist, because our mind captures their *simulacra*, especially during sleep. They go unnoticed to the other five senses because they are made of very faint emanations [4 (123-24) Arrigh. (*Sent.* 1 and D.L. 10. 123-124)].

In relation to Psychology, Epicureans thinks that the human being as a whole (body and soul) is a congregation of atoms. Its soul is a body mass consisting of subtle and spherical atoms, which is scattered throughout the body. It is a combination of air, heat and a very subtle matter, endowed with extraordinary mobility and very attuned to the body, which causes feelings and thoughts [2 (63) Arrigh. (D.L. 10. 63)]. Furthermore, death is absolute. Soul and body, both matter, die together [Lucr. 3. 445-458 and 2 (63) Arrigh. (D.L. 10. 63)].

---

[8] Cf. Cordero *et al.* 2015: 445-447 nn. 264-265.
[9] In fact, Cicero says in his treatise *On the Nature of the gods* 1. 43. 120 (D. A. 74): *vir magnus* (sc. Democritus) *in primis cuius fontibus Epicurus hortulos suos inrigavit.*

As far as Aesthetics and Epistemology are concerned, for Epicureans the criteria of truth are four: the sensations, the preconceptions, the feelings and the fantasies of understanding.

As all reasoning depends on sensations [1 (31-34) and 2 (38) Arrigh. (D.L. 10. 31-34 and 38)], the sensation is the first criterion of truth. The preconception is the image or mental concept produced by the memory of impressions already received from certain objects. The feeling is the immediate response of the subject with the sensation, usually of pleasure or pain. And, finally, the fantasy is the imaginative capacity of the mind to infer the existence of unperceived objects by the senses.

Consistently, we see and think when something enters us from external objects [2 (49) Arrigh. (D.L. 10. 49)], because very thin films of atoms are continually shed from the bodies, which largely retain their shape, color and other qualities[10]. When these simulations play a sensory organ, especially sight, they cause an impression on the mind. But the mind can be touched by these effluvia without sensory organs. The mind works, therefore, as a sensory organ more than anything else [2 (50-53) Arrigh. (D.L. 10. 50-53)].

These impressions of the mind, captured directly or indirectly through the senses, are real, that is, they reflect the truth, because the *simulacra* keep the shape, color, and other qualities of the original objects [2 (50) Arrigh. (D.L. 10. 50)]. However, the imaginative capacity of the mind (fantasy) can add to perceptions errors, when it adds conjectures that are not confirmed or refuted by other sensory testimonies, by trying to explain the original data [2 (50) Arrigh. (D.L. 10. 50)].

Still, the intelligence can reach no sensitive truths, provided that the assumptions made by fantasy can be proved by reasoning, using analogies and significant evidence of the insensible found in the perceptible phenomena [1 (32) Arrigh. (D.L. 10. 32)]. Therefore, the intelligence, thanks to sensory experience, can deduce the existence of atoms and empty, although these are not perceptible by the senses [2 (39) Arrigh. (D.L. 10. 39)].

In regards to Ethics, Epicureans think death must not be feared, because all evil or good reside in sensation and death is, above all, a lack of sensation [4 (124) Arrigh. (*Sent*. 2 and D.L. 10. 124)]. In this sense, the sage must accept his death calmly (*Sent*. 20). Besides, the gods neither punish men [2 (81-82) Arrigh. (D.L. 10. 81-82)] nor they are moved for their sacrifices and prayers (*Sent*. 1; 387 and 388 Us., and Lucr. 1. 44-49). As a logical conclusion, there is no afterlife beyond death (Lucr. 3. 14-47)[11].

---

[10] Democritus held this same theory, Felton 1999a: 20.

[11] On death as annihilation among the Epicureans and Stoics, cf. Laguna Mariscal 1997: 207.

With these postulates, it is clear that both the pre-Socratic atomism and its successor, the Epicurean, denied the existence of ghosts in the traditional religious meaning[12], that is, as proof that there is life in the afterlife, but mediocre and incomplete, and that the souls of the dead, in special circumstances[13], can communicate with the living and interfere in their lives, for good sometimes, for bad other times.

The malicious lies of the Acherusia templa

It was Lucretius, as we said, who used this denial of ghosts to remove the fear of the gods and death. Consequently, it is he who explains in detail the opinion of the Epicureans and who has the last word of the Atomism around the issue. Indeed, Lucretius articulates all the arguments one way or another to prove the nonexistence of ghosts, hence its relevance at the end of this study.

Certainly, if the peaceful temple of the knowledge is solidly built thanks to the wisdom of Epicurus, the kingdom of Acheron[14] and, by extension, the underworld is the result, on the contrary, of the ignorance. If we meditate on this a little, this infernal world is based on fallacies that are fantasies of the mind, conditioned by the fear of death, which has been shaped by vague and confusing perceptions received especially during sleep (Plut. *Brut.* 37. 1-3 and Lucr. 1. 104-106)[15]. Instead of doubting its veracity, the collective imagination (Lucr. 5. 1194-1195) considered all these fantasies valid, creating a parallel world, the underworld, hellish and terrifying, with its rivers and streams, with its rooms, classes, guardians and owners, that Lucretius, faithful to his evangelizing mission, intends to debunk[16]. And, first of all, the nature and occupation of the gods must be explained, because, according to traditional religion, they rule as diligent owners the destinies of the men on earth and in hell. Therefore, Lucretius, even before jumping right into their anti-providentialist arguments, says in the preface of the first book the following (1. 44-49):

---

[12] For a definition of ghost in the ancient world, cf. Felton 1999a: 12.

[13] Cf. Felton 1999a: 25.

[14] Collison-Morley 1912: 36 says: "We still possess accounts of the working of these oracles of the dead, especially of the one connected with the Lake of Avernus, near Naples. Cicero describes how, from this lake, 'shades, the spirits of the dead, are summoned in the dense gloom of the mouth of Acheron with salt blood'" (Cic. *Tusc.* 1. 36-37).

[15] Some of the most famous ghost stories of Classical Antiquity are actually the result of a dream or nightmare, as Collison-Morley 1912: 14 and Felton 1999a: 62-65 say.

[16] Collison-Morley 1912: 2 recalls how every Roman city had its own entrance to the underworld. It consisted of a ditch where a hole was left that was covered with a stone, the *lapis manalis*. In addition, there were sacred places in different locations of the Ancient World that were considered entrances to Hades. In Heraclea, for example, there was a *psychomanteion*, where the souls of the dead could be summoned and consulted (Collison-Morley 1912: 33-34). About descriptions of the traditional hell in some classical authors, especially Seneca the Philosopher, see cf. Laguna Mariscal 1997: 204 n. 8.

omnis enim per se divum natura necessest
immortali aevo summa cum pace fruatur   45
semota ab nostris rebus seiunctaque longe.
nam privata dolore omni, privata periclis,
ipsa suis pollens opibus, nihil indiga nostri,
nec bene promeritis capitur nec tangitur ira.

For it is necessary in itself the whole nature of the gods enjoys by absolute peace of the immortality, secluded and separated from our affairs, because, deprived of any pain, deprived of dangers, self-sufficient thanks to its innate wealth, it does not need anything from us, neither it bows to our merits nor it is affected by anger.

With this brief digression, repeated in 2. 646-651, the Roman Epicurus exposes the true nature of the gods (1. 51 *vera ratio*): the gods are not moved by the entreaties nor do they take care of the human affairs, as they entertain time in absolute peace and happiness there in the *intermundia* [Cic. *Div.* 2. 40 and 3 (89) Arrigh. (D.L. 10. 89)]. Yes, they live forever and we know they exist because *simulacra* of them come to us from their quiet headquarters. There is not, therefore, reason to think that they are responsible for managing the wretched existence of the dead, since they are not disturbed by the living.

Given this fact, the work of the priests, their paraphernalia, ritual and sacrifices are not necessary. But in real life this does not happen, on the contrary. Guided by the credulity to the tales of the fantasy and religion, they are fraught with superstitions, frighten men with the future vengeance of the gods and commits crimes allegedly to appease them (Lucr. 1. 82b-83)[17]:

quod contra saepius illa
religio peperit scelerosa atque impia facta.

On the contrary, the religion often caused criminal and impious acts.

The same idea appears in Lucr. 1. 101-103:

tantum religio potuit suadere malorum.
tutemet a nobis iam quovis tempore vatum
terriloquis victus dictis desciscere quaeres.

---

[17] However, if we remember so common inscriptions as *aeterna pax tecum* (Collison-Morley 1912: 5), it seems that the collective consciousness conceived death as a peaceful sleep, similar to the view in this Epicurean. In short, people had a more benevolent death opinion than the priestly caste's.

So many ills religion could lead! Yourself, overcome by the horrific statements of the priests, will want to get away from us at some point.

This fear of death that religion feeds, thanks to which the priestly caste lives, is founded not only on the belief in providence, but also on the belief that the soul survives beyond death in the cloisters of Acheron. Hence Lucretius has to explain the nature of the soul (1. 112-116):

> ignoratur enim quae sit natura animai,
> nata sit an contra nascentibus insinuetur
> et simul intereat nobiscum morte dirempta
> an tenebras Orci visat vastasque lacunas   115
> an pecudes alias divinitus insinuet se.

For it is unknown what is the nature of the soul, if it was born or if it is insinuated into these that are born, or if it dies when we die or if it visits the darkness of Orco and its enormous gaps, or if it introduces in other animals by divine grace.

And it is that these inveterate popular beliefs were defended by some philosophical schools, like the Platonic or Pythagorean. The first defended the theory of the *anamnesis*, according to which the soul kept memories of his previous life[18]. Meanwhile, the Pythagoreans believed in the *metempsychosis*, according to which the souls of the living beings passed from one body to another[19]. Both theses are refuted by Lucretius in the third book (670-783) since he has argued for the mortality of the soul from many premises, of which I quote the most important below.

First, the materiality of the soul: that is, a being which is composed of spirit or mind (*mens* or *animus*) and soul (*anima*) is pure matter (3. 94-135): *Primum animum dico, mentem quam saepe vocamus, / in quo consilium vitae regimenque locatus est, / esse hominis partem nilo minus ac manus et pes* (3. 94-96). The soul is a part of the body, just like a hand or a foot. And, being an angular issue of the school, there is an appropriate aphorism of Epicurus: ἡ ψυχὴ σῶμά ἐστι [3 (63) Arrigh. (D.L. 10. 63)]. However, our spirit (*mens* or *animus*) is made up of special particles that give it outstanding agility and dexterity and, in particular, it is equipped with a great subtlety that allows it to empathize without difficulty with the rest of the human organism. Regarding its location as a member, Epicurus, according to Democritus, placed the spirit in the chest. The soul (*anima*),

---

[18] Cf. Pl. *Phd.* 72e-77a, 77c-d and 91e-92c, as well as *Men.* 85ab. Aristotle, Posidonius and Varro, among others, believed in it cf. Bailey 1998, vol. 2: 1105.
[19] Cf. Stob. 1. 49. 38, cf. Woltjer 1987: 75.

instead, would be disseminated throughout the body, consisting of particles of great subtlety, though not as much as these of the spirit.

Second, it is the superiority of the spirit over the soul (*anima*): *sed caput esse quasi et dominari in corpore toto / consilium quod nos animum mentemque vocamus* (3. 138-139). The soul obeys the orders of the spirit (τὸ ἡγεμονικόν) since it acts more freely. The spirit can enjoy and suffer outside of it, regardless of whether the soul feels pleasure or pain. Instead, the spirit is ever conscious within the mind.

Another important issue is that the particles of the soul are very subtle, round and light (3. 177-322): *principio esse aio persubtilem atque minutis / perquam corporibus factum constare* (3. 179-180). Its size and weight must be, of necessity, minimal since, when a human being dies, the corpse, without feeling and warmth already, shows no signs of loss or size or weight, despite the soul fading away (3. 206-20). Something similar happens when wine loses its aroma. Its smell disappears but a loss of weight is not noticeable (3. 221-227).

And, finally, the assertion that death means the joint dissolution of the soul and the body (3. 526-579). It must, accordingly, be admitted that death, like birth, is jointly for the body and soul. At the critical moment of death, the soul leaves the body causing its dissolution: *resoluto corporis omni / tegmine et eiectis extra vitalibus auris / dissolvi sensus animi fateare necessest* (3. 576-578).

This highlighted the immortality of the soul and, as a result, argued for the most absolute eschatological nihilism. It is also easy, therefore, to remove the afterlife of ghosts.

The materialist explanation of ghosts

Ghosts (*simulacra pallentia*, as Lucretius says in 1. 123) are not illusions, but matter, hence he argues this [Lucr. 4. 42-43 = 2 (46) Arrigh. (D.L. 10. 46)]:

> *dico igitur rerum effigias tenuisque figuras*
> *mittier ab rebus summo de corpore eorum*

> I say, therefore, that subtle effigies and forms emanate from the surface of things.

Also in Lucr. 4. 216-217:

> *Quare etiam atque etiam mitti fateare necessest*
> *corpora quae feriant oculos visumque lacessant.*

> Consequently, it is necessary to recognize that bodies emit again and again forms capable of reaching the eyes and impacting the vision.

Thus proved the materiality of the images, we must make some clarifications, particularly on how they are perceived by the organs of the sight and of the

mind. First, these corpuscular effluvia are not captured by the eyes and the mind individually, but in a continuous film succession (Lucr. 4. 87-89, 105-107 and 256-264) that creates an image (*phantasía*). Thus, the mind tries, excited by the images that touch the eye, to determine its nature, though it provided limited information about its color or shape. In this act of cognition, the mind tries to recognize the image by reviewing concepts stored therein (*prolépseis*). If the vision is clear by the closeness, the spirit or mind is able to accurately classify its sense. Now, if the perception is flawed by the remoteness, the mind, unable to assimilate accurately, forms a false opinion (*dóxa*) in many cases, as when we see a tower in the distance without a clear appreciation of its exact contour (4. 353-363). It seems rounded at the ends, as its *simulacra* lose some of their atomic structure in transit through the air, but actually it is square. It is, then, an optical illusion, which shows that the senses are reliable, because the mind is solely responsible for adding to the image a false opinion (4. 462-468). It is, therefore, possible that some ghosts are nothing more than optical illusions.

The mind (*mens* or *animus*), despite being the most accurate sensitive organ of man, also perceives by contact (Lucr. 4. 730-731):

> corporis haec (sc. simulacra) quoniam penetrant per rara cientque
> tenvem animi naturam intus sensumque lacessunt.

> Because these *simulacra* penetrate for a few pores of the body and excite the tenuous nature of the mind inside, and hurt its sensitivity.

The other five senses (sight, touch, taste, smell and hearing) are sensory capabilities of the soul. But thought is the quintessential sensation of it. This is produced by images (*eidola*) that contact through the pores of the body with the mind, an organ of thought, as Epicurus said [2 (49) Arrigh. (D.L. 10. 49)]:

> Δεῖ δὲ καὶ νομίζειν ἐπεισιόντος τινὸς ἀπὸ τῶν ἔξωθεν τὰς μορφὰς ὁρᾶν ἡμᾶς καὶ διανοεῖσθαι[20].

> And we must also recognize that, when entering some external objects, we see their forms and we understand them.

According to Lucretius, the *simulacra* that agitate the mind are so subtle that not even the sight captures them (4. 728-731). Moreover, if sight perceives images only while it is awake, the mind always feels and works, even though the body and the other senses rest. For this reason, dreams are nothing less

---

[20] Democritus had already postulated this sensualist premise: Δημόκριτός γέ φησιν φρόνησιν μὲν τὴν αἴσθησιν, ταύτην δ' εἶναι ἀλλοίωσιν (Arist. *Metaph*. 3. 5. 1009b).

than extraordinary images that the mind perceives when the other senses do not distract it (4. 749-776). Mental perception of impossible realities, such as dead people, can be explained because our capacity for discernment is relaxed during sleep (*epimartyresis*). It is hence at that moment when the mind fables and invents, often stimulated by the obsessions that disturb man during the day.

Lucretius also says that the reveries, as the *simulacra*, are captured during sleep, depending on our offices, needs and passions in waking life, and have nothing prophetic or serve as *medium* between the man and the divinity, as the Stoics assert[21]. And that way many lawyers imagine that they defend their causes during sleep, the circus fans think they see games from the stands and the adolescents are left spellbound by the influx of erotic images to their mind; indeed, even the animals fantasize in the torpor with its daily activities: the domestic dogs, for example, threaten to lift its body as if they saw someone (4. 962-972).

This fantastic capacity of the sleep is largely responsible for the existence of religion and, by extension, of ghosts[22]. So the Roman poet says in the book 5, explaining the origin of the religious beliefs (5. 1161-1240), within the section of the history of the civilization (5. 1011-1457).

From the earliest dawn of civilization, religion has played a paramount role, because men, while they were asleep, saw in his imagination the spectra of giant gods who moved and seemed to speak to mortals (5. 1169-1174). Then humans, unable to give an explanation to those gestures, ascribed feeling and an appropriate speech to them, more so, when they seemed to enjoy an eternal life by the continuous arrival of their images (5. 1175-1176). They were considered superior beings, firstly, because they enjoyed immortality (a gift denied to mortals); and, secondly, because they were seen to perform miracles without effort in daydreams (5. 1177-1182). To these wonders, their total ignorance of the causes that ruled the sky, the earth and the universe must be added, so they ended up believing that the gods had created the world and, consequently, ruled it (5. 1183-1187). They consider the sky as eternal abode of the gods, as well as the sun, the moon, the stars, the clouds, the thunder, and the lightning: a set of phenomena that exert great influence on the earth (5. 1188-1193). But, by putting the gods in these instances, mortals attribute the lightning to their anger and the eclipses to their desire for destroying the world (5. 1194-1195).

Due to these superstitions, their hearts were filled with both fear and devotion. However, the real devotion does not lie in being a sanctimonious,

---

[21] We find in Cicero, *Div*. 1. 63-64, an eloquent example of this view (Godwin 2000: 77). Epicurus repudiated the divination, such as the fr. 395 Us. makes clear: Ξενοφάνης καὶ Ἐπίκουρος ἀναιροῦσι τὴν μαντικήν. A vivid portrait of the Epicurean contempt for divination is in the story of Lucian *Alexander the False Prophet*.

[22] Cf. Bailey 1998, vol. 3: 1296 and Giancotti 1998: 508. On the connection already in Antiquity among sleep, night and ghosts, cf. Felton 1999a: 7.

but in observing the world and in trying to explain it. If gods are believed to be rulers of the world, man lives fearful of their mysterious plans: either he is afraid of their punishments or he falls into devotion for gods whom not even the prayers of the nobles and kings appear to move (5. 1194-1240).

The fragment is the most extensive and eloquent from the Epicurean conception of gods and religion (cf. 2. 646-651, 3. 18-24, 5. 146-155 and 6. 68-78), hence its importance[23].

If this happens due to corpuscular effluvia arrived from the *intermundia*, with greater abundance and recurrence this will happen with the countless *simulacra* from objects and beings that float and roam here on earth, mixing and forming authentic chimeras (4. 724-734).

Conclusions

Ghosts, therefore, are nothing more than flying images[24] or old prints that, as preconceptions, the mind recovers from its memory. They exist because atoms are immortal. If living matter dies, its *simulacra* survive, but this does not mean that such beings live in the hereafter, even though eminent poets like Ennius sing it so (1. 117-126):

> *Ennius ut noster cecinit, qui primus amoeno*
> *detulit ex Helicone perenni fronde coronam,*
> *per gentis Italas hominum quae clara clueret;*
> *etsi praeterea tamen esse Acherusia templa*   120
> *Ennius aeternis exponit versibus edens,*
> *quo neque permaneant animae neque corpora nostra,*
> *sed quaedam simulacra modis pallentia miris;*
> *unde sibi exortam semper florentis Homeri*
> *commemorat speciem lacrimas effundere salsas*   125
> *coepisse et rerum naturam expandere dictis*[25].

As our Ennius sings, who first carried down from the pleasurable Helicon the evergreen crown and so he won illustrious fame among the people of Italy. And, still, Ennius states that there are regions of the Acheron, proclaiming it in eternal lines, where neither our souls nor our bodies remain, but some strangely pale *simulacra*; emerged from there, he recalls, the image of the always flourishing Homer began to shed bitter tears and to expose the nature of the universe.

---

[23] Cf. Bailey 1998, vol. 3: 1507.
[24] Cf. Collison-Morley 1912: 14.
[25] For more information on this fragment and the allusion to Ennius, cf. Harrison 2000.

This thesis of the spectral emanations had an extraordinary mark on the treaties of *erotodidaxis* during the Renaissance, especially through the *De amore* (1469) of Marsilius Ficinus[26]. Although Neoplatonism and Christianity were syncretized in these love handbooks, the physiological explanation of the amorous passion (*furor amoris*) given in them owes much to Lucretian atomism, especially in regard to the mechanism by which, either during the wakefulness or sleep, the images of the beloved, alive or dead, touch the feverish mind of the lover, exciting his fantasy. A good example is this sonnet by the Portuguese national poet, Luís Vaz de Camões (1524-1580):

> Quando de minhas magôas a comprida
> Maginação os olhos me adormece,
> Em sonhos aquela alma me aparece
> Que pera mim foi sonho nesta vida.
>
> Lá numa saudade, onde estendida   5
> A vista pelo campo desfalece,
> Corro pera ela; e ela então parece
> Que mais de mim se alonga, compelida.
>
> Brado: "Não me fujais, sombra benina!"
> Ela -os olhos em mim c'um brando pejo,   10
> Como quem diz que já não pode ser-
>
> Torna a fugir-me; e eu gritando: "Dina..."
> Antes que diga *mene*, acordo, e vejo
> Que nem um breve engano posso ter[27].

When the prolific imagination numbs my eyes out my pains, that soul comes to me in dreams that was a dream for me in this life. There, in the nostalgia, where the sight extended across the field falters, I run to her, but it seems she moves further away from me, compelled. I shout: "Do not run from me, benign shadow!". She looks with some embarrassment as if to say it can no longer be, and she returns to flee; and I, shouting "Dina...", wake up before saying "mene", and I realize that not even I can have a brief deception.

---

[26] For its fortune in the Renaissance Italian literature, cf. Prosperi 2004: 158-174. For its projection on European and Spanish literature, cf. Traver Vera 2009: 988-996.

[27] I quote according to the edition of Cidade 1962: 236. This poem was freely imitated (*aemulatio*) by the poet Luis Martin de la Plaza (1577-1625), as revealed by his modern editor and critic Morata Pérez (1995), in his sonnet "Cuando a su dulce olvido me convida".

The role of the ghosts in Seneca's tragedies[1]

Miguel Rodríguez-Pantoja
University of Córdoba
(orcid.org/0000-0002-6115-4412)

Abstract: This chapter aims to present the general frame of Seneca's tragedies, and the formal frame and the typology of the apparitions of ghosts within them. It also reviews the presence of *umbrae* and *simulacra* in Seneca's tragedies. It concludes with a brief reflection about the "afterlife" in the author's dramatic work.

Keywords: Seneca, tragedy, ghost, *umbrae*, *simulacra*, afterlife.

We will focus on the apparition of *umbrae* (and, occasionally, *simulacra*, which are basically different from the former in that they are not identifiable), in Seneca's tragedies: the Greek word *phantasma* appears very sporadically in Latin, at least in the texts that we keep; in fact, according to the *Thesaurus linguae Latinae*, it is used for the first time by Pliny 'the Younger' (61-112 AD) in his important letter on this subject and does not appear again until Tertullian (c. II/III AD)[2].

It deals with the two most common fields where such phenomenon takes place, or is imagined, even in real life: dreams and apparitions.

The general frame: Seneca's tragedies

Before analyzing it in detail, I think that it is necessary to briefly review the literary field where those apparitions take place, the tragedy as it is understood by the Cordubensis.

In general terms, the question often arises from if they were written for performance or only to be read, which, as it happens habitually, has defenders, detractors and intermediate positions[3].

First, we have to try and place them in their cultural context. We all know that when we like a dramatic performance, we tend to enjoy it again when we hear or watch it a second, third or fourth time. That has to do with the intellectual reactions and sensations: it impresses the first time because it is unexpected;

---

[1] This text is the translation of the conference "El papel de los fantasmas en las tragedias de Séneca", presented on May 16, 2013 within the course "El fantasma en la Literatura".

[2] *ThlL* vol. X, 1 p. 204, 71: "*legitur semel apud* PLIN. *min.* [p. 205, 8 ss.: *epist.* 7. 27. 1 velim scire, esse -ta et habere propriam figuram numenque aliquod putes an inania et vana ex metu nostro imaginem accipere] *et inde a* TERT. [p. 2005, 10 s.: apol. 22, 12 -ta Castorum (*sim. de deis paganorum e. g.* idol. 4. 3 servitis -bus et daemoniis et spiritibus)]"

[3] About this matter, cf. Dupont 1997, Fitch 2000, Kragelund 2008.

the rest of them it has a similar effect because the spectator is getting ready, conscious or unconsciously, to enjoy its performance. On the other hand, if the actors are different, they lead to comparison and, therefore, to immediate discussions. In conclusion, the spectator becomes an active protagonist.

Indeed, since the beginning of theatrical performances, we know that the good ones, of course, and even those that are not so good, were repeated over and over again. And it is happening just the same today.

It is evident that an essential part of any drama is what we call staging the action. And since ancient times, as Cicero formulated it with his well-known competence, we know for sure that there is no efficient rhetoric unless it is accompanied by a competent *actio*. It is clearly seen what we mean. Seneca stood out for dominating the word. A question of inheritance: we would exaggerate if we say that he grew up among *controuersiae* and *suasoriae*, his father's main literary activity, but there is no doubt that he had a careful education in that field, so that he was returned from exile in Corsica to Rome by Agrippina, Nero's mother, in order to take care of his rhetoric education.

Consequently, Seneca's tragedies are full of rhetoric, and rhetoric made from the techniques practiced during the time in which he lived. These techniques were so well compiled by his father: the above mentioned controversies and suasories, based on fictitious situations of characters or real circumstances. And we should not forget that both were performances with public, an usually knowledgeable public and, therefore, able of judging what they are watching and listening to. As homework, as advanced as they might be, interested people, as educated as they might be, it is no wonder that the development of a much more complex rhetoric exercise, being a drama, could have a guaranteed public.

The formal frame

All the ghosts that appear in Seneca's dramas came from the Hades, described several times by the author, from the inside as well as the outside.

1. From the inside

Hercules and Theseus saw it with mortal eyes and can tell it, as they return together, in the tragedy that is the first published in the most reliable editions and translations, *Hercules furens*. When Amphitryon asks him, the second one describes it as follows (*Her.F.* 709-722)[4]:

> *Est in recessu Tartari obscuro locus,*
> *quem grauibus umbris spissa caligo alligat.* 710

---

[4] The Latin texts, unless otherwise indicated, are taken from Zwierlein 1986, the translations from Fitsch 2002 and 2004.

> *a fonte discors manat hinc uno latex,*
> *alter quieto similis (hunc iurant dei)*
> *tacente sacram deuehens fluuio Styga;*
> *at hic tumultu rapitur ingenti ferox*
> *et saxa fluctu uoluit Acheron inuius*   715
> *renauigari. cingitur duplici uado*
> *aduersa Ditis regia, atque ingens domus*
> *umbrante luco tegitur. hic uasto specu*
> *pendent tyranni limina, hoc umbris iter,*
> *haec porta regni. campus hanc circa iacet,*   720
> *in quo superbo digerit uultu sedens / animas recentes.*

In a dark recess of Tartarus there is a place bound by thick fog and deep shadows. Here from a single source there flow disparate streams: the one, appearing at rest (by it the gods swear oaths), conveys the sacred Styx on its silent course; the other races fiercely with great turbulence and rolls rocks along in its current —Acheron, impassable to any recrossing. The palace of Dis is ringed in front by this pair of rivers, and the huge house is masked by a shadowing grove. Here is the cavernous arched doorway of the tyrant; this is the path for the shades, the gate of the kingdom. Around it lies a level space, where he sits with a haughty air to organize the newly arrived spirits.

And after that, he continues with the description of the god of the hell, Dis, a Latin translation from the Greek Pluto (a name that, by the way, is only used four times by Seneca, once in *Phaedra* and thrice in *Hercules Oetaeus*[5]). I will omit it, as it is not relevant here.

Here it is interesting to remember a part of the immediate dialogue between the two same protagonists.

Amphitryon asks (*Her.F.* 727-730):

>   *Verane est fama inferis*
> *iam[6] sera reddi iura et oblitos sui*
> *sceleris nocentes debitas poenas dare?*
> *quis iste ueri rector atque aequi arbiter?*   730

Is the story true that belated justice is meted out to those below, and that guilty ones are duly punished though they have forgotten their crimes? Who is that lord of truth and arbiter of justice?

---

[5] Cf. *Phaed.* 628; *Her.O.* 935, 1142 and 1954. In the tragedies Dis appears up to 30 times (and out of them, just one, in *Apoc.* 13. 3. 3).

[6] *iam* Ageno, Fitch: *tam* EA Zwierlein.

Theseus answers (*Her.F.* 735-736):

> *Quod quisque fecit, patitur; auctorem scelus*   735
> *repetit suoque premitur exemplo nocens.*

What each man did, he suffers: the crime recoils on its perpetrator, and the criminal is plagued by the precedent he set.

And further he adds (*Her.F.* 739-745):

> *Quisquis est placide potens*
> *dominusque uitae seruat innocuas manus*   740
> *et incruentum mitis imperium regit*
> *animaeque[7] parcit, longa permensus diu*
> *uiuacis[8] aeui spatia uel caelum petit*
> *uel laeta felix nemoris Elysii loca,*
> *iudex futurus.*   745

But anyone who governs mildly, who keeps his hands guiltless as master of life and death, who conducts a gentle, bloodless reign and spares lives —he measures the long sweep of a life full of years, and then reaches either heaven or the happy setting of the blessed Elysian grove, to serve as judge.

This idea of punishment after death, personalized in a number of famous people, is a recurrent issue, as we will see, in Seneca's tragedies. When Amphitryon asks, Theseus numbers the most outstanding (*Her.F.* 750-759):

> *Rapitur uolucri tortus Ixion rota;*   750
> *ceruice saxum grande Sisyphia sedet;*
> *in amne medio faucibus siccis senex*
> *sectatur undas, alluit mentum latex,*
> *fidemque cum iam saepe decepto dedit,*
> *perit unda in ore; poma destituunt famem.*   755
> *praebet uolucri Tityos aeternas dapes*
> *urnasque frustra Danaides plenas gerunt;*
> *errant furentes impiae Cadmeides*
> *terretque mensas auida Phineas auis.*

Ixion is whirled and racked on a speeding wheel; a huge rock rests on Sisyphus' neck. In mid-river an old man with parched jaws pursues the water; it laps against

---

[7] *animaeque* E PCS Fitch: *animoque* TPC recc. Zwierlein.
[8] *uiuacis* Bentley, Fitch: *felicis* EA Zwierlein.

his chin, and after inspiring his trust, though so often deceived, it vanishes from his mouth; the fruits leave his hunger cheated[9]. Tityos furnishes the vulture with an eternal feast, and the Danaids carry full pitchers to no avail. The unnatural Cadmeids wander in madness, and the gluttonous birds threaten Phineus' table[10].

2. From the outside

2.1. Talthybius, Agamemnon's messenger, claims to have seen with his own eyes (using the same words coming from Juno's mouth when he appeared in *Her.F.* 50: *uidi, ipsa uidi*) and heard Achilles' ghost in *Troades*. He describes the scene like this (*Tro.* 168-180):

> *Pauet animus, artus horridus quassat tremor.*
> *maiora ueris monstra (uix capiunt fidem)*
> *uidi ipse, uidi. summa iam Titan iuga*   170
> *stringebat ortu, uicerat noctem dies,*
> *cum subito caeco terra mugitu fremens*
> *concussa totos traxit ex imo sinus;*
> *mouere siluae capita et excelsum nemus*
> *fragore uasto tonuit et lucus sacer;*   175
> *Idaea ruptis saxa ceciderunt iugis.*
> *[nec terra solum tremuit: et pontus suum*
> *adesse Achillem sensit ac uoluit[11] uada.]*
> *Tum scissa uallis aperit immensos specus*
> *et hiatus Erebi peruium ad superos iter*
> *tellure fracta praebet ac tumulum leuat.*   180

My mind feels fear, a shuddering tremor shakes my body. Things too unnatural to be true —they scarcely command belief— I saw with my own eyes, I saw then. The Titan was just grazing the mountain ridges as he rose, day had defeated night, when suddenly the earth shook with a muffled roar and heaved all of this inner recesses from the lowest depths. The treetops swayed; lofty woodland and sacred grove thundered with an awesome sound of breaking. On Ida rocks fell from the shattered ridges. Not only the earth trembled: the sea too sensed its own Achilles near, and made its waters roll.

Then a newly opened chasm revealed measureless hollows, and the gaping maw of Erebus gave passage to the world above through the fractured earth, and eased the tomb's weight[12].

---

[9] Referring to Tantalus.
[10] It refers to the harpies.
[11] *uoluit* suggested as one possibility by Delz and Fitch: *strauit* EA Zwierlein.
[12] The great tomb of Achilles.

Then he narrates Achilles' apparition, about which we will discuss later.

2.2. Something similar happens in *Thyestes*, where the messenger describes an access to after death through a holy place with several votive offering and mentions the apparition of *simulacra*, or spectral images (*Thy.* 650-656+665-673):

> Arcana in imo regio secessu iacet,   650
> alta uetustum ualle compescens nemus,
> penetrale regni, nulla qua laetos solet
> praebere ramos arbor aut ferro coli,
> sed taxus et cupressus et nigra ilice
> obscura nutat silua, quam supra eminens   655
> despectat alte quercus et uincit nemus.
> ...
> Fons stat sub umbra tristis et nigra piger   665
> haeret palude: talis est dirae Stygis
> deformis unda quae facit caelo fidem.
> hinc nocte caeca gemere feralis deos
> fama est, catenis lucus excussis sonat
> ululantque manes. quidquid audire est metus   670
> illic uidetur: errat antiquis uetus
> emissa bustis turba et insultant loco
> maiora notis monstra.

At the farthest and lowest remove there lies a secret area that confines an age-hold woodland in a deep vale —the inner sanctum of the realm. There are no trees here such as stretch out healthy branches and are tended with the knife, but yews and cypresses and a darkly stirring thicket of black ilex, above which a towering oak looks down from his height and masters the grove. [...]
In the gloom is a dismal stagnant spring, oozing slowly in the black swamp. Such is the unsightly stream of dread Styx, which generates trust in heaven. Here in the blind darkness rumour has it that death gods groan; the grove resounds to the rattling of chains, and ghosts howl. Anything fearful to *hear* can be *seen* there. A hoary crowd walks abroad, released from their ancient tombs, and things more monstrous than any known caper about the place.

We should remark that there is also a generic reference to ghostly beings, coming from the Hades, called by the name *simulacra*, in *Oedipus*, when the chorus refers the misfortunes that affect Thebes (*Oed.* 171-175):

Quin Taenarii uincula ferri
rupisse canem fama et nostris
errare locis, mugisse solum,
uaga per lucos <uolitasse sacros>[13]
simulacra uirum maiora uiris.   175

Yet more, the hound[14] has burst his chains of Taenarian iron, some say, and roams at large in our land; the earth has groaned: through the <sacred> groves <have flitted> errant images of men, larger than men.

Typology of the apparitions

Once we have seen the frame, it is time to establish, although just to lead this process, a basic typology of what we can interpret as a ghost, or apparition, and its objectives in the tragedies that we are dealing with.

A.- We will start with the objectives:

    A.a. Claiming revenge

    A.b. Informing or warning about something

B.- Regarding the introduction we can discuss:

    B.a. Apparitions that take a direct part in the dramatic action:

They are the ghosts that act on stage in front of the spectators, like characters interpreted by an actor. The inclusion in the context that we are dealing with can be argued, but, certainly, they are visions of supernatural or fantastic beings. Although the playwright places them formally in the same level as the human beings, they have their own characteristics, because they go beyond nature's limits. The two ghosts that take part in Seneca's tragedies play a similar role to that of Juno in *Hercules furens*' prologue.

    B.b. Apparitions that do not take part directly in the dramatic action:

They are the shades that appear in front of specific characters and whose presence we know through them. Their participation can be important in the development of the drama.

    Such apparitions have at least two ways of being show in dramatic fiction. They can be, in fact,

        B.b.1 Induced (evocations). They are an answer to the participation of someone who is able to contact death beings, to see what they are doing and hear what they are saying, arousing their presence more or less willingly.

        B.b.2 Non induced. They are occasional and admit at least two differences:

            B.b.2.1 In direct visions

---

[13] Lacuna identified, and supplement proposed, by Zwierlein.

[14] Cerberus.

B.b.2.2 In dreams

C.- If ghosts take part in the action directly or indirectly, they do it in two ways:

    C.a. Addressing the spectators

    C.b. Addressing any of the characters within the plot. And here again there are two options:

        C.b.1 Human beings

        C.b.2 Non human beings

D.- When ghosts do not appear on stage, some of their physical traits are described. Laius: *stetit per artus sanguine effuso horridus, / paedore foedo squalidam obtentus comam* (*Oed*. 624-626, "he stands caked in the blood that poured over his body, with his hair covered in squalid filth"); Apsyrtus: *cuius umbra dispersis uenit / incerta membris?* (*Her.O.* 963-964, "whose shade approaches ill-defined with limbs dispersed?"); Hector: *non ille uultus flammeum intendens iubar, / sed fessus ac deiectus et fletu grauis / similisque nostro, squalida obtectus coma* (*Tro*. 448-450, "it was not that face directing its fiery radiant gaze, but one tired and downcast and heavy with weeping, and like my own, masked by filthy hair"); Achilles: *emicuit ingens umbra Thessalici ducis, / Threicia qualis arma proludens tuis / iam, Troia, fatis strauit…* (*Tro*. 181ff., "Out darted the huge ghost of the Thessalian chief, looking as when he defeated Thracian arms, already in training for your doom, Troy…").

Ghosts in Seneca's tragedies

Once we have established the typology, and leaving behind those unnamed *simulacra* that *Thyestes*' messenger and *Oedipus*' chorus referred to, it is time to see the ghosts that appear in Seneca's tragedies.

- In section B.a ("Apparitions that take a direct part in the dramatic action") we include the protagonists of *Agamemnon* and *Thyestes*' prologues.

1. The drama *Agamemnon* starts with the presence on stage of Thyestes, Tantalus' grandson, Atreus' brother and Aegisthus' father's shade, inviting these ones to avenge his son [A.a].

Thyestes, *profundo Tartari emissus* (*Ag*. 2 "released from Tartarus' deep cavern"), addresses the spectators [C.a]: *En horret animus et pauor membra excutit* (*Ag*. 5 "Ah, my spirit shudders, my limbs tremble") and, after describing the tortures, which he obviously knows because he has seen them live, of Ixion (*Ag*. 15-16 *ille celeri corpus euinctus rotae / in se refertur*: "the one whose body is bound to a swift wheel circles back on himself"), Sisyphus (*Ag*. 16-17 *per aduersum irritus / redeunte totiens luditur saxo labor*: "uphill toil is vain and mocked as the stone repeatedly descends"), Tityus (*Ag*. 18 *tondet ales auida fecundum iecur*: "the greedy bird crops the ever growing liver") and Tantalus (*Ag*. 19-20 *et inter undas feruida exustus siti / aquas fugaces*

ore decepto appetit: "one parched mid-river with burning thirst seeks the fleeting water with his often cheated lips")[15], numbers their own sins, which have changed nature (*Ag.* 34 *uersa natura est retro*), and addresses Aegisthus [C.b.1] *causa natalis tui, / Aegisthe, uenit* (*Ag.* 48-49 "the reason for your birth has come, Aegisthus").

Indeed, according to some oracles, Thyestes, whose brother Atreus had killed his three sons, serving then in a feast, could only be avenged by another of his sons, the result of incestuous relations with his daughter Pelopia. This son was, obviously, Aegisthus, who at the beginning of the drama was joined to Clytemnestra, Agamemnon's wife, Atreus' son, who was killed by both of them. Thyestes' ghost foresees it: *iam scelera prope sunt, iam dolus caedes cruor...* (*Ag.* 47 "now crimes are near, now treachery, slaughter, gore...").

2. If in *Agamemnon* the shade that materializes in front of the spectators is Thyestes, in the tragedy whose name is that of this character, appears his grandfather's, Tantalus, who begins, as well as the previous one, wondering *quis inferorum sede ab infausta extrahit / auido fugaces ore captantem cibos* (*Thy.* 1-2 "from the accursed abode of the underworld, who drags forth the one that catches at vanishing food with his avid mouth?"), and then mentions his torture: *peius inuentum est siti / arente in undis aliquid et peius fame / hiante semper?* (*Thy.* 4-6 "has something worse been devised than thirst parched amidst water, worse than hunger that gapes forever?").

Later he will find out that they are the Furies, with one of whom he dialogues along this prologue [C.b.2]. But before doing so, he also refers to the same tortures that Thyestes mentioned (*Thy.* 6-12):

> *Sisyphi numquid lapis*
> *gestandus umeris lubricus nostris uenit*
> *aut membra celeri differens cursu rota,*
> *aut poena Tityi, qui specu uasto patens*
> *uulneribus atras pascit effossis aues*   10
> *et nocte reparans quidquid amisit die*
> *plenum recenti pabulum monstro iacet?*

Can it be that Sisyphus' stone comes to be carried —so slippery— on my shoulders, or the wheel[16] that racks limbs in its swift rotation? Or the punishment of Tityos, who with his cavernous vast opening feeds dark birds from his quarried

---

[15] Description of the tortures: *Her.F.* 750ff.: Ixion, Sisyphus, Tantalus, Tityus, Danaids, "Cadmus' daughters" (Agave and Ino), Phineus; *Phaed.* 1229ff. (Theseus) "Sentenced shades": Sisyphus, Tantalus, Tityus, Ixion; *Ag.* 15ff. (Thyestes' ghost): Ixion, Sisyphus, Tityus, Tantalus; *Her.O.* 942ff.: Sisyphus, Tantalus, Ixion, Tityus, Danaids, Procne…, 1068ff. wheel (Ixion), Tityus, Tantalus, Sisyphus.

[16] Of Ixion.

wounds —who regrows by night what he lost by day, and lies as a full meal for the fresh monster?

Tantalus tries to avoid tragedy by speaking about his grandchildren [C.b.1] (*Thy.* 93-95):

> *Moneo, ne sacra manus*
> *uiolate caede neue furiali malo*
> *aspergite aras. stabo et arcebo scelus.* 95

I warn you, do not defile your hands with accursed bloodshed, and do not sprinkle the altars with the evil of avenging fury. I shall stand and block the crime.

But his own presence is already baneful, as the Fury explains: *sentit introitus tuos / domus et nefando tota contactu horruit* (*Thy.* 103-104, "the house feels you entering, and shudders throughout at this accursed contact"), being satisfied: *actum est abunde. gradere ad infernos specus / amnemque notum* (*Thy.* 105-106, "it is done, and amply! Go to the infernal caverns and the river you know").

Here it is the presence of the Furies that indicates that we are again in front of revenge as an objective [A.a.].

- Section B.b. ("Apparitions that do not take part directly in the dramatic action") is, obviously, more complex.

It can be used as an example of direct evocation of the afterlife's souls (and, finally, goddess Hecate's) [B.b.1] Medea's, in the tragedy which is named after her, where, once again, we find Ixion, Tantalus and Sisyphus' known tortures, to which he adds Danaid's (*Med.* 740-751):

> *Comprecor uulgus silentum uosque ferales deos* 740
> *…*
> *supplicis, animae, remissis currite ad thalamos nouos:*
> *rota resistat membra torquens, tangat Ixion humum,*
> *Tantalus securus undas hauriat Pirenidas,* 745
> *[grauior uni poena sedeat coniugis socero mei]*
> *lubricus per saxa retro Sisyphum soluat lapis.*
> *uos quoque, urnis quas foratis inritus ludit labor,*
> *Danaides, coite: uestras hic dies quaerit manus.*
> *- nunc meis uocata sacris, noctium sidus, ueni* 750
> *pessimos induta uultus, fronte non una minax.*

I invoke the thronging silent dead, and you the gods of the grave. […] Eased of your torments, run, you ghosts, to this strange marriage rite; the wheel that tortures limbs my stop, Ixion touch the ground, and Tantalus may swallow

down Pirene's stream in peace. But my heavier punishment rest on one, my husband's marriage relation: over the rocks may the slippery stone roll Sisyphus back downhill. And you who are mocked by fruitless toil with pitchers pierced by holes, assemble here, you Danaids: this day demands your hands. Now summoned by my rites appear, you heavenly globe of night, displaying your most hostile looks, with menace in every face[17].

3. In the tragedy *Oedipus*, it is Creon, Jocasta's brother, who sees to the details and the whole ritual put on stage in its appropriate place by the seer Tiresias to evoke the shades and find out the remedy for the misfortune that destroys Thebes [B.b.1]. Creon wants his words to be real, stating them before describing the wonders that he is watching, with a resource that we have already seen in Juno and Talthybius' mouths (*Oed*. 583-586):

> *Ipse pallentes deos*
> *uidi inter umbras, ipse torpentes lacus*
> *noctemque ueram; gelidus in uenis stetit*   585
> *haesitque sanguis.*

With my own eyes I saw the pallid gods among the shades, I saw the stagnant lakes and authentic night. My blood stopped still, cold in my veins.

He finishes with a physical description of Laius, Oedipus' father (*Oed*. 608-626):

> *Pauide latebras nemoris umbrosi petunt*
> *animae trementes: primus emergit solo,*
> *dextra ferocem cornibus taurum premens,*   610
> *Zethus, manuque sustinet laeua chelyn*
> *qui saxa dulci traxit Amphion sono,*
> *interque natos Tantalis tandem suos*
> *tuto superba fert caput fastu graue*
> *et numerat umbras. peior hac genetrix adest*   615
> *furibunda Agaue, tota quam sequitur manus*
> *partita regem: sequitur et Bacchas lacer*
> *Pentheus tenetque saeuus etiamnunc minas.*
> *Tandem uocatus saepe pudibundum extulit*
> *caput atque ab omni dissidet turba procul*   620
> *celatque semet (instat et Stygias preces*
> *geminat sacerdos, donec in apertum efferat*
> *uultus opertos) Laïus - fari horreo:*

---

[17] It refers to Hecate.

stetit per artus sanguine effuso horridus,
paedore foedo squalidam obtentus comam,   625
et ore rabido fatur.

In panic the timid spirits seek out hiding places in the shadowed grove. First
to emerge from the ground is Zethus, his right hand restraining a fierce bull
by the horns, and Amphion, holding in his left hand the lyre whose sweet
sound once shifted stones. Amongst her children the Tantalid[18], at last safe
in her pride, carries her head high in insufferable arrogance and counts her
ghosts. Here is a worse mother than she, frenzied Agave, followed by the whole
troop that sundered the king; the Bacchae are followed by the torn Pentheus,
still fiercely continuing his threats.
The one repeatedly summoned at last raises his head, sullied as it is, but stays
concealed far from the main crowd. Insistently the priest redoubles his Stygian
prayers, until Laius reveals his hidden face. I shudder to speak of it. He stands
caked in the blood that poured over his body, with his hair covered in squalid
filth, and speaks in rage.

Then he mentions Laius' long speech, who, first addressing the *Cadmi
effera /… domus* (*Oed.* 626-627, "savage house of Cadmus") and later Oedipus
himself [C.b.1], explains his murder and his own revenge, which will not end
until Oedipus suffers a worthy punishment. Again we are in front of a shade that
claims revenge [A.a].

4. As a non-induced apparition, we can add Medea's vision, who, in her
delirium, watches the Furies and his brother (Apsyrtus') shade, whom she had
killed and torn apart so that her father Aeetes delayed his chase when Medea
was fleeing with Jason after seizing the Golden Fleece [B.b.2.1]. Apsyrtus also
claims revenge [A.a] (*Her.O.* 963-965):

    Cuius umbra dispersis uenit
incerta membris? frater est, poenas petit:
dabimus, sed omnes.   965

Whose shade approaches ill-defined with limbs dispersed? It is my brother, he
seeks amends. We shall pay them, yes, everyone.

5. Similarly non-induced is the apparition that Talthybius, Agamemnon's
messenger, refers in *Tro.* 190-197. I have already mentioned the participation
of this character describing the place where *tum scissa uallis aperit immensos
specus / et hiatus Erebi peruium ad superos iter / tellure fracta praebet* (*Tro.* 178-
180 "then a newly opened chasm revealed measureless hollows, and the gaping

---

18 Niobe.

maw of Erebus gave passage to the word above through the fractured earth"), through which *emicuit ingens umbra Thesalici ducis* (*Tro.* 181 "out darted the huge ghost of the Thessalian chief"), that is to say, Achilles, claiming Polyxena's, Hecuba and Priam's younger daughter, sacrifice at the hands of Pyrrhus, Achilles and Deidamia's son himself, so as to calm his *manes* and Greece keeps on paying for the big heroes' anger. Only thus could the Greeks surf what he calls "my seas" (her mother Thetis was the daughter of the marine god Nereus).

In this case, the narrator, after describing his appearance by means of a comparison, *Threicia qualis arma proludens tuis / iam, Troia, fatis strauit…* (*Tro.* 182-183 "looking as when he defeated Thracian arms, already in training for your doom, Troy…"), he states the literal words of the ghost addressing the Greeks [C.b.1] claiming revenge [A.a.] (*Tro.* 191-196):

> 'Ite, ite, inertes, debitos manibus meis
> auferte honores, soluite ingratas rates
> per nostra ituri maria. non paruo luit
> iras Achillis Graecia et magno luet:
> desponsa nostris cineribus Polyxene   195
> Pyrrhi manu mactetur et tumulum riget'.

> Go on, you idlers, carry away the honours owed to my hands, launch your ungrateful ships —to travel through my seas! It cost Greece no small price to appease Achilles' wrath, and it will cost her dear. Let Polyxena, betrothed to my ashes, be sacrificed by Pyrrhus' hand and quench the tomb's thirst.

6. It is not induced, but it materializes through a dream, the one which as it did in *Troades* appears to Andromache: in this case it is Hector, her husband, who advises what to do in order to save her son [A.a.].

Andromache refers to her dream in a dialogue with an old man (*Tro.* 434-436):

> Turbat atque agitat Phrygas
> communis iste terror; hic proprie meum   435
> exterret animum, noctis horrendae sopor.

> That is a shared terror which disturbs and shakes the Prygians, but my mind is filled with a private dread from this fearful night's dream.

And, on his behalf, she describes his aspect, as we have already seen, specifying it (*Tro.* 443-450):

> Cum subito nostros Hector ante oculos stetit,
> non qualis ultro bella in Argiuos ferens

> *Graias petebat facibus Idaeis rates*   445
> *…*
> *non ille uultus flammeum intendens iubar,*
> *sed fessus ac deiectus et fletu grauis*
> *similisque nostro, squalida obtectus coma.*   450

Suddenly Hector stood before my eyes, not as he looked when he carried the war forward against the Argives and attacked Greek ships with Idaean firebrands, […] it was not that face directing its fiery radiant gaze, but one tired and downcast and heavy with weeping, and like my own, masked by filthy hair.

On this occasion the words of the apparition are stated (*Tro.* 452-456):

> *'Dispelle somnos' inquit 'et natum eripe,*
> *o fida coniunx: lateat, haec una est salus.*
> *omitte fletus -Troia quod cecidit gemis?*
> *utinam iaceret tota. festina, amoue*   455
> *quocumque nostrae paruulam stirpem domus'*

"Cast off sleep, my faithful wife, and rescue our son. He must be hidden, this is the only hope of safety. Leave off weeping. Are you lamenting Troy's fall? I wish she were completely fallen! Hurry, take the little offspring of our house away somewhere, anywhere!"

Summary table

Character	Tragedy	Apparition	Speaks	Description	Objective
Thyestes	*Agam.*	direct	yes	-	revenge
Tantalus	*Thy.*	direct	yes	-	revenge
Laius	*Oed.*	evocation	yes	yes	revenge
(Apsyrtus)	*Med.*	vision	no	no	revenge
Achilles	*Tro.*	vision	yes	yes	revenge
Hector	*Tro.*	dream	yes	yes	warning

To sum up, apart from the spectral images or *simulacra* mentioned twice in different circumstances, there are six ghosts that appear on stage in two ways: directly at the beginning of the tragedies (Thyestes and Tantalus) and through specific people's evocations, visions or dreams (Laius, Apsyrtus, Achilles, Hector). These, except for Apsyrtus, whose name is not even mentioned, are described likewise by an intermediate person, who is watching them now and had seen them alive; a message is transmitted through this person, with the purpose of claiming revenge.

The value of the apparitions in Seneca's work: the afterlife

Ghosts, the shades that we have been reviewing, are beings intimately joined to "life" after death. Their simple presence, which goes beyond the *simulacra*, because they are identifiable by their presence even by their voice, implies the admission that, not only the soul, but also some corporeality exists, since they are described, when necessary, with physical traits[19]. In fact, they are *umbrae*, something always joined to a corporeal entity.

Even, as we have seen, Seneca offers, through Theseus' eyes, the description of the Hades divided in the two classical parts: the part of the good ones, the Elysian Fields, and the one of those that were not, a place of punishment, gloomy, dark, where there were even some sounds of chains; in conclusion, the performance of all the evils that fetter the men. In that same passage he speaks about a justice *post mortem*.

The ghosts that we are dealing with are "shades", not "souls"; the souls themselves, as they are ethereal, go up to heaven, according to the most elemental physical law. Seneca is not a theorist of philosophy, but an eclectic and pragmatic one who, as such, cannot omit, in such an important issue, at the most, a vague negation or acceptation, based on the doctrines of the "wise" or, just, the belief of the most.

In fact, in all of his work, depending on the circumstances, he openly admits the immortality of the soul, not even partial, that is to say, until the end of a cycle, following the Stoic doctrine (thus, above all, in the *Consolationes ad Martiam* and *ad Polybium*), or he considers it a *desideratum* and he even denies it in the so discussed chorus, typically Epicurean, of *Troades*, which, from the formal point of view, has a rhetoric component, where the technique of the customary syllogism appears[20].

Before ending, it will be a good idea to see and contextualize that Trojan chorus, which participates immediately after Calchas, the fortune teller, announced the two terrible conditions imposed by the *fata* in order that the Greek fleet can sail: the sacrifice of Polyxena, Priam and Hecuba's daughter, *Thessali busto ducis* (*Tro.* 361 "on the Thessalian leader's tomb"), that is to say Achilles, and Astyanax's, also Hector and Andromache's son, dropping

---

[19] Another thing is the repeated description of the main punishments suffered by mythic characters who evidently are related to the ethic objectives of Seneca's philosophy, taking into account that they refer to unnatural actions and pride actions: Tantalus (Zeus and the oceanid Pluto's son) was punished for killing his son Pelops and serving him in a feast to the gods; Ixion (Ares' grandson) for his tray, obviously failed, to force Juno and, later, make fun of the gods, priding of his great feat; Tityus (Zeus' son) also for having tried to rape Leto, Apollo and Diana's mother, or else Diana herself; Sisyphus (Aeolus' son) similarly for having tried to deceive the gods; the Danaids (daughters of a Nayad) for killing their husbands, fulfilling certainly, an order of his father; Agave and Ino (daughter and granddaughter of the goddess Harmonia) for destroying Pentheus, her son and brother, respectively...

[20] Cf. Laguna Mariscal 1997: 206-207.

him from the top of the tower. The Trojan women say (*Tro.* 371-372+378-381+390-392+397+401-408):

> *Verum est an timidos fabula decipit*
> *umbras corporibus uiuere conditis?*
> *…*
> *an toti morimur nullaque pars manet*
> *nostri, cum profugo spiritus halitu*
> *immixtus nebulis cessit in aera*   380
> *et nudum tetigit subdita fax latus?*
> *...*
> *nec amplius*   390
> *iuratos superis qui tetigit lacus,*
> *usquam est;*
> *…*
> *post mortem nihil est ipsaque mors nihil,*   397
> *…*
> *mors indiuidua est, noxia corpori*   401
> *nec parcens animae: Taenara et aspero*
> *regnum sub domino limen et obsidens*
> *custos non facili Cerberus ostio*
> *rumores uacui uerbaque inania*   405
> *et par sollicito fabula somnio.*
> *quaeris quo iaceas post obitum loco?*

Is it true, or a tale to deceive the faint-hearted, that spirits live on after bodies are buried […]? Or do we die wholly, and does no part of us survive, once the spirit carried on the fugitive breath has mingled with the mist and receded into the air, and the kindling torch has touched the naked flesh? […] No longer does one who has reached the pools[21] that bind the gods' oaths exist at all. […] After death is nothing, and death itself is nothing […] Death is indivisible, destructive to the body and not sparing the soul. Taenarus, and the kingdom under his harsh lord, and Cerberus guarding the entrance with his unyielding gate —hollow rumours, empty words, a tale akin to a troubled dream.

A Trojan chorus speaks, I insist, who have just heard the tale of the shouts thrown by Achilles' ghost, leaving the infernal areas, and the verdict of the *fatum* itself. The reality stated by Talthybius, which I have already repeated (*uidi ipse, uidi*), contrasts, within the structure of the drama, with the words of the women who try desperately to avoid the consequences of such a vision, appealing to the impossibility of its being real, because there is not anything after that.

---

[21] Those of the Styx.

And it is meaningful that a little before, the misfortunate Hecuba threw a shout of hope, while stating (*Tro.* 145-150):

> *'Felix Priamus' dicite cunctae:*   145
> *liber manes uadit ad imos,*
> *nec feret umquam uicta Graiium*
> *ceruice iugum;*
> *non ille duos uidet Atridas*
> *nec fallacem cernit Vlixem...*   150

«Blest is Priam» you should all say: he goes in freedom to the shades below, and his neck will never bear the yoke of the Greeks in defeat. He does not see the two sons of Atreus, he does not behold deceitful Ulysses.

And the chorus answered (*Tro.* 156-163):

> *'Felix Priamus' dicimus omnes:*
> *secum excedens sua regna tulit.*
> *nunc Elysii nemoris tutis*
> *errat in umbris interque pias*
> *felix animas Hectora quaerit.*   160
> *Felix Priamus:*
> *felix quisquis bello moriens*
> *omnia secum consumpta tulit.*

«Blest is Priam» we all say: in departing he has taken his kingdom with him. Now he wanders among the peaceful shadows of the Elysian grove, and blest among the righteous spirits he looks for Hector. Blest is Priam; blest is anyone who, dying in war, has taken with him his whole destroyed world.

Seneca applies here, as I have said before, what is the most efficient in each case in order to reflect different situations of man's life and behavior, definitely the only protagonist in a strict sense of the tragedy.

I do not think that we can extrapolate from these statements what the author believes, since the author makes use of this rhetorical device in order to remark the dramatic character in some works which, on the other hand, everyone considers fiction[22].

---

[22] As Setaioli 2000: 282 n. 37 states, "Le numerose descrizioni dell'oltretomba mitologico che appaiono nelle tragedie si spiegano appunto col fatto che in esse Seneca parla da poeta, non da filosofo", and underlines (322) the "sostanziale irrelevanza del problema dell'oltretomba dal punto di vista senecano". Cf. also Laguna Mariscal 1997 passim.

(Página deixada propositadamente em branco)

Ghosts of girlfriends past: development of a literary episode[1]

Gabriel Laguna Mariscal
University of Córdoba
(orcid.org/0000-0001-5554-3473)

Abstract: Most ancient Greeks and Romans believed in the ability of ghosts to interact and communicate with living humans by means of apparitions, usually through dreams. The ghost of a beloved one could show up to the surviving lover with the purpose of reproaching him for his past behavior or conveying instructions. This chapter explores some relevant milestones in the history of this literary motif from Homer to contemporary culture. As a precedent, Patroclus appears to Achilles to require a proper burial (*Il.* 23. 65-107). In Propertius (*Elegies* 4.7), Cynthia shows up to Propertius in a dream and reproaches him. The Propertian passage will be a key reference for later treatments. Petrarch remembers Laura's visits from heaven in numerous poems of his *Canzoniere*. The Mannerist poet Luis Martín de Plaza also dedicated a moving sonnet to the motif to express his feelings of haplessness. In contemporary poetry, Jaime Gil de Biedma describes the ghostly visit of his beloved Bel as a symbol of remorse. The motif constitutes the subject-matter of an entire poetic cycle by Luis Alberto de Cuenca: the ghostly visits only cause frustration in him.

Keywords: Ghosts, girlfriend, topos, classical tradition, divination, dreams, apparition, epiphany.

In this chapter, we will first examine the beliefs of ancient Greeks and Romans about the apparitions of ghosts. Then we will survey some relevant milestones of the transmission of a literary topic: the visit of a deceased girlfriend to her beloved in a dream. The scene of Patroclus appearing to Achilles can be interpreted as a referential precedent. Propertius took inspiration from this Homeric model for describing the apparition of Cynthia in his elegy 4. 7. In its turn, Propertius' elegy will become a model in Western literature for Petrarch, Luis Martín de la Plaza, Jaime Gil de Biedma, and Luis Alberto de Cuenca. The motif reappears in contemporary mass culture, which confirms its relevance.

Beliefs of Greeks and Romans about the Visits of Ghosts

Did ancient Greeks and Romans believe in ghosts? The safest answer to this question would be: some did, some did not. As a scholar remarks, classical beliefs about the survival of the human soul after death lacked consensus and

---

[1] I am grateful to the two anonymous referees for their critical suggestions.

"ranged from the completely nihilistic denial of after-life, through a vague sense of souls' ghostly existence, to a concept of the individual soul's survival and of personal survival in a recognizable form"[2]. The Atomists and Epicureans were the most reluctant to accept the existence of the ghosts and tried to provide a materialistic explanation for them[3]; on the other hand, the Stoics and the Pythagoreans believed in the existence of ghosts and in prophetic appearances[4]. The Peripatetics and Academics held a more ambiguous position[5].

Now it is true that ghost episodes are featured conspicuously in many fictional texts of classical literature. In Aeschylus' *Persians*, the ghost of the late king Darius, summoned by the Chorus, appears on stage to comment about the situation of the Persian empire[6]; in the *Iliad* by Homer, the shadow of Patroclus communicates with Achilles (we will analyze this passage); and, in the *Aeneid* by Vergil, the ghost of Creusa appears to his husband Aeneas[7]. This does not prove that Greeks and Romans believed in these ghostly manifestations at face value. Similarly, popular success of modern films like *Ghost* (1990), *Casper* (1995), and *The Sixth Sense* (1999), as well as of television series like *American Horror Story* (2011), does not prove that Americans believe in the existence of ghosts[8], although it does suggest that American people are familiar with ghost folklore and are readily able to recognize the main conventions of this kind of stories.

The Romans were quite prone to what we would consider today superstitious attitudes. They believed in Fortune as a leading principle of nature and furthermore as a quality inherent in some individuals[9]. Romans classified days in the calendar as *fasti* or *nefasti* (adequate or inadequate for business and ceremonies). They conceived religion as a contractual rapport with gods: devotees payed sacrifices to the gods, and these protected the Roman state in exchange. They believed that future was predetermined and, consequently, that it could be explored by means of divination practices (as shown in *De divinatione* by Cicero). For another thing, many Romans believed that they could achieve their purposes by the means of magical operations[10]. Most of them took prodigies and portents as warnings from the gods.

---

[2] Hopkins 1983: 227. Felton 1999a: 4-21 discusses ancient views on ghosts, held both by common people and philosophers.

[3] See Felton 1999a: 21, Traver Vera 2014 and the chapter by Traver Vera in this volume.

[4] See Cic., *Div.* 1. 27 and the discussion by Lévy 1997 and Felton 1999a: 20-21.

[5] Kemper 1993: 18, Felton 1999a: 21.

[6] A., *Pers.* 681-842. A relevant detail is the fact that Darius' ghost comments on the difficulty to exit Hades (*Pers.* 688-690). On this episode see Hernán-Pérez Guijarro 2009: 36-38. On ghosts in Greek tragedy the *locus classicus* is Hickman 1938; see also Aguirre Castro 2006 and 2009.

[7] Verg., *A.* 2. 771-794.

[8] For the beliefs of modern Americans about ghosts, see the statistics cited by Emmons 2003: 92.

[9] Cic., *De Imperio Cn. Pompei* 28: *scientiam rei militaris, virtutem, auctoritatem, felicitatem*. Paragraphs 47-48 are devoted to prove Pompey's intrinsic fortune.

[10] See Luck 1985, Socas 2011.

Against this background, it should come as no surprise that most common Romans would accept that ghosts, defined as "a disembodied figure believed to be the spirit of a living being who has died"[11], could keep a certain form of existence[12]. The *Di Manes* were considered precisely a collective divinity of the deceased. The phrase D. M. S. (*Deis Manibus Sacrum*, "consecrated to the gods Manes") was customarily dedicated to them in funeral inscriptions, and they received regular cult in the *Parentalia* festivities. In the festival *Feralia*, which closed the *Parentalia*, people brought humble offerings to the graves of their relatives, intended to placate the potential hostility of the spirits[13]. It is therefore safe to assume that Roman feared the possibility of these ghosts interacting with living people. Furthermore, Roman people believed that the ghosts of unburied dead, called *Lemures*, haunted inhabited areas, so they should be appeased by means of apotropaic rites carried out during the *Lemuria* festivity.

An episode in the comedy *Mostellaria* by Plautus can contribute to a better pondering of Roman beliefs about ghosts. In this play, we find the earliest extant haunted-house story in classical literature[14]. The *Mostellaria* belongs to the *palliata comoedia*-genre, whose plot takes place in a relatively realistic setting and whose characters are ordinary people. In fact, the ghost episode is simply a story made up by a slave. While Theopropides is travelling abroad, his son Philolaches dilapidates the familiar fortune. When the old father returns home unexpectedly, the slave Tranio tries to keep him from the house and from finding out about his son's misbehavior. Tranio tells Theopropides that the whole family has been forced to abandon the house, because it has been haunted by a ghost. To add likelihood, the slave inserts an explanation typical of ghost folktales: the ghost haunts the house because he had been violently murdered and badly buried (497-505), and the ghost himself disclosed his story to Philolaches in dreams (490-505):

> TH. *Quis homo? an gnatus meus? TR. St, tace, ausculta modo.*
> *ait venisse illum in somnis ad se mortuom.* 490
> TH. *Nempe ergo in somnis? TR. Ita. sed ausculta modo.*
> *ait illum hoc pacto sibi dixisse mortuom.*
> TH. *In somnis? TR. Mirum quin vigilanti diceret,*
> *qui abhinc sexaginta annos occisus foret.*
> *interdum inepte stultus es,* 495

---

[11] Felton 1999a: 12. Compatible definitions are offered by Emmons 2003: 88 ("the returning spirits of dead humans"), and Hernán-Pérez Guijarro 2009: 31-32. Similar definitions of ghosts were provided in antiquity by Lucretius 1. 134-135, 733-734, as discussed by Traver Vera 2014: 29.

[12] For the beliefs of the Greeks on the afterlife, see Rohde 1925. For the Roman views on this subject-matter, see Laguna Mariscal 1997 and Felton 1999a: 4-21.

[13] On these festivals see Felton 1999a: 12-14.

[14] See the discussions by Felton 1999a: 50-61, Felton 1999b, and García Jurado 2006.

THEUROPIDES- What person? My son?

TRANIO- Hist! hold your peace: just listen. He said that a dead man came to him in his sleep----

THEUROPIDES- In his dreams, then, you mean?

TRANIO- Just so. But only listen. He said that he had met with his death by these means----

THEUROPIDES- What, in his sleep?

TRANIO- It would have been surprising if he had told him awake, who had been murdered sixty years ago. On some occasions you are absurdly simple.

Two points concern us: the fact that Theopropides swallows the tale and gets frightened, in spite of certain inconsistencies in Tranio's speech[15]; and the fact that the slave specifies that the ghostly apparition happened in a dream, while mocking the old man's suggestion that the ghost could have appeared in person (493-495). This suggests that the audience of the play (and Roman people in general), while being mostly skeptical about ghosts appearing in person, was ready to accept their appearing in dreams. In other words, a natural connection between ghosts and dreams was felt, as asserted by Felton[16]: "Many ghosts in Classical Literature appear to people in their dreams, and the Greeks and Romans clearly were not unaware of the connection"[17].

Epic sweetheart: Apparition of Patroclus to Achilles

A specific example of this possibility occurs when the ghost of a late girlfriend or beloved shows up to her/his sleeping lover in a dream, with the purpose of reproaching him for his past behavior or conveying instructions. We find a precedent in Chant 23 of Homer's *Iliad*. Patroclus had been killed in the battlefield by Hector in Chant 16, but his body had been neglected because of Achilles' urgent desire to exact revenge on Hector. It is not until the second night after Patroclus' death that Achilles and his comrades, the Myrmidons, lament his death and carry out some preliminary ceremonies (23. 1-34). Then they have a rich dinner and go to bed (23. 54-58). Achilles himself falls asleep out of over-tiredness (23. 59-64). Then, as Patroclus' body keeps unburied (*ataphos*), his ghost appears to Achilles in a dream (23. 65-92). Achilles answers to him, and the apparition makes him reflect (23. 93-104).

It is worth noticing the main elements of this episode. Patroclus's ghost has the same appearance he had when he was alive, in stature, eyes, voice, and

---

[15] Detected and discussed by Felton 1999b.
[16] Felton 1999a: 19.
[17] Dimundo 1990: 44-53 also explores the natural link between dreams and ghosts' apparitions. For the various functions of dreams in early modern English culture, see Levin 2010.

clothes (23. 66-67, 107). In his speech, Patroclus touches on three main points: he requests a proper burial, so that he can enter safely the realm of Hades for never returning (23. 70-79); he prophesizes Achilles' own death (23. 80-81); and he asks for the bones and ashes of both heroes (Patroclus and Achilles) to be reunited after Achilles' death, as a monument of the intimacy[18] they shared while living (23. 82-92). Achilles promises to obey the instructions (23. 93-96) and tries to embrace the ghost of his dear comrade, but the soul dissipates like smoke (23. 97-101). Finally, Achilles reflects on the destination of the souls: for him, the ghostly apparition proves that the souls keep a certain kind of after-life existence, although this existence is not full, since their mental strength does not remain.

In this passage, the episode of the ghostly apparition of a person to his/her lover features for the first time in Western literature. Several of its elements will be echoed in later treatments.

Cynthia haunts the dreams of Propertius

By the time Propertius wrote his fourth book of elegies, he had broken up with Cynthia (as narrated in elegies 3. 24 and 3. 25), who had eventually passed away. Poems included in the fourth book either develop etiological discussions on the history of Rome, or remember Cynthia from the distance, without the pressing emotions present in books 1-3[19]. Some scholars have called this book an "anomaly" in the corpus[20]. Propertius writes poem 4. 7 as a kind of recapitulation on his love affair with Cynthia[21]. The following structure can be established for the poem:

1. *Introduction* (1-12)
    - Reflection on Manes (1-2)
    - Apparition of Cynthia (3-12)
2. *Speech* by Cynthia (13-92)
    a. Complaint about Propertius' unfaithfulness (13-48)
    b. Self-defense (49-70)

---

[18] This professed intimacy confirms that the relationship between Achilles and Patroclus was homoerotic in nature, as put forward by Sanz Morales – Laguna Mariscal 2003 and Laguna Mariscal – Sanz Morales 2005.

[19] Ramírez de Verger 1989: 29, Dimundo 1990: 15.

[20] Knox 2004: 153. On the odd structure of this book, Janan 2001: 7 speaks about the "contradictory division of Propertius' fourth book into erotic and political elements, along with the dichotomies of private versus public and individual versus social suggested by the principal divide". See also Janan 2001: 13-22, Wyke 2002: 99-108, Dufallo 2007: 83, 98, and Keith 2008: 83.

[21] This long and difficult elegy has been discussed by Muecke 1974, Yardley 1977, Dimundo 1990, Janan 2001: 100-113, Knox 2004, Hutchinson 2006: 170-189, and Dufallo 2007: 77-84.

As an introduction, Propertius affirms the existence of Manes, taking Cynthia's visit as an argument for this conviction (1-2); then he describes her physical appearance (3-12):

> Sunt aliquid Manes: letum non omnia finit,
>   luridaque evictos effugit umbra rogos.
> Cynthia namque meo visast incumbere fulcro,
>   murmur ad extremae nuper humata tubae,
> cum mihi somnus ab exsequiis penderet amoris,   5
>   et quererer lecti frigida regna mei.
> eosdem habuit secum quibus est elata capillos,
>   eosdem oculos: lateri vestis adusta fuit,
> et solitum digito beryllon adederat ignis,
>   summaque Lethaeus triverat ora liquor.   10
> spirantisque animos et vocem misit: at illi
>   pollicibus fragiles increpuere manus:

There are Spirits, of a kind: death does not end it all, and the pale ghost escapes the ruined pyre. For Cynthia, lately buried beside the roadway's murmur, seemed to lean above my couch, when sleep was denied me after love's interment, and I grieved at the cold kingdom of my bed. The same hair she had, that was borne to the grave, the same eyes: her garment charred against her side: the fire had eaten the beryl ring from her finger, and Lethe's waters had worn away her lips. She sighed out living breath and speech, but her brittle hands rattled their finger-bones.[22]

Cynthia's long speech to Propertius (13-92) focuses on *her* loyalty and *his* unfaithfulness. She reproaches Propertius for being able to sleep, in spite of her decease being so recent, and she recalls their past physical intimacy (13-22):

---

[22] Translations from Propertius are by Kline 2012.

'perfide nec cuiquam melior sperande puellae,
  in te iam vires somnus habere potest?
iamne tibi exciderunt vigilacis furta Suburae   15
  et mea nocturnis trita fenestra dolis?
per quam demisso quotiens tibi fune pependi,
  alterna veniens in tua colla manu!
saepe Venus trivio commissa, et pectore mixto
  fecerunt tepidas proelia nostra vias.   20
foederis heu pacti, cuius fallacia verba
  non audituri diripuere Noti!

'Faithless man, of whom no girl can hope for better, does sleep already have power over you? Are the tricks of sleepless Subura now forgotten, and my windowsill, worn by nocturnal guile? From which I so often hung on a rope dropped to you, and came to your shoulders, hand over hand. Often we made love at the crossroads, and breast to breast our cloaks made the roadways warm. Alas for the silent pact whose false words the uncaring South-West Wind has swept away!

In the section of instructions (71-94), the ghost of Cynthia asks for further funeral dispositions (77-86) and requires Propertius to respect visits by the ghosts as an authoritative source of messages and warnings (87-94). Then Cynthia prophesizes that their ashes will eventually be reunited in the afterlife (93-94). When Propertius tries to hug her, she dissipates among his arms (95-96):

nunc te possideant aliae: mox sola tenebo:
  mecum eris, et mixtis ossibus ossa teram.'
haec postquam querula mecum sub lite peregit,   95
  inter complexus excidit umbra meos.

Now, let others have you: soon I alone will hold you: you'll be with me, I'll wear away the bone joined with bone.'
After she'd ended, in complaint, her quarrel with me her shadow swiftly slipped from my embrace.

Scholars have long recognized that Propertius portrays Cynthia's apparition on the model of the scene in *Iliad* 23[23]. Many of the elements in the Homeric

---

[23] At least from the article by Muecke 1974 and the monograph by Hubbard 1975: 149-152. After them, the Homeric background has become *doctrina communis*: Dalzell 1980: 33, Panpanghelis 1987: 146, Dimundo 1990: 27-43, Canali 2000: 443-452, Knox 2004: 55 and n. 6, Hutchinson 2006: 170, Günther 2006: 380, and Dufallo 2007: 78. For another thing, Dickie 2014: 4 considers the Propertian parallel in his discussion on the meaning of the passage in the *Iliad*.

episode are echoed in Propertius' account. Both ghosts (Patroclus and Cynthia) are said explicitly to appear in a dream. Their main purpose is to reproach their lovers for neglecting their burial, and to request fast and proper burial dispositions, although Cynthia's request includes further items. Like Patroclus' ghost, Cynthia is said to hover above Propertius' head. Both ghosts are described as having the same physical appearance that they had when alive, although the ghost of Cynthia seems somehow more emaciated and grim. Both Patroclus and Cynthia reproach their lovers for being able to sleep in the circumstances. Both recall their past physical / sexual intimacy with their lovers. And finally, both ask their lovers to mix their ashes and bones as a sign of love. The two survivors (Achilles and Propertius) take the visits by their beloved as evidence of the existence of ghosts: Achilles expounds this conviction as a conclusion and Propertius as an opening generalization[24].

For a scholar like Dalzell[25], Propertius has used a sophisticated Homeric framework to sum up some elegiac motifs very dear to him: faithfulness versus infidelity, death, and the underworld. The main innovation of Propertius in respect to Homer (*oppositio in imitando*) is the fact that Cynthia contrasts her own faithfulness with Propertius' infidelity. By this procedure, Propertius inserts the ghost episode within the tradition of Latin love elegy, faithfulness or loyalty (*fides*) being the *sine qua non* condition for the love relationship[26]. The message of this elegy is that the relationship between Propertius and Cynthia failed for lack of loyalty among the lovers.

Petrarch's Laura: the Ghost turned into an Angel

Petrarch (1304-1374) can be considered an agent of the Classical Tradition, since he introduces several classical motifs in modern poetry[27]. He is the author of a *Canzoniere*, whose main subject matter is his love for Laura, a girl whom he allegedly met in 1327. He wrote the collection over a period of 40 years. The sequence has been divided traditionally in two sections: *Rime in vita di Madonna Laura*, that is, poems written while the Lady was alive (poems 1-266); and *Rime in morte di Madonna Laura* (poems 267-366), that is, poems written after Laura's death, which took place in 1348.

Not less than fifteen poems in the latter section present Laura's spirit appearing to Petrarch, to provide him with comfort and advice[28]: "Ben torna

---

[24] Hutchinson 2006: 172 on Propertius 4. 7. 1: "The poem begins from the end of Homer's episode: Achilles says in grief (*Il.* 23. 103-104) 'so even in Hades there is a soul and ghost' (or, with an ancient variant, 'soul and ghost are something')."

[25] Dalzell 1980: 35.

[26] See Librán Moreno 2014.

[27] As stated by Laguna Mariscal 2000: 245 n. 4, and Schwartz 2004: "Petrarca, el gran intermediario".

[28] *Canzoniere* 279, 281, 282, 283. 9-11, 284, 285, 286, 302, 328. 9-14, 336, 341, 342, 343, 359,

a consolar tanto dolore / madonna"[29]. Several points are likely inspired by Propertius 4. 7: the apparition of the late Lady in dreams[30]; the description of her physical beauty equaling the looks she had when alive (386. 3 "qua lio la vidi in su l' etá fiorita")[31]; and her ability to utter messages[32]. A couple of representative examples will suffice to show Petrarch's tone and feelings:

> *CANZONIERE* 282
> Alma felice che sovente torni
> a consolar le mie notti dolenti
> con gli occhi tuoi che Morte non à spenti,
> ma sovra 'l mortal modo fatti adorni:
>
> quanto gradisco che' miei tristi giorni   5
> a rallegrar de tua vista consenti!
> Così comincio a ritrovar presenti
> le tue bellezze a' suoi usati soggiorni,
>
> là 've cantando andai di te molt'anni,
> or, come vedi, vo di te piangendo: 10
> di te piangendo no, ma de' miei danni.
>
> Sol un riposo trovo in molti affanni,
> che, quando torni, te conosco e 'ntendo
> a l'andar, a la voce, al volto, a' panni.
>
> *CANZONIERE* 326
> Or ài fatto l'extremo di tua possa,
> o crudel Morte; or ài 'l regno d'Amore
> impoverito; or di bellezza il fiore
> e 'l lume ài spento, et chiuso in poca fossa;
>
> or ài spogliata nostra vita et scossa   5

---

362. See the survey by Regn 2014. Schwartz 2004 has noticed the influence of Propertius 4. 7 in Petrarch, although she only considers *Canzoniere* 359.

   [29] *Canzoniere* 283. 9-10.

   [30] *Canzoniere* 282, 342. 6 "al lecto", 343, 359. 3 "ponsi del letto", 359. 71 "sonno".

   [31] *Canzoniere* 282. 13-14 "te conosco e 'ntendo / a l'andar, a la voce, al volto, a' panni", 284. 8 "sí dolce in vista", 286. 3-4 "anchor par qui sia, / et viva, et senta", 302. 4 "la rividi piú bella", 328. 9 "Li occhi belli", 336. 3 "qua lio la vidi in su l' etá fiorita", 359. 56-58. However, in one single passage Petrarch portrays Laura's face faded by death: "Discolorato ài, Morte, il piú bel volto / che mai si vide, e i piú begli occhi spenti;" (283. 1-2), which reminds us of Cynthia's degradation in Propertius 4. 7. 7-12.

   [32] *Canzoniere* 279. 9-14, 282. 14 "la voce", 283. 12 "come ella parla", 285. 10 "nel parlar", 286. 13 "suo dir", 336. 8-9 "sua dolce favela", 341. 9-14, 342. 9-14, 343. 4 "voce".

> d'ogni ornamento et del sovran suo honore:
> ma la fama e 'l valor che mai non more
> non è in tua forza; abbiti ignude l'ossa:
>
> ché l'altro à 'l cielo, et di sua chiaritate,
> quasi d'un piú bel sol, s'allegra et gloria,   10
> et fi' al mondo de' buon' sempre in memoria.
>
> Vinca 'l cor vostro, in sua tanta victoria,
> angel novo, lassú, di me pietate,
> come vinse qui 'l mio vostra beltate.

But there are two main differences: while Cynthia is described as a ghost with a grim appearance, escaped from Hell, Laura is pictured rather as a beautiful angel, coming from Heaven[33]; the aim of Cynthia was to reproach Propertius while Laura's purpose is declaredly to offer comfort and holy advice[34]. The heathen Roman ghost has turned into a Renaissance Christian angel.

The coy ghost flees the desire of Luis Martín de la Plaza

Luis Martín de la Plaza (1577-1565)[35] belonged to the Antequera's school of poets, transitional between Renaissance and Baroque. His poetic work, though valuable, is scarcely known today, perhaps because it has not been properly edited[36]. Twenty-seven of his poems were included in the Mannerist anthology *Flores de poetas ilustres*, published by Pedro de Espinosa in 1605[37]. In the following poem (number 4 of *Flores*), which Luis Alberto de Cuenca had included in a collection of Spanish poetry[38], Martín de la Plaza recalls how his deceased Lady[39] appeared to him in a dream:

> Cuando a su dulce olvido me convida
> la noche, y en sus faldas me adormece,

---

[33] *Canzoniere* 281. 2 "in forma di nimpha o d'altra diva", 343. 3 "angelica", 359. 60 "Spirito ignudo sono, e 'n ciel mi godo".

[34] *Canzoniere* 279. 9-14, 282. 2 "consolar", 282. 6 "rallegrar", 283. 9 "consolar", 284. 3 "medicina", 285. 4 "fedel consiglio", 286. 9-14, 341. 5 "ad acquetare il cor misero et mesto", 342. 10-11 "col suol dir m'apporta / dolcezza", 343. 8 "al mio scampo".

[35] Pepe Sarno – Reyes Cano 2006: 185-186.

[36] This is the view of Morata Pérez 1995.

[37] Modern edition by Pepe Sarno – Reyes Cano 2006.

[38] Cuenca 1998: 184-185.

[39] The poem has also been interpreted by Vique Domene 2011 as dealing with a living Lady, who despises the poet during the day and whose image appears to the lyric subject in dreams. I think that the phrase "de aquella que fue sueño en esta vida" (4) and the adverb "aun" (10) rather suggest that the Lady is dead by now.

entre sueños la imagen me parece
de aquella que fue sueño en esta vida.

Yo, sin temor que su desdén lo impida,   5
los brazos tiendo al gusto que me ofrece;
mas ella (sombra al fin) desaparece,
y abrazo al aire, donde está escondida.

Así burlado, digo: «¡Ah falso engaño
de aquella ingrata, que aun mi mal procura;   10
tente, aguarda, lisonja del deseo!»

Mas ella, en tanto, por la noche obscura
huye; corro tras ella, ¡oh caso extraño!
¿Qué pretendo alcanzar, pues sigo al viento?

The apparition is identified as the ghost of a dead beloved (4: "de aquella que fue sueño en esta vida"), who appears to the lyric subject in a dream (3: "entre sueños") during the night (2: "la noche", 12: "por la noche obscura"). The main motif of the sonnet is the poet's desire (6: "gusto", 11: "deseo") and his vain attempt to embrace her (5-14). This attempt fails because the image has an airy- and wind-like quality (8: "abrazo al aire", 14: "sigo al viento"), so it eventually fades and flees from the frustrated lover (12-14). Most of these elements come from Homer, Propertius, and Petrarch. In contrast to these texts, the ghost is not given a voice in the sonnet by Martín de la Plaza, and the main subject matter is not her reproach, but the lover's frustrated desire.

The ghost of the beloved in Jaime Gil de Biedma

The poet Jaime Gil de Biedma (1929-1990), a member of the poetic generation of the 50's[40], was homosexual, but he had a love relationship with an attractive young woman, named Isabel Gil Moreno de Mora (1938-1968) but known by the nickname "Bel". She was a Muse (together with Teresa Gimpera) of an intellectual and political group, called the "gauche divine" (*divine Left*)[41]. He dedicated at least two poems to Bel. While she was alive, the poet wrote "A una dama muy joven separada" for her. Bel died tragically in December 1968 as her car was dragged away by a flash flood; Gil de Biedma attempted to commit suicide (by cutting his veins), which prevented him from attending her funeral. In his poem "Conversación" the poet imagines that her ghost appears to him in a dream[42]:

---

[40] See Riera 1988.
[41] On this group, see Vázquez Montalbán 1971, Regàs 2000, Moix 2002.
[42] For this elaboration, see Laguna Mariscal 2002 and 2005.

CONVERSACIÓN
Los muertos pocas veces libertad
alcanzáis a tener, pero la noche
que regresáis es vuestra,
vuestra completamente.

Amada mía, remordimiento mío,   5
la nuit c'est toi cuando estoy solo
y vuelves tú, comienzas
en tus retratos a reconocerme.
¿Qué daño me recuerda tu sonrisa?
¿Y cuál dureza mía está en tus ojos?   10
¿Me tranquilizas porque estuve cerca
de ti en algún momento?

La parte de tu muerte que me doy,
la parte de tu muerte que yo puse
de mi cosecha, cómo poder pagártela...   15
Ni la parte de vida que tuvimos juntos.

Cómo poder saber que has perdonado,
conmigo sola en el lugar del crimen?
Cómo poder dormir, mientras que tú tiritas
en el rincón más triste de mi cuarto?   20

It is my contention that Propertius' elegy 4. 7 was a conspicuous reference in contemporary letters and the main model for the development of this ghostly episode[43]. Contrary to Propertius, Gil de Biedma does not lend Bel a voice; but, like Propertius, he describes the circumstances of her visit and her difficulty fleeing the realm of the dead (1-4). He also describes her physical appearance (9-10: mouth, eyes) and he remembers their past intimacy (11-12, 16). Although the voiceless lady cannot reproach him for anything, he feels partially responsible for her past life and death (5, 13-15). The fact that the poet was unable to attend Bel's funeral reminds us of Cynthia reproaching Propertius for neglecting her funeral. The consequence is that Bel haunts the nights[44] of the poet (5-8, 17-20) as an act of retaliation, like Cynthia haunted Propertius' sleep. While Cynthia reproached Propertius for sleeping, Biedma acknowledges his inability to sleep (19-20). The evocation of Propertius' elegy 4. 7 is clear, but Biedma retorts the classical motif to express his feelings of remorse.

---

[43] Laguna Mariscal 2002. García Jurado 2010 has explored the creative use of Propertius by Proust.

[44] As in the title of a novel by Joaquín Leguina: *Tu nombre envenena mis sueños* (1992).

The poetic cycle of Rita in Luis Alberto de Cuenca's poetry

The poet Luis Alberto de Cuenca (1950), who belongs to the Spanish poetic group of the 70's, develops many motifs coming from the Classical Tradition in his poetry[45]. When he was a teenager and during three years he had a relationship with a girl named Rita Macau Fárrega (1951-1970). Tragically, she died in a car accident[46]. De Cuenca was acquainted and familiar with the main texts that have transmitted the episode of the ghostly visit, since he published a translation of Propertius 4. 7[47] and included the sonnet "Cuando a su dulce olvido me convida" by Luis Martín de la Plaza in his anthology *Las cien mejores poesías de la poesía castellana*[48]. Against this background, Luis Alberto has written a cycle of poems dealing with the memory of Rita[49]: his main hypotext is Propertius 4. 7, but he is also inspired by the feeling of frustration featuring in Luis Martín de la Plaza's sonnet.

In the poem "El fantasma" ("The Ghost"), included in the book *Necrofilia* (1983), the poet asks the ghost of Rita for sexual intimacy, only to discover that this is impossible, since she is only an apparition in a dream. This poem echoes the sections of Propertius 4. 7 where Cynthia remembers the physical intimacy of the lovers and where Propertius tries vainly to embrace her image:

> EL FANTASMA
> Cómeme y, con mi cuerpo en tu boca,
> hazte mucho más grande
> o infinitamente más pequeña.
> Envuélveme en tu pecho.
> Bésame.   5
> Pero nunca me digas la verdad.
> Nunca me digas: «Estoy muerta.
> No abrazas más que un sueño»

In the poem "Rita", belonging to the book *El otro sueño* (1987), the lyric subject dreams again about Rita. De Cuenca takes two elements from Propertius: he imagines Rita alive in a dream (9: "tan viva como entonces"); and he yields to the evidence that she cannot flee the grave and the realm of the dead:

---

[45] As explored by Suárez Martínez 2008, and Martínez Sariego – Laguna Mariscal 2010.

[46] This story is told by the poet himself: Cuenca 1997 and 2015: 37. See Lanz 2006: 241 and Peña Rodríguez 2009.

[47] Cuenca – Alvar Ezquerra 2004: 94-97.

[48] Cuenca 1998: 184-185.

[49] Lanz 2006: 241, 309, 404, Martínez Sariego – Laguna Mariscal 2010: 390.

RITA
Rita, ¿qué vas a hacer el domingo? ¿Hay domingos
donde vives? ¿Hay citas? ¿Se retrasa la gente?
No sé por qué te agobio con preguntas inútiles,
por qué sigo pensando que puedes contestarme.
Sé que te gustaría tener voz y palabras   5
en lugar de silencio, y escapar de la tumba
para contarme cosas del país de los muertos.
Pero no puedes, Rita, no yo debo soñarte
una noche de agosto tan viva como entonces.
Hay que guardar las formas. Al cabo, los domingos   10
son los días peores para salir de casa.

The last poem by De Cuenca we are going to explore is "Qué complaciente estabas, amor mío, en la pesadilla" ("How obliging you were, honey, in the nightmare"), included in the book *Por Fuertes y Fronteras* (1996):

QUÉ COMPLACIENTE ESTABAS, AMOR MÍO, EN LA PESADILLA
El problema no es tener que abandonarlo
todo a cambio de ti.
El problema es tener que abandonarte a ti
a cambio de un fantasma.
Son las cosas que ocurren cuando sueñas que vuelve   5
la mujer que no ha de volver.

Like Propertius, Luis Alberto de Cuenca narrates that the ghost (4: "fantasma") shows up to him in a dream/nightmare (title: "en la pesadilla", 5: "cuando sueñas"), but in contrast to Cynthia's message, he acknowledges that dead people cannot return from the afterlife (6: "la mujer que no ha de volver")[50]. In a way, De Cuenca is correcting (*oppositio in imitando*) both Propertius, who thought that ghosts existed; and Cynthia, whose ghost asserted that ghostly apparitions in dreams are authoritative.

Besides this clear evocation of Propertius, Luis Alberto de Cuenca follows on the footsteps of Martín de la Plaza. Like Martín de la Plaza, De Cuenca refuses to accept the reality of the ghost, so the ghostly visit only exacerbates his hapless longing for the dead beloved.

---

[50] This idea is well known in classical and modern literature. Catullus wrote: *qui nunc it per iter tenebricosum / illuc, unde negant redire quemquam* (3. 11-12). De Cuenca himself translated those lines: "Ahora marcha por un camino tenebroso / hacia el país de donde nadie regresa" (Cuenca – Alvar Ezquerra 2004: 27). It is remarkable that De Cuenca inserts in his translation an echo of the phrase "The undiscovered Country, from whose Borne / no Traveler returns," (W. Shakespeare, *Hamlet* A3 S1 79-80). For this blending of sources (*contaminatio*) see Laguna Mariscal 2007.

The motif in contemporary popular culture

The modern film *Ghosts of Girlfriends Past* (2009)[51] tells the story of Connor, a young womanizer unable to engage with women. The ghost of his deceased uncle, uncle Wayne, tries to persuade him to change his attitude. Uncle Wayne announces that Connor will be visited by three female ghosts, coming from the past, the present, and the future. The three ghosts reproach Connor for his misbehavior towards women and eventually succeed in making him change his attitude. Lastly, he decides to engage in a faithful relationship with his first girlfriend, Jenny. While the general scheme of the plot is obviously based on Charles Dickens' famous story *A Christmas Carol*, the erotic application is a development of the classical motif explored in this paper. We mention this film not because of its quality, but because it proves that the classical motif is alive today, even in mass culture.

Conclusions

The ghostly visit of the sweetheart first appeared in a passage by Homer, where the soul of Patroclus showed up to Achilles, which established the main elements of the episode: apparition of the ghost in a dream, difficulty to escape the realm of Hades, aspect of the ghost similar to the aspect he/she had when living, speech by the ghost (usually conveying reproach and instructions), general discussion about afterlife existence, and impossibility to embrace the fading ghost.

Propertius drew inspiration from Homer to describe the apparition of the deceased Cynthia to him in elegy 4. 7: Cynthia's main purpose is to reproach him for his unfaithfulness. The present research has shown that the Propertian elegy was the main reference for modern treatments.

Petrarch, who was very fond of Propertius and therefore likely took the motif from the Roman elegiac poet, dedicated numerous poems of his *Canzoniere* to represent the late Laura appearing to him in dreams: but Laura is not a hellish ghost but rather a heavenly angel, whose purpose is to comfort, not to reproach. Luis Martín de la Plaza writes about the visit of a female ghost in a dream: the impossibility to embrace her causes frustration in him. Contemporary poets like Jaime Gil de Biedma and Luis Alberto de Cuenca, who also picture their late girlfriends appearing to them in dreams, use the motif to deploy their own anxieties. The apparition of Bel to Gil de Biedma awakens feelings of guilt. Luis Alberto de Cuenca translated Propertius and edited Martín de la Plaza: like in

---

[51] *Ghosts of Girlfriends Past*. 2009. Nationality: USA. Director: Mark Waters. Script: Jon Lucas, Scott Moore. Cast: Matthew McConaughey (Connor Mead), Jennifer Garner (Jenny Perotti), Michael Douglas (uncle Wayne).

the sonnet of Martín de la Plaza, the ghostly visit of the deceased girlfriend stirs up despair and frustration.

The film *Ghost of Girlfriends Past* deals with the classical motif, confirming that it is alive in contemporary culture. Classical culture continues to be a living code for conveying ideas, feelings, and anxieties.

On Women's Faithfulness And Ghosts: About *Decameron* 7. 1[1]

Francisco José Rodríguez Mesa
University of Córdoba
(orcid.org/0000-0002-7411-6669)

ABSTRACT: The seventh day of *Decameron* is devoted to "policies and deceits that women have used for beguiling of their husbands, either in respect of their love, or for the prevention of some blame or scandal". The first story of this section is preceded by the exegetical paratext "Gianni Lotteringhi hears knocking at night on the door; he awakens his wife, and she makes him believe that it is the ghost; they conjure him with a prayer, and the knocks cease". In this chapter I aim to analyze the ghost as a comic and pseudo-religious motif in this novella. The role of the tale within its literary frame will be studied in order to determine the function of the delusion concocted by the wife in the global context in which it appears. The tale will also be analyzed taking into account the different roles of its characters and the dichotomy between feminine and masculine worlds it implies since its very beginning.

KEYWORDS: *Decameron*, Giovanni Boccaccio, women in Middle Ages, short-story, Medieval comicality.

Ghosts in Medieval Italian Literature

Ghosts are not very frequent motifs in Medieval Italian literature, as it is normal in that period. In fact, the very few appearances of these elements are either marginal from the point of view of the plots –in the case of literary works– or they are mere excuses for dissertation –within theoretical treatises.

With respect to the Medieval Italian terms used in reference to ghosts, the *Grande dizionario della lingua italiana* (*GDLI*) shows two different entries, which share etymological roots and which could be considered two variants of the same word: 'fantasima' and 'fantasma'. In both cases, the word these terms derive from is the Greek *phantasma, -atos* through the Latin noun *phantasma, -ătis*. The result of the first of these variants, 'fantasima', comes from the addition on an epenthetic 'i' to the desinence *-sma*[2].

In terms of meaning, both entries could be interpreted as synonyms in a certain way since the *GDLI* shows approximately the same definitions for both

---

[1] This paper is one of the results of the Research Project "Voces de mujeres en la Edad Media: realidad y ficción (siglos XII-XIV)" (FFI2014-55628-P), funded by the Spanish Ministry of Economy.

[2] Even if this phenomenon is typical of the popular language and could be described as vulgar in its roots, a similar process can be observed in solutions whose use has been accepted with the pass of time, such as 'cresima' or 'spasimo'.

nouns. Nevertheless, if the order of the presentation of these definitions is to be taken into account, 'fantasma' seems to be a more specific word, typical of cultivated language and even technique, related to philosophy. As a matter of fact, among the sixteen meanings of this term included in the *GDLI*, the first three entries refer to philosophy:

> 1. Filos. Immagine, rappresentazione soggettiva di un oggetto, di una realtà percepita attraverso i sensi (nella filosofia aristotelica); la sensazione, la percezione stessa considerata da parte di chi la riceve. In partic. nella filosofia tomistica, l'immagine sia delle cose presenti sia di quelle passate [...]. 2. L'immagine, la visione o l'intuizione propria dell'artista, che con essa comincia a prendere coscienza di quel mondo poetico che tradurrà poi in parole o suoni, colori, ecc. In senso generico: prodotto della fantasia poetica [...]. 3. Immagine, visione o pensiero, sensazione, moto dell'animo suscitato dalla fantasia o dalla memoria; il ricordo stesso, reminiscenza; idea confusa, indefinita, appena abbozzata.

As for its use, 'fantasma' can be documented in Italian with these meanings from the 15th century onwards –in effect, the first known text in which the term is used in the Thomistic way was written by Leon Battista Alberti[3].

In contrast with these three initial definitions and with a more restrictive, less common meaning, the forth definition is much closer to what could be translated as 'ghost': "la forma materializzata secondo una comune credenza, dello spirito di un trapassato; spettro, ombra, apparizione notturna". Examples of this use can be found in Italian documents since the 13th century, which proves that –despite being more frequent– the previous definitions arrived to Italy much later and probably as cultivated loanwords from Greek or Latin[4], which are completely alien to Italian lexicon[5]. An additional definition can be found inside this fourth entry, which is also relevant for the current use of 'ghost'. This new entry is explained as "creatura dell'oltretomba, spirito infernale"; in

---

[3] Alberti wrote in his *Discorso sulla nobiltà della pittura* "essendo che [il pittore] si serve molto sottilmente dell'apprensione in questo che volendo dipingere bisogna che abbia i sensi acuti e molto buona imaginativa, in la quale apprenda le cose poste dinanzi agli occhi e acciò quelle entrate dipoi alla presenza, e transformate in fantasmati perfettamente riduca all'intelletto", in Bottari 1845: 284.

[4] See chapters 1, 2, 3, 6 and 7 of this book.

[5] The testimonies collected in the *Tesoro della lingua italiana delle origini* (*TLIO*) seem to support our hypothesis, since the definition of the entry 'fantasma' as "presenza maligna, apparizione di persona morta che tormenta i vivi" is shown as the sixth of six meanings, even if it is documented for the very first time in the so-called *Laude cortonesi*, a series of verses written in 13th century, where the following lines can be read: "sconiuro te per Dio, et sì te dico / si tu se' phantasma o nimico, / ke tu te parti et non stea più con meco", in Varanini 1981: 85 (http://tlio.ovi.cnr.it/TLIO/, 05/05/2016).

other words, and in opposition with the previous meaning –which seems to be more restrictive–, a 'fantasma' could exist in an autonomous way and not as the mere manifestation of somebody who previously lived and died and –according to this new definition– evil is a constituent part of its nature.

Returning to the *GDLI*, the entry 'fantasima' shows a slightly different situation, firstly because this variant is defined as typical of the literary language, but also due to the fact that the four meanings of this noun have a negative connotation and all of them are related to the supernatural world, as can be easily deduced from the first of these definitions, "essere mostruoso e terrificante creato dalla fantasia popolare; spettro, fantasma". The first time this term was used can be traced back to Italian documents, within the so-called *Tristano Riccardiano*, whose unknown author wrote in the 13th century "venne uno nano ala corte der ree Marco, lo quale iera figliuolo di re, e lo padre l'avea cacciato inpercioe ch'egli iera zenbo dinanzi e di dietro e pparea pur una fantasima"[6].

As already mentioned, the variant 'fantasima' is widely used in literary texts and it goes back to the 13th century, which implies –if compared to the definitions of 'fantasma'–that the supernatural nuance in these terms is related to the very root of their use in Italian, even if the technical, specialized treatises written during the Renaissance shunted this meaning in the frequency of cultivated use. In addition, as it will be proved in the following section, canonical authors such as Boccaccio were completely oblivious to the solution without the epenthetic 'i'.

Boccaccio, 'Fantasime' and Women

'Fantasima' is the only term used by Boccaccio in the three passages of his works where he talks about ghosts[7], conceived as terrifying, supernatural beings that frighten people. Linguistically, this fact could be explained taking, as a basis, the dialectal origins of the process of addition of the epenthetic 'i', which could be considered as a mark of the Tuscan speech used by Boccaccio[8].

1. *Il corbaccio:* an isolated mention

The latest work of the Certaldese in which the noun 'fantasima' appears is *Il corbaccio*. This narration, dated around 1365, is structured according to the

---

[6] Parodi 1896: 64. As far as this case is concerned, we cannot agree with the explanation given by the *TLIO*, which classifies the *Tristano Riccardiano* quotation as an example of "immagine vana e irreale, creata dalla mente", in other words, as a neutral term. In our view, the intention with which the noun is used in this sentence is clearly negative, being the prince compared to an awful, uncanny creature.

[7] As we will see, these passages belong to *Il corbaccio* and to *Decameron* 7 and 10.

[8] As a matter of fact, other cases of words with epenthetic 'i' appear frequently in Boccaccio's works, such as the verbs 'biasimare' and 'ispasimare' (and their derivative forms), the adjectives 'medesimo/a/i/e' or the noun 'quaresima'.

form of a Medieval dream vision and tells the story of a desperate, unrequited lover that falls asleep and has a series of revelations about the woman he loves that make him take the decision of both stopping loving her and writing a treatise through which men will be advised of the female evil. As it could be easily deduced, in the entire *Il corbaccio*, misogynist elements predominate and it is within one of these dissertations against women that the allusion to 'fantasima' occurs:

> Esse si mostrano timide e paurose; e comandandolo il marito, quantunque la cagione fosse onesta, non sarebbono in niuno luogo alto, ché dicono che vien meno loro il cerebro; non entrerebbono in mare, ché dicono che lo stomaco nol patiscie; non andrebbono di notte, ché dicono che temono gli spiriti, l'anime e le fantasime. Se sentono un topo andare per la casa e che'l vento muova una finestra o che una piccola pietra caggia, tutte si riscuotono e fugge loro il sangue e la forza, come se a un mortale pericolo soprastessono[9].

The word 'fantasima' is used here just as one element belonging to a larger series of examples whose aim is to illustrate women's behavior. However, in contrast to what could be thought of this passage, the author's critique does not address female weakness, but its falseness and pretense, since –according to Boccaccio– women are fragile and irresolute only in appearance, and with this subterfuge they just expect to gain their husbands' confidence so that they can deceive them more easily. As a matter of fact, in the same fragment of *Il corbaccio*, the Tuscan writer, trying to reveal the truth about female nature, also asserts:

> [C]olei che in questa moltitudine più casta e più onesta ti pare, vorrebbe avanti solo un occhio avere, che esser contenta solo d'un uomo; e se forse due o tre ne bastassero, saria qualche cosa, e forse saria tollerabile, se questi due o tre avanzassero i mariti, o fossero almen loro pari. La loro lussuria è focosa e insaziabile, e per questo non patisce nè numero nè elezione: il fante, il lavoratore, il mugnaio, e ancora il nero etiopo, ciascuno è buono sol che possa[10].

Even if the role of the word 'fantasima' in *Il corbaccio* could not be described as particularly relevant, it is meaningful that the context of its appearance shows wide parallelisms with the other cases in which the term is documented in Boccaccio's works, more specifically in *Decameron* 7. 1, since feminine lust is, in a certain way, the element that provokes the allusion to the supernatural world.

---

[9] Boccaccio 1968: 75.
[10] Boccaccio 1968: 75.

2. *Decameron*

As happened in *Il corbaccio*, also in Boccaccio's masterpiece, *Decameron*, the term 'fantasima' occurs and, what is more, not only does it appear with a higher frequency[11], but –as previously mentioned– its recurrence is also connected to female lust and carnal desire; in addition, the ghost is one of the central elements in the first tale of the seventh day. The plot of this day, under Dioneo's command, should be "[le] beffe, le quali o per amore o per salvamento di loro le donne hanno già fatte a' suoi mariti, senza essersene avveduti o sì"[12], and Emilia, the first of the narrators, decides to tell a story preceded by the exegetical paratext "Gianni Lotteringhi ode di notte toccar l'uscio suo; desta la moglie, e ella gli fa accredere che egli è la fantasima; vanno a incantare con una orazione, e il picchiare si rimane"[13].

As far as the origin of this tale is concerned, Branca stated not to have found any real antecedent to this *novella*[14]. It is truth that Landau[15] linked this story both to the *fabliau* titled *Le revenant*[16] and to a popular Swedish composition[17], but in both cases and as Branca observed, parallelisms could be described as mere coincidences. In addition and in our view, the large number of allusions to the history and to citizens of Florence indicates the possibility of a popular, regional root as the multiple elements concerning Thompson's index seem to prove[18].

In spite of the allusion to female sexual desire, the context of *Decameron* 7. 1 could be described as diametrically opposed to *Il corbaccio*, mainly because of the differences in the audience towards which the work is addressed. While the latter had a preferential masculine public, *Decameron* as a whole seems to be predominantly dedicated to women[19]; as a matter of fact, in the introduction to 7. 1 Emilia, the narrator, claims for the attention of the other women in the group and she asserts that her narration will provide them with useful

---

[11] The ten appearances of the term 'fantasima' are documented in *Decameron*. Eight of them belong to 7. 1, another appears in 7. 3, within an allusion to the tale narrated in 7. 1. The last of the cases, also linked to sexual connotations, can be found in the introduction to 10. 10.

[12] Boccaccio 1992: 785.

[13] Boccaccio 1992: 789.

[14] Boccaccio 1992: 789. In fact, the critical works about 7. 1 mentioned in the introduction of Branca's edition to *Decameron* (cfr. Boccaccio 1992: CIX) are quite general, especially if compared to the thoroughness with which the roots of other tales are analyzed. The references to 7. 1 are reduced to Bottari 1818, Perito 1901, Segre 1974, Sinicropi 1975, Fido 1977, Falassi 1977, Celati 1986 and Mazzotta 1986.

[15] Landau 1869: 86.

[16] See Montaiglon and Raynaud 1872-1890, vol. 6: 138.

[17] See Afzelius 1872, vol. 2: 279.

[18] Specifically, motifs K 1546, 1961; V 66.1; X 441.

[19] In the beginning of 1. 1, Boccaccio addresses to the "graziosissime donne" (Boccaccio 1992: 13).

advice: "ingegnerommi, carissime donne, di dir cosa che vi possa essere utile nell'avvenire"[20].

The way Emilia starts her tale is very meaningful too, in order to try to understand Boccaccio's intention with 7. 1: the narrator says that her story will be useful to the audience, so that a didactic purpose could be expected from her words. Nevertheless, the narration could be read as an exaltation of adultery and, besides, the author specifies that Emilia starts her tale "sorridendo"[21]. Hence, irony and mockery are present from the very beginning of the story, and irony and mockery are, indeed, the main keys for reading the whole narration.

The explanation that Emilia gives about the utility of her tale is both ironic and mocking, and in this elucidation, there are remarkable parallelisms with the previously mentioned passage of *Il corbaccio* and its critic about the falsity of women's weakness:

> [S]e così son le altre [donne] come io paurose e massimamente della fantasima (la quale sallo Iddio che io non so che cosa si sia né ancora trovai che'l sapesse, come che tutte ne temiamo igualmente), a quella cacciar via quando da voi venisse, notando bene la mia novella, potrete una santa e buona orazione e molto a ciò valevole apparare[22].

The counterpart of irony and mockery, as elements providing the key for the interpretation of the narration, seem to be the main features of the description of the three characters. Boccaccio sets from the opening that Gianni is a "uomo più avventurato nella sua arte che savio in altre cose"[23], focusing on his foolishness; in contrast, Tessa is described as "savia e avveduta molto"[24] and, above all, completely aware of "la semplicità del marito"[25], whereas Federigo is characterized as "bello, fresco e giovane"[26] in clear contrast with Gianni. Characters in this tale are quite simple and, in fact, the plot derives from the combination of the foresaid features with the general irony and mockery provided by Emilia. This combination forces some parallel situations to emerge in which contextual differences are stressed, such as the divergences between the sexual use of the bed that Tessa and her lover use ("Federigo […] in sul vespro se n'andò là sù e, non venendovi la sera Gianni, a grande agio con molto piacere cenò e albergò con la donna; e ella standogli in

---

[20] Boccaccio 1992: 789.
[21] Boccaccio 1992: 788.
[22] Boccaccio 1992: 789-790.
[23] Boccaccio 1992: 790.
[24] Boccaccio 1992: 791.
[25] Boccaccio 1992: 791.
[26] Boccaccio 1992: 791-792.

braccio la notte gl'insegnò da sei delle laude del suo marito"[27]) and the description of the moments when wife and husband share that same bed:

> Disse allora Gianni: "Va, donna, non aver paura se ciò è, ché io dissi dianzi il *Te lucis* e la*'Ntemerata* e tante altre buone orazioni, quando a letto ci andammo, e anche segnai il letto di canto in canto al nome del Patre e del Filio e dello Spirito Santo, che temere non ci bisogna: ché [la fantasima] non ci può, per potere ch'ella abbia, nuocere"[28].

Also regarding these contradictions, the passage in which Tessa's thoughts about Federigo are exposed –while her lover is knocking at the door– is remarkable: "la donna, acciò che Federigo per avventura altro sospetto non prendesse e con lei si turbasse, diliberò del tutto di doversi levare e di fargli sentire che Gianni v'era"[29]. This extract is strange within the kind of relationship that Tessa and Federigo have. The wife's reflection may indicate that her lover seems to claim for her faithfulness even if he knows that she is married and his relationship with her is only an affair out of the boundaries of any kind of regulation. Moreover, while Federigo understands Tessa's refusal to communicate with him while cheating on her husband, Boccaccio states that the lover was "già di gelosia uscito"[30]; but where does this jealousy come from?

As previously said, under no circumstances could Federigo expect a complete dedication from Tessa taking into account that, given the entity of their relationship, he did not have any rights over the woman. This idea suggests another possibility to explain Tessa's concern: maybe her interest in the ghost subterfuge was not merely to make Federigo understand that she was not alone, but to make him hear her husband's voice so that he realized that she was with Gianni and not with another lover[31].

The prayer to protect themselves from the ghost can be considered as the climax of irony and mockery, facilitated by the foresaid features of both Gianni and Tessa. From a narratological point of view, this passage implies a remarkable strategy, since in the tale there are two versions of the prayer: the first one is included in the body of the narration, whereas the second one is mentioned by Emilia in the conclusion of the tale while speaking about a possible alternative to the facts she has just told. In this chapter, both because of its more complex structure and because of its situation within the story, our attention will be focused on the first of the two testimonies: "Fantasima, fantasima che di notte

---

[27] Boccaccio 1992: 792. Mockery, even towards Gianni, is obvious in this passage.
[28] Boccaccio 1992: 794.
[29] Boccaccio 1992: 794.
[30] Boccaccio 1992: 795.
[31] This interpretation could be also considered as a misogynist one, since in a certain way it implies that, as *Il corbaccio* says, female lust cannot be sedated.

vai, a coda ritta ci venisti, a coda ritta te n'andrai: va nell'orto, a piè del pesco grosso troverai unto bisunto e cento cacherelli della gallina mia: pon bocca al fiasco e vatti via, e non far mal né a me né a Gianni mio"[32].

From a structural point of view, this prayer is built according to the traditional schemes of popular literature, especially verse[33], and it could be divided into two different parts. Textually speaking, the first one contains a wide range of easy rhymes based mainly on verbal desinences (vai : andrai : troverai) and on minimal pairs (mia : via); also some structural parallelisms (fantasima, fantasima; a coda ritta ci venisti, a coda ritta te n'andrai[34]) are present. In terms of verbal forms, there are three verbal tenses belonging to two verbs very close semantically, "andare" and "venire". These forms cover the whole range of verbal time (present: vai; past: venisti and future: andrai). Nevertheless, in this first part one of the communicative purposes of the prayer and the impossibility of the sexual encounter is also introduced. In addition, it is done by anticipating how things will finish for Federigo that night: "a coda ritta ci venisti, a coda ritta te n'andrai", linking the motif of the ghost with the parodic meaning that Boccaccio confers to the term in his works.

In our opinion and in contrast with the second part of the prayer, Tessa's main goal with this opening is to imitate religious utterances so that Gianni cannot suspect neither her nor her real purposes. In this sense and as far as structure is concerned, the beginning is organized in a much more traditional and canonical way than the ending of the prayer.

On the other hand, the second part of the orison is the one in which Tessa tries to make Federigo understand the situation, and with this change in the purpose also the structure drastically changes. If in the first part the predominant function of the language was the poetic one[35], in the conclusion the referential function prevails[36]. From a textual point of view this passage is mainly characterized by imperative forms (va, pon, non far) that provide Federigo with his lover's instructions and it is devoid of any structural complexity linked to liturgical rhetoric[37].

---

[32] Boccaccio 1992: 795. The second version of the prayer, much shorter and structurally simpler, says "Fantasima, fantasima, fatti con Dio, ché la testa dell'asino non vols'io, ma altri fu, che tristo il faccia Iddio, e io son qui con Gianni mio" (Boccaccio 1992: 796).

[33] For analogue texts, see Amati 1866, Casini 1886, D'Ancona 1906 or Fumi 1907.

[34] These kinds of parallelisms are also extremely frequent in liturgical language, similar structures can be found, for instance, in the Catholic Eucharist (e.g. "pacem relinquo vobis, pacem meam do vobis", "ecce Agnus Dei: ecce quit tollit peccata mundi"…).

[35] It must be taken into account that even when Tessa makes Federigo understand that they will not be able to meet that night, the poetic function of the language is essential, as can be seen in the use of rhetoric forms and strategies.

[36] Even if some parallelisms, assonances, rhyme (via/mia) and polyptoton (mia/mio) appear, they are not as strong as in the previous part.

[37] Only Tessa's request to Gianni to spit could be interpreted as a ritual element, but in this

The general implication of this orison is to mock Gianni by creating a kind of utterance with which he is deeply familiarized, the religious one, but with a subversive intention that completely alters its function. Accordingly, if with a prayer the speaker expects an improvement of their current situation, the effect that the false orison has on Gianni is the very opposite one, since it contributes to the maintenance of his wife's affair. Furthermore, the mocking goal of the invocation will be confirmed and claimed by the couple of lovers themselves when Emilia tells that Federigo "dell'altre volte ritrovandosi con la donna, molto di questa incantazione rise con essolei"[38].

The prayer against the ghost also contributes to the characterization of Tessa, Gianni and Federigo. As a result, two categories of characters could be drawn in this tale according to both their relationship with religion and their role in the prayer; in broad terms, this distinction could refer to Durkheim's dichotomy between profane and religious worlds[39]. This differentiation is also related to a topic similar to Turner's theories[40]: the way of understanding rituals in traditional and modern societies, about what it could be stated that when a society becomes modern, rituals are reduced and the stress on public and community life that they imply moves towards private and personal life.

Taking these ideas into consideration, it could be said that Boccaccio builds the characters of Tessa and Federigo as modern ones: they are described as people completely oblivious to any kind of supernatural world –religion included– who only focus their attention on enjoying at the most the opportunities that life gives to them. It must also be said that these opportunities are restricted because of the sacred link that unites Tessa and Gianni, but despite it –or maybe because of it– they are autonomous characters, whose behaviors come from and are explained just by themselves and by their desire to live in a private, personal sphere. On the other hand, Gianni's obsession with religion and superstition is connected to ancient societies and makes him abandon his wife. Consequently, he neglects the link of marriage and this is the essential reason why he will be punished.

Conclusion: one tale, two worlds

Decameron 7. 1 is globally structured in a dichotomous way: female and masculine understanding of the world or, in other words, traditional and modern conceptions of live are continually opposed, dealing with topics of such

---

case it implies a ritual dealing with actions, not with language. In this way Pitrè 1885: 233 stated that "prima e dopo il secolo XVI lo sputo fu ritenuto mirabile per certe guarigioni". See also Bonomo 1953.

[38] Boccaccio 1992: 796.

[39] See Durkheim 2003 (first published in 1912).

[40] Turner 1983: 157-158.

a relevance as religion, marriage, pleasure or the very essence of living. This double-faced feature does not merely affect Boccaccio's literary world, but it comes from and it is a consequence of the social context in which the author lived and worked, a context in which the blossoming of a new era and the death of an old one were taking place.

From a semiotic point of view and narratively speaking, it is remarkable that Boccaccio decided to embody this conflict between two opposite ways of conceiving this mutant reality in such a complex and obscure figure as a false ghost, which could be interpreted as a metaphor of the social conflict itself.

The "Ghost" in the Magic Treatises by Lope de Barrientos[1]

Antonia Rísquez

University of Pompeu Fabra – Barcelona

(orcid.org/0000-0002-0419-9972)

Abstract: In this chapter I have done a revision of the "ghost's idea" in the Magic Treatises written by Lope de Barrientos. These scholastic and didactic books are related with the Aristotelian gnoseology and his theory of external and internal senses. Moreover, I will study the relation of Magic Treatises with theology.

Keywords: Lope de Barrientos, ghost, magic, Medieval literature.

Introduction

The main thing we have to highlight in respect to the figure of Lope de Barrientos is that the reigns of Juan II and Enrique IV cannot be understood without him. He was even exempt from attending his diocese by a papal bull in order to attend the issues of the court. He was an ambitious man who achieved excellence in every scope he decided to work: as a Professor at the University of Salamanca and tutor of the Prince Enrique, the future Enrique IV, who was the son of Juan II; as clergyman he was one of the most famous bishops of the diocese of Cuenca; as a politician he was one of the most influential and powerful man in the court of Juan II. However, he did not have so great influence during the reign of Enrique IV, either because of the age of the bishop or because of his disagreements with the king[2].

There are two episodes in his life that I consider paradigmatic and exemplary of the personality of Barrientos and his vital trajectory. The first of them occurs during his initial steps in the court of Juan II as tutor of the prince Enrique. In 1434 Enrique de Villena, Marquis of Villena, dies, accused of sorcery and necromancy. Due to the serious accusations, Juan II orders a book purge and burning of the personal library of Villena[3], and he entrusted Lope de Barrientos with it. This is the first book burning of which we have evidence, and it earned Barrientos the reputation of barbaric inquisitor throughout centuries. Nevertheless, it should be pointed out that the first person who

---

[1] *In memoriam patris mei.*

[2] In relation to the biography of Barrientos, cf. Rísquez Madrid 2010 and 2011 and Martínez Casado 1994, where documentation about his activities can be found.

[3] In the work of Cotarelo y Mori 1896 it can be found a reconstruction of the library of the Marquis of Villena according to the various testimonies collected through years.

accuses Barrientos of doing things wrongly is the poet Juan de Mena[4], who accused him of not having shared the books of Villena's library and kept them all, except those which were burnt. Ever since, many authors have written about this action of Barrientos, even the Padre Feijoo, who blames him for not having knowledge of the topics of the books. However, it is highly improbable and nowadays it is well known that, after this incident, Lope de Barrientos wrote his Magic Treatises, where he made reference to this episode and some of the purged books[5]. Besides, it must be taken into account that Lope de Barrientos belonged to the Dominican order, known by his extensive inquisitorial task in Europe at the command of the Holy Office, but also by being great experts in the forbidden works.

This defence of the converted could be considered the second episode of Barrientos' life that has marked his figure throughout centuries[6], and although some scholars such as Constanza Cavallero[7] connected him with the writing of the Magic Treatises, I am convinced that this is a wrong hypothesis due to the own nature of the works and the topics they deal with. Moreover, in the Treatises he mentioned the episode of the purge and the fire of Villena's library[8], but there is no reference at all to the revolt of Toledo in 1499[9].

Within his literary output[10], the three Magic Treatises of Lope de Barrientos are the writings that have caught the interest of the literary critics and researchers[11]. However, there is not a critical edition of the Treatises as a whole, but individually, and, when they have been edited together, not all the available testimonies have been taken into account.

It is noteworthy that, within the literature of magic in Castile, Barrientos' Treatises are the first ones written in the Romance language[12], which speaks to the eagerness to disseminate his ideas inside Castilian territory. Moreover, the reason for choosing Castilian is not owing to his ignorance of Latin, as the bishop

---

[4] An extensive commentary of this episode can be found in Rísquez Madrid 2010: 29-40.

[5] Cf. Alonso Getino 1927: 122.

[6] Cf. Rísquez Madrid 2010: 54-61.

[7] Cf. Cavallero 2010.

[8] Cf. Alonso Getino 1927: 117-118.

[9] Regarding this event, he wrote a group of works: *Contra los cizañadores de los convertidos de la nación de Israel* (Alonso Getino 1927: 180-204) and *Opusculum super intellectu quorundam verborum ciuisdam decreti cotenti in volumni Decretorum, ubi Gratianus tractans de materia sacrilegii in casu 17 et quaest. 4 ait*: "Sacrilegii quoque reatum incurrit qui Iudeis publica officia committit", whose translation into Spanish -*Respuesta a una duda*- has been also edited in Martínez Casado 1996: 25-64.

[10] A more detail study related to the work of Lope de Barrientos could be consulted in Martínez Casado 1994 and Rísquez Madrid 2010.

[11] Cf. Rísquez Madrid 2014a, where a review of the edition of the Treatises is given and there is also a description of one of the testimonies almost unknown up to then.

[12] Cf. Morgado García 1999: 12.

uses it in other writings, as it is the case of *Clauis sapientiae*[13]*,* but to his concern for the reader of this work and the search for a wider dissemination.

Regarding the date of the composition of the Treatises, scholars do not agree with it, except in that they could not be written after the death of Juan II in 1454, as the king entrusted Barrientos with their composition, according to his own words in the prefaces of these works. So, the temporal spectrum considered by the scholars encompasses from his early days at the court to the last years of the king. What is proven is that the date of the copy of the oldest preserved testimonies is after 1445, because the treatment given to Lope de Barrientos is "bishop of Cuenca", the position he held since that year. The relative chronology is also certain among the three Treatises: firstly, he writes *De caso e fortuna*[14]; secondly, *Del dormir e despertar*[15], and, finally, *De la divinança e sus especies*[16].

The Treatises have a scholastic style: their structure is established in the beginning, where their parts and chapters are distinguished, and the topic is written in an organized and clear way and with a noticeable educational character. Taking into account their structure as well as their language, nowadays we would say that it is a work of "scientific diffusion", since it clarifies concepts, resolves doubts and gives arguments of authority necessary to defend his opinion. The Treatises fulfil the purpose mentioned in the prefaces: to give to the King Juan II the theological arguments in order to distinguish the legal magic practices and the illegal ones.

Ghostly apparitions in Barrientos' Treatises

The treatise *Tractado del dormir e despertar* deals with the concept of 'ghost' more extensively than the other two ones. In the *Tractado de caso e fortuna* there is no reference to either ghost or a similar concept, which is understandable as its main topic is not related to it at all. The same applies to *Tractado de la divinança e sus especies* as it does not deal with ghost or phantasia, but with the concept of 'spirit'.

In the preface of the *Tractado del dormir e despertar* it is anticipated that in the second part of the work:

> […] se dirá cómmo se causan las visiones que paresçen a los onbres, así dormiendo commo velando, e cómmo por la mayor parte todas son yllusiones

---

[13] This work is the only medieval complete encyclopaedia written in a Hispanic sphere whose critical edition can be consulted online in Rísquez Madrid 2010, together with a detail study.

[14] The edition I will follow in this chapter is the edition of Godinas 2006.

[15] The most complete edition until now is the edition of García-Monge Carretero 2001.

[16] This treatise is the one that has more editions edited till nowadays. I will follow the one of Cuenca Muñoz 1994, although, for reasons of accessibility, I will quote according to number of page of the edition of 1992.

e operaçiones de la fantasia, fablando naturalmente, o de los malos spíritus, fablando theologalmente[17].

This double reference is very interesting to the concept, given that he mentions a duality in the 'ghost' to which I refer later: on the one hand, it deals with a gnoseological conception, and, on the other hand, with a theological one.

The beginning of the second part of the *Tractado del dormir e despertar* is written about the five exterior powers and the five inner ones. The fifth inner power is phantasia. It is located in the middle part of the brain, because, being located in such a position, it receives the images of both the imaginative power, which is situated in the front part of the brain, and the memorative one, whose location is the posterior part of the brain. The function of this fifth power is to create images adding or dividing from others. Another characteristic of phantasia is their constant state of activity, they are either asleep or awake. Barrientos also writes in the forth premise that the memorative power retains the similarities and the figures obtained by the external senses, so, in the absence of the sensorial stimuli, everything that have been perceived previously can be judged. Thus, these similarities or images of the things represent real things:

> Así las semejanças e figuras de las cosas inpressas en las virtudes sobredichas representan al animal las cosas de quien son figuras, e por tanto los phísicos algunas vezes las llaman ymagines e a las vezes ýdolos, e otras vezes simulacros, e a las vezes espeçies e otras vezes intençiones, e a las vezes semejanças e otras vezes fantasmas[18].

Later, it is said that:

> […] sueño es aparíçión que se faze dormiendo, causada de las ymágines de las cosas conservadas en la memoria o retentiva; quiere dezir que el sueño es visión o aparesçimiento, el qual dormiendo se causa de la ymágines e semejanças de las cosas que sentimos quando velamos, las quales figuras e ymágines se retienen e conservan en la memoria […], quando el onbre duerme encógense los sentidos e átanse commo dicho es, por tal manera que non puede sentir nin resçebir inpresiones de las cosas sensuales que son de la parte de fuera, e estonçe la fantasía ofresçe a los sesos las figuras e ymagines de las cosas conservadas e figuras[19].

Therefore, the dream is one of the main elements for the intervention of the phantasia. So, it is important to consider the dream in itself, which is the

---

[17] Cf. García-Monge Carretero 2001, vol. 2: 2.
[18] Cf. García-Monge Carretero 2001, vol. 2: 19.
[19] Cf. García-Monge Carretero 2001, vol. 2: 19-20.

objective of this treatise, where the causes of the dreams will be given, as well as the way in which the ghosts that are originated in the phantasia –that is, the natural ghosts and the ones from the evil spirits- will be shown in the dream[20].

Below he explains the ways that dreams occur. Concerning phantasia, he says: "La primera es quando dormiendo se representan a la fantasía las ymágines e figuras de las cosas en formas indistintas e confusas, por tal manera que non se pueden disçerner e determinar las ymágines e figuras de las tales cosas"[21]. That is, the dreams cause confusion in the person who is dreaming to the point of presenting the known things in different ways, so he cannot recognise them.

In the section dedicated to resolve important questions, Barrientos allocates one part to study when people are less susceptible to have dreams: in this treatise he explains that the physical cause for the production of the dream is a kind of streams that arise to the head in certain circumstances (tiredness, increase of temperature after an abundant meal, for instance); sometimes these streams are so thick that they prevent the person from seeing the images produced by the phantasia, as it happens to children or drunk people and, as a result, the dream is not produced[22].

In the eighth doubt, Barrientos deals with somnambulism, where he explains that some people do things while they are asleep as if they were awake, and it is a consequence of "[…] la potençia que llamamos fantasía, por quanto, sengut dicho avemos, más sueltamente faze sus operaçiones dormiendo el onbre que velando". Thus, somnambulism is a natural product of the phantasia. Nevertheless, sometimes the actions committed by the sleeping person are of considerable importance, even for harming someone: according to Barrientos, in these cases the somnambulism is not owing to the natural action of the phantasia, but to the action of the evil spirits, who incite the person to achieve what he wants while he is asleep, because he cannot achieve it while he is awake[23].

Finally, in the chapter where an answer is given to the sixteenth question, which deals with how to be able to distinguish the false dreams from the true ones, Barrientos writes that some sick people have seen their fears or their wishes and it is because the inner senses are damaged and do not work properly, as these visions are actually operations of the phantasia. When it happens to a healthy person, either he does not make an issue of it, because he knows that these ghosts are operations of the phantasia, or his case should be analysed by the sages as if they were miraculous apparitions. Barrientos describes these ghosts as operations of the phantasia that "acaesçen más de noche que de día, por quanto a las personas temerosas les paresçe que veen aquello que temen, por

---

[20] Cf. García-Monge Carretero 2001, vol. 2: 20-23.
[21] Cf. García-Monge Carretero 2001, vol. 2: 24.
[22] Cf. García-Monge Carretero 2001, vol. 2: 32-33.
[23] Cf. García-Monge Carretero 2001, vol. 2: 40-41.

quanto así commo lo temen, así lo representa la fantasía al seso común, e el seso común lo representa a la vista e a los otros sesos particulares". Thus, this is the explanation of why people say they have seen supernatural beings[24].

In the *Tractado de la divinança e sus especies* there are references to a concept related to that of the ghost: the spirit. In fact, it is said that the evil spirits can materialize themselves when they possess a body, as it can be read in the second chapter of the first part of the treatise[25]. He also distinguishes between good spirits and evil ones, although at a first moment all of them cause terror: "Asymesmo pone Tullio en el libro *De republica* que veyendo Sçipión que Africano, que era muerto, le aparesçió en forma más espantable que lo él oviese conosçido, súbito cayó espantado, al qual dixo Sçipión: *Esfuérçate, non temas, e nota las cosas que te diré, ecétera.* Esto es en prueva que causan espanto en prinçipio quando aparesçen"[26]. Likewise, the evil spirits increase the fear, while the good ones comfort those who see them[27].

Regarding the nature of the spirits, Barrientos notices that "los ángeles buenos commo los malos toman los dichos cuerpos de ayre, el qual para tal operaçión se espessa e forma en la manera del cuerpo que el tal spíritu ha de tomar. Pero ay esta diferençia, que los buenos spíritus toman cuerpos del ayre alto e más linpio, e los malignos spíritus toman cuerpos del ayre más baxo e fidiondo"[28]. In this description of the spirits it can be noted a radical difference between the concepts of ghost and spirit: the ghost is an image understood by the inner senses, that is produced in the brain of the person, in contrast to the spirit, which is a corporeal being and, thus, is understood through the external senses.

Concept of Ghost and Phantasia: From Aristotle to Barrientos

Throughout the Middle Ages, two meanings of the concept 'ghost' can be distinguished. The first meaning comes from the gnoseological theory of Aristotle, that a ghost would be the product of the phantasia, this one being of the inner senses of the human being. The second meaning is the apparition of the person after his death: the fear of death and the dead play an essential role in this definition that is deeply rooted in the Roman tradition. It could be said that this second meaning is best known in a popular context as opposed to the first one, which is developed in a learned context. However, both have a place in the medieval literature: the gnoseological concept of 'ghost' is found in learned authors that study it in their philosophical works, as Thomas of

---

[24] Cf. García-Monge Carretero 2001, vol. 2: 63-65.
[25] Cf. Cuenca Muñoz 1992: 181.
[26] Cf. Cuenca Muñoz 1992: 189.
[27] Cf. Cuenca Muñoz 1992: 190-191.
[28] Cf. Cuenca Muñoz 1992: 190-191.

Aquinas or Albertus Magnus, but also in Alfonso X the Wise or the poet Juan de Mena[29]; the popular concept is found in countless stories for a long time as well, starting from Pliny the Young[30] in the Roman literature to nowadays; likewise this concept was studied and analysed from the theological point of view of the Fathers of the Church, Tertullian and Augustine of Hippo, the most important and meaningful authors[31].

The Aristotelian theory of knowledge is based in the perception through the sensitive faculties of an object of knowledge or substance, that is, the object is perceived by the external senses that send the perceptions to the common sense, which is one of the inner senses. Once common sense joins the different perceptions (sight, hearing, smell, taste and touch), imagination produces a sensitive image that the active intellect submits to a process of abstraction and the passive intellect creates the concept of the perceived object. Therefore, to reach the knowledge a joint effort should be made between the senses and understanding. In this summarised way, this is the Aristotelian gnoseological process.

Having said that, during the Middle Ages (around the 10th century) the Aristotelian work came to the West through Arab translations. I will not comment on the process of translation and commentary on the Aristotelian work, but I would like to highlight that the Aristotle we have in this period is the Latin Aristotle, which is a combination of translations and commentaries on his work made by different authors. Avicenna, Averroes, Albertus Magnus, Thomas of Aquinas and a long list of authors, translators and commentators are the ones who pass on the Aristotelian ideas during these centuries. Hence the fact that we do not have neither a standardized text nor a sole interpretation adjusted to the Greek text from where nowadays the philosophical study of Aristotle is started. The appropriateness of this marginal note is emphasised when we analyse the inner senses: their number and their names change depending on the authors; therefore there would be three, four or even seven different faculties.

Concerning the topic of this chapter, I will discuss briefly the inner sense of the phantasia. *Phantasia* is a Greek term that in Latin is equivalent to *imaginatio*; thus, ghost and image are equal terms in this context. However, this comparison is found in some texts but not in all, so some authors speak about the four inner senses that Aristotle draws up (common sense, estimative power, memory and phantasia), although others add a fifth one, the imagination. This system of five inner senses is developed by Avicenna, and since then it will be present in many other authors.

---

[29] Cf. Tubau 2007.

[30] He is considered to be the first author who wrote a ghost story (*ep.* 7. 27) that will be the archetype in the later literature of ghosts.

[31] Cf. Lecouteux 1986: 1ª, 3, 1-2.

The popular meaning of ghost as the apparition of a person after his death was subject of study for the Fathers of the Church, because the fear of death and of the apparition of the dead is established in the society of every age. As heir of the pagan culture and religion, the medieval society also inherited both these fears and the Roman literature and customs[32]. As it is logical, the belief in these ghosts clashes with the dogmas of the Christian Church, and due to it, the Fathers of the Church replied to these phenomena. Tertullian is the first author in dealing with this topic in his treatise *De anima* where he admits the existence of ghosts as a product of an evil's possession through black magic and necromancy in order to provoke fear in people. Therefore, Tertullian denies that dead could return to life or stay with the living as ghost or apparition, but that these ghosts would be in fact devilish possessions. In short, he denies the supernatural nature of the ghost and transforms it into a theological question.

The discourse of Augustine is very interesting, as his starting point is the unburied dead and how they appear in dreams to their loved ones in order to reveal their location. He says that it could not be denied that it occurs, because later the corpses are found, so he introduces a new type of possession: the possession of the good angels. For him, ghosts are incorporeal, and because of it, they manifest themselves especially in the oneiric sphere, therefore the good angels are responsible of the good dreams and the fallen angels are of misleading dreams and ghosts[33].

In general, in regards to the matter of ghosts, the Christian Church gave a series of solutions to explain these different phenomena. Following Tertullian and Augustine these questions will be answered, so at the end of the 12th century all ghosts and apparitions will be considered as possessions, either incorporeal or corporal, during dreams or wakefulness[34].

Returning to Lope de Barrientos, the first work where the concept of 'ghost' can be seen is *Clauis sapientiae*, which, as it has been mentioned, is an encyclopaedia whose aim is to define and to explain the concepts of the natural and moral philosophies. Through the encyclopaedia 'phantasia' and 'ghosts' are mentioned in the Aristotelian sense of the term, that is, ghosts are apparitions, products of the phantasia, which is one of the inner senses of the intellectual soul: *Dicitur autem fantasia in quantum facit talium formarum diuersas compositiones et dicitur a «fanos», quod est apparitio, quia facit homini diuersa apparere, unde et tales apparitiones fantasie dicuntur et ipse species in ea conseruate fantasmata appellantur*[35]. According to this fragment, there is an etymological explanation of the term 'phantasia' and, therefore, of 'ghost': it is an apparition.

---

[32] Regarding this topic, cf. Lecouteux 1986. See also chapter 4 of this book.
[33] Cf. *De cura pro mortuis gerenda*.
[34] Cf. Lecouteux 1986: 1ª, 3, 5.
[35] Cf. Rísquez Madrid 2010: 693.

In the Treatises, the term 'phantasia' also appears in the Aristotelian sense collected in his encyclopaedia. As the scholar Llosa Sanz points out[36], it is especially related to the dream, where phantasia works with complete freedom linking known images in order to create other new ones unseen previously. Lope de Barrientos follows in his work the commentaries of Albertus Magnus and Avicenna on Aristotle about the division of the inner senses in five powers: common sense, imagination, phantasia, estimative power, and memory. In this way, he presents it in his *Clauis sapientiae* and it is written similarly in his Treatises. This division also corresponds to a division of the inner senses in a symmetrical way: sight, hearing, smell, taste and touch, what allows a more understandable system. As it has been said, Aristotle points out four inner senses, so the division of Barrientos corresponds to the use of the texts originated in Avicenna's commentaries.

Thus, it is clear that Barrientos never separates himself in his Magic Treatises from the tradition, but he considers that phantasia, as either imagination or memory, as one of the senses located in the brain and its operations produce the ghosts. So, ghosts are a phenomenon neither strange nor exterior to the person, but are originated and perceived in the inner. It is interesting to highlight that the person who perceives a ghost, does not see it with his eyes, because the sight is an external sense, but because it is a product of an inner sense, the person only sees it inside his brain. In this way Barrientos studies it in the *Tractado de dormir e despertar*, from which many instances have been quoted in which Barrientos explains that ghosts are products of the operations of the phantasia.

In respect to the second meaning of 'ghost', the one whose nature is popular and whose difficulties have been analysed by the Church, is also dealt with by Barrientos. As it can be read in the passages quoted as examples of the treatment of the concept 'ghost' in the Magic Treatises, in *Tractado del dormir e despertar*[37] and in *Tractado de la divinança e sus especies*[38], both refer to spirits. It is said that spirits are exterior beings that can possess a body and act through it, to make good as well as to make evil. That means that the spirit is corporeal and it is perceived by the external senses: it is seen and it is hearing by the sight and by the heard respectively.

Barrientos is aware of the difference between a type of ghost and another one, and thus he specifies at the beginning of *Tractado del dormir e despertar*[39] when he points out that one can speak about ghosts either "naturalmente" and therefore he refers to the operations of phantasia, or "theologalmente" when it is made reference to spirits. So, he starts from the duality of the concept of

---

[36] Cf. Llosa Sanz 2008: 151-152.
[37] Cf. García-Monge Carretero 2001, vol. 2: 20-23.
[38] Cf. Cuenca Muñoz 1992: 190-191.
[39] Cf. García-Monge Carretero 2001, vol. 2: 2.

'ghost', to which he will refer during his exposition. He will follow clearly the theoretical guidelines of the Aristotelian doctrine for the natural explanation and the ecclesiastical one for the theological explanation.

Conclusions

On the 15th of December of 1434 Enrique de Villena dies in Madrid, and after his death he was accused of having practised necromancy and heresies. So, the Crown confiscated his property. Nevertheless, the charges could not convince Juan II, who asked to the then friar Lope de Barrientos to write a work explaining which magic practises were licit and which were not. Taking into account the aim of the Magic Treatises it is understandable that Barrientos would write a work of an easy clarifying and didactic reading, that he uses the arguments of authority and he knows his way around the accepted theories in philosophical and theological topic: Aristotle and his theory of knowledge and the explanations of the Fathers of the Church will be his theoretical and doctrinal sources.

This duality of the treatment of the topic –the explanation of the natural philosophy and the theological explanation- gives rise to the duality of the concept of the ghost present in the Treatises. These two perspectives of study, in short, are the two core ideas that regulate the exposition of Barrientos, who assembles in his work the double view of the dealt phenomena. None of the points of the Treatises are original in themselves, neither the concepts nor the explanations, nor the structure of the work, but all of them together lead to an agile and effective work in order to achieve the goals Barrientos resolves. This is characteristic of the vital trajectory of Lope de Barrientos.

On the other hand, it seems to me interesting to point out a terminological issue: images, apparitions, idols, semblances, species, intentions, similarities... they all are different terms used to name ghosts, not only by Barrientos, but also during the Middle Ages and throughout history. However, Barrientos distinguishes between these terms and 'spirit', which in the Treatises is referred specifically to ghosts, which is explained by Theology.

In sum, it has been shown the idea of the bishop of Cuenca, Lope de Barrientos, about what a ghost is, connecting it with the most important philosophical and theological theories of his time, so we can consider the magic Treatises as a paradigmatic example of the philosophical and theological thought of the 15th century Treatise.

"Phantom Ladies" and "Ghost Gallants": the Motif of Supernatural Lovers in the Spanish Golden Age Theatre

Ane Zapatero Molinuevo
University of the Basque Country, UPV/EHU
(orcid.org/0000-0003-0695-9450)

Abstract: Spanish Golden Age plays about a supernatural lover are usually considered regular situation comedies, but also make up a subgroup among them. In this particular type of comedy, the *galán* (gallant) or the *dama* (lady) assumes the disguise of a ghost or another magical creature in order to overcome an obstacle that hinders their love relationship. Moreover, the gender of the disguised character is the key to analysing the two ways in which the motif of the supernatural lover displays itself in Golden Age plays. On the basis of a comparison between two plays by Calderón featuring this motif from the two approaches, female and male disguised characters —*La dama duende (The phantom lady)* and *El galán fantasma (The ghost gallant)*— and using examples from other plays in which it is also used, this chapter tries to analyse and explain these two ways in which the motif of the supernatural lover displays itself in the 17th century Spanish Theatre.

Keywords: Comedy, lie, supernatural, gender differentiation, Calderón de la Barca.

Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to highlight the main features of a group of Spanish *comedias* written in the 17th century revolving around the motif of the "supernatural lover". In these plays the love relationship between the *galán* and the *dama* is shaped by a special characteristic: the supernatural disguise that one of them adopts. We will describe the principal traits of this scheme focusing on the differences aroused from the gender of the character that disguises himself or herself in each case, taking the comparison of two famous plays by Calderón de la Barca based on this motif as a starting point —*La dama duende* (1629) with a female leading character, and *El galán fantasma* (1637) with a male one—. This analysis will be completed with examples taken from other plays where this theme works as a main driver, such as *El diablo está en Cantillana* (1662) by Luis Vélez de Guevara and others where the motif acts as a subsidiary element in a more complex plot, as in Tirso de Molina's *Don Gil de las calzas verdes* (1615)[1].

---

[1] In the text, dates in brackets refer to the year when the first edition of each play was published. All the plays discussed are listed here with estimated composition dates: *La viuda valenciana* (1599-1600), *Don Gil de las calzas verdes* (1615), *La fantasma de Valencia* (1625), *El diablo está en Cantillana* (around 1626), *La dama duende* (1629), *El galán fantasma* (1629-1637), *El imposible vencido* (1637), *Bellaco sois, Gómez* (1641-1643) and *El encanto sin encanto* (1650-1652). All texts are quoted from the editions included in the bibliography.

It is a well-known fact that in the *Comedia Nueva* love is usually depicted in terms of conflict until a catharsis takes place at the very end of the play in the form of marriage[2]. A similar problem arises in our plays, but in these cases the characters opt to disguise themselves as supernatural creatures, with the resulting trick. The ploy can carry out various aims, the main ones being: the desire to start a courtship and the need to protect a consolidated couple from the love requirements of a character from a higher social class. The consequences in the development of the plot and in the general tone of the play are different for each of these two distinct situations. At this point it should be noted that the plays we are considering here are often read and studied with others, like *Amar por señas* or *La celosa de sí misma*, both by Tirso de Molina. In this vein, De Armas has suggested all these works can be grouped together under the motif of the "invisible lover". In all of them, he points out, a young foreigner is invited to love a lady who cannot be seen, as she is covered, wears a mask, or always receives the *galán* in a dark room[3]. This classification of undeniable interest only explains plays in which women disguise themselves and is nevertheless too general, in light of the overly too frequent presence of components such as masks, the covered lady (*la tapada)*, or spaces like dark rooms and secret passageways in the comical theatre of the Golden Age. All of them serve the purpose of creating identity misunderstandings, confusion and the *quid pro quo* distinctive feature of comedy —appearing not only in the Spanish Golden Age plays, but also in the ones by Shakespeare, Molière, Plautus or Menander—. Therefore, this study will focus on the plays where the habitual string of misunderstandings is linked to a supernatural lie, given that it has important consequences in the way the plot and its humorous mechanisms are devised. This deception is concocted through different textual and spectacular elements, anchored in certain cultural conceptions[4]. In fact, cultural aspects —especially those concerning beliefs in ghosts, goblins and other magical creatures— play an important role in these plays and contribute to create a double comical perspective. On the one hand, reactions towards the supernatural are remarkably efficient dramatically speaking, not to mention the contrast between sceptical characters and gullible ones (*graciosos*, most of the times). This is underlined by the contrast between the knowledge of the spectator —already aware of the false nature of the supernatural element— and the limited perspective of the characters. A further trait of these plays is the romance between a lady or a gallant and a mysterious creature which —save from being defined as male or female— cannot be identified as a human or a ghost. In order to further study the cultural constructs beneath the supernatural lover motif, it may be relevant to make some brief observations on the precedents of the ghost gallant and the phantom lady.

---

[2] Di Pinto 2004: 131-132.
[3] De Armas 1986: 341-342.
[4] Cazés Gryj 2013: 71.

Regarding the female variation of the theme, the figure of the lady masquerading as a supernatural being is not easy to trace in Spanish literature, despite the well-known prejudice of the diabolic linked to females. This idea was common in the Judaeo-Christian tradition and was widely spread throughout the Spanish Middle Ages[5]. However, in the medieval texts devilish beings that impersonate women are abundant, while real women who try to masquerade as supernatural creatures are rather unusual. Another view on the topic is provided by De Armas —let us recall his selection of plays on "invisible women"— where he suggests that the origin of the motif goes back to the story of Cupid and Psyche included in Apuleius' *The Golden Ass*. According to De Armas, these women reverse the roles of the classical myth: they remain hidden under the guise of the supernatural mask, leaving men to burn with love and curiosity. Right after, De Armas draws the transmission of the motif until the 17th century theatre, via the Italian *novella* and the Spanish *El soldado Píndaro* (1626) by Céspedes y Meneses[6]. Even if the echoes of these works are significant, points of convergence between texts are scarce, and the similarities analysed by De Armas seem "undeniable, but minimal regarding extension and global structure of the plot"[7]. Therefore, it is more cautious to keep a sceptical stance on the precedents of these dramatical "phantom ladies". Conversely, tracing back the origins of the ghost gallant turns out less difficult, as the "ghost in love" is a recurring topic in Spanish literary history. Closely linked to folklore, it is always a male figure who dresses up as a spirit to hide his love away from the prying eyes of any onlookers[8]. Furthermore, the belief in ghosts —which was common in the 17th century— usually has a comical stage effect in these plays where the false spirit is a character in disguise that frightens others and brings laughter to the audience[9]. All in all, these ghostly figures in love were not unfamiliar to the *corrales de comedias* of the 17th century and their audience: spectators knew the true identity of these figures beforehand and could even guess a love relationship being hidden —which increased the comical effect.

Variations in the motif: phantom ladies [female leading role] and comical tone

The first aspect to draw attention to when comparing *La dama duende* to *El galán fantasma* is the comical tone of the first, as it belongs to the prolific "cloak--and-sword" theatrical production of Calderón. These plays are a continuation of the ones written by Lope and Tirso, always centred around love and jealousy,

---

[5] Escartín Gual 2008: 67.
[6] De Armas 1976.
[7] Antonucci 2006: XXXVIII.
[8] Pedrosa 2006: 733-734.
[9] Laplana Gil 1993: 95.

although increasingly stylized, complex and ingenious[10]. Here, women usually play the leading role, as does our model of phantom lady. The main character of *La dama duende* is Ángela, a young widow, curious and restless, who longs to escape her brothers' constant surveillance. Her desire for freedom drives her to adopt a supernatural disguise, which offers her a good chance to establish contact with the opposite sex —as it also happens to the ghost gallants. Nevertheless, the obstacles that Ángela and the other disguised female protagonists must overcome are mild and usually restricted to the private and the domestic. The supernatural disguise allows Ángela to flirt with Manuel, the gallant, without endangering her honour or confronting her brothers' authority. Significantly, turning into a phantom lady will also enable her to take the lead in the courtship. Far from being a novelty in the "cloak-and-sword" comedies, as Wardropper pointed out, in these plays women are able to take the initiative in the courtship, contrary to what is usually established —a fundamental lack of mutual understanding between real men and women which comedy loves to exploit[11]. In the plays considered, the disguise clearly enables women to take part in the game of seduction, as we see in *El encanto sin encanto* (1672) by Calderón[12]. The lady in this comedy, Serafina, locks Enrique up in a fortress with the help of her servants under the pretext of protecting him. While concealing her identity from the gallant, Serafina sings, dances and even declares her love for him, always disguised as a sort of ghostly apparition Enrique is forbidden to touch. Once again, the supernatural lie allows the lady to adopt an identity that effectively protects her honour.

The supernatural disguise may also play a small or secondary role in other plays, such as *La viuda valenciana* (1620) by Lope de Vega, *Don Gil de las calzas verdes* (1635) by Tirso de Molina or *Bellaco sois, Gómez* (1643), attributed to Tirso. In the first one, another young widow, Leonarda, is willing to indulge her desire for Camilo, a gallant she has spotted in the street, without marrying him or jeopardising her good name. In order to achieve her goal without the young man discovering her identity, Leonarda asks her servants for help: they blindfold Camilo and take him to Leonarda's place, where they sleep together. According to Ferrer Valls in her edition of the play, Camilo's ignorance of his lover's identity is the core plot-premise[13]. This only proves *La viuda valenciana*'s close relationship with regular comedies on mistaken identities, but one of the sub-themes in the play sets up a clear dialogue with the phantom lady motif. Thus, when Camilo is on the brink of discovering Leonarda's identity, she confuses him, making the young man believe he has been sleeping with an old lady. Camilo, scared, resumes

---

[10] Wilson 1974: 171.
[11] Wardropper 1978: 222.
[12] Valbuena Briones 1973: 635 had already pointed out the links between *La dama duende*, *El galán fantasma* and *El encanto sin encanto*, plays he regarded as a trilogy on "mysterious lovers".
[13] Ferrer Valls 2001: 35.

one of his frights since the affair began: his mysterious lover must be a demon, a witch or a "*lindo encantamiento*". Even if Leonarda has never disguised herself, her behaviour induces his lover to believe a magical creature has been involved in their romance, which may relate the play to *La dama duende*[14].

In *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*, Juana chases Martín, who has fled after taking advantage of her under a promise of marriage. According to a carefully designed plan, Juana assumes the new identity Martín has adopted in Madrid while —after spreading the news she has died— she pretends to be a ghost in front of him. A similar trick can be found in *Bellaco sois, Gómez*: after announcing her own false death to Gregorio, Ana pursues him under various male and female disguises, one of them supernatural. She impersonates her own lost soul and threatens to continue haunting the gallant. Both Martín from *Don Gil* and Gregorio from *Bellaco sois, Gómez* end up surrendering to the insistence of such clever ladies and accept to marry them. In the two plays, thus, the supernatural disguise is one among many devices used by women to achieve their goals —no need to say the fear awakened provides them with a major advantage over men.

In the four above-mentioned plays, supernatural disguise is mainly used by women to solve two regular female dramatic problems: the urge to seduce a man or the need to win back a lover who has left them. The main obstacle here is usually the lady's own honour, not an external real threat, for when this appears it is always under the form of a close relative (Angela's brothers, Leonarda's aunt...). Hence, women use the supernatural disguise to face inner difficulties —even if they may have external consequences— linked to an honour code they have made their own. Such ruses are the way women temporarily avoid this strict code, keeping even their love interests from finding out the transgression. An acute female awareness of the laws of their society is thus revealed, as stated by Wardropper in his renowned article[15]. In fact, these phantom ladies display an outstanding ability to cloak themselves with an aura of mystery, taking men aback and achieving a more powerful position than them. They do not hesitate to make use of secret spaces and passages, costumes, favourable conditions, carefully outlined plans and the help of servants. However, as said before, these female spheres of influence are often restricted to a domestic setting. This setting, the female leading role and the nature of the conflict developed contribute to lending an intentionally cheerful and comical tone to this group of plays. This is significantly less marked in plays revolving around a male main character, that is, a ghost gallant.

---

[14] Critics such as De Armas 1993: 65 have analysed the ties between the two works, once again on the basis of the Cupid and Psyche myth, for «both Leonarda and Ángela turn into invisible Cupids, ensuring their faces are not shown».

[15] Wardropper 1978: 226.

Variations in the motif: ghost gallants [male leading role] and serious tone

The first remarkable aspect of *El galán fantasma* is its setting: the action takes place in the ducal court of a foreign kingdom —a much higher social sphere than the one depicted in *La dama duende* and other related plays. The second striking element is the desperate situation that compels the main character, Astolfo, to make use of the supernatural disguise: the Duke of Saxony wants to eliminate him in order to abuse his fiancée, Julia. As a consequence, it is not possible for Astolfo to enjoy his trick the way Ángela and other phantom ladies do. In fact, he only takes advantage of a situation in which other characters misinterpret his presence as a ghostly appearance —for everyone thinks he was killed by the Duke in a duel. Bearing these elements in mind and considering their implications in the verse, Parker claims *El galán fantasma* "is not a funny play and it can only be considered a comedy regarding its type of plot" and that "even if the situation is comical, the humorous aspects are not developed"[16]. In this line, the brutality displayed by the Duke towards the couple (he nearly kills Astolfo and tries to rape Julia) connects *El galán fantasma* with a number of baroque plays where the dominant/dominated dichotomy plays an important role. Their plots always revolve around an outrage committed by a character coming from the high nobility, who abuses his power induced by sexual attraction towards a woman of a lower social level[17].

On the contrary, the above-mentioned play is far away from those tragic pieces such as *Fuente Ovejuna* or *El alcalde de Zalamea*, common models of plays centred in the abuse at the hands of the powerful character. Indeed, the very use of the supernatural disguise to circumvent the abuse of the tyrant provides some comic relief as well as a parodic tone to *El galán fantasma*. Therefore, Arellano's suggestion to include the play among Calderón's *comedias palatinas*[18] on account of its exotic palace setting and the presence of a noble character seems quite convincing. Iglesias Iglesias also argues in favour of considering the play a subtype of *comedia palatina* —those constructed around the lust of a powerful nobleman. Difficulties with the classification of the play arise from the seriousness of the conflict —insistently highlighted by Calderón— in contrast with its comical components. This mixture of tragic plot and comical treatment is one of the distinctive features of *El galán fantasma*, even if comical elements are limited to certain sequences and characters (like the *gracioso*) in the play. This comical-serious model, as defined by Vitse[19], was more frequent in Calderón's time —and

---

[16] Parker 1991: 191-195.
[17] Diallo 2013: 67-68.
[18] Arellano 2012: 503-504.
[19] Vitse 1983: 526.

meant to endure. It is more in line with the definition of *comedia seria* suggested by Arellano[20], which would be the best framework to understand a play as *El galán fantasma*. On this basis, we can draw the first conclusions around the character of the ghost gallant: he is a young man in love facing a typical conflict of duties, due to the fact that a nobleman belonging to a higher social position —and therefore worthy of respect— lusts after his fiancée. The gallant will be forced to resort to the supernatural disguise against his own will in order to avert the danger. The result is a comical-serious play set in a high-class environment that remains comical —even if it involves many serious and tragic elements. This scheme is not only to be found in Calderón's play. In fact, Vélez de Guevara's *El diablo está en Cantillana* (1622) shares the same plot and a similar approach[21]: Lope Sotelo is a loyal vassal to his lord, King Don Pedro of Castile, until asked by him not only to give up his lady, but also to help him seduce her. Incapable of persuading the monarch to abandon this whim, a desperate Lope will disguise himself as a ghost to avoid the royal command and keep his lady. Once again we witness the conflict between a vassal and a lord who abuses his power —this time, in a medieval and rural context. However, a more comical perspective can be entertained: Vélez takes more advantage of the traditional sources of the "ghost in love" scheme, and the funny reactions of the peasants of Cantillana towards the ghost contribute to stress the hilarious aspects of the plot. Rodríguez Baltanás has pointed out the importance of the ghostly ruse in the play, as it structures its plot —and its serious passages—, while serving as an effective trigger for comedy[22]. Thus, both the play by Calderón and the one by Vélez develop —and neutralize— a tragic conflict through humour[23]. Overall, men are always disguised against their will, forced by a critical situation they cannot face by any other means. The disguise allows them to fight back against powerful opponents indirectly and stop them from abusing their power. Moreover, in these plays the supernatural trick is not restricted to the domestic setting, rather taking place outdoors (the streets of Cantillana, Julia's garden…) enabling more characters to get involved in the appearances of the supposed ghost.

At this stage, after pointing out the differences between plays based on female and male supernatural lies, we are going to focus on the main elements involved in this type of trick which are common for both types of plays —and

---

[20] Arellano 2012: 138.

[21] Links between both plays have been well analysed by Iglesias Iglesias 2013, in her thesis on *El galán fantasma*, concluding both draw from tradition (the mentioned "ghost in love" scheme). Nevertheless, there are elements Calderón seems to borrow from Vélez.

[22] Rodríguez Baltanás 1992: 87.

[23] The motif of the ghost gallant can also be found in *novellas* written in the same period: *La fantasma de Valencia*, included in *Tardes entretenidas* (1625) by Alonso de Castillo Solórzano and *El imposible vencido* from the *Novelas amorosas y ejemplares* (1637) by María de Zayas y Sotomayor. We will not devote more attention to them for they are novels and not theatre plays, but they are the proof that the motif considered here was not restricted to the dramatic genre.

proof of both of them being variations of the same literary motif—, this is, elements regarding the set design, the romantic relationship, the presence of other characters who may be accomplices or victims of the supernatural lie and the way in which the trick is discovered at the end.

1. Set design (mechanisms making the ghost possible)

In many of these plays, a stage device contributes to the creation of the supernatural lie: a secret passage that connects two faraway spaces. This enables the alleged supernatural being to move from one place to another, to the amazement of characters ignorant to the existence of the passageway. The knowledge of its existence earns the supernatural lover a privileged position: without it, the existence of the supernatural is the most straightforward account for those mysterious movements. This device can take various forms: the cupboard that connects Ángela's and Manuel's rooms in *La dama duende*, the mine that joins Julia's garden with the house of a friend of Astolfo's in *El galán fantasma* or the secret passage used by Serafina to reach the fortress where she keeps Enrique in *El encanto sin encanto*. In *La viuda valenciana* there is not any secret passage, but the path to Leonarda's house reminds one of it, as it is a walk Camilo goes over at night and blindfolded: the young man does not know how to reach her lover's house and feels as defenceless before her as the above mentioned characters ignorant to the existence of the secret passage.

But what about the plays where the passage-device is missing? The supernatural trick is played without it in *El diablo está en Cantillana*, *Bellaco sois, Gómez* and *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*. In these cases, the costume takes the role of the passage. Lope uses the traditional ghost costume —a white sheet and chains—, while Ana simply covers her head with a cloak while her words reveal her as a ghost, in the manner of a verbal disguise. Juana's trick is similar, since it is the false identity taken from his lover, plus the untrue news she spreads, the basis to make her supernatural nature believable.

2. The deceiver / deceived lover and the romantic relationship

The relationship between the supernatural lover and its love interest is always tinged with mystery, as the later ignores the true nature of the supernatural being. If the gallant is the disguised one, the uncertainty is usually short-lived: the lady is deceived for a little while, since the trick is aimed at someone external to the couple, this is, the powerful nobleman. Ladies react to these ghosts with terror and tend to believe in their supernatural condition. In *El galán fantasma*, Julia panics the first time she sees Astolfo in her garden, having assumed Astolfo had died from the wounds previously caused by the Duke in their duel. However, in case the lady was in the dark about the whereabouts of her lover but did not presume he was dead, the first apparition of the ghost gallant is less disturbing.

In *El diablo está en Cantillana*, the first encounter with the ghost gallant takes place when the lady is in her bed, talking to Lope in her sleep. When he wakes her up all of a sudden, the lady simply believes she is still in a dream (691-695)[24].

Women who assume supernatural disguises face far more complex situations: it is not only their relatives they want to deceive, but also the men they are trying to seduce, awakening their interest while keeping their identity a secret. These phantom ladies are wittier than their male counterparts when plotting their tricks and enjoy stretching on the supernatural lie as much as possible. This applies even when other characters are on the verge of discovering them: Ángela, for example, upholds she is not a woman but a phantom even when she has been caught red-handed by Manuel (2104-2110)[25]. This daring female behaviour enabled by the supernatural disguise has a deep impact on the development of the romance, encouraging the gallants to win those women over. In the first instance, gallants praise and flatter the phantom ladies —even if they are unsure of their true nature. However, as soon as men try to approach them, ladies invoke supernatural elements as a pretext, claiming the loss of "a greater gift" by their lovers if they move forward, according to Ángela. This resistance, triggered by women's desire to keep both their honour and the supernatural deception, puts male characters in a difficult position, since their courage and desire comes into conflict with the lady's will. For example, in *El encanto sin encanto*, Enrique is tempted to defy Serafina's order:

> SERAF.   Deteneos,
>   porque en el instante mismo,
>   que me toquéis, no hallaréis
>   nada de cuanto habéis visto.
> ENRIQ.   Primero que de cobarde,
>   he de morir de atrevido.
>   Si es fantástico o real,
>   ¡viven los Cielos divinos!,
>   he de ver, por más que diga
>   vuestra voz… (III, pp. 428-429) [26]

This behaviour may also be related to rationalistic attitudes: men usually look more reluctant than women to accept the supernatural nature of phantoms and always strive to find a logical explanation for them. The best exponent is probably Manuel in *La dama duende*, who —aided by logic— is able to overcome even the sudden apparition of Ángela inside his own room. In other cases, men

---

[24] According to the edition by Muñoz Cortés 1976.
[25] According to the edition by Antonucci 1999.
[26] According to the edition published by Neumeister 2010.

reckon they are in front of a hard-to-explain incident, but refuse any supernatural explanation (e.g., Enrique in *El encanto sin encanto*). However, there are exceptions to this rule and some men are completely fooled, as Martín in *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*. It is always the lady who puts an end to the trick, but she always delays the revelation of her true identity until the very end of the play, making it match with the happy ending (this is, marriage).

3. Other characters involved in the trick: opponents, relatives and servants

In plays revolving around a ghost gallant, the figure of the powerful nobleman competing for the lady is essential, as it is him who forces the gallant's disguise. This antagonist is also the main victim of the deception, but acts as bravely as expected from a nobleman in front of the alleged supernatural being. King Don Pedro from Velez's play remains sceptical about the existence of the ghost and he approaches it asking for its identity and drawing his sword at their first encounter. In *El galán fantasma* the Duke acts in a similar way, even when expected to fear Astolfo's ghost since he allegedly killed him. In contrast, phantom ladies do not trick any high-status character nor pretend to be a supernatural being in front of no one other than their lovers and the servants of them[27]. Women who must account for their actions (Ángela lives with her brothers; Leonarda is visited by her uncle) resort to the above-mentioned scenic elements to avoid the vigilance of their relatives, while they reserve the supernatural disguise to contact men. In other plays this difficulty does not play an important role, for they are independent female characters, like Serafina —whose family is not mentioned in the play—, or because they have left home to chase their lovers, like Ana and Juana.

Servants, for their constant presence near ladies and gallants, always get involved in the supernatural trick: they can be accomplices of the supposed ghost or witnesses of its appearances. Both Isabel, Ángela's servant in *La dama duende,* and Rodrigo, Lope Sotelo's servant in *El diablo está en Cantillana,* fit in the figure of the accomplice-servant, without whom the trick would have been impossible. In the first case, Isabel is the first to discover the secret passage in the cupboard that links the rooms and shares it with her mistress. Afterwards, she accompanies Ángela whenever the lady enters Manuel's room and even acts as a second phantom, tormenting Manuel's servant, Cosme, parallel to her mistress. In *El diablo está en Cantillana*, Rodrigo is responsible for suggesting the ghostly costume, and he complements his master's supernatural lie making it more believable by joining the scared peasants of Santillana and pretending

---

[27] *Don Gil de las calzas verdes* is an interesting exception, since Juana has two servants who display opposed roles: Quintana fits in the accomplice-servant figure, while Caramanchel is one of the main victims of the supernatural trick, even if Juana does not intend to deceive him.

his exorcisms will expel the ghost from the town. In the second case, victim-servants are usually the first characters to get the mysterious happenings wrong, blaming a supernatural creature for them. For example, in *La dama duende*, Cosme states the earliest claim that there is a phantom in the house. Besides, the typical characterisation of servants in theatre allows them to act cowardly and in a ridiculous manner. One of the most widely used devices —while a powerful comical element— to point out the lack of bravery of the servants is the comparison between their reactions and the ones displayed by their masters. This also serves as a bridge between the ideal and the real, the hero and the audience[28]. These contrasts are very common in the works we are considering here: in *La dama duende*, for instance, interactions between Manuel and his servant, Cosme, are exploited for comical purposes every time they face a "supernatural" element:

> DON MAN.   ¡Válgame el cielo! ¿Qué haré?
> Nunca me he visto cobarde
> sino sola aquesta vez.
> COSME   Yo sí, muchas. (II, vv. 2068-2070).

4. The end of the trick

Let us focus on the end of the supernatural lie, scenes where the gallant or the lady reveals his or her true identity thus leading to the happy outcome. These always take place after a climax event, in which the ruse is discovered by someone else or the liar is forced to admit it. In the masculine variants the identity of the gallant is unveiled by the powerful nobleman himself, who always forgives the gallant for his lie. In *El galán fantasma*, Astolfo does not admit his trick, but the Duke comes to the conclusion that he must be alive, anyway. In *El diablo está en Cantillana*, in contrast, Lope —still in disguise— fights the king back and, once defeated, he has no choice but to beg him for mercy and reveal his true identity (807-822). On the other hand, phantom ladies keep their identity secret until the end of the play and there are many possible ways in which the truth can be revealed. Some ladies find themselves trapped in a situation where they simply cannot uphold the lie any longer. This is the case of Ángela when she gets locked in the same room as Manuel (III, 3072-3079). The ending of *La viuda valenciana* outlines another possibility, since Leonarda never gets to admit the truth: it is her lover who brings a light to one of their dates arguing that the trick «cannot be endured more» (III, 2870)[29]. There are especially quick-witted ladies too, whose deceptions develop just as planned

---

[28] Arango 1980: 379.
[29] According to the edition by Ferrer Valls 2001.

from beginning to end. Serafina, in *El encanto sin encanto*, puts an end to her game with Enrique because other characters find out where she had been keeping him, but they cannot prove she was protecting the gallant nor her reputation had been damaged. Tirso's female characters go further: in *Bellaco sois, Gómez* Ana could have lengthened the string of false identities indefinitely, nevertheless decides to stop it after showing up as a lost soul for the last time. In *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*, Juana confesses the truth to Martín after punishing him severely and being on the brink of sending him to jail. After the unveiling of the mystery, forgiveness and wedding proposals come immediately afterwards. In an analysis of the suspense of *La dama duende* Beecher claims the happy ending proceeds from an agonistical confrontation and this can be generalised to every play based on a supernatural lie[30]. In those plays where the disguised character is a male and, therefore, the victim of the trick is a nobleman, he goes through a sudden repentance and a change in his intentions. The example of the Duke from *El galán fantasma* is illustrative: when the lie is discovered, instead of the expected reaction of anger, Astolfo is forgiven and allowed to marry Julia. In the comedies with a female lead, as soon as they ask forgiveness to their lovers —who play the same power position towards women than the noblemen towards the gallants—, the family of the lady or other witnesses enter the scene, asking the lady's good name to be repaired through marriage. The gallants, even if recently aware of the women's true identity, acknowledge the cleverness of their lovers and happily accept the wedding, just like Gregorio does, who immediately falls for Ana's beauty and states:

> Cuando no traigáis más dote
> que las sutilezas raras
> de ese ingenio, que eternicen
> plumas, buriles y estatuas,
> merecen que yo os adore.
> Dadme esa mano.[31]

Conclusions

In the previous pages it has been pointed out that in the same way Calderón wrote *El galán fantasma* using a parallel motif to the one used in *La dama duende,* the plays revolving around a supernatural lie can be grouped into two categories, depending on the gender of the character playing the trick. Each has its own traits, but they can be understood as two variations on the same motif, that is, the character of the supernatural lover, as they share various common

---

[30] Beecher 2000: 12.
[31] According to the digital edition by Williamsen 2000; lines not numbered.

features, arising from the comical use of the supernatural world on stage. It may therefore be useful to study these plays as a separate —not isolated— group, aside from the plays based on the mysterious lover (thus, the traditional game of misunderstood identities). This proposal is based on the grounds that the mere identity misunderstanding can be found in nearly every Golden Age comedy, while comedies on supernatural lovers entail a number of special inherent traits.

The comedies with a male supernatural lover tend to maintain the same structure, partly inherited from the folklore. As we have previously stated, the ghostly disguise is the gallant's last resort to avoid the unfair abuse of the powerful and protect the lady. Moreover, not only do they feel uncomfortable playing this role, but they are never the authors of the trick. In the case of Lope Sotelo in *El diablo está en Cantillana*, it is his servant who suggests it; this same role is assumed by Astolfo's friend Carlos, since the entrance to the mine that leads to Julia's garden is located in his house. The resulting plays show a more serious tone than their lady-leaded counterparts, as long as in all of them the potentially tragic conflict becomes blurred through a comical subterfuge, aka the supernatural disguise. This device permits the fight between vassal and lord to be conducted through comical attitudes and closed with a happy ending, that is, the end of the requirements of the powerful over the lady and his recognition of the young couple's legitimacy. It appears more difficult to draw general conclusions regarding the plays where women resort to the supernatural disguise, but all of them share a similar comical tone, sensual and festive at the time. Ladies seem more comfortable playing the role of the supernatural lover, enjoy the trick, acting boldly when protected by it, and extend it as much as possible. They are, thus, to be considered prime examples of those feminine figures characterized by their audacity, determination and ingenuity, responsible for many Golden Age comical plots. This has led many critics to reflect on the sympathy of the playwrights for women and even to consider the feminism of the Golden Age comedy, especially from the 1978 homonymous essay by Wardropper.

Regarding the causes and meanings of these differences between male and female, we should remember that even if the supernatural lie is a clever and audacious trick —of undeniable utility for the lady or gallant that uses it—, it is nevertheless a deceitful strategy. It is therefore unworthy of a man, but much more acceptable as a feminine strategy. Probably, the gallants' decorum —since they are always young noblemen— required them to despise a trick that involves hiding their own identity to impersonate a ghost, thus delaying to take up arms. Without a doubt, the audience would have condemned Astolfo for enjoying his ruse and stretching it as much as possible. However, ladies make fun of their trick, talk about it with their friends and servants and even manage to get their way when the lie is about to be discovered. In conclusion, the lady *gains* freedom when she disguises and stops being a woman —just the same way she gains it when she impersonates a man or even when she covers herself as a *tapada*—; the

gallant loses it, given that it is shameful to reject one's own manly nature to be another thing. Therefore, only the menacing context and the imminent assault, aimed at himself as much as at his lover, justify the disguise. The male supernatural trick is in close relationship with the circumstances of the moment and entirely owing to them, but it is never representative of the gallant's nature or habitual attitude. The lady, however, employs the same strategy without so many explanations being necessary, for in comedies female characters are expected to use any trick to marry the men they like.

Under such circumstances, the supernatural ruse seems to be substantially feminine, one among the many inventions by women in comedies —which amused the audience by means of the contrast between the fictitious female prominence and their real-life subordination to men. The male supernatural lover appears like a derivative figure that keeps the decorum of the gallant in abeyance: an ambiguous comical-paradoxical effect is thus suggested, as long as it endangers the model of noble manhood, tingeing it with femininity. On the other hand, it entails an ethic and circumstantial legitimization, which makes clear the gallant does not use the trick willingly, but pressured by an abuse of power. Nevertheless, plays on phantom ladies and ghost gallants share the same humorous devices. In both of them, laughter is prompted by trouble being overcome through the supernatural lie —and it should be hilarious to see servants, ladies and gallants trembling with fear at alleged ghosts. After all, in the plays we are considering here, as much as in any comedy, the key is the triumph of love and the happy-ending —proof that there is no difficulty that cleverness cannot overcome. The supernatural trick is always at the service of love and it is, thus, always forgiven, as Ángela argues when Manuel discovers her lie:

> Por haberte querido
> fingida sombra de mi casa he sido;
> por haberte estimado
> sepulcro vivo fui de mi cuidado;
> porque no te quisiera
> quien el respeto a tu valor perdiera,
> porque no te estimara
> quien su traición dijera cara a cara (2989-2996)

Tomorrow in The Battle Think on Me:
Haunting Ghosts, Remorse and Guilt in Shakespeare's *Richard III* and Javier Marías

Mónica Martínez Sariego
University of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria
(orcid.org/0000-0003-0299-7265)

Abstract: The objective of this chapter is to analyze the novel *Mañana en la batalla piensa en mí* (Javier Marías, 1994) in its relation to the Shakespearean play *Richard III* and its film adaptation (Laurence Olivier, 1955). A notable section of the play depicts a parade of ghosts haunting the psyche of Richard III, which constitutes the source of the exceedingly bright title of the novel. This scene also provides quotations that appear all over the narrative, in form of long nonstop sentences and paragraphs. It can be argued that *Richard III*, Marías' basic hypotext, provides the key for the interpretation of the novel. In what follows, I intend to analyze Marías' text as an extended reflection on guilt and remorse based on *Richard III* (5. 3), and as a postmodern rewriting of the ghost theme.

Keywords: Shakespeare, *Richard III*, Javier Marías, *Mañana en la batalla piensa en mí*, ghosts, guilt.

Introduction

Richard III is the last of the four plays in the Shakespearian minor tetralogy of English history. It concludes a dramatic chronicle started by *Henry VI Part 1* and also containing *Henry VI Part 2* and *Henry VI Part 3*, and depicts the Machiavellian rise to power and subsequent short reign of Richard III of England. The entire four-play saga was composed early in Shakespeare's career, most scholars giving *Richard III* a composition date of 1591 or 1592. Concluding with the defeat of King Richard III at the battle of Bosworth, *Richard III* is a dramatization of actual historical events that culminated in the year 1485, when the rule of the Plantagenet family over England was replaced by the Tudor monarchy[1]. Today, readers and audiences may find extremely difficult to follow the overlapping webs of political intrigue, family relationships, and personal hostilities and retaliations, but Shakespeare's audiences were definitely familiar with them. They were particularly fascinated with the character of Richard III, a pure, self-professed villain of gigantic proportions whose evil drives the plot. Until his final defeat by the Earl of Richmond in the last act of the play, the good forces opposing him are a ready prey for his killing schemes, which affect his enemies,

---

[1] For Shakespeare's treatment of history, cf. Etty 1900-1901, Churchill 1976 and Becker 1977.

his kinsmen, his wife, and most of his supporters. Because Richard's personality, rather than the issue of the Wars of the Roses, is of most interest to modern audiences, many current productions focus more closely on Richard himself and the motivation for the evil he commits than on the historical background.

So, both Ian McKellen's *Richard III* and Laurence Olivier's 1955 film version of the play simplify the text, leave some characters out of the script, and give Richard even more prominence. Richard is indeed a fascinating character, one who speaks directly to the audience and involves them in his own plots. In this sense, he is not very dissimilar from Víctor Francés, the main character in *Mañana en la batalla piensa en mí* (Javier Marías 1994)[2], who, like Richard[3], has been described as "histrionic"[4]. Marías' novel, which takes a sentence from *Richard III* as a source for its exceedingly bright title, also explores the dysfunctional mind and heart of Víctor, a screenwriter and a ghostwriter, and, like Richard III, a blatant usurper of things and people that do not belong to him[5]. The novel begins when Víctor's prospective mistress, Marta, dies of a sudden illness in her own home. Instead of calling the police, Víctor prepares breakfast for Marta's sleeping two-year-old son, and leaves. Inexplicably drawn towards intimacy with Marta's distraught family, including her husband, Víctor engages in extended monologues on ghosts, horses in the city of Madrid, the roots of certain Anglo-Saxon words (mostly in reference to different men having intercourse with the same woman), hotels and restaurants in London, sleeplessness and dreams, memory, the role of change in our lives and, most of all, death. The ravings of Marta's Polonius-like father, the digressions by the King of Spain, referred to as The Only One, and the final monologue of Marta's widowed husband, Deán, punctuate the splendidly handled plot.

It is precisely in the thick rhetorical fog cast over the novel by Víctor's exhaustively digressive monologues where Shakespeare's quotations feature prominently. Quotations from *Richard III* appear not only in the title, but all over the narrative, as Wagnerian motifs, in the form of long nonstop sentences and paragraphs. What is more, it could be argued that *Richard III*, Marías' basic hypotext, provides the key for the interpretation of the novel, which I intend to analyze in what follows, as an extended reflection on guilt and remorse based on *Richard III* (5. 3).

---

[2] The English translation by Margaret Jull Costa will be used for quoting purposes throughout this paper (Marías 2003). Scarlett 2004: 400-403 has explored the multi-layered forms of intertextuality between the tragedy *Richard III* and the novel by Marías.

[3] Rossiter 1989: 20.

[4] Morales Rivera 2006: 227.

[5] When studying Marías' novel as a rewriting of *Richard III*, Scarlett 2004 emphasizes, in fact, the usurpation subtheme rather than the issue of guilt that will be examined throughout this chapter. For the influence of Shakespeare's tragedies in Marías' novel, see also Herzberger 2011: 139-178.

Richard III (5. 3): Ghosts haunting the psyche of a villain

Richard is a villain who seems unbothered by conscience. The dark shadow of guilt, dimly perceived in the depth of his soul, does not appear to surface until towards the end of the play, when he is preparing to meet on the battlefield his enemy, the forces led by the Earl of Richmond (later to be King Henry VII), who relish the prospect of relieving England of Richard's tyranny. More concretely, Richard awakens to conscience in Act 5, Scene 3, after he is cursed by the ghosts of his murdered victims. The significance of the ghostly procession and Richard's subsequent monologue will be analyzed in what follows.

1. A ghostly procession: accusations and curses

The temporal setting for the scene is "dead midnight", the "witching hour", the time of night when "the lights burn blue", which refers to an old superstition according to which, when ghosts or spirits are about, they affect the lamps. On the eve of battle at Bosworth, King Richard is haunted by the ghosts of his victims, including King Henry VI (the Lancastrian king defeated by Richard's family and succeeded by Richard's brother King Edward IV), young prince Edward (son of Henry VI), Clarence, Rivers, Grey, Vaughan, the two murdered young princes, Hastings, Lady Anne, and Buckingham. Each ghost accuses the sleeping Richard of the foul deeds committed against them and curses him with death and despair, while at the same time visiting Richmond to bestow him with blessings.

The effect of the ghosts' procession is that of eleven bitter curses cast upon Richard in sequence. In these curses Shakespeare is at his best. For one thing, the substance of what each ghost says is entirely appropriate to the speaker and by referring back to past events in the tetralogy serves to reinforce the unity of the set of tragedies. For another thing, Shakespeare gives his/her language the maximum of personal differentiation of which he was capable. He achieves this differentiation not by surprising conjunctions of words or new imagery, as in other excerpts of the play, but by subtle musical variations within a context of incantation.

These subtle musical variations affect, above all, the sentences "Let me sit heavy on thy soul tomorrow" (119, 132, 140, 163), "despair and die" (126, 127, 128, 136, 141, 149, 164), "tomorrow in the battle think on me" (135), or "fall thy edgeless sword" (136, 164), including variations, such as "bloody and guilty / guiltily awake, / and in a bloody battle end thy days. / Think on…" (147-149), "Think upon… and let thy soul despair" (142), "Think upon…, and with guilty fear, / Let fall thy lance" (143-144), "Dream on … / Let us be lead within thy bosom,… / and weigh thee down to ruin, shame, and death" (152-154), and "O, in the battle think of…, / And die in terror of thy guiltiness. / Dream on, dream on of bloody deeds and death; / Fainting, despair: despairing, yield thy breath" (170-173).

2. Inside Richard's conscience: a shadow of guilt

When Richard wakes, he is shaken by a bout of self-doubt and soul-searching that is unparalleled in the play, and that many readers consider one of Shakespeare's greatest moments of insight into human psychology. Richard –the greatest villain ever, the bloody "hell-hound"– is pushed to look into his soul, and what he finds there terrifies him. Sweating and horrified, Richard asks desperately, "What do I fear? Myself? There's none else by. / Richard loves Richard; that is, I am I. / Is there a murderer here? No. Yes, I am" (183-185). With this sudden, terrible revelation that there is a murderer in the room, and that it is him, Richard is suddenly uncertain of whether to be afraid even of himself. Once he realizes that he is afraid of himself, because he is a murderer, his immediate question is whether or not he will kill himself. His answer is ambivalent: although he claims that he loves himself and therefore would not kill himself, he also realizes that he hates himself for the hateful deeds he has committed. In this scene it is very clear that Richard has moved beyond a simple, flat version of the medieval, allegorical character Vice, and experiences the deeply divided emotions that characterize real human beings[6].

In an outlandish, haunting, and even touching conclusion, Richard unexpectedly turns to thoughts of others, and grieves for his isolation: "I shall despair. There is no creature who loves me, / And if I die no soul will pity me. / Nay, wherefore should they? —Since that I myself / Find in myself no pity to myself?" (201-204). With these words he realizes, angry and desperate, that he does not even sympathize with himself. Even if he manages to put aside his terror and resumes the semblance of his old arrogance[7], this sensation does not fade[8]. Clearly, for Richard, the end is near.

In reference to the play as a whole, this speech by Richard reflects the disorder he has inflicted on the kingdom by clearing his path to the throne through murder and wickedness. In a Machiavellian way, Richard, the greatest among English tyrants[9], had attempted indeed to set aside the moral order of the world through a policy of ruse, treachery, and murder. Richard's real crime, according to the Elizabethan view of the "divine right of kings", had been to take his own destiny and that of his country into his own hands. He had disturbed the natural order of things, and for that he must be punished.

---

[6] Spivack 1958; Frisch 1993.

[7] The tone of the speech changes as it progresses, paralleling Richard's confusion when he first wakes up, his growing awareness that what woke him was a dream, and his returning confidence in himself. Unlike Macbeth, Richard, unrepentant, does what he always does: acting expediently to prevent the curses of the ghosts from coming true with a mind bent on the weaknesses of other.

[8] The echoes of his dream in the pre-battle speech contribute to this effect: "You sleeping safe, they bring you to unrest" (5. 3. 321).

[9] Spivack 1958.

Javier Marías: a Shakespearean voice in Spanish contemporary literature

1. Marías' intellectual background: an anglophile

Garlanded in literary prizes and signaled as a future Nobel winner, the Spanish author Javier Marías (1951-) is a much-travelled man, an excellent linguist, a translator, and an anglophile. He was born in Madrid, lived parts of his childhood in the United States –where his father was exiled and taught at various institutions, including Yale University and Wellesley College–, and attended the Complutense University of Madrid, where he studied English Philology. He went on to translate English and American authors into Spanish, including Sterne[10], Updike, Hardy, Conrad, Nabokov, Faulkner, Kipling, James, Stevenson, Browne, and of course Shakespeare. For two years in the early 1980s, Marías was a lecturer in Spanish translation at Oxford, an experience he drew on for *All Souls* (1989), in which a Spanish lecturer in Spanish translation at Oxford has an affair with a female lecturer (the affair, emphasizes Marías, was fictional)[11]. For some time he was also a lecturer in English translation at the Complutense University of Madrid[12].

Even Marías' narrative voice epitomizes an ideal of English masculinity, cool and urbane in tone, ironic, somewhat studied. The shadowy first-person narrator in most of Marías' novels is in no hurry to get to the point. His style is one rich in clauses and qualifiers; his favorite word would seem to be "or"; his books question the border between truth and fiction, and the hidden influence of the past versus what he has called "the prestige of the present moment", in a style that is mesmerizing, crackling with sly wit, above all, prolix, and which has been defined as "angloaburrido", and even as "anglosajodido"[13].

Marías barely starts a story before breaking into a side story, into a meditative digression, into fictionalized family history, or into a disquisition on a word, sometimes Anglo-Saxon words, as in *Tomorrow in the Battle Think on Me*. In this novel he refers indeed to a disappeared Anglo-Saxon word designating different men having congress with the same woman[14], and also to

---

[10] His translation of Sterne's *Tristram Shandy* was awarded the Spanish National Award for Translation.

[11] The same narrator recurs in the trilogy *Your Face Tomorrow* (2002, 2004, 2007).

[12] Although Marías does not elaborate upon this fact, the narrator of *Tomorrow in the Battle Think on Me* also declares to have been an English lecturer at University (290).

[13] Apparently, it was Francisco Umbral, a political enemy of Marías and his family, who described him first in this non-flattering way. His entry for Marías in the *Diccionario de la literatura española* reads as follows: "Máximo representante de una novela aseptizada, de una prosa despersonalizada, de un victorianismo que se agrega al panorama español con reservas y escrúpulos" (Umbral 1995: 156).

[14] "When I learn of sexual infidelities or I am a witness to changes of partner or to second marriages –also when I see prostitutes in the street (…)– I always remember my time as a

the etymology of *nightmare*, which he connects not to mere 'mare', but to *mara* 'incubus', the malign spirit or demon that squatted or lay on the sleeping person, crushing their chest and creating the oppressive sense of nightmare[15].

2. Shakespearean intertexts in Marías' novels

Marías, who honed his craft by translating English novels, uses parallels and echoes deliberately. In this sense, the fact that many of his titles have been drawn from Shakespeare seems significant. "Shakespeare opened so many byways, and didn't explore them", said Marías himself[16].

The first novel to bear a Shakespearean title was *Heart so White* (1992), a novel at whose center are the costs of ambivalence, like in Shakespeare's *Macbeth*: "My hands are of your colour; but I shame / To wear a *heart so white*" (2. 2. 64-65)[17]. *Dark back of time* (1998) is an extended novel, whose main theme is the exploration of how fiction and reality interpenetrate and influence one another in story-telling and, ultimately, in memory and in history. In this novel Marías expands on the "dark back of time", a phrase and a concept borrowed from Shakespeare's *The Tempest*: "What seest thou else / In the dark backward and abyss of time?" (1. 2. 49). The trilogy *Your Face Tomorrow* (2002, 2004, 2007) takes its title from *Henry IV Part 2*, more concretely from the scene where Henry IV, being still Prince Hal, comments to his unsuitable companion Poins shortly before he abandons his bosom friend Falstaff for duty to the State: "What a disgrace it is to me to remember thy name, or to know *thy face tomorrow*!" (2. 2. 14-16). From *Richard III* Shakespeare takes not only one, but two titles. Apart from *Tomorrow in the battle think on me* (1994), Marías has written *When I was mortal* (1996), a collection of twelve stories whose title was inspired by the words of King Henry VI to Richard III in the ghost parade (5. 3. 125).

All these sentences and phrases –"When I was mortal", "Your face tomorrow", "The dark back of time…"– recur, like echoes, within novels. Marías likens his technique to music: "That reappearance –I wouldn't say repetition,

---

student of English, when I learned of the existence of an ancient verb, no longer in use, an Anglo-Saxon verb that has not survived and, which, besides, I cannot quite remember (…). The word describes the relationship or kinship acquired by two or more men who have lain with or slept with the same woman (…) The verb probably bore the prefix ge, which originally meant 'together' (…), and that verb, which has now disappeared and which I no longer remember, was perhaps ge-licgan, since licgan means 'to lie' in the sense of 'to lie with someone', 'to fornicate', and this the translation and the idea would, therefore, be something like "co-fornicate" or, rather, "co-fuck", if the word were rather cruder" (176). Since further reflection on this word is found later in the novel (205, 207, 213, 288), it could thus be considered as one of its main leitmotifs.

[15] The narrator mentions this etymology for the first time when reflecting upon Spanish horses (216) and comes back to it later in the story (268).

[16] Edemarian 2005.

[17] Italics are mine.

because it's not exactly that– that reappearance of a motif is very often extremely moving. The fact that you recognise something…"[18]. In fact, in *Tomorrow in the Battle Think on Me* one can find all these quotations which would provide titles for later books. The expression "When I was mortal" features in excerpts quoting *Richard III* (48, 160), and the phrase "dark back [of time]", along with an extended commentary on the concept –referred to the enormous swath of time which is not captured by human memory or subject to our limited perception–, appears both at the beginning of the novel, when Víctor is watching the sleep of Marta's child –

> So much else goes on behind our backs, our capacity for knowledge is so limited, we cannot see what lies beyond a wall or anything happening at a distance, someone only has to whisper or move slightly away from us and we can no longer hear what he or she is saying, and our life might depend on it, all it takes is for us not to read a book and therefore not know about the principal danger, we cannot be in more than one place at once, and even then we often have no idea who might be watching us or thinking about us, who is about to dial our number, who is about to write to us, who is about to want us or seek us out, who is about to condemn us or murder us and thus put an end to our few evil days, who is going to hurl us over on the reverse side of time, on to its dark back... (55)

–and at the end of the novel: "where we travel slowly towards our dissolution, merely in order to traverse *the back or reverse side of time*, where one can no longer keep thinking or keep saying goodbye" (311). This fact highlights the relevance of the motif. In any case, Marías' repetition –or "reappearance"– technique could be connected, to a certain extent, with that of Shakespeare in the ghost procession of *Richard III*, whose subtle musical variations within a context of incantation were praised above.

Marías' *Tomorrow in the battle think on me*: *Richard III* as a key hypotext

1. *Tomorrow in the Battle Think on Me*: a literary puzzle

In *Tomorrow in the Battle Think on Me*, Marías explores the guilty mind of his own troubled protagonist, Víctor. What was expected to be an evening of passion with Marta, a married woman he barely knew, ended unexpectedly when she suddenly became sick and, over a few hours, died. It was 2 a.m., but instead of calling the police he set up breakfast for Marta's two-year old son in the other room, watched part of a television program, and went out the door

---

[18] Edemariam 2005.

carrying, among other things, the only copy of her husband's telephone number in London, and the tape from their answering machine.

Víctor thinks obsessively and guiltily about Marta, whom he might have saved had he taken charge. In hysterical and dreamlike speculation, he also reflects upon the members of Marta's family and his relation to them, and the tenuous, and often ironic connection of the dead to the living. Over the next few days, Víctor cleverly arranges to get into a lunch with Marta's father, her sister, and her widower. Marta's elderly father is afflicted that his daughter died alone, but the rest of the family are aware that she was not alone when she died. Deán, the widowed husband, is strongly determined to find out who was sharing her bed that night. All might have remained undiscovered, but Víctor confesses. Further complications are added to the plot by means of Víctor's job as a ghostwriter, working even for the King of Spain, and by means of his ongoing and deeply confused détente with his ex-wife Celia.

We are apparently on a ramble, but, in fact, the story is carefully plotted. Due to the strange characters involved, most of the scenes, built up with their troubling and extended meditations on various subjects, are packed out with tension. Marías' clotted monologues have led critics to compare him to Proust, but he is probably best seen as a 21st century version of Henry James, who provides us with interesting and believable variations of his leitmotifs in the experiences of the characters. This is especially true for Marta's husband –whose trip to London and the accident wherein his mistress dies supply an eerie commentary on the tragedy of Víctor and Marta–, and even for the King of Spain, who confesses having been watching, during a night of insomnia –the same during which Víctor failed to take care of Marta–, a film which the narrator is able to identify as *Chimes at Midnight* (Orson Welles 1956), whose script, significantly enough, contains text from five Shakespearean plays: *Henry IV Part 1, Henry IV Part 2, Richard II, Henry V*, and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*[19]. *Tomorrow in the Battle* is, in short, a disturbing and dreamlike literary puzzle, which comes together with great force and clarity in its final few pages.

---

[19] Though filtered by the film adaptation, these Shakespearean plays also appear as key hypotexts for the novel. The allusions are numerous and varied in form. First, the night Marta dies, Víctor, while changing channels, realizes that *Chimes at Midnight* is being shown (53). That same night –as we learn later in the novel and as it has been described above– the King of Spain was also watching the film. The images of Henry IV and Henry V the latter, when he was still the Prince of Wales, impress him deeply, making him think about how "our actions and personalities were in part determined by people's perception of us, as if we came to believe that we are different from what we thought we were because chance and the heedless passing of time change our external circumstances and our clothes" (128). Further references to the film and quotations from it feature in later sections of the novel (152, 168, 242, 266). *Tomorrow in the Battle Think on Me* ends, in fact, with a quotation of Falstaff: "Goodbye laughter and goodbye scorn. I will never see you again, nor will you see me. And goodbye ardour, goodbye memories" (311).

2. Intertextual connections: *Richard III* as a leitmotif in *Tomorrow in the Battle Think on Me*

As detected by Scarlett[20], the connection with *Richard III* is, primarily, an intertextual one, which is displayed through the title –the most obvious sign of literary kinship–, and through the quotations which appear, as a leitmotif, throughout the novel: "Tomorrow in the battle think on me" (24); "Tomorrow in the battle think on me, and fall thy edgeless sword" (27); "Tomorrow in the battle think on me, and fall thy edgeless sword: despair and die" (34); "Tomorrow in the battle think on me, when I was mortal; and let fall thy lance" (48); "Tomorrow in the battle think on me, and fall thy edgeless sword. Tomorrow in the battle think on me, when I was mortal, and let fall thy pointless lance. Let me sit heavy on thy soul tomorrow, let me be lead within thy bosom and at a bloody battle end thy days. Tomorrow in the battle think on me, despair and die" (160-161). These quotations refer to Marta's death. However, the quotation turns up in its most complete form on the night Víctor arrives home having just concluded a tête-à-tête with a woman who may be a prostitute and whom he has identified as his ex-wife Celia in disguise. The TV program Víctor happens to see when he turns on the TV is a broadcast of the film *Richard III* (Laurence Olivier 1955)[21], which is a faithful rendering of Shakespeare's tragedy:

> The scene immediately changed to show another man, this time lying down, fully clothed, a king, I thought, when I saw the flounced sleeves of his shirt, a king suffering from insomnia or who was perhaps asleep with his eyes wide open, he too was in a tent of war, although he was lying on his back in a real bed with pillows and sheets, I don't remember much about it, but I do remember that. And then, one after another, ghosts began to appear, superimposed on a landscape, perhaps the site of a future or imminent battle: a man, two children, another man, a woman, and another man bringing up the rear, shaking his fists in the air and crying out like someone calling for vengeance, all the others had sad, desolate faces, their hair had grown white and their bitter words were pronounced by pale lips which seemed to be reading something in a quiet voice rather than speaking it, those who are now ghosts do not always find it easily to talk to us. That king was haunted or under a spell or, to be more exact, he was being haunted that very night by those closest to him, who were reproaching him with their deaths and calling down misfortunes on him in the battle that would take place the following day, they were saying terrible things in the sad voices of those who have been betrayed or killed by the person they loved: "Tomorrow in the battle think on me", the men, the woman and the children said to him

---

one after the other, "and fall thy edgeless sword: despair and die!" "Let me sit heavy on thy soul tomorrow, let me be lead within thy bosom and in a bloody battle end thy days: let fall thy pointless lance". "Think on me when I was mortal: despair and die", they repeated one after the other, the children and the woman and the men. I remember those words clearly, especially those spoken to him by the woman, the last to address him, his ghost wife whose cheeks streamed with tears: "That wretched Ann thy wife", she said to him, "that never slept a quiet hour with thee, now fills thy sleep with perturbations. Tomorrow in the battle think on me, and fall thy edgeless sword: despair and die!". And that king sat up or awoke terrified or awoke terrified and screaming at those terrible night visions and I too was afraid when I saw them and heard his scream coming from the television; I felt a shiver run through me –the sheer power of the performance, I suppose – and I changed channels with the remote control (207-208).

What is more, Shakespearean quotations also occur much later, in connection to Deán's mistress: "let me be lead within thy bosom, let me sit heavy on thy soul tomorrow, bloody and guilty" (308).

As a conclusion, Marías, by using these Shakespearean iambs about curses and haunting, despair and death, is revealing the core of his novel. As Scarlett (2004: 401) asserts, the tragedy by Shakespeare, through the mediation of its broadcasting in television, constitutes a global intertext with a possible generative role in both story and discourse of the novel. It must be recognized, however, that this core is probably hidden away in one of the doppelgangers or in the throwaways which pervade the narration. What T.S. Eliot said about Shakespeare is also applicable to Marías' novels: "I would suggest that none of the plays of Shakespeare has a 'meaning', although it would be equally false to say that a play of Shakespeare is meaningless"[22].

3. *Richard III* as a key for the interpretation of *Tomorrow in the Battle Think on Me*: ghosts and guilt

As it was previously indicated, *Tomorrow in the Battle Think on Me* begins with the narrator witnessing the sudden death of his lover. Because the affair was secret, and because the lover had died while her husband was away, the narrator feels the necessity to escape without leaving fingerprints. Although he has made sure that the little boy will have his breakfast, he cannot help feeling guilty, since he thinks Marta might have saved if he had taken charge. Víctor thinks compulsively and uncomfortably about Marta, and his remorse leads him to find out information about the woman's family and the aftermath of her death. Regarding her husband, he asserts:

---

[22] Eliot 1963: 309.

I want to meet that man, and talk to him and call him to account and tell him what happened because of him, in particular, I want to tell him exactly how I spent that whole day when he thought Marta was still alive and when she was, in fact, dead, and how I feel about that day now when it's repeated in my nightmares and I hear the voice that says: *Tomorrow in the battle think on me, and fall thy edgeless sword. Tomorrow in the battle think on me, when I was mortal, and let fall thy pointless lance. Let me sit heavy on thy soul tomorrow, let me be lead within thy bosom and at a bloody battle end thy days. Tomorrow in the battle think on me, despair and die* (160-161).

The description of the feeling of guilt along with the quotations of Shakespeare and the allusions to the nightmares that torment the narrator confirm the connection between *Tomorrow in the Battle Think on Me* and *Richard III*. The narrator indeed is constantly referring to ghosts and even gets into digressions about the meaning of the English word "to haunt", closely related to the French verb "hanter", and more or less untranslatable to Spanish. Both words describe what ghosts do to the places and people they frequent, watch over or revisit:

The etymology is uncertain, but it seems that both come from other verbs in Anglo-Saxon and Old French meaning "to dwell," "to inhabit," "to live in" permanently (dictionaries are as distracting as maps). Perhaps the link was merely that, a kind of enchantment or haunting, which, when you think about it, is just another name for the curse of memory, for the fact that events and people recur and reappear indefinitely and never entirely go away, they may never completely leave or abandon us, and, after a certain point, they live in or inhabit our minds, awake and asleep, they lodge there for lack of anywhere more comfortable, struggling against their own dissolution and wanting to find embodiment in the one thing left to them that can preserve some validity and contact, the repetition or infinite resonance of what they once did or of one particular event: infinite, but increasingly weary and tenuous. I had become the connecting thread (66-67).

Víctor's relationship with his ex-wife Celia, with whom he displays a paternalist attitude and for whose behaviour he feels responsible, also evidences this connection. The strange, albeit mesmerizing, chapter that shows us Víctor conflating the identity of his ex-wife and that of a prostitute, while considering the concept of co-fornicator[23], is, precisely, the sequence which includes the longest Shakespearian quotation in the novel (207-208, see previous section above). There is, besides, another linking point between Marta and Celia. In the tape from the answering machine that Víctor took from Marta's house, after various trivial messages,

---

[23] See note 14 above.

> a final voice emerged, a voice that said one thing only, the voice of someone crying (…) please … please… please… it was not so much a genuine plea intended to have some effect as a conjuration, ritual, superstitious words, empty of meaning, spoken either to overcome or to fend off a threat (71).

Fearful, Víctor is on the verge of stopping the tape when he realizes that it had not happened when Marta died, since she had not complained or pleaded, nor had he committed any brutal act. Later on, he relates these words to those of Celia, who, some years before, had also said to him: "Please… please… please" (172). In *Tomorrow on the Battle Think on Me* guilt and remorse are pervasive. The words from Marta and Deán's answering machine belong neither to Marta, not to Celia, but to Eva, Deán's mistress.

As it was anticipated in section 1 of this part, the business trip of cheating and cheated-on Marta's husband, Deán, to London, supplies an uncanny commentary on the tragedy of Víctor and Marta. During those hours Deán himself was participating in the death of another woman, Eva, his mistress. After having disputed over a feigned abortion, she had escaped from the bus where they both were, and she had had the misfortune of being hit by a taxi. Deán did nothing about this:

> I did nothing, I mean. I didn't get off at the next stop or at the next set of traffic lights in order to accompany the dead Eva and to help with the formalities (…). Strictly speaking, I hadn't killed her, the taxi had, but a minute before, I had wanted her death and sought it and now it was done, and by my own wavering will, if not by my hand (307).

When he learnt that he had spent twenty hours unaware of his wife's sudden death, Deán became obsessed by what he might have done differently in that situation. Deán, who, as the narrator realizes, also wants "to escape from the enchantment" (284), explains that Eva's death "was just that of another tourist over in London from the Continent" who, yet again, forgot to look in the right direction after getting off a bus on the left-hand side and then, trying to cross the road, failed to remember that the traffic was coming from the other direction. Deán emphasizes that he "hadn't done anything, no one had, a mere accident, a misfortune" (308), but he feels guilty in any case. Víctor then reflects on the connection between guilt and ghosts:

> The dead person who haunts and watches and revisits him is different from my dead person, the person who lives in his thoughts and mine does in mine like an incessant beating, awake or asleep, his *unfortunate wife* and his *unfortunate lover* mingled and both lodged in our heads for lack of anywhere more comfortable, struggling against their own dissolution and seeking embodiment in the one thing that remains to them if they are to preserved

their validity and maintain contact, the repetition or infinite reverberation of what they once did or what happened one day: infinite, but ever wearier and more tenuous. And his dead woman, like mine, belongs to the very recent past and was neither powerful nor an enemy, yet her unreality grows apace (310).

Even if Víctor and Deán are not villains, like Richard III, they are both guilty of non-assistance to people in danger. And Víctor is doubly charged with guilt, since he failed both to help Marta and to phone Deán so that he could have acted otherwise with his mistress, since Marta was already dead. Marta and Eva are thus the ghosts who, like the "wretched Anne" from the ghost procession in *Richard III*[24], haunt, watch over, and revisit Víctor and Deán, who are still alive, and who, for one reason or another, have become their "connecting thread" (67) with the world. These shadows, of course, are psychological projections of their guilt and remorse.

Conclusions

Neither Shakespeare nor Marías are fond of stereotypical literary ghosts. Rather, they prefer to create ghosts that are eerie symbols of the characters' conscience and extensions of everyday reality, by embroidering the strange and the sinister on it. *Richard III* and *Tomorrow in the Battle Think on Me* are not exceptions to this formula. In fact, some critics have wondered if the authors did not intend the strange and sinister to be embroidered only on the characters' deranged minds, and not on objective reality.

Richard successfully conceals his nightmares for a long time. He rarely mentions his troubling dreams prior to the one nightmare that almost completely unnerves him. The dark shadow of guilt surfaces only through the ghostly procession haunting him the night before the battle at Bosworth field, which obliges him to face up to the horror of his crimes and curses him to "despair and die". Richard had never dreamed possible that conscience could get under his skin, and he even attempts to defy it: "conscience is but a word which cowards use, devised at first to keep the strong in awe" (5. 3. 310-311), but he is clearly at war with his conscience. The action of the play moves between Richard's announcement in the opening scene of his determination to prove himself a villain and the eventual realization, after the ghosts appear to him in a dream, that he is a villain. It is a moment in which he confesses to himself that he hates himself for the hateful deeds he has committed. He is stricken with remorse and he almost completely loses his presence of mind,

---

[24] This excerpt contains, in fact, a textual echo from *Richard III*, somehow lost in translation. For "unfortunate wife", the Spanish text reads "su desdichada mujer" (Marías 1994: 365). Marías was probably thinking on Shakespeare's "wretched Anne, thy wife" (5. 3. 160), but the translator, apparently not noticing the Shakespearean echo, used, instead, "unfortunate", a synonym.

crying to Jesus for mercy. In Act 5 Scene 3, Richard, who refuses to recognize the existence of conscience, gives himself over to the terrible tortures of his conscience[25].

Marías' characters are also haunted by Shakespearean ghosts. As an anglophile and even a translator of Shakespeare, he has drawn from the bard the titles for some of his novels, being *Tomorrow in the Battle Think on Me* a meaningful example of this. Marías uses quotations from *Richard III* in the title –borrowed from 5. 3. 135–, but also to punctuate the splendidly handled plot. Long sentences and paragraphs taken from *Richard III* (5. 3), and also from the film version (Laurence Olivier 1955), occur as Wagnerian leitmotifs throughout the narration. These Shakespearian intertexts could be said to be providing the key to decode the novel, which might be interpreted as an extended reflection on guilt and remorse.

Víctor cannot help feeling guilty, since he thinks that Marta might have been saved if he, instead of shamefully running away, had taken charge. The narrator thinks obsessively about the events, sharing his meditations and his remorse with the reader. Finally, given the fact that he cannot endure living with shadows, he decides to reveal the truth. But, even if Deán also brings his secrets into the open, both continue to be haunted by the dead women who are lodged in their heads and whose destiny seems to be to recur and reappear indefinitely and never entirely go away. In Marías' novel the classical and the postmodern mingle, as Shakespearean ghostly quotations, are combined with images on television screens and messages on answering machines. This is a fast-paced, urban world full of antiquarian echoes from the past. And it is, for another thing, a nightmarish world of refraction and repletion, of reflection and echoes, of doppelgangers and ghosts, not unlike the late medieval world, filtered through Elizabethan eyes, depicted by Shakespeare in *Richard III*.

Shakespeare's plays deal very often with the reestablishment of order in the Universe, and so do Marías' novels. But whereas Richard has to pay for having disturbed the natural order of things by clearing his path to the throne through murder and wickedness, Marías' characters keep a hope for redemption. In spite of the ghostly procession which will continue to haunt his existence (Marta, Celia, Eva), Víctor dreams indeed of a thriving future[26], in which he will marry Marta's sister and will adopt the child. This is probably the most relevant difference between the play and the novel whose comparative analysis this chapter was endeavored to undertake.

---

[25] Frisch 1993.

[26] Nevertheless, according to Morales Rivera 2006: 225, "lo que en verdad Víctor obtiene al final de la novela no es tanto el castigo a su extraño sentimiento de culpa o el alivio de su angustia (…) sino el sentimiento de culpabilidad que le produce la ausencia de resolución y de significación de su rol o de sus roles dentro de las historias de Marta y de Eva".

Ghostly presences in H.P. Lovecraft's "Cool Air" and *The Case of Charles Dexter Ward*

Juan L. Pérez-de-Luque
University of Córdoba
(orcid.org/0000-0002-7000-2787)

Abstract: H.P. Lovecraft (1890-1937) is a writer characterized for his mixture of genres –what is known as the weird tale– that borrows influences from gothic fiction, fantasy, horror and science fiction. This amalgam of styles and genres results in the unusual apparition of classical horror figures (vampires, zombies, ghosts) that are filtered through a very original view. It is the goal of this chapter to analyze how Lovecraft dealt with ghostly presences in his tales. Through the review of theoretical approaches to ghosts and specters, I will focus my attention on two texts, "Cool Air" and *The Case of Charles Dexter Ward*, in order to unravel the connections that seemingly detached characters might have with the classical gothic ghost.

Keywords: Ghost, weird fiction, haunting figure, spectrality, Lovecraft, gothic.

On ghosts, new and old

One of the most difficult –and maybe unfruitful– tasks that scholars approaching the figure and work of H.P. Lovecraft have tackled, is the categorization of the author in a particular genre. Having written tales that cover a range of styles, from gothic to pure horror fiction, from Dunsanian oneiric stories to science fiction, Lovecraft said that "(t)here is no field other than the weird in which I have any aptitude or inclination for fictional composition"[1]. But weird fiction is still a troublesome concept that needs further clarification. Lovecraft himself provided a definition in his introduction to the *Supernatural Horror in Literature* essay:

> The true weird tale has something more than secret murder, bloody bones, or a sheeted form clanking chains according to rule. A certain atmosphere of breathless and unexplainable dread of outer, unknown forces must be present; and there must be a hint, expressed with a seriousness and portentousness becoming its subject, of that most terrible conception of the human brain—a malign and particular suspension or defeat of those fixed laws of Nature which are our only safeguard against the assaults of chaos and the daemons of unplumbed space[2].

---

[1] Lovecraft 1998: 395.
[2] Lovecraft 2000: 22-23.

This is probably the most accurate description of weird fiction that can be found in literature. However, Joshi mentions the following:

> As I see it, the weird tale must include the following broad divisions: fantasy, supernatural horror, non-supernatural horror, and quasi science fiction All these categories should be regarded as loose and nonexclusive, and there are some other subtypes that are probably amalgams or offshoots of those just mentioned[3].

Torres Oliver, for his part, argues that Lovecraft retains some of the classical gothic roots, but that there are three main points in which the writer moves away from the genre: the cosmic dimension of his tales, which contrasts with the close environments of the Gothic; the absence of religion, clearly different from the religiosity of many gothic stories; and the lack of the feminine factor in most of his stories[4].

The weird tale, then, seems to be a liminal genre that borrows elements from the Gothic, science fiction, horror and cosmicism. The weird tale, in a sense, undergoes the same process described by Maggie Kilgour when defining the Gothic itself as a literary Frankensteinian phenomenon that brings together topics and influences from very distant times, motifs and authors, from Shakespeare to Spenser, from Burke to Rousseau[5]. Like a modernist version of the Gothic, the weird tale is a blending of genres which has, at the same time, a clear influence in the way Lovecraft deals with one of the most classical gothic tropes, that of the ghost. It is not too risky to claim that there are no ghosts within the Lovecraftian corpus, or at the very least, there are no ghosts that are presented like those in the classical tradition, spirits that haunt a place and scare human beings. This lack of a "canonical" ghost in the narrative of H.P. Lovecraft has come from a critical disinterest in this particular motif, all the attention being hoarded by the alien-god creations that the writer from Providence imagined, and that have nowadays become part of the popular culture: Cthulhu, Nyarlathotep, Dagon, etc.

However, there are figures that share many of the same purposes, effects and origins of the phantom, as defined by critics. Instead of revenants, spirits or ectoplasmic scary characters, Lovecraft used a variety of human beings and supernatural events that provoke effects similar to that of the classical ghost. It is the goal of this chapter to highlight how, in spite of the lack of a clearly defined ghostly presence, Lovecraft is able to reproduce the typical features and behaviours of a ghost, personified by other entities that, at first sight, might not be considered as spectral presences at all.

---

[3] Joshi 2003: 6-7.
[4] Torres Oliver 2009: 103-105.
[5] Kilgour 1995: 4.

Modern criticism on ghosts and spectres suggests a remarkable tendency to highlight the more psychoanalytical and metaphysical aspects of the ghost. Among contemporary authors, Derrida's *Specters of Marx* is one of the cornerstones to be considered. The French philosopher distinguishes between spectre and spirit, the former being "a certain phenomenal and carnal form of the spirit"[6]. At the same time, both spectres and spirits are "an unnameable or almost unnameable thing; something, between something and someone, anyone or anything"[7]. They are liminal subjects, that are difficult to apprehend and that constantly cross the frontier between existence and non-existence. The conception of the ghost as something between two worlds, standing on the threshold of two opposites, will be one of the constant distinctive features of the entity for most scholars.

According to Brogan, a ghost is an "enigmatic transitional figure moving between past and present, death and life, one culture and another"[8]. Colin Davis, when referring to the concept of hauntology, inspired by Derrida's *Specters of Marx*, also focuses on the liminality of the ghost, a figure that

> is neither present nor absent, neither dead nor alive […] A wholly irrecoverable intrusion in our world, which is not comprehensible within our available intellectual frameworks, but whose otherness we are responsible for preserving[9].

Thurston, supporting Badiou's ideas, also focuses on the ghost as a boundary figure, "the rupture of consistent presentation, of the plausible discursive 'order of things'-thus as an uncanny effect of the inconsistency of Being itself"[10].

In a more general approach, Jerrold H. Hogle also connects the confrontation of opposites to the Gothic genre as a whole. In words of Hogle:

> The reason that Gothic others or spaces can abject myriad cultural and psychological contradictions, and thereby confront us with those anomalies in disguise, is because those spectral characters, images, and settings harbor the hidden reality that oppositions of all kinds cannot maintain their separations, that each "lesser term" is contained in its counterpart and that difference really arises by standing against and relating to interdependency[11].

---

[6] Derrida 1993: 5.
[7] Derrida 1993: 5.
[8] Brogan 1998: 6.
[9] Davis 2005: 373.
[10] Thurston 2012: 6.
[11] Hogle 2002: 11.

Brogan, Davis, Thurston and Hogle also support the idea of the ghost as something that stands between two –metaphorical or not– worlds, an idea that even stands out over that of the frightening side of the creature. The ghost is an uncanny figure in its most Freudian conception, i.e., "arouses dread and creeping horror"[12], and its source of discomfort for human beings seems to rely on its supernatural nature, its ability to belong to two different universes at the same time. However, the authors previously mentioned do not particularly emphasize the frightening capacities of the ghost, and instead they focus their attention, as has been already mentioned, on the nature of the creature itself.

It must be highlighted that, whereas Derrida distinguishes between spectre and spirit, the other authors talk about ghosts. Taking into account that Derrida states that the spirit "assumes a body, it incarnates itself, a spirit, in the spectres"[13], we might then consider that ghosts and spectres are equivalent categories under the light of the given approaches. The ghost and the spectre are the physical manifestations of the spirit mentioned by Derrida, the figures that can be noticed by humans.

"Cool Air" and the ghostly physician

As has already been stated, it is difficult to identify pure classical ghosts within the Lovecraftian oeuvre. However, there are several samples in which Lovecraft presents a figure that fits the liminal definition of the ghost, beings that reunite two opposites in the tale and that provoke, if not a straightforward sense of dread, at least a clear uneasiness in the reader, derived from the connotations that the mere existence of that particular being implies. At the same time, these figures show clear haunting qualities, and are able to somehow affect the houses and buildings where they dwell.

That is the case of "Cool Air", where the narrator meets Dr. Muñoz, a physician who lives above him and who is constantly troubled with keeping his room at low temperatures. As the tale unravels, the narrator keeps several conversations with the doctor, realizing how obsessed with death the man is. After a breakdown in a cooling machine that he has in the room, the doctor's physical body vanishes, leaving "a kind of dark, slimy trail led from the open bathroom door to the hall door, and thence to the desk, where a terrible little pool had accumulated"[14]. A handwritten note on the desktop explains that Dr. Muñoz died eighteen years ago, and he has been able to cheat death by maintaining his tissues under specific temperature conditions, basically keeping the room as cool as possible.

---

[12] Freud 2009: 122.
[13] Derrida 1993: 4.
[14] Lovecraft 1999: 138.

Dr. Muñoz is probably Lovecraft's closest portrait of a classical ghost. He is a mysterious figure that, in a sense, haunts the whole building. Like the ghost that moves objects or provokes noises and poltergeists, Dr. Muñoz's first appearance in the tale is not as a physical figure. Instead, he leaves a sign of his activity: some liquids that flow from his room to the narrator's. His presence on the block disturbs not only the daily routine of the narrator, but also that of Mrs. Herrero, the landlady, who has to deal with the smell of ammonia and other problems resulting from the machine installed in Dr. Muñoz's room. This is the way in which the doctor haunts the house, by means of noises and small annoyances which cause some discomfort to the landlady and the tenants.

The physical look of the doctor is neat. Far from being fearsome, he looks like an exquisite gentleman:

> The figure before me was short but exquisitely proportioned, and clad in somewhat formal dress of perfect cut and fit. A high-bred face of masterful though not arrogant expression was adorned by a short iron-grey full beard, and an old-fashioned pince-nez shielded the full, dark eyes and surmounted an aquiline nose which gave a Moorish touch to the physiognomy otherwise dominantly Celtiberian[15].

The external aspect of the gentleman is far from any monstrous hint, but however there is a certain sense of uneasiness invoked by his presence, that the narrator perceives the very first time they meet, "a repugnance which nothing in his aspect could justify"[16]. This dreadful feeling will ultimately result in the discovery of the secret that Dr. Muñoz keeps: that he is dead but alive. Like any other ghost, the doctor provokes the same shock both in the reader and in the narrator. He is an entity that has been "living" on the threshold of two opposite worlds, that of life and death. In words of Thurston, the creature indicates "the radical breach or suspension of diegetic reality involved –and it is this disobedience of the laws of rational narrative that can make the literary ghost a truly disturbing event"[17]. This dual nature is reinforced by Lovecraft when contrasting the terrible, almost illusory scenery where the physician has vanished, with the sunny weather and the very mundane sounds of the cars and trucks that the narrator hears coming from the street, through the window. The disturbing effects of Dr. Muñoz's truth are even more terrible when considering that there is only a wall that separates the pulpy remains from a busy street of Providence.

At the same time, the spectre provokes, according to Thurston, an ontological problem due to its nature as both being and no-being, that triggers

---

[15] Lovecraft 1999: 132.
[16] Lovecraft 1999: 133.
[17] Thurston 2012: 7.

an "anamorphic eclipse of ordinary discourse"[18]. Discourse is distorted when the ghost appears, since the phantom is "at odds with the meaningful structure of discursive narration"[19]. Or, in words of Derrida, "this thing that looks at us, that concerns us [*qui nous regarde*], comes to defy semantics as much as ontology, psychoanalysis as much as philosophy"[20]. In fact, Dr. Muñoz also incites a rupture of discourse in "Cool Air". The particular moment in which this breach of language is produced takes place at the end of the tale, when the narrator bursts into the doctor's room to find that he is no longer there and he reads the terrible handwritten note that the physician has left. The reader knows only about a little pool and some remains of a dark slime, but the narrator asserts that "(w)hat was, or had been, on the couch I cannot and dare not say here"[21]. We cannot but wonder what kind of horrid thing lied on the couch, but Lovecraft will not provide the reader with access to it. The impossibility of depicting the reality observed by the narrator, in this case the remains of what was Dr. Muñoz, his true nature as spectre that is unmasked at the climax of the tale, follows the pattern of the language malfunction described by Thurston and, at the same time, exemplifies the "unnameable or almost unnameable" thing proposed by Derrida.

In the particular case of Lovecraft, Graham Harman studies the ways in which the writer explicitly shows a language failure: what he calls the vertical and the horizontal gap in language. According to him,

> Language (and everything else) is obliged to become an art of allusion or indirect speech, a metaphorical bond with a reality that cannot possibly be made present. Realism does not mean that we are able to state correct propositions about the real world. Instead, it means that reality is too real to be translated without remainder into any sentence, perception, practical action, or anything else[22].

Daily situations might be easy to describe using language, but when the ghost appears, it completely breaks the rules of our reality due to a nature that belongs to two different worlds, and we are unable to cope with it in terms of language. The vertical gap occurs when Lovecraft uses "vaguely relevant descriptions that the narrator is able to attempt"[23], whereas the horizontal gap "language is overloaded by a gluttonous excess of surfaces and aspects of the

---

[18] Thurston 2012: 7.
[19] Thurston 2012: 5.
[20] Derrida 1993: 5.
[21] Lovecraft 1999: 138.
[22] Harman 2012: 16.
[23] Harman 2012: 24.

thing"[24]. So it seems clear that when the narrator avoids the description of what is on the couch at Muñoz's room, Lovecraft is effecting a vertical gap that makes it impossible to apprehend the real nature of the ghost[25].

As in part of the classic Gothic tradition, it is interesting to notice that Lovecraft also tries to provide a rational explanation for the unbelievable events. But whereas some kind of detective work is traditionally used to unmask the illusion, here the use of technology and the vague explanations provided by Dr. Muñoz both in his final letter and during the conversations he keeps with the narrator through the story produce a different impact, since the figure of the ghost is not refuted but reinforced. There is a scientific explanation for the events and that will not trigger a relief; much to the contrary it will create a feeling of uneasiness due to the acceptance as a fact that, with the suitable knowledge, Dr. Muñoz's case can be replicated, producing an impregnable breach between life and death.

THE CASE OF CHARLES DEXTER WARD: GHOSTLY PAST, HAUNTED PRESENT

The Case of Charles Dexter Ward is a much more complex text, in which the figure of Joseph Curwen, ancestor of Charles Dexter Ward, is central as a spectral figure that haunts the present and the past, and tortures –and ultimately murders– his descendant. The novella narrates the investigation conducted by Marinus Bicknell Willett, Ward's doctor, after the disappearance of the latter from the mental asylum where he has been confined. Firstly, he is able to reconstruct Curwen's biography and most remarkable life events, a century and a half ago, when he was an evil magician and necromancer. Willett's discoveries conclude that, in the fictional present, Ward has been killed and replaced by his resurrected ancestor -owing to the extreme physical resemblance they had–, who came back to life thanks to Ward himself. Curwen had plans, together with some fellow necromancers, to subjugate humanity, acquiring immense power and knowledge by torturing the wisest minds on Earth, but his strange behaviour pretending to be Ward sent him to the asylum. At the end, Willett is able to confront and overcome the necromancer in his cell, using a kind of exorcism that turns the wizard into a little mountain of dust.

Through Willett's discoveries, the reader is told about the life history of Curwen, and how he comes to be a figure that, like a ghost, haunts the community he inhabits. It is made clear that there have been several attempts over time to destroy any reference to the historical figure of the necromancer, removing most of the available records and documents related to him, "as if a conspiracy

---

[24] Harman 2012: 25.
[25] For a more detailed analysis of Lovecraft's gaps and its connections with the Lacanian concept of reality and the Real, see Pérez-de-Luque 2013.

had existed to blot him from memory", becoming a "hushed-up character"[26]. Curwen, who is a deviation from the regular human being, an uncomfortable celebrity, is kept apart from records in order to sink him into oblivion. He is the spectre that nobody wants to mention but everybody gossips and whispers about. The deliberate attempts to throw him into oblivion are a way of repressing the troublesome disturbance of reality that, in case of being widespread, might collapse humanity due to the implications that reality entails.

Joseph Curwen was surrounded by a mysterious aura and seen with suspicion by his neighbors in Providence during his life. He owned both a house and a farm, and from the very beginning there are references to both dwellings that match that of a haunted house, "with the queer gleaming of his windows at all hours of night"[27]. Willett finds testimonies of neighbors claiming that "certain sounds […] came from the Curwen place in the night. There were cries, they said, and sustained howlings"[28].

He acquires the role of the haunted presence that lives in his frightening residences. But far from being a ghostly figure, except for his paleness, he is not a particularly aloof citizen and maintains some social life. However, the town rejects him because of the gossip surrounding his figure, the disappearances that take place around his properties and his incorruptible body, which seems to be forever young as years go by. As far as the necromancer is not affected by aging, looking "hardly middle-aged in aspect yet certainly not less than a full century old"[29], he is again a figure between two worlds that challenges the natural order, being a singular living ghost. This position in the frontier between life and death is reinforced by the fact that the magician is said to be in contact with the dead. Willett reads several testimonies in which "the sinister scholar began to astonish people by his possession of information which only their long-dead ancestors would seem to be able to impart"[30].

As time goes by, Curwen haunts not only his house and farm, but also the underground. Witnesses asserted, according to Willett readings, that there were "faint cries and groans"[31] that came up from the regions under the farm, and many different voices and accents could be distinguished. Curwen apparently used underground corridors, halls and catacombs to proceed with his secret experiments and rituals. At a certain point, the community decides to take action. The most influential people in Providence conclude that "Curwen, it was clear, formed a vague potential menace to the welfare of the town and

---

[26] Lovecraft 2001: 98.
[27] Lovecraft 2001: 99.
[28] Lovecraft 2001: 100.
[29] Lovecraft 2001: 105.
[30] Lovecraft 2001: 109.
[31] Lovecraft 2001: 112.

Colony; and must be eliminated at any cost"[32]. They believe that Curwen must be confined in a mental asylum if he is a madman or, if he is performing any kind of grotesque activity, he must be killed "and even the widow and her father need not to be told how it came about"[33]. It should be noted how the plan of repression and suppression is secret, probably because were the truth known, the ghostly element would alter the reality of the community, in so far as Curwen's horrendous experiments would certainly disturb the conception of life that the inhabitants of Providence might have. The liminality of the spectre, again, threatens those who are haunted by his presence. But this time, in contrast with Dr. Muñoz, Curwen is an active evil being and actions are taken to exorcize him from the community, restoring the natural order of life.

The raid against Curwen is successful but little is known about what really happens in the combat that takes place on the farm and in the underground corridors. Curwen dies, and the survivors "had lost or gained something imponderable and indescribable. They had seen or heard or felt something which was not for human creatures, and could not forget it"[34]. Once again, as shown in "Cool Air", the direct assimilation of the nature of the ghostly figure, that takes place once the party explores Curwen's dwelling, provokes the fracture of language mentioned by Harman, and the horrors that take place during the combat cannot be explained with language. As in the case of Dr. Muñoz, Curwen's real nature is impossible to apprehend due to its duality, which locates him between two worlds, that of the living and that of the death. A vertical gap arises from the very moment that the events are not suitable for human creatures, and there is a loss (or gain) of something that cannot be described for those men who took part in the combat. The truth behind the ghost remains unexplained.

At the same time, Curwen's defeat can be read, following Derrida, as a political conjuration:

> A conjuration, then, is first of all an alliance, to be sure, sometimes a political alliance, more or less secret, if not tacit, a plot or a conspiracy. It is a matter of neutralizing a hegemony or overturning some power. […] For to conjure means *also* to exorcise: to attempt both to destroy and to disavow a malignant, demonized, diabolized force, most often an evil-doing spirit, a specter, a kind of ghost who comes back or who still risks coming back *post mortem*. Exorcism conjures away the evil in ways that are also irrational, using magical, mysterious, even mystifying practices[35].

---

[32] Lovecraft 2001: 115-116.
[33] Lovecraft 2001: 116.
[34] Lovecraft 2001: 122.
[35] Derrida 1993: 58-59.

The first time he is attacked and vanquished, Curwen is still a living creature that haunts his dwellings. What the citizens perform is a restoration of the original order, in which the social threat disappears by using mysterious (for not being explained) ways and tricks. Similarly, when Willett defeats Curwen at the asylum, the exorcism-like conjuration takes place. Willett uses a magic formula that allows him to permanently expel the spirit of Curwen:

> So in a clear voice Marinus Bicknell Willett began the second of that pair of formulae whose first had raised the writer of those minuscules - the cryptic invocation whose heading was the Dragon's Tail, sign of the descending node[36].

The second frontier in which Curwen is involved is the temporal one. He is a character that belongs to the past, but he is able to come back from remote ages to haunt Charles Dexter Ward and his environment. The process of obsession and gradual madness suffered by Ward and described by Willett, reaches its climax when the young man is able to resurrect his ancestor. But in the meanwhile, until this happens, Ward will become himself a modern version of Curwen. When he gets locked in his room and attic, the whole family mansion becomes haunted with the sounds, screams, smells and strange events that take place in these chambers, and the effects produced in the Ward's residence are very similar to those described in Curwen's places:

> There were chantings and repetitions, and thunderous declamations in uncanny rhythms; and although these sounds were always in Ward's own voice, there was something in the quality of that voice, and in the accents of the formulae it pronounced, which could not but chill the blood of every hearer. […] And always in the night those rhythms and incantations thundered, till it became very difficult to keep servants or suppress furtive talk of Charles's madness[37].

Ward's secret activities, then, trigger a domestic haunted setting that has been ultimately brought about by the influence that the historical figure of his ancestor creates over the young man. This kind of ghostly *mise en abyme* will literally create a "menace to the order and nervous well-being of the entire household"[38], that being the typical effect caused by the presence of a spectral figure who confronts people with a dual nature that escapes human understanding.

Apart from the evident life/death nature of Curwen, he is also a being that oscillates in the timeline, divided between past and present. He is, before

---

[36] Lovecraft 2001: 205.
[37] Lovecraft 2001: 143-144.
[38] Lovecraft 2001: 149.

being resurrected, a historical character that exerts a fascination over Ward to the point of affecting Ward's own personality and essence, turning him into a spectral figure as well that starts exhibiting uncanny behaviors in his mansion. In this sense, Curwen behaves like a classical "ghost from the past", typical of Gothic narratives, in which a secret –in this case, family related– torments and captures a being from the narrative present. As Botting states, when he analyses Radcliffe's *The Mysteries of Udolfo*, "ghosts of past family transgressions become the major source or awful emotion"[39]. In the same vein, Mitchell, when she refers to the ghosts in the novels *Sixty Lights* and *Afterimage*, states that:

> Ghostliness becomes a metaphor for a past both lost and, paradoxically, perpetuated, endlessly returned or repeated in the present. The mediums for this haunting are photographs, maps, bodies and, importantly, novels and stories[40].

Obviously, the textuality of the ghost expressed by Mitchell, the way in which ghostliness appears throughout novels and stories, is a cornerstone in *The Case of Charles Dexter Ward*. Most of the story is a reconstruction of the different manuscripts, documents, letters, etc., that Willett has been able to collect. In this way, he can reproduce the life story of Curwen. The texts provide the description of his haunting presence, and also textual is the representation of the fears, via the testimonies provided by his contemporary neighbors. A second level of textual haunting[41] occurs when Ward himself tries to get as much information as possible about his ancestor. In order to do so, he also gets access to letters, books, documents, diaries, etc., that will provoke the progressive transformation of Ward into a ghostly presence, until he is killed and substituted by Curwen himself.

CONCLUSIONS

The three figures that have been studied, Dr. Muñoz in "Cool Air", and Curwen and Ward in *The Case of Charles Dexter Ward*, might not fit into the classical view of the ghost, as an apparition of the dead, that has been traditionally used in literature. However, they act as spectral figures at two key levels, those of haunting presences and liminal beings. They are able to create gothic settings in a technological context –in the case of Dr. Muñoz–, or in a much more classical environment –both Ward and Curwen– in which they highlight their connection with the past. The three of them, without being typical representations of the

---

[39] Botting 1996: 69.
[40] Mitchell 2008: 82.
[41] In words of Wolfreys 2002: 12, "we speak of the text as 'saying something', we write that the text does things or makes things occur, as though it had a life or will of its own".

ghost, act as spectres that follow the conventional features of that motif, as described in the different approaches through the chapter. Lovecraft, then, is not strictly following the literary tradition of the ghost, but he is able to distill the essence of the trope and transfer it into characters more suitable for his modern view of horror, located within the weird tale.

The influence of *The Castle of Otranto* in *The Shining*, or the reception of eighteenth-century Gothic ghosts in Stephen King's literature

Cristina A. Huertas Abril
University of Córdoba
(orcid.org/0000-0002-9057-5224)

Abstract: This chapter aims at drawing a thematic and formal outline of the eighteenth-century Gothic novel (focussing mainly on Walpole's *The Castle of Otranto*) and its reception on the current American Gothic, led by Stephen King. To do this, we start from the assumption that there are several constant parameters in the evolution of the Gothic genre, namely: the limits of rationality and passions, the family ties, the settings, the claustrophobic atmosphere, etc. Due to King's enormous literary production, one of his most relevant works has been chosen: *The Shining,* in order to carry out a comparative analysis underlining the reception, the evolution and the interferences of elements from the beginnings of the Gothic literature.

Keywords: Gothic literature, Walpole, King, interference, reception.

The beginnings of Gothic literature took place in a historical and cultural moment with numerous attempts to open up new forms of cultural expression and new topics – many of them arose when looking back at the past. In this context, Addison, mainly known for founding *The Spectator* with Richard Steele, posed a challenge in 1712 where he encouraged the *literati* to dispel the reason, and write ghost stories that triggered "a pleasing kind of Horror in the Mind of the Reader"[1]. Addison stressed that these type of stories "bring up into our memory the stories we have heard in our childhood, and favour those secret terrors and apprehensions to which the mind of man is naturally subject"[2]. Some years later, in 1721, Parnell wrote 'A Night Piece on Death' – the poem that originated the Graveyard School[3] – as a sort of response to the challenge:

---

[1] Huertas 2012: 26.

[2] Addison 1712.

[3] The "Graveyard poets" or "Graveyard School poets" were a group of pre-Romantic writers of the 18th century, whose poetic works focused on pessimistic reflections about death. Blair, Parnell, Gray, Goldsmith and MacPherson, among others, belong to these "Graveyard poets" that, as Blair set on "The Grove" (1787: 8) "Midst sculls and coffins, epitaphs and worms: / Where light-heel'd ghosts, and visionary shades, / Beneath the war, cold moon (as fame reports) / Embody'd, thick, perform their mystic rounds." Their interest in mystery, as well as in popular and traditional English poetic forms, have led them occasionally to be considered as precursors of the Gothic genre.

> Why then thy flowing sable stoles,
> Deep pendant cypress, mourning poles,
> Loose scarfs to fall athwart thy weeds,
> Long palls, drawn hearses, covered steeds,
> And plumes of black, that, as they tread,
> Nod o'er the scutcheons of the dead?[4]

Nevertheless, it was not until four decades later when *The Castle of Otranto* was published and, due to its relevance, Horace Walpole is considered in the annals of universal literature as the pioneer of the Gothic genre[5]. It cannot be forgotten, however, the peculiarities of the qualifying term 'Gothic':

> The attachment of the term *Gothic* to the literature of terror is quite a recent development –and almost entirely accidental. (...) The addition [of 'a Gothic story'] was a flippant paradox chiefly intended, one infers, to annoy stuffy critics who objected to the experiment. After all, how could a Gothic story have a modern author? (...) After *Otranto* the only significant work in which 'Gothic' appears in a subtitle was Clara Reeve's *The Old English Baron*. The "Gothic novel" is thus mostly a twentieth-century coinage[6].

The first edition of *The Castle of Otranto: a Story* was published in Walpole's Strawberry Hill Press[7] on Christmas Day 1764, although it is necessary to highlight that the author decided to publish the novel anonymously. The unexpected success and the enormous spreading among the contemporary elite motivated Walpole to recognise his authorship in the second edition, published in April 1765. Considering the novelty of the work, however, Walpole decided to justify his purpose and add this term to the subtitle: *The Castle of Otranto: a Gothic Story*:

> an attempt to blend the two kinds of Romance, the ancient and the modern. In

---

[4] See Huertas 2012.

[5] The Gothic is often seen as a literary genre, although some critics, including Clery 2011 and Miles 2011, state that there is "a cultural phenomenon known as Gothic writing" where diverse textual typologies interfere with each other. These authors highlight, indeed, that the relevance of the Gothic as a genre has not diminished over the decades, but it continues with unceasing artistic expressions – not only limited to literature.

[6] Clery 2011: 21.

[7] The acquisition of Strawberry Hill marked a turning point in Walpole's life and literary production. It was a mansion built from 1749 to 1753 following the French Gothic style, although it actually presents an eclectic amalgam, including pointed arches, towers, gargoyles, etc. Walpole, as a remarkable connoisseur, ordered the construction of a library, a gallery, a cloister, a refectory, an entrance hall and the wall. The installation of his own press (Officina Arbuteana or Elzevirianum) not only gave Walpole loads of additional work, but also enjoyment and pleasure. The Strawberry Hill Press allowed him the edition of his poems for his distinguished guests, as well as the first editions of *The Castle of Otranto*.

the former, all was imagination and improbability; in the latter, nature is always intended to be, and sometimes has been, copied with success. Invention has not been wanting; but the great resources of fancy have been dammed up, by a strict adherence to common life. (…) The actions, sentiments, conversations, of the heroes and heroines of ancient days, were as unnatural as the machines employed to put them in motion. The author of the following pages thought it possible to reconcile the two kinds. Desirous of leaving the powers of fancy at liberty to expatiate through the boundless realms of invention, and thence of creating more interesting situations, he wished to conduct the mortal agents in his drama according to the rules of probability; in short, to make them think, speak, and act, as it might be supposed mere men and women would do in extraordinary positions[8].

Walpole's attempt to combine these two types to create fiction is based on the fact that the author seemed to observe certain deficiencies in both 'kinds of romance'. On the one hand, Walpole considers that modern literary works are essentially mimetic, since they are based on the imitation of nature; on the other hand, he found old works as implausible and hard to believe, especially because of the unnatural definition of the characters. Regarding these considerations, Clery considers that "Walpole seems to be suggesting, to allow a modern reader a proper point of identification"[9]. As a result, the genre originated by Walpole was sporadically imitated by some contemporary authors, but they only started from the decade of 1790's, when the Gothic gained a prominent position in Europe as well as in the United States.

The persistence of the genre on both sides of the Atlantic in the last 250 years, however, has not entailed an exact, concrete definition of the Gothic for two main reasons: the huge number of works, and its adaptability and flexibility. In spite of this variation, we consider *The Castle of Otranto* to establish a series of distinctive features that may help us to identify fiction works belonging to this genre. This chapter aims at highlighting, considering these characteristics together with its evolution over the years, the influence of the 18th century Gothic (and especially of Walpole's work) in Stephen King's *The Shining*.

The continuous attraction for horror stories: defining the genre and King's revitalization of the American Gothic

Unanimously considered the initiator of the Gothic genre, Walpole reached with *The Castle of Otranto* an enormous influence in most European countries in the last years of the 18th century and in the 19th century, especially in

---

[8] Walpole 1766: xiv.
[9] Clery 1994: 40.

England, France and Germany. In fact, the turn of the century witnessed the beginnings of the distinctive features of the American Gothic. The cultural role that the Gothic played in Europe was against the predominant movement, the Enlightenment, as the American Gothic arose from an outright rejection of the search for happiness aimed at by the 'American dream'. The most remarkable characteristic of the beginnings of the American Gothic was the new possibilities of innovation in literature. As a consequence, the Gothic genre is used with a series of literary resources suggesting a reflection on American history, as well as metaphors focusing on local obsessions combined with motifs – and even sceneries – of the English Gothic. This can be seen in the prologue of *Edgar Huntly*:

> One merit the writer may at least claim:—that of calling forth the passions and engaging the sympathy of the reader by means hitherto unemployed by preceding authors. Puerile superstition and exploded manners, Gothic castles and chimeras, are the materials usually employed for this end. The incidents of Indian hostility, and the perils of the Western wilderness, are far more suitable; and for a native of America to overlook these would admit of no apology. These, therefore, are, in part, the ingredients of this tale, and these he has been ambitious of depicting in vivid and faithful colours. The success of his efforts must be estimated by the liberal and candid reader[10].

Fifty years later, Hawthorne published his masterpiece *The Scarlett Letter* (1850) and, unlike Brown, went a step further locating the plot in the puritan Boston of the 17th century. In a sense, there is a certain connection with another of the works by Walpole – *The Mysterious Mother* – as it deals with its two main topics: sin and blame. Nevertheless, "for a fully realized aesthetics of the corpse and the darkest attractions of death, Hawthorne's work required the supplement of Edgar Allan Poe"[11]. Poe, traditionally considered as a sort of "underworld inhabitant" due to his numerous excesses, made use of the Gothic genre to reflect his obsessions – and it could even be affirmed that the elements of Poe's works, like the coffins representing an extreme claustrophobia, shape series of ambitions and wishes impossible to achieve.

In this light, and despite that part of the critics who state that marvellous and fantastic elements typically belong to horror literature, we consider that the distortions of reality also play an essential role when provoking fear or anxiety. There are several recurrent elements that may lead to this feeling of anxiety: response to the other/strange, loss of important persons or of a part of the body, separation, surrender, responsibilities of the adult life, fear of the death, and the

---

[10] Brown 2007: 3
[11] Savoy 2011: 180.

loss of the body functions in the old age, among others[12]. The main concerns of the 18th-century Gothic are not really different from the contemporary Gothic, as it continues to emphasize the limits of passion and rationality, the fear of the strange/unknown, and family ties: "there is now no question that the Gothic, particularly in prose or verse, narrative, theatre, and film (…) has become a long-lasting and major, albeit widely variable, symbolic realm in modern and even postmodern western culture, however archaic the Gothic label may make it seem"[13]. In fact, the meaning of a work as a horror story may vary in specific details, although the articulation of the genre ensures its attachment to it. The Gothic genre, thus, is defined by a combination of themes and formal resources, despite its variability and adaptability.

Despite the enormous diffusion of Gothic stories in the 19th century, it was not until the 20th century when the term 'Gothic novel' was coined – especially because of its popularization after the Second World War. In the 1970s, Stephen King opened the path of Gothic bestsellers with *Carrie* (1974), whose adaptation to the big screen by Brian de Palma (1976) entailed a higher impact among the population. In 1977 after the release of *Salem's Lot* (1975), King published *The Shining,* also adapted for the screen (Kubrick 1980). The impact King has had in current literary studies is undeniable[14]; in this light, as mentioned above, this chapter focuses on *The Shining,* the novel that firmly confirmed him as a preeminent author in the genre.

Eighteenth-century Gothic elements in *The Shining*

The enormous success of King's third novel, *The Shining,* firmly established him as a preeminent author in the genre, as it was then reassured thanks to his prolific literary production. It is widely considered that *The Shining* was inspired by the short stories "The Fall of the House of Usher" (Poe 1839), "The Masque of the Red Death" (Poe 1842), and "The Veldt" (Bradbury 1950); as well as by the novels *The Haunting of Hill House* (Jackson 1959), and *Burnt Offerings* (Marasco 1973). Together with these influences, there are some elements from Walpole's 18th century Gothic also present in *The Shining;* in this chapter, we will focus mainly on four, namely: i) the settings; ii) the stifling claustrophobic atmosphere; iii) family ties, paying a special attention to the relationship father-son; and iv) ghosts and supernatural elements.

---

[12] See Mack 1970.

[13] Hogle 2011: 2.

[14] Indick 1985; Hoppenstand and Browne 1987; Strengell 2005a and 2005b; Simpson and McAleer 2014.

1. The settings: The Castle of Otranto vs. the Overlook Hotel

One of the main features from the beginnings of the Gothic genre is the setting, that is, the scenario where action takes place totally or partially:

> a Gothic tale usually takes place (at least some of the time) in an antiquated or seemingly antiquated space – be it a castle, a foreign palace, an abbey, a vast prison (…). Within this space, or a combination of such spaces, are hidden some secrets from the past (sometimes the recent past) that haunt characters, psychologically, physically, or otherwise at the main time of the story.

These hauntings can take many forms, but they frequently assume the features of ghosts, spectres or monsters[15].

This feature was already highlighted in Walpole's work, in which his own castle entitled the "Gothic story". *The Castle of Otranto* takes place inside the walls of an old castle located in Italy, due to the fascination for the Mediterranean environment from the beginning of the genre till the 1850s. Its relevance lies in the fact that the castle holds a curse tormenting its inhabitants, as the principality has been usurped by Manfred – not its real owner. The medieval castle transforms itself, thus, as another character participating in the plot (the revenge and subsequent recovery of the power by the legitimate heir) and with a relevant expressive power. In this light, "[t]he castle is central to the fable and seems to have a life of its own. It traps and conceals; its walls frame almost all the main events with a specificity on which Walpole prided himself"[16]. This feature can be observed in the following excerpt:

> A clap of thunder at that instant shook the castle to its foundations; the earth rocked, and the clank of more than mortal armour was heard behind. Frederic and Jerome thought the last day was at hand. The latter, forcing Theodore along with them, rushed into the court. The moment Theodore appeared, the walls of the castle behind Manfred were thrown down with a mighty force, and the form of Alfonso, dilated to an immense magnitude, appeared in the centre of the ruins[17].

As we mentioned previously, Walpole was inspired by his own "castle" in Strawberry Hill for the detailed description of the different passages of the castle of Otranto, such as "(t)he lower part of the castle was hollowed into several intricate cloisters; and it was not easy for one under so much anxiety to find the door that opened into the cavern"[18].

---

[15] Hogle 2011: 2.
[16] Clery 2011: 26.
[17] Walpole 1766: 194.
[18] Walpole 1766: 22.

Like Walpole, King was also inspired by a real setting to create the Overlook Hotel: The Stanley Hotel in Ester Park, Colorado; which has become one of the most well-known and spooky buildings of modern horror. After his two first novels located in his native Maine, King decided to look for a change of setting in his new book, so he actually checked into the Stanley Hotel, being the only guest there. Similar to the castle of Otranto, this hotel holds a curse that hounds the characters, the Torrances, giving a notorious relevance to the building from the beginning of the story. While the hotel manager warns Jack in the job interview, Danny is warned by his imaginary friend Tony with the word "REDRUM" to stay away from one of the rooms:

> And in the bug, which moved upward more surely on the gentler grade, he kept looking out between them as the road unwound, affording occasional glimpses of the Overlook Hotel, its massive bank of westward-looking windows reflecting back the sun. It was the place he had seen in the midst of the blizzard, the dark and booming place where some hideously familiar figure sought him down long corridors carpeted with jungle. The place Tony had warned him against. It was here. It was here. Whatever Redrum was, it was here[19].

2. Claustrophobic atmosphere

Related to the previous section, the setting where the action takes place – either the castle or the hotel – is clearly related to the claustrophobic atmosphere hounding continuously the characters, as can be compared in the two following excerpts:

> The gates of the castle she knew were locked, and guards placed in the court. Should she, as her heart prompted her, go and prepare Hippolita for the cruel destiny that awaited her; she did not doubt but Manfred would seek her there, and that this violence would incite him to double the injury he meditated, without leaving room for them to avoid the impetuosity of his passions. Delay might give him time to reflect on the horrid measures he had conceived, or produce some circumstance in her favour, if she could for that night at least avoid his odious purpose. –Yet where conceal herself! how avoid the pursuit he would infallibly make throughout the castle! As these thoughts passed rapidly through her mind, she recollected a subterraneous passage, which led from the vaults of the castle to the church of St. Nicholas[20].

> "I suspect that what happened came as a result of too much cheap whiskey, of which Grady had laid in a generous supply, unbeknownst to me, and a curious condition which the old-timers call cabin fever. Do you know the term?" Ullman offered a patronizing little smile, ready to explain as soon as Jack admitted his

---

[19] King 1977/2012: 90.
[20] Walpole 1766: 21.

ignorance, and Jack was happy to respond quickly and crisply. "It's a slang term for the claustrophobic reaction that can occur when people are shut in together over long periods of time. The feeling of claustrophobia is externalized as dislike for the people you happen to be shut in with. In extreme cases it can result in hallucinations and violence — murder has been done over such minor things as a burned meal or an argument about whose turn it is to do the dishes"[21].

The sensation of claustrophobia connected to the setting increases in Jack throughout the novel and, together with his growing addiction to alcohol, the main character sees how the hotel has a direct influence in his behaviour:

> He almost fell over the drinks cart that was being wheeled along by a low-browed man in a white mess jacket. His foot rapped the lower chromed shelf of the cart; the bottles and siphons of top chattered together musically.

> "Sorry," Jack said thickly. He suddenly felt closed in and claustrophobic; he wanted to get out. He wanted the Overlook back the way it had been… free of these unwanted guests. His place was not honoured, as the true opener of the way; he was only another of the ten thousand cheering extras, a doggy rolling over and sitting up on command[22].

3. Family relationships

Family ties are also a recurrent element from the beginnings of the Gothic as a genre. Walpole is especially attracted to family problems[23]: in the case of *The Castle of Otranto*, these ties are related to revenge, in order to restore the honour and the principality to the legitimate heir. This idea of revenge is backed by a supernatural being, a ghost (discussed later). This association between family and revenge is not exceptional and, in fact, it is commonly used to justify the appearance of ghosts:

> "Behold in Theodore the true heir of Alfonso!" said the vision: And having pronounced those words, accompanied by a clap of thunder, it ascended solemnly towards heaven, where the clouds parting asunder, the form of St. Nicholas was seen, and receiving Alfonso's shade, they were soon wrapt from mortal eyes in a blaze of glory.

The beholders fell prostrate on their faces, acknowledging the divine will. The first that broke silence was Hippolita[24].

---

[21] King 1977/2012: 12.
[22] King 1977/2012: 515.
[23] *The Mysterious Mother* is a clear example of this attraction, as it even addresses the complex topic of incest.
[24] Walpole 1766: 195.

In 20th century fiction, however, there was a significant rise (though not studied with much depth) of the issue of children in horror literature. As a consequence, daily family relationships and very realistic characters put particularly emphasis on father-son ties in several works written by King, where *The Shining* is not an exception. King, about this novel, said:

> When I wrote *The Shining*, for instance, the protagonist of *The Shining* is a man who has broken his son's arm, who has a history of child beating, who is beaten himself. And as a young father with two children, I was horrified by my occasional feelings of real antagonism toward my children. Won't you ever stop? Won't you ever go to bed? And time has given me the idea that probably there are a lot of young fathers and young mothers both who feel very angry, who have angry feelings toward their children. But as somebody who has been raised with the idea that father knows best and Ward Cleaver on 'Leave It To Beaver,' and all this stuff, I would think to myself, Oh, if he doesn't shut up, if he doesn't shut up…[25]

The writer used Danny to emphasize the madness of Jack Torrance, although the defencelessness position of the boy is difficult to address, thus reflecting an undeniable critic of our society. In fact, "Writers like King no doubt use the child to portray the faults of the adults, but in the process they offer adult readers disturbing images of victimised and victimising children"[26].

Furthermore, *The Shining* underlines the special tie between father and son, although it is the mother who really protects and cares for him. The following excerpt shows certain resignation from the mother due to the impossibility for her of having a closer relationship with her son, who is "his father's boy":

> She had stuck with Jack more for Danny's sake than she would admit in her waking hours, but now, sleeping lightly, she could admit it: Danny had been Jack's for the asking, almost from the first. Just as she had been her father's, almost from the first. (…) He loved his mother but he was his father's boy[27].

4. Ghosts

In the first prologue of *The Castle of Otranto*, the inclusion of ghosts and paranormal phenomena is justified because "Miracles, visions, necromancy, dreams and other preternatural events, are exploded now even from romances. That was not the case when our author wrote (…). Belief in every kind of prodigy

---

[25] Beahm 1995.
[26] Martín Alegre 2001: 105.
[27] King 1977/2012: 77.

was so established in those dark ages, that an author would not be faithful to the *manners* of the time"[28].

According to Walpole, these representations would be associated to the superstitions of medieval Catholicism. This "accurate" image of medieval beliefs in ghosts presented by the author, however, is somewhat ambivalent: while it is occasionally seen like mockery and even provokes the scepticism of the noble characters, in others, especially in the case of Father Jerome, it is described as an honest man of strong moral convictions (to whom Manfred and Hippolita even asked for redemption). We find these two clearly opposing views in the following fragments – the first (A) being in a certain teasing tone, and the second (B) substantially more profound:

> (A) Replied Manfred: Frederic accepts Matilda's hand, and is content to wave his claim, unless I have no male issue –as he spoke those words three drops of blood fell from the nose of Alfonso's statue. Manfred turned pale, and the Princess sunk on her knees[29].

> (B) Manfred, who hoped by the confessor's means to come at the youth's history, readily granted his request: and being convinced that Father Jerome was now in his interest, he ordered him to be called and shrive the prisoner. The holy man, who had little foreseen, the catastrophe that his imprudence occasioned, fell on his knees to the Prince, and adjured him in the most solemn manner not to shed innocent blood[30].

Paranormal phenomena in *The Shining* are subtler, as they seek to capture and hold the attention and bewilderment of the reader. On the one hand, we find Danny's invisible friend who provides information – and sometimes even leads the boy to lose consciousness. Throughout the novel, it is unclear if it could be a schizophrenic disease or a direct contact with the supernatural:

> "No," he whispered. "No, Tony please — "
> And, dangling over the white porcelain lip of the bathtub, a hand. Limp. A slow trickle of blood (REDRUM) trickling down one of the fingers, the third, dripping onto the tile from the carefully shaped nail —
> No oh no oh no —
> (oh please, Tony, you're scaring me)
> REDRUM REDRUM REDRUM
> (stop it, Tony, stop it)
> Fading[31].

---

[28] Walpole 1766: vii.
[29] Walpole 1766: 164.
[30] Walpole 1766: 81.
[31] King 1977/2012: 47.

On the other hand, we cannot forget the relevance of Jack Torrance in this section on ghosts and supernatural phenomena. The hotel tries to influence and even possess Danny, but as it cannot do it, the Overlook does not hesitate to possess Jack, releasing its anger on him until he finally ends his own life:

> Danny darted out of her arms then and raced down the corridor. She looked after him, and as he vanished around the corner, back at Hallorann. "What if he comes back?"
> "Your husband?"
> "He's not Jack," she muttered. "Jack's dead. This place killed him. *This damned place.*" She struck at the wall with her fist and cried out at the pain in her cut fingers[32].

Conclusion

Horace Walpole inaugurated a genre in the mid-eighteenth century, whose influence continues today. The elements Walpole introduced in *The Castle of Otranto* have been adapted to later fiction works in Europe and, from the 19th century, also in the United States – where the variant of the American Gothic was developed.

In spite of the direct influence that Edgar Allan Poe has exerted on Stephen King, one of the most relevant bestseller authors nowadays, we can draw some connections with the beginnings of the genre in Strawberry Hill. To do this, we have tried to show this influence in certain elements of *The Shining* already present in *The Castle of Otranto*, namely: settings, claustrophobic atmosphere, family relationships, and ghosts and paranormal phenomena.

It is unquestionable that the early stages Gothic were as a reaction against rationality, and the development of this genre has needed a change of the motifs – currently, a mixture of entertainment and criticism against current society. Nonetheless, there are certain elements that continue from the very beginnings of the genre, and can be observed even in the most recent Gothic works. In this light, we consider that further studies should also continue to investigate these interferences, influences and connections.

---

[32] King 1977/2012: 637.

(Página deixada propositadamente em branco)

The Ghostly, the Uncanny and the Abject in Jean Rhys's *After Leaving Mr Mackenzie*

María J. López
University of Córdoba
(orcid.org/0000-0001-9227-6757)

Abstract: My aim in this chapter is to analyse the Gothic elements in Jean Rhys's *After Leaving Mr Mackenzie* (1930), an important dimension of the novel that has suffered from critical neglect. In particular, I would like to call attention to Rhys's use of the figure of ghost to underline her characters' alienated and marginal condition. Their liminality between life and death must be seen as related to the blurring of other conceptual categories pervading the novel – familiar and unfamiliar, *heimlich* and *unheimlich*, self and other, human and animal, animate and inanimate –, with the subsequent emergence of the Freudian uncanny and the abject as discussed by Julia Kristeva.

Keywords: Jean Rhys, *After Leaving Mr Mackenzie,* ghost, uncanny, abject.

In her short story, "I Used to Live Here Once" (*Sleep It Off Lady*, 1976), Jean Rhys uses the figure of the ghost in what we could call a literal sense. In this story, we encounter a female narrator that describes different aspects of a landscape – it progressively emerges that we are in a Caribbean context – comparing its present state to a time in the past when it looked different: "She was standing by the river looking at the stepping stones and remembering each one. … The road was much wider than it used to be … The only thing was that the sky had a glassy look that she didn't remember"[1]. Towards the end of the story, after obtaining no response from some children, who feel sudden cold as she approaches them, the female narrator realises that she is dead. In other words, she is a ghost.

Jean Rhys's fiction is actually pervaded by a rhetorics of ghostliness. Plenty of critics have pointed to the importance of the figure of the ghost in Rhys's best-known novel, *Wide Sargasso Sea* (1966)[2] – her famous rewriting of Charlotte Brontë's *Jane Eyre* (1847) – which has become a classic reference in what has come to be known as postcolonial Gothic[3]. However, not enough attention has been paid to Gothic elements in Rhys's pre-war novels, *Quartet* (1928), *After Leaving Mr Mackenzie* (1930), *Voyage in the Dark* (1934) and *Good Morning, Midnight*

---

[1] Rhys 1987: 387.
[2] See, for instance, Choudhury 1996 and Fayad 1988.
[3] Go to Paravisini-Gebert for an overview of colonial and postcolonial Gothic coming from the Caribbean. This critic analyses *Wide Sargasso Sea*, arguing that "[n]owhere has the Gothic mode crossed oceans more powerfully or in more of a sharp dialogue between the postcolonial and the English Gothic" (2002: 252).

(1939), which in general have tended to suffer from critical neglect. Focusing on *After Leaving Mr Mackenzie*, my argument in this essay is that Gothic elements – in particular, the use of the figure of the ghost, together with the Freudian uncanny and the notion of the abject, as discussed by Julia Kristeva – are in fact essential for Rhys's construction of her characters' sense of identity.

As pointed out above, in "I Used to Live Here Once", we find a 'literal' ghost: a dead being comes back to the world of the living. In Rhys's early novels, on the other hand, we generally have a metaphorical or figurative use of the ghost[4]: the ghostly quality of Rhys's female protagonists derives from their alienated and marginal status, which condemns them to a liminal position between life and death. They are alive from a physiological point of view, but dead from a psychological, emotional and social one. My focus, then, is on what Peeren has called "the spectral metaphor". Peeren situates her analysis within the so-called spectral turn, which, as defined by this critic, "from the early 1990s, has marked the transformation of the ghost and its capacity to haunt from a genre convention or plot device in ghost stories, Gothic fiction and horror into a theoretical 'idiom'"[5]. I adopt Peeren's broad notion of spectrality, which encompasses not only the ghosts of the past (history haunting the present or childhood haunting the subject), but also those living ghosts produced in and by the present[6]. Peeren's concern, in fact, is with living ghosts: subjects, such as migrants, servants, mediums and missing persons, who, as shown by contemporary British and American cultural imagination, "already in their lifetime, resemble dispossessed ghosts in that they are ignored and considered expendable"[7].

I also approach Rhys's female characters as 'living ghosts' subjected to dispossession. They generally are isolated women, continually drifting from one place to another, addicted to alcohol, financially unstable, dependent on the money given to them by the different men they encounter along their life. In particular, I would like to argue that one of the main factors contributing to their ghostly existence is the fact that they have undergone some sort of traumatic event in the past that keeps haunting them. In the case of Julia Martin, the protagonist of *After Leaving Mr Mackenzie*, she had a child who died and later separated from her husband. Critics and theorists have pointed to the relation between trauma and the ghostly. As put by Whitehead, "[i]n its disturbed and disrupted temporality, trauma, for Freud, is inextricable from the ghostly or the spectral: it represents the haunting of the individual by an image or event and testifies to the profoundly unresolved nature of the past"[8]. Whitehead is

---

[4] Peeren (2014: 4-5) also draws on this distinction between literal and figurative ghosts.
[5] Peeren 2014: 9.
[6] Peeren 2014: 9.
[7] Peeren 2014: 14.
[8] Whitehead 2004: 13.

implicitly alluding to Freud's concept of *Nachträglichkeit*, translated as 'deferred action' or 'afterwardness', and which, as this critic explains, "refers to the ways in which certain experiences, impressions and memory traces are revised at a later date in order to correspond with fresh experiences or with the attainment of a new stage of development"[9].

In her significant contribution to the field of Trauma Studies, Cathy Caruth has also drawn on Freud's ideas, providing the well-known definition of trauma as an event "not assimilated or experienced fully at the time, but only belatedly, in its repeated *possession* of the one who experiences it"[10]. Caruth insists on the unrepresentable excess, resistance to conceptualization and incomprehensibility of the traumatic event. The literary manifestation of trauma, then, as put by Whitehead, "requires a literary form which departs from conventional linear sequence"[11]. Certainly, the past events haunting Rhys's female protagonists are never told in a straightforward fashion, but as fragmented memories, dreams or hallucinations that disrupt the linear progress of the narrative. As Moran has argued in her analysis of the aesthetics of trauma in Rhys and Virginia Woolf, "highly visual, intrusive fragments of 'past time' frequently rupture the narrative 'present'"[12].

This interruption of the past into the present places Rhys's characters in a double temporality that prevents them from fully inhabiting the present and from fully abandoning the past. "I Used to Live Here Once" is traversed by this temporal duality –highlighted by the very title – as we see how the protagonist can only perceive the present through the optic of the past. Munroe has pointed to liminality – 'living on the edges' – as the defining characteristic of Rhys's fiction: "Her characters inhabit the narrow and precarious space circumscribed by the phrase 'neither/nor': neither 'truly' British nor Caribbean, neither respectable women nor prostitutes, neither domesticated nor liberated"[13]. To this list, I would like to add temporal liminality: Rhys's characters are neither here nor there in temporal terms, which undermines any sense of full presence or stable identity. According to Whitehead, "[t]he ghost represents an appropriate embodiment of the disjunction of temporality, the surfacing of the past in the present"[14]. It is in this sense that we can speak of Rhys's characters as ghosts.

However, the ghostly in Rhys's fiction does not remain at a temporal level, but acquires an existential dimension according to which characters feel neither alive nor dead. As I will show, the figure of the ghost often works as the characters' double, which endows Rhys's novels with a strongly uncanny

---

[9] Whitehead 2004: 6.
[10] Caruth 1995: 4.
[11] Whitehead 2004: 6.
[12] Moran 2007: 5.
[13] Munroe 2015: 108.
[14] Whitehead 2004: 6.

dimension. The blurring of the opposition between life and death is connected with the continuous destabilization of other conceptual boundaries –animate and inanimate, self and other, *heimlich* and *unheimlich*, human and animal–, which accounts for the emergence of the abject as defined by Kristeva. These elements, together with the gloomy and phantasmagoric description of the places inhabited by Rhys's characters, definitely endows her early urban novels with a Gothic dimension that has generally escaped critical attention.

Turning now to the novel that constitutes the focus of my analysis, the importance of temporality is underlined by its very title, *After Leaving Mr Mackenzie*, which highlights the protagonist's subjection to a temporal process of post-ness after the traumatic event of finishing her relationship with Mr Mackenzie. However, in her first conversation with her new lover, Mr Horsfield, we learn that Julia's emotional instability is not only due to her failed relationship with Horsfield, but also due to some traumatic events from her past[15]. Julia is telling Mr Horsfield about the time when she left England and came to Paris:

> I pulled out all the photographs I had, and letters and things. And my marriage-book and my passport. And the papers about my baby who died and was buried in Hamburg.
> But it had all gone, as if it had never been. And I was there, like a ghost. And then I was frightened, and yet I knew that if I could get to the end of what I was feeling it would be the truth about myself and about the world …[16]

Julia perceives her existence as a ghost due to the traumatic experience of loss she has undergone in the past. The 'truth' about herself lies precisely in the spectral limbo she occupies, which is "a beastly feeling, a foul feeling, like looking over the edge of the world"[17]. Her identity as a ghost is stated on other occasions along the novel[18]. The most significant moment, however, comes later in the novel, in the second part, focused on her return to London after an absence of almost ten years. There she meets her own ghost:

> She walked on through the fog into Tottenham Court Road. The houses and the people passing were withdrawn, nebulous; there was only a grey fog shot with yellow lights and its cold breath on her face, and the ghost of herself coming out of the fog to meet her.

---

[15] This information had already been vaguely anticipated by Mr Mackenzie himself, in a passage in which the narrative is told from his point of view (Rhys 1971: 19-20).

[16] Rhys 1971: 41.

[17] Rhys 1971: 41.

[18] As when she enters the restaurant to meet Mr Mackenzie and we read that "[s]he walked in - pale as a ghost" (Rhys 1971: 22). A few paragraphs later, her ghostly quality is again emphasised: "she had walked in silent and ghost-like" (Rhys 1971: 22).

> The ghost was thin and eager. It wore a long, tight check shirt, a short dark-blue coat, and a bunch of violets bought from the old man in Woburn Square. It drifted up to her and passed her in the fog. And she had the feeling that, like the old man, it looked at her coldly, without recognizing her[19].

Munroe, one of the few critics that has pointed to the Gothic dimension of Rhys's early fiction, argues that the ghosts that Julia meets in London are those of her "past selves". Her lack of self-recognition, according to this critic, reveals her failure to realise what she has become or how she has been transformed[20]. Munroe's interpretation of this passage is related to her more general argument about Rhys's Gothic depiction of London, which this critic describes as "labyrinthine", "oneiric"[21] and "impenetrable"[22]. Munroe also argues that as opposed to what we find in the work of other women writers, the city in Rhys does not offer the possibility of a community or any interpersonal relationships: her characters are "solitary figures" that "negotiate the city in a detached, semiconscious trance (as if sleepwalking)"[23].

While I agree with Munroe's analysis, her emphasis is more on the ghostly context inhabited by Rhys's characters rather than on the ghostly identity they themselves have, which constitutes the focus of my analysis. Thus, going back to the passage above, Julia emerges as entrapped in a temporal disjunction between past and present directly related to her condition as ghost[24]. She simultaneously inhabits a double temporality that turns her into a ghost or spectre as defined by Smith: "an absent presence, a liminal being"[25]. This double temporality, as in the short story "I Used to Live Here Once", is highlighted by how Julia perceives every element of the present in London through the lens of the past: her Bloomsbury bedroom is exactly like the Bloomsbury bedroom she had left nearly one decade before, the clock strikes each quarter like the clock she used to hear, she meets the same old man selling violets at the corner of Woburn Square or sees a cinema she

---

[19] Rhys 1971: 49.

[20] Munroe 2015: 119.

[21] Munroe 2015: 110.

[22] Munroe 2015: 114.

[23] Munroe 2015: 114.

[24] Among the most relevant recent discussions of spectrality, we find Jacques Derrida and his *Specters of Marx* (1993). Basing his analysis on the famous sentence from Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, 'the time is out of joint', Derrida also discusses the figure of the ghost in terms of a disjunction of temporality: the ghost must be thought in the "non-contemporaneity of present time with itself … at the articulation of between what absents itself and what presents itself" (2006: 29). Derrida, however, relates this "disjointure" of the present not only to the past, but also to the future (2006: 33), an optimistic note absent from Rhys's depiction of the ghostly interval in *After Leaving Mr Mackenzie*.

[25] Smith 2007: 147.

remembers going in with a Belgian during the war[26]. The result is a dissolution of conventional temporal markers so that the boundary between present and past is blurred: "Perhaps the last ten years had been a dream; perhaps life, moving on for the rest of the world, had miraculously stood still for her"[27].

This sense of temporal stagnancy is also conveyed by the circular temporality that structures the narrative. The novel is divided into three parts: the first one takes place in Paris, the second in London, and the third in Paris again. This circularity also defines the protagonist's actions along the novel, as the novel begins with Julia's swearing to herself that she will never ask Mr Mackenzie for money again, and finishes with her going back to him to demand some money[28]. Temporality, however, does not only work in the novel as palimpsestic continuum, but also as fragmentation: "The visit to London had lasted ten days, and already it was a little blurred in Julia's memory. It had become a disconnected episode to be placed with all the other disconnected episodes which made up her life"[29]. According to this passage, Julia inhabits a fragmented temporality that cannot become a coherent whole. Whether as blurring continuum or as fragmented discontinuity, Julia is subjected to a temporality that rules out any sense of real progress or resolution. It is also in this sense that she is dead in life.

In the passage in which Julia confronts her own ghost in Tottenham Court Road, ghostliness is objectified and externalised into a detached being that works as Julia's double. Sigmund Freud famously analysed meeting one's double as an adult as one of the experiences of the uncanny. Freud's general thesis is that the uncanny is the mark of the return of the repressed; it is anything that reminds us of elements of our unconscious life, earlier psychological stages or the primitive experiences of the human species. Thus, the experience of the uncanny is intimately related to repetition, which allows the recurrence of something long forgotten and repressed, with the familiar turning into the unfamiliar. This is what happens when the subject meets the double: "the subject identifies himself with someone else, so that he is in doubt as to which his self is, or substitutes the extraneous self for his own. In other words, there is a doubling, dividing and interchanging of the self"[30]. Read against Freud's ideas on the double, Julia's sense of self is radically destabilized as she faces an 'extraneous self' that, furthermore, does not recognize her. The Julia that returns to London is, in a way, the same

---

[26] Rhys 1971: 48-49.
[27] Rhys 1971: 48.
[28] Critics have pointed to this temporal circularity. Munroe 2015: 118 has analysed how the circular movement determines both spatial and temporal patterns in the novel, and according to Mossin 1981: 145, the cycle is the central image of the novel.
[29] Rhys 1971: 129.
[30] Freud 1919: 234.

person, but at the same time, she is a totally different one. The familiar is inhabited by the unfamiliar.

Julia's visit to London is actually traversed by the experience of the uncanny from beginning to end. From the moment of her arrival, as pointed out above, her encounter with the different people and places is marked by both familiarity and unfamiliarity. In this sense, her experience very much resembles the dialectic between *heimlich* and *unheimlich* as analysed by Freud. According to Freud, the 'uncanny' is something fearful and frightening, while at the same time it is related to the known and the familiar. The point of departure of his analysis is the meaning of the German word *heimlich* as "belonging to the house, not strange, familiar, tame, intimate, friendly"[31]. However, Freud explains that *heimlich* can also mean "concealed, kept from sight, so that others do not get to know of or about it, withheld from others"[32]. What is *heimlich*, then, comes to be *unheimlich*.

Julia's return to her homeland, England, and her family house, where she meets her sister Norah and her moribund mother, can be seen as an attempt to return to the *heimlich* or homely. However, as the ghost she meets in Tottenham Court Road reveals, that process is going to be disrupted by the encounter with alterity, and in particular, with what constitutes the most radical form of otherness, death itself. According to Freud, the double is "the uncanny harbinger of death"[33]. Certainly, as we have seen, death –mainly materialized in her child's– haunts Julia from the beginning of the novel. It becomes, however, a much more powerful presence after her arrival in England. Thus, in her first visit to a restaurant, there is a fairly enigmatic moment in which an unknown man sits opposite her, to tell her about a "most extraordinary thing" that has happened to him: "I've just seen a man I thought was dead. … A man I thought was killed in the Japanese earthquake"[34]. The lack of connection between this moment and the rest of the plot, together with the previous references to the war[35], underlines Rhys's desire to introduce death as an inescapable force determining characters' ghostly existence.

Death becomes especially important in what constitutes the central event during Julia's stay in London: her mother's passing away. The encounter with deadly materiality is anticipated by Julia's confrontation with her mother's sick body:

> Julia stared at the bed and saw her mother's body – a huge, shapeless mass under the sheets and blankets …

---

[31] Freud 1919: 222.
[32] Freud 1919: 223.
[33] Freud 1919: 235.
[34] Rhys 1971: 50.
[35] Rhys 1971: 49.

> And yet the strangest thing was that she was still beautiful, as an animal would be in old age. …
> The sick woman looked steadily at her daughter. Then it was like seeing a spark go out and her eyes were again bloodshot, animal eyes[36].

In his analysis of E.T.A. Hoffmann's short story "The Sandman" as an example of the uncanny, Freud draws on Ernst Jentsch's interpretation. Jentsch pays special attention to Olympia, "a doll which appears to be alive", pointing to the uncanniness derived from the "uncertainty whether an object is alive or not, and when an inanimate object becomes too much like an animate one"[37]. In her description of Julia's sick mother as a 'mass', Rhys emphasises this uncanny lack of sharp distinction between the living and the inanimate, later on underlined again as we read how Norah "hauled at the inert mass"[38]. The passage also includes animal similes in order to describe Julia's mother's condition, with the subsequent blurring of the boundary between the human and the animal. As it emerges as a composite entity, in-between the living-inanimate and the human-animal opposition, Julia's mother's body signals the emergence of the abject, as defined by Julia Kristeva. The uncanny and the abject are, in fact, deeply inter-related categories, both of them resulting from the blurring or destabilization of conceptual boundaries. According to Kristeva, the abject is "what disturbs identity, system, order. What does not respect borders, positions, rules. The in-between, the ambiguous, the composite"[39]. Being "neither subject nor object"[40], the abject undermines the distinction between self and other, just as we see in the description of Julia's mother's body.

In terms of individual psychosexual development, the abject, for Kristeva, marks a return to the moment in which we separate ourselves from our mother: "The abject confronts us … within our personal archeology, with our earliest attempts to release the hold of maternal entity"[41]. Hence the feeling of abjection that emerges in Julia as she finds herself once again in a symbolic struggle with her mother. Abjection, however, understood in this sense, is even more important in the case of her sister, Norah, who has spent her life taking care of their mother. According to Kristeva, the subject must fully repel and reject – ab-ject – the mother in order to become "autonomous and authentic"[42]. Arguably this is a process that Norah has not undergone, due to her attachment to her mother, with the subsequent lack of an independent and stable sense of identity. Her feeling

---

[36] Rhys 1971: 71.
[37] Freud 1919: 234.
[38] Rhys 1971: 71.
[39] Kristeva 1982: 4.
[40] Kristeva 1982: 1.
[41] Kristeva 1982: 13.
[42] Kristeva 1982: 13.

of abjection comes to the foreground in a passage in which the narrative adopts her point of view:

> Then she had got up and looked at herself in the glass. She had let her nightgown slip down off her shoulders, and had a look at herself. … She had laughed at herself in the glass and her teeth were white and sound and even. Yes, she had laughed at herself in the glass. Like an idiot.
> Then in the midst of her laughter she had noticed how pale her lips were; and she had thought: 'My life's like death. It's like being buried alive. …'[43]

This is a moment with strongly Gothic overtones in which the different concepts we have been analysing – the ghostly, the uncanny and the abject – come to converge. Norah's reflection in the glass, her nightgown, her pale lips, her lonely laughter: all these elements contribute to her depiction as a ghost, definitely implied by her conception of herself as dead in life, again a blurring of the boundary between death and life. In his discussion of the uncanny, Freud alludes to Otto Rank's analysis of the double as related to reflections in mirrors[44]. As she confronts the doubleness of her projected image in the glass, Norah becomes painfully aware of the otherness and death inhabiting her. This moment connects with another one later on in the novel in which Julia also experiences death as she looks at herself in a mirror: she has just learnt that her mother has passed away, and as she makes herself up, "something in her brain was saying coldly and clearly: 'Hurry, monkey, hurry. This is death. Death doesn't wait'"[45].

According to Freud, "[m]any people experience the feeling [of the uncanny] in relation to death and dead bodies"[46]. The uncanny permeates chapter 8 of *After Leaving Mr Mackenzie*, significantly entitled "Death" and centred on Julia's mother's death. And once again the sense of uncanniness merges with that of abjection. Kristeva makes an intimate connection between abjection and the dead body: "The corpse … is the utmost of abjection. It is death infecting life. Abject. It is something rejected from which one does not part, from which one does not protect oneself as from an object"[47]. Julia's reaction to her mother's corpse is depicted in terms of the feeling of abjection: "Julia thought that her mother's sunken face, bound with white linen, looked frightening – horribly frightening, like a mask. Always masks had frightened and fascinated her"[48]. As she emphasises how 'frightening' she finds her mother's face, Julia experiences the horror that, according to Kristeva, abjection provokes in the subject. For Kristeva,

---

[43] Rhys 1971: 75.
[44] Freud 1919: 235.
[45] Rhys 1971: 86.
[46] Freud 1919: 241.
[47] Kristeva 1982: 4.
[48] Rhys 1971: 89-90.

in the confrontation with a deadly materiality, what the subject experiences is the horror of non-being:

> For it is death that most violently represents the strange state in which a non-subject, a stray, having lost its non-objects, imagines nothingness through the ordeal of abjection. The death that 'I' am provokes horror, there is a choking sensation that does not separate inside from outside but draws them the one into the other, indefinitely[49].

Julia imagines this 'nothingness' during his mother's funeral, experienced as "a painful dream", while her brain makes "a huge effort to grapple with nothingness"[50]. References to dreams abound in Rhys's novels, with two different but interrelated effects. On the one hand, as they inhabit their surrounding reality as if it was a dream, the identity of Rhys's heroines as 'non-subjects' is reinforced. Kristeva suggests that in dreams we may be deprived of "the assurance of being ourselves, that is, untouchable, unchangeable, immortal"[51]. Depicted as living in a dream, the ghostly, alienated and liminal existence of Rhys's characters is brought to the foreground. On the other hand, this blurring between reality and dreams is connected with the undecidability of the life-death and animate-inanimate opposition traversing Rhys's texts: "she was unable to resist the dream-like feeling that had fallen upon her which made what he was saying seem unreal"[52].

Reality had already been radically questioned earlier in the novel, in the conversation analysed above between Julia and Mr Horsfield. Julia is telling Mr Horsfield about the time, after arriving in Paris, in which she used to sit for the sculptor Ruth and describes to him the picture of a naked woman by Modigliani she used to look at: "A sort of proud body, like an utterly lovely proud animal. And a face like a mask, a long, dark face, and very big eyes. The eyes were blank, like a mask, but when you had looked at it a bit it was as if you were looking at a real woman, a live woman"[53]. The woman in the picture, posing for Modigliani just as Julia is posing for Ruth, functions as Julia's double, so that by looking at the painted woman, Julia is looking at her own self. The description of the painted woman –and hence of Julia herself– is based on a destabilization of the animate-inanimate opposition. On the one hand, Julia highlights that in spite of being a picture, the woman looks as if she was a 'real' and 'live' one. On the other, lack of life is suggested as Julia points out that both her eyes and her face look like a 'mask', a simile that she uses later on in her description of her dead

---

49 Kristeva 1982: 25.
50 Rhys 1971: 94.
51 Kristeva 1982: 38.
52 Rhys 1971: 63.
53 Rhys 1971: 40.

mother's face. The whole point of the passage on Modigliani's picture is actually to undermine Julia's sense of reality, as she tells Mr Horsfield that she "felt as if the woman in the picture were laughing at me and saying: 'I am more real than you'"[54]. Julia, borrowing Kristeva's words, is "at the border of [her] condition as a living being"[55], "[o]n the edge of non-existence"[56].

The use of the mask simile is not without significance, working as an element that suggests death, paralysis or inertia in life, hence blurring the boundary between the living and the non-living. In his analysis of the uncanny lack of distinction between the animate and the inanimate, Jentsch gives as example "wax-work figures, ingeniously constructed dolls and automata"[57]. Uncanniness, as understood by Jentsch, certainly finds its way into Rhys's text, in which Julia's very condition of being alive is constantly questioned, as she is often depicted as an inanimate object. Her behaviour is many times described as resembling that of a doll or of an automaton. She speaks "mechanically"[58], smoothes her hair "with a regular and mechanical gesture"[59], or is perceived by Mr Horsfield as "a clockwork toy that has nearly run down"[60]. In this way, Julia's identity is depicted as inhabited by irreducible alienation, one that is also emphasised in the depiction of herself as an animal: "She felt as though her real self had taken cover, as though she had retired somewhere far off and was crouching warily, like an animal, watching her body in the armchair arguing with Uncle Griffiths about the man she had loved"[61]. This highly revealing passage once again points to the doubling and divisiveness characterising Julia's sense of self. Her identity "exists at the *limen* or threshold between two opposing conceptual categories"[62], the human and the animal, which definitely endows her with an abject identity that corresponds to her place in society[63]. Like all Rhys's protagonists, she is in a position of exclusion and marginality.

Hurley has analysed the blurring of boundaries characterising the abject and the grotesque as an important element of Gothic fiction[64]. As we have seen, a pervasive Gothic atmosphere progressively emerges in this way throughout *After Leaving Mr Mackenzie*, one that probably reaches its peak in chapter 13, "The

---

[54] Rhys 1971: 41.
[55] Kristeva 1982: 3.
[56] Kristeva 1982: 2.
[57] Freud 1919: 226.
[58] Rhys 1971: 96.
[59] Rhys 1971: 103.
[60] Rhys 1971: 107.
[61] Rhys 1971: 59.
[62] Hurley 2007: 138.
[63] As put by Chrysochou 2011: 140, Julia is a "borderline" character: she is "positioned in between antitheses, neither material nor ephemeral, occupying the categorical position of neither human, beast or ghost".
[64] Hurley 2007.

Staircase". Julia is returning to her boarding-house with Mr Horsfield and as they go up the stairs, she is frightened as she feels that somebody has touched her: "'Who touched me?' she screamed. 'Who's that? Who touched my hand? What's that?'"[65]. Mr Horsfield tries to calm her down with no luck, as it emerges that she thinks she has been touched by a ghost: "'I thought it was – someone dead,' she muttered, 'catching hold of my hand'"[66]. This episode definitely highlights Julia's alienation from a stable and comfortable sense of identity. As put by Thruston, "the appearance of the uncanny spectre has the effect of jeopardizing the ordinary onlooker's presence-to-self, separating him from his own familiar, plausible identity"[67]. What Julia has experienced is an encounter with her own ghostly existence, with herself as a ghost, with her abject and borderline identity.

The very end of the novel, with Julia back in Paris and after having met Mr Mackenzie to ask him for money, confirms the argument I have been tracing: "The street was cool and full of grey shadows. Lights were beginning to come out in the cafés. It was the hour between dog and wolf, as they say"[68]. The novel's final words create once again an effect of liminality, a blurring of boundaries between day and night, light and darkness[69]. The novel finishes in the temporal interlude in which the dog –the tame– gives way of the wolf –the wild–, a limen or threshold into which all the other conceptual boundaries blurred throughout the novel come to converge –familiar and unfamiliar, *heimlich* and *unheimlich*, self and other–, provoking the emergence of the uncanny and the abject. The imminent arrival of the hour of the wolf suggests the Gothic atmosphere that, as we have seen, traverses all the novel. And it is this uncanny and abject liminality that defines Julia's ghostly identity, at the boundary between human and animal, life and death.

---

[65] Rhys 1971: 118.
[66] Rhys 1971: 120.
[67] Thruston 2012: 22.
[68] Rhys 1971: 138.
[69] See Chrysochou's analysis of Rhys's characters as inhabiting, both literally and metaphorically, the twilight zone, which denotes a transitional area, in temporal and spatial terms, where binary opposites such as life/death and light/dark blur their distinctive boundaries (2011: 139).

The Moroccan *jinn* in the Anglo-American literary and ethnographic tradition

María Porras Sánchez
Complutense University of Madrid
(orcid.org/0000-0003-4001-8670)

Abstract: In the Arab culture, the *jinn* (pl. *jnūn*) is a spirit that can assume various forms and exercise supernatural powers. In Morocco, it is a fundamental figure of the local folklore. As such, it has attracted the attention of different field anthropologists throughout the 20th century such as Westermarck or Capranzano, who studied the *jnūn* and their relationship with religious brotherhoods and devoted a monograph to A'isha Qandisha, a seductive *jinniya* or female *jinn* very popular in Morocco. However, *jnūn* have also attracted the attention of literary authors, as is the case of the American expatriate Paul Bowles, who frequently included them in his short fiction and claimed they existed as projections of common belief. More recently, the Anglo-Afghan travel writer Tahir Shah has explored the supposed presence of *jnūn* in Moroccan daily life in his works *The Caliph's House* (2006) and *In Arabian Nights* (2008). I intend to explore the figure of the *jinn* as portrayed by all these authors, focusing on how they contribute to preserve this element of Moroccan folklore while at the same time they (re)produce it for a Western readership.

Keywords: *jinn*, ghost, Paul Bowles, Tahir Shah, Moroccan folklore, Western readership.

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of the figure of the *jinn* in the Islamic tradition in general and the Moroccan folklore in particular, while analyzing its presence in literary and ethnographic texts from the Anglo-American tradition. The reason why it seems interesting to approach these texts from that double perspective is that Anglo-American ethnography took an early interest in Moroccan folklore in the 20th century, many decades before Moroccan anthropologists started to work on this field. Anglo-American anthropologists would help disseminating certain myths and traditions that would later appear in the literary production of English and American writers who settled in Morocco. In turn, these writers would also partake of Moroccan culture, spreading the Eastern myth for their Western readership, always eager for exotic tales, proving the universal appeal of myths.

Throughout the different sections of the chapter, the origins of the *jinn* will be traced in two of the most important texts of Arabic culture: the Qur'an and *The Thousand and One Nights*; then, I will address the presence of the *jinn* in Moroccan traditional culture and its particular relation to saints and religious brotherhoods, as seen by the anthropologists Edward A. Westermarck and Vincent Crapanzano; the next section will explore the attributes and special

powers of the Moroccan *jinn* and the last sections of the chapter will analyze the presence of the *jinn* in some literary texts by Paul Bowles and Tahir Shah, two writers who settled in the North African country. In the conclusion, I will try to shed some light on the symbolic connotations of *jinn* belief and compare the literary and anthropological views on the subject.

The *jinn* in Islamic mythology

The *jinn* (pl. *jinn/jnūn*[1]) is perhaps the most conspicuous supernatural being of Islamic mythology and Arab culture in general. Although these creatures are present in pre-Islamic sources, their appearance in the Qur'an marks their importance and present day survival in Islamic cultures. According to the Qur'an, God created *jinn* and mankind so they could worship Him[2]. Just as there are evil men, there are also evil *jinn* who will be punished in Hell if they do not follow God's command, but there are also devote *jinn* that do not hesitate to adhere to the Qur'an[3]. Surah 55, entitled "The *jinn*," divides mankind and *jinn* into three categories: the disbelievers, condemned to Hell, the ordinary believers, meant for Paradise, and the best of believers, with access to a higher level of Paradise. In this Surah, there is a clear reference to their nature: "He created mankind out of dried clay, like pottery, the *jinn* out of smokeless fire"[4]. However, in a different Surah, it is mentioned that *jinn* were created before mankind, "from the fire of scorching wind"[5]. Here are the foundations of the myth; they are insubstantial beings, "spirits" of air and fire, who occasionally manifest themselves as men, even though they usually dwell in their own parallel, underground world. The world of the *jinn* resembles the human world, with social organization and similar institutions. They are intelligent creatures and they bear a likeness to humans in some ways: there are male and female *jinn* (sing. *jinniya*, pl. *jinniyat*), they eat and drink, they can breed and they profess different faiths: Islam, Judaism, or Christianism.

The most elaborate passage in the Qur'an involving one of these creatures appears in Surah 27, where it is mentioned that King Solomon had "hosts of *jinn*" to do his bidding[6]. When he asked for the throne of the Queen of Sheba to be brought to him, one *jinn* obliged. Literally, the text mentions "a powerful one from among the *jinn*". The Arabic word used for "a powerful one" is *'ifrit*.

---

[1] *Jinn* is plural in Classical Arabic. *Jnūn* is the Moroccan Arabic plural form. The French phonetic adaptation of the word (sing. *djinn*, pl. *djenoun*) is also frequent, even in English-speaking authors.

[2] Haleem 2008: 344 (51: 56).

[3] Haleem 2008: 88 (6: 112); 144 (11: 113).

[4] Haleem 2008: 253 (55: 14-15).

[5] Haleem 2008: 163 (15: 27).

[6] Haleem 2008: 240 (27: 17).

For some scholars, the term refers to a different kind of supernatural being while others claim that they are a concrete category of powerful and cunning *jinn*[7]. Ethnologist Edward A. Westermarck called them "the aristocracy of the *jnūn*"[8]. In any case, the features and obedience of King Solomon's *'ifrit* (pl. *afārīt*) echo the obedient attitude and attributes of the *jinn* in the cornerstone of Middle Eastern and South Asian culture, *Alf layla wa-layla*, or *The Thousand and One Nights*. In this collection of tales, *jinn* are shown as airy and powerful creatures, capable of covering great distances in a matter of minutes and ready to obey their master when summoned[9]. In the Western imaginary, the *jinn* is associated to the genie in Aladdin's lamp. However, as Mohammed Maarouf has pointed out, the relationship between the *jinn* and King Solomon, one of the prophets of Islam, cannot be extrapolated to the relation between *jinn* and regular human beings[10]. As we will see in the next pages, the relation between *jinn* and humans in Morocco would be completely different.

Whereas regular *jinn* and *'afarit* can have either good or evil inclinations, there are some intrinsically wicked spirits in Islamic and Arabic mythology. It is the case of the *marid*, a different category of supernatural being that appears in the Qur'an as well, literally called *shaytan marid* or rebellious devil[11]. It is considered by some scholars a particularly unruly *jinn*[12].

The last category of *jinn* to be found in Islamic and Arabic literatures is the *ghul* (pl. *ghwal*). Usually translated as "ogre", the *ghul* is a shape-shifting being that already appears in pre-Islamic texts. They are associated to the darkness of the night and the desert, where they manifest themselves, seducing and driving their victims mad by their constant metamorphoses[13]. This figure is also traceable in *The Thousand and One Nights*, where a *ghula* or female *ghul* attempts to seduce the prince in the story "The King's Son and the Ogress".

The *jnūn* in the context of Moroccan traditional culture

As the anthropologists Edward A. Westermarck and Vincent Crapanzano point out, *jnūn* are an active part of traditional Moroccan Islam. Regardless of the fact that their relevance might be connected to the absence of ghosts and ancestral spirits in the country[14], they belong to a system of belief that is

---

[7] El-Zein 2009: 142.
[8] Westermarck 1926, vol. 1: 262.
[9] See, for instance, "The Tale of Sayf al-Muluk", "The Fisherman and the Jinn" or "Maaruf the Cobbler and his Wife Fatimah".
[10] Maarouf 2007: 98-99.
[11] Haleem 2008: 285 (37: 7-8).
[12] El-Zein 2009: 142.
[13] El-Zein 2009: 139.
[14] Crapanzano 1980: 17.

intrinsically Moroccan. We need to consider that traditional, unorthodox Islam in Morocco is eminently based on the worship of Muslim saints or *marabouts* (*murābiṭ*). Anthropologist Dale F. Eickelman described the *murābiṭ* as a person, living or dead "to whom is attributed a special relation toward God which make them particularly well placed to serve as intermediaries with the supernatural and to communicate God's grace (*baraka*) to their clients"[15]. There is an implicit connection between saints and *jnūn*. As Westermarck noted in his encyclopedic compendium of Moroccan lore, entitled *Ritual and Belief in Morocco* (1926), saints are said to have the ability to rule over *jnūn* and even recruit *jnūn* assistants[16]. Besides, *jnūn* can inhabit the outskirts of a saint's tomb. In fact, Westermarck and Crapanzano argue that the figures of the saint and the *jinn* are frequently confused in Morocco, and that there were shrines that could correspond to any of them[17].

Saints are usually worshiped by specific religious brotherhoods. These are cults related to a dead saint, whom they considered their head and patron. Even if they wrote from different perspectives, the writer Paul Bowles listed the same brotherhoods in his works than the anthropologists in Morocco: the Darqawa, the 'Isawa, the Heddawa, the Ḥamadsha, the Jilala and the Gnawa[18]. Religious brotherhoods derive from Sufi doctrine, although this doctrine is frequently mixed with previous religious beliefs and may have evolved into simple ritual. The members reach a collective trance state by following the rhythm of the music and the words, a kind of liturgical prayer based on the Qur'an, the *hadith* or certain compositions created by Sufi masters. As Bowles explains in his travel essay "Africa Minor" (1959), "each brotherhood has its own songs and drum rhythms, immediately recognizable as such by persons both within and outside the group. In early childhood rhythmical patterns and sequences of tones become a part of an adept's subconscious, and in later life it is not difficult to attain the trance state when one hears them again"[19]. Some religious brotherhoods, like the Gnawa and the Ḥamadsha, perform violent rites and self-lacerations. In *The Ḥamadsha: A Study in Moroccan Ethnopsychiatry* (1976), the monograph devoted to this brotherhood, Crapanzano explored the role *jnūn* played in Ḥamadsha ceremonies and their presence in the hagiographies of their patron saints. The Ḥamadsha dance to evict *jnūn*, but they also invoke them to achieve the trance state. In this sense, *jnūn* have an

---

[15] Eickelman 1976: 6.

[16] Westermarck 1926, vol. 1: 167, 333, 350-364, 389; Crapanzano 1973: 78-79.

[17] Crapanzano 1973: 136.

[18] Bowles 2002: 724; Westermarck 1926, vol. 1: 182-185. Westermarck lists some other cults, but argues that the 'Isawa, the Jilala and the Gnawa are the most renowned due to their public performances for curative purposes.

[19] Bowles 2002: 724. There are other descriptions of trance rituals in Bowles's fiction. See Bowles 1952: 270-271; 1955: 312-355.

instrumental function for humans. Besides, they can also assist in the practice of magic and witchcraft.

Attributes and powers of Moroccan *jnūn*

In Moroccan popular culture, we can find three categories of *jinn*: regular *jnūn*, *'afarit* and *shayatin*[20]. They can be easily confused and they are referred to by means of epithets such as "the invisible ones", "the hidden ones", "those below the ground", etc. Westermarck and Crapanzano suggest that these may be connected to the ancestral fear of invoking the spirits by means of naming them[21]. Travel writer Tahir Shah, in his memoir *In Arabian Nights* (2008), quotes his Moroccan maid, who called them "the Changed Ones" and warned him not to name them[22].

Even though they are amorphous creatures, when *jnūn* choose to manifest themselves they can adopt different shapes. Westermarck mentions that they often look like men or women, and he also records different cases of marriage or sexual intercourse between a man and a *jinniya*[23]. In other occasions, *jnūn* appear as monsters with the body of a man and the legs of a donkey, but more frequently, they disguise themselves as animals: sheep, goats, horses, donkeys, camels, cats, dogs, tortoises, frogs, snakes, hens, cocks, etc. Some humans are unable to see them, but everyone is vulnerable to their doings, especially children, religious persons, brides and bridegrooms, and also dead people, whose corpses have to be protected with amulets and recitations from the Qur'an before they are buried. Since *jnūn* are especially attracted to blood, homicides, witches, and places such as slaughterhouses are very likely to be haunted by them: "Nothing is more haunted by *jnūn* than blood", confirms Westermarck[24].

Bad dreams are said to be sent by *jnūn*[25]. They can also manifest themselves by causing diseases such as sudden blindness, deafness, organic lesions, barrenness and epilepsy, but also by taking full possession of a human body. Although they are not necessarily evil, *jnūn* are considered whimsical creatures, quick tempered and revengeful. They are said to like water and they dwell in places such as rivers, marshes, springs, wells, fountains, baths, and even toilets and drains. They are also drawn to old cemeteries, grottos and caves, and certain trees as well. In a household, the fireplace and the threshold are the most haunted places. *Jnūn*

---

[20] Plural of *shaytan*, or devil.
[21] Westermarck 1926, vol. 1: 263; Crapanzano 1973: 136; 1980: 68-69, 95.
[22] Shah 2008: 48.
[23] Westermarck 1926, vol. 1: 265-266.
[24] Westermarck 1926, vol. 1: 277.
[25] Crapanzano 1973: 139, Shah 2008: 47-48.

also exist in the Western world, but Westerners do not believe in their doings[26].

These creatures may have a name, as specific supernatural beings, or they might be unnamed. Named *jnūn* do not differ from ordinary *jnūn* in their attributes, but they have more elaborated personalities and some of them are associated to local legends. Knowing the name of the *jinn* is the first step to exorcise it. Among the named *jnūn*, Crapanzano and Westermarck list 'A'isha Qandisha as the most famed *jinniya* in Morocco. She may appear as a woman of extraordinary beauty with the feet of a camel or a donkey. She is an active seductress and a man can only defend himself against her by driving a steel knife into the earth as soon as he sees her. He is otherwise bound to be married to Qandisha and do her bidding[27]. Alternatively, she can present herself as an old hag with long pendant breasts. 'A'isha Qandisha has similar features to those of the *ghula*, as she can change her bestial appearance and become an alluring being. Westermarck also included the figure of 'A'isha Qandisha in his atlas of ritual and belief. He explains that she was a popular figure related to Northern Morocco in particular and defined her as a "libidinous" character[28]. He linked her to the ancient Astarte, suggesting Qandisha was the goddess of love "degraded to a Moorish *jinniya* of a most disreputable character"[29].

According to Crapanzano, another named *jnūn* in Morocco is Hammu Qiyu, a *jinn* that is said to be married to 'A'isha Qandisha. However, male *jnūn* are less developed characters than their female counterparts. Lalla Malika is another well-known *jinniya*. She is portrayed as a fanciful and elegant being, fond of bright clothes, perfumes and dances. Even though she is also a seducer, she does not attack her followers[30]. Other female *jnūn* are Lalla Mira and Lalla Mimmuna.

The best precaution to avoid *jnūn* is reciting short prayers or invoking the name of God in the proximity of their favorite spots[31], or by sprinkling salt near such places. They also have aversion to benzoin, different incenses, iron and steel, and silver, as well as to some spices such as coriander seed[32]. Even though they are attracted to fireplaces, they prefer darkness to light, and they are said to be terrified of burning candles. Loud music and sounds they also tend to avoid. Westermarck argues that nothing is more effective than some pious words; the

---

[26] Sukayna, the seer that the narrator visits in Tahir Shah's *In Arabian Nights,* reflects that when bad things happen, Westerners think is at random, even though misfortunes are caused by *jnūn*, cf. Shah 2008: 202.

[27] Crapanzano 1973: 144; 1980: 68-69, 165.

[28] Westermarck 1926, vol. 1: 392.

[29] Westermarck 1926, vol. 1: 393, 395-396.

[30] Crapanzano 1973: 146-147.

[31] Westermarck 1926, vol. 1: 270.

[32] Shah 2008: 245, 256; Crapanzano 1973: 138; Westermarck 1926, vol. 1: 302-312.

convention of saying *bismillah*[33] before a meal comes from the habit of saying it to prevent *jnūn* from eating with you[34].

In case these prophylactic measures fail and a *jinn* manages to control or make someone ill, the person is required to follow a series of rituals to please the spirit, like wearing certain colors or burning a specific incense. They also require certain sacrifices, food or visits to some shrine. But nothing is more effective than a performance of a religious brotherhood. The Ḥamadsha and the Gnawa are popular for performing their trance ceremonies (*ḥadra*) to please and appease *jnūn*. These brotherhoods also treat illnesses caused by these spirits, and they can also help people who have been possessed by them. The ʿIsawa and the Jilala also execute curative performances. The Ḥamadsha specializes in dealings with ʿAʾisha Qandisha and "hold her responsible for their trance"[35]. In fact, she is an important character in the biography of their patron saints, Sidi ʿAli and Sidi Ahmed. According to the legends, Sidi ʿAli was magically transported by Sidi Ahmed to the palace of the king of Sudan, where he captured ʿAʾisha Qandisha and took her with him back to Morocco. In 1980, Vincent Crapanzano published *Tuhami: Portrait of a Moroccan*, telling the story of his informant, a Meknes tile-maker who was convinced he was married to the seductive spirit. Crapanzano points out at the symbolic function of ʿAʾisha Qandisha, who represents the main subject of Moroccan folklore: women and female spirits enslaving men[36].

Jnūn seen by literary authors

American writer Paul Bowles (1910-1999) found a source of inspiration in Moroccan cultural traditions, which have a prominent position in his fiction and non-fiction writings. Without being a professional anthropologist, Bowles shared the same interest for the heterodox cultural manifestations and the beliefs of common people. During the five decades that he spent in the country, he accumulated a considerable amount of cultural knowledge in terms of language, tradition, ritual, and further interaction with its native population. There are recurrent ethnographic elements in Bowles's writings. Besides exploring the belief in magic and witchcraft and the importance of dreams, he was attracted by the cultural manifestations that were unique from his point of view, such as the cult of the saints, the practices of the religious brotherhoods and their trance rituals, and the belief in *jnūn*. Thus, anthropology works as an undercurrent that permeates part of his fiction and non-fiction, where he tried to adopt "the point of

---

[33] Literally, "in the name of Allah", the first word of Surah Al-Fatihah, the first one in the Qurʾan. The complete verse is *Bismillahi r-rahmani r-rahimi*, "In the name of God, the Lord of Mercy, the Giver of Mercy!" (Haleem 2008: 3).
[34] Westermarck 1926, vol. 1: 312.
[35] Crapanzano 1973: 44.
[36] Crapanzano 1980: 102.

view of the primitive mind"[37]. In this sense, Bowles was deeply influenced by the sociologist and ethnologist Lucien Lévy-Bruhl (1857-1939) and his ideas about the "primitive" mind. In *La Mentalité Primitive* (1922) he stated that abstract thinking and reasoning —as perceived by Westerners— were unrelated to the mentality of the "primitive" peoples. According to Lévy-Bruhl, the behaviour of the "primitives" was permeated by a common belief: human beings, divine creatures, spirits and invisible forces coexisted in the same world. For Lévy-Bruhl this "primitive mentality" was essentially mystic, and this peculiarity had important effects on the way in which "primitives" thought, felt or acted. This also explained why rituals, dreams, and omens were fundamental in "primitive" cultures, as means to approach and communicate with non-human forces and creatures[38]. These assumptions were related to *la participation mystique*, a notion that Bowles found particularly appealing. This was a mystic force that linked animals, objects and plants to the "primitive" mind and made that coexistence of the visible and invisible possible[39]. Bowles transferred this idea to his fiction, trying to reproduce the "primitive's" reality as he considered they perceived it, a reality ruled by a different logic.

Bowles wrote to a friend that his chauffeur had crashed his car after a *jinn* attack, mentioning it quite casually: "The *djinn* seized the steering-wheel and jerked it out of his hand when he was changing gears"[40]. Critic Allen Hibbard has argued that, while Bowles did not believe in magic himself, this was one of the aspects that made living in Morocco so appealing. But he reacted to these generalized beliefs as a "dispassionate observer", then took those amazing stories, "run them through the mill of his imagination, and retold them to Western audiences, ever aware of the appetite for exotic tales"[41]. In any case, Bowles's ethnographic knowledge was consistent and informed, showing a deep understanding of the Moroccan lore. For instance, he tells us of the presence of *jnūn* in the fire, also recorded by Westermarck[42], in the short story "He of the Assembly" (1960): "I looked in the fire and I saw an eye in there, like the eye that's left when you burn *chibb* and you know there was a *djinn* in the house"[43].

---

[37] Bowles 1972: 261.

[38] Even though Lévy-Bruhl's theory of a double mentality was refuted, among others, by Claude Lévi-Strauss and Clifford Geertz, it had a wide influence in its day. Postcolonial critic V.Y. Mudimbe lists Lévy-Bruhl as one of the anthropologists responsible for reducing people to the status of mere objects with his theories, especially considering that he used to work by proxy following the model of natural sciences of the time (Mudimbe 1988: 75-76).

[39] Lévy-Bruhl 1923: 35-36, 163-164.

[40] Letter to Peggy Glanville-Hicks, November 5, 1951. Miller 1994: 242.

[41] Hibbard 2004: 54-55.

[42] Westermarck 1926, vol. 1: 314.

[43] Bowles 2002: 244.

In the short story "Things Gone and Things Still Here" (1976), Bowles's discusses at length the figure of the spirit: "For people living in the country today the *djinn* is an accepted, if dreaded, concomitant of daily life. The world of *djenoun* is too close for comfort"[44]. He tells about their underground ecosystem, their ways, their intercourse with humans, their presence in rivers, drains, and other places where there is running water, always maintaining a subjective, casual approach, as if he were writing about some real events, an attitude that critic Arthur Redding called a "studied cultivation of detachment"[45].

The figure of the *jinn* also appears in "The Wind at Beni Midar" (1962). The core of the story is the conflict between popular belief and "modern" thinking. Driss is a soldier who despises manifestations such as *jnūn* and Jilala rituals and he thinks the government should eradicate such superstitions. His superior agrees and argues that "modern" education will kill those beliefs. One day, Driss loses his rifle and, not finding a better excuse, he blames a *jinn*. Even as a non-believer, Driss is apprehensive of his own act: "It was the first time he had had anything to do with a *djinn* or an *affrit*. Now he had entered into their world. It was a dangerous world"[46]. When his superior hears the story, he is outraged and decides to teach him a lesson: he convinces him that the only solution to find the weapon is to ask a Jilali in trance where the *jinn* has placed it. When Driss learns he has been the victim of a trick, he decides to punish his superior and goes to see a witch who prepares some powder for him. When Driss pours the powder into his superior's drink, his soul is "torn out of his body" and his power "truly broken", so he has to be taken to some mental institution[47]. Initially, Driss impersonates the new nationalist: a "modern" Moroccan that believes in the institutions and despises superstition. When lacking a better answer, he involuntarily turns to superstition, undergoing what we may call a cultural lapse. Wit overcomes superstition when his superior answers applying reason, tricking him into believing there was a supernatural solution for the loss of the rifle. But, surprisingly, when Driss learns he has been taken for a fool, he does not rely on reason to punish his superior, but again turns to superstition and gets a magic concoction from a local witch. It seems that Bowles is trying to emphasize that the "primitive mentality" lies beneath the rational surface, even in those who despise popular belief. At the same time, he presents us with characters that react differently towards magic and belief. Whether they believe in these supernatural elements or not, some of them use superstition in their own benefit, knowing the effects it provokes on other people. Bowles denied that the marvellous or the

---

[44] Bowles 2002: 479.
[45] Redding 2008: 111.
[46] Bowles 2002: 256.
[47] Bowles 2002: 274.

mystical had any presence in his writings[48]. He was exploring the works of the "primitive" mind and the effects of believing in supernatural phenomena, while at the same time showing that there were natives working outside this apparatus that took advantage of their superstitious fellows.

In the last decades of his life, Paul Bowles was seen by Western journalists as a major expert on Moroccan cultural manifestations. In his interviews, he was frequently asked about the *jinniya* 'A'isha Qandisha. If Westermarck explained that she was connected to the rites of the Ḥamadsha and to the ancient rites of the goddess Astarte, Bowles reached the same conclusion by means of direct observation and possibly through his readings. He described her as a beautiful grown-up woman who tried to seduce handsome young men. In 1974 he affirmed that it was a character that induced "mass psychosis"[49]. In 1981, he described her as a "vestigial Tanit", a pre-Islamic deity that was transformed into a personification of evil by Muslims. He showed his anthropological knowledge by explaining that she was a "beautiful but dreaded spirit" who frequented haunted men with the sole purpose of ruining them. He also compared her to La Llorona, the Mexican evil spirit who lives in the banks of streams and calls men at night[50]. Besides, he mentions that the Ḥamadsha leave sacrifices for her in form of chickens, like they do with saints, and lists some ways of getting rid of her: formulas from the Qur'an, a knife with a steel blade or even a magnet[51].

'A'isha Qandisha appears for the first time in Bowles's short fiction in "He of the Assembly" (1960). The *jinniya* is a fearsome figure, a threat in the mind of the protagonist, full of *kif*:

> Aïcha Qandicha can be only where there are trees by running water. She comes only for single men by trees and fresh moving water. Her arms are gold and she calls in the voice of the most cherished one […] when a man sees her face he will never see another woman's face. He will make love with her all night […] Soon he will be an empty pod and he will leave this world for his home in Jehennem [hell][52].

The Anglo-Afghan travel writer and documentary maker Tahir Shah (b. 1966) has been living in Morocco since 2006 and has used the Moroccan

---

[48] Caponi 1993: 143.

[49] Caponi 1993: 78.

[50] La Llorona is a "ghostly female figure who appears narratively in difficult circumstances, wailing in search of her lost children". Locke *et al.* 2008: 558. The connection between La Llorona and 'A'isha Qandisha can be an example of polygenesis; considering how distant their locales are, we can assume that the origin of both myths is unrelated.

[51] Caponi 1993: 105, 131.

[52] Bowles 2002: 249-250.

background as a source of inspiration for some of his books[53]. Unlike Bowles, Shah does not speak the local language and he is frequently drawn to examples of Oriental exotica. However, he does not embody the classic Orientalist writer because he incorporates the voice of the Other in his writings, always choosing interlocutors from different sociocultural backgrounds. Moreover, being an Anglo-Afghan citizen and a Muslim, Shah is half an Oriental, half a Western subject. He sees himself as the bridge between cultures, a storyteller with the power to reduce or erase the gap between East and West[54].

The Caliph's House: A Year in Casablanca (2006) is a travel book that tells us about the author's experiences in Morocco renovating and living in a luxuriant but dilapidated old villa called Dar Khalifa, "the caliph's house", where he moved with his wife and children. For Shah, the house symbolizes his Oriental fantasies, "a fantasy inspired by the pages of the *Arabian Nights*" or "a secret about to be revealed"[55]. The book takes a humorous approach to Moroccan daily life and culture, and the author's struggles to decipher and coexist with the new environment. *Jnūn* have a prominent presence in this narrative: Dar Khalifa has been vacant for a long time and now they are outraged at being disturbed. Even though the narrative does not pretend to be a scholarly compendium, it is very interesting to trace all the data related to *jnūn* and then compare it to the anthropological evidence Westermarck had found eighty years before.

Shah is familiar with *jinn* mythology: he explains that God created *jnūn* after mankind, from fire, and that they share the Earth with mankind. He elaborates by saying that they resemble humans in the sense that they are born, get married, bear children and die. Their peculiarity is that "most of the time they are invisible to humans, but they can take almost any form they wish"[56]. He specifies that they usually appear in the hours after dark, something confirmed by Westermarck[57], and they often adopt the form of cats, dogs or scorpions. For Shah, most *jnūn* are wicked: "nothing gives them greater pleasure than injuring man for the discomfort they imagine he causes to them"[58]. He also notes that they live "in animate objects"[59], a confusing statement I have been unable to confirm elsewhere.

---

[53] Shah has authored at least fifteen travel books and novels that keep track of his journeys through Africa, Asia and the Americas. Aligning himself with travel writers such as Bruce Chatwin and Wilfred Thesiger, whom he considered a mentor, Shah avoids tourist landmarks in his works and turns instead to everyday life details, celebrating otherness and diversity.

[54] Shah 2008: 366.

[55] Shah 2006: 2.

[56] Shah 2006: 15. See also Shah 2008: 11.

[57] Westermarck 1926, vol. 1: 300.

[58] Shah 2006: 16.

[59] Shah 2006: 15.

Shah describes that in Morocco "an empty house invites […] the wicked forces"[60], confirming something that Westermarck had already observed: "Certain houses are haunted to such a degree that nobody dares to live in them", especially those places that have been vacant for a long time[61].

The three guardians who work for Shah in Dar Khalifa are experts on *jnūn*. In fact, they become Shah's translators of cultural traditions. As soon as Shah and his family move into the house, they provide a long list of warnings to avoid enraging the *jnūn*: to sleep inside a circle drawn with coal, to close the windows, to restrain themselves of singing, laughing, speaking loud, or entertaining impure thoughts. And above all, they are advised to avoid the toilet at night[62], for *jnūn* are particularly fond of current water. ʿĀisha Qandisha also appears in *The Caliph's House*, even though she is called just Qandisha and Shah initially mistakes her with a male *jinn*. To appease Qandisha, the writer is advised to leave for her plates of couscous and meat at night. According to Westermarck, food offerings to please "the masters of the house" —another euphemism for *jnūn*— are frequent[63]. Shah agrees, even though he is certain that the guardians are the final beneficiaries of the offering.

To contain the *jinn* situation, the guardians throw handfuls of salt in the corners of the rooms and recite verses from the Qur'an. One of them also draws squares on the walls, amulets that are frequently used to prevent the evil eye[64]. Like Westermarck, Shah also notices the *bismillah* formula as a protective mechanism to avoid *jinn* attacks[65]. Likewise, Shah observes that the call of the muezzin from the nearby mosque is seen as a "powerful purging force in itself—as if he was blessing us five times a day", even though he feels that the voice through the loudspeakers sounds quite irritating[66].

But these prophylactic measures only keep *jnūn* at bay. To eject them forever, the guardians are convinced of the effectiveness of performing a big sacrifice and killing a goat in every room of the house. Westermarck and Crapanzano confirm *jnūn*'s fondness of blood[67], a substance containing *baraka*[68] that is frequently employed in the concoction of cures and magical potions. Shah even

---

[60] Shah 2006: 8.
[61] Westermarck 1926, vol. 1: 296.
[62] Shah 2006: 18-19.
[63] Westermarck 1926, vol. 1: 317-318.
[64] Westermarck 1926, vol. 2: 455-460.
[65] Shah 2006: 114.
[66] Shah 2006: 394.
[67] Westermarck 1926, vol. 1: 264; Crapanzano 1973: 50.
[68] *Baraka* is defined by anthropologist Clifford Geertz 1968: "blessing, in the sense of divine favor". It is a quality attributed to saints, descendants of the Prophet, even members of brotherhoods, and places and objects associated to them. Those close to these people, places and objects are blessed by proximity. *Baraka* might cure an illness, secure protection or simply bring good luck. According to Geertz, it is also associated with magical power.

tries a local remedy, spreading some blood from a slaughterhouse in his face to make the *jnūn* in his house visible. Always advised by his guardians, he also takes the decision to visit the tomb of the saint Sidi Abdur Rahman. He defines that kind of shrines "as a focal point for anyone hoping to be healed or to attain *baraka*"[69], insightfully noticing that, compared to most of Arab countries, the cult to the saints is especially strong in Morocco. He also explains that it is frequent to hear tales of people so afraid of *jnūn* that they move into shrines and refuse to go back to their houses. In *Tuhami*, Crapanzano explains how Tuhami, who firmly believed that he was possessed and married to ʿAʾisha Qandisha, visited shrines and tombs obsessively, where he spent long periods of time.

Crapanzano indicates that, to identify an attacking *jinn* it is necessary to call in an "exorcist-seer"[70]. They are frequently women, as it is the case of Sukayna in *In Arabian Nights*, or the unnamed sorceress in Sidi Abdur Rahman in *The Caliph's House*. This sorceress assures that the *jinn* had taken possession not only of the house, but also of its owner, and identifies her as a powerful and murderous female spirit. She recommends an exorcism performed by the religious brotherhood of the ʿIsawa from Meknes. According to Crapanzano, the ʿIsawa, like the Ḥamadsha, usually perform rituals to exorcise *jnūn*, although their ceremonies are less violent than the former ones, who slash their heads while in trance. Complying, Shah invites a large number of ʿIsawa to Dar Khalifa to perform a ceremony: "In each, they performed the same ritual, spraying the corners with milk, salt and blood. They danced back and forth, rustling the bouquet of smoking leaves as they chanted a solemn mantra"[71]. The ceremony is completed with the performance of the *ḥadra*, the dance in which the participants reach a trance state. After that, *jnūn* are appeased and the author and their family can resume their lives undisturbed.

In Arabian Nights: A Caravan of Moroccan Dreams (2008) reads as the continuation of *The Caliph's House* and takes up where the previous narrative finishes. Although *jnūn* come back to haunt the narrator, their presence is not as determinant as in the previous work. This time, the subject of the book is the author's search of a narrative voice; Shah feels the need to become a storyteller, as his father and grandfather before him. The oral tales he collects from different Moroccan interlocutors serve him as a source of inspiration and as a demonstration of the maintenance of an oral tradition in present-day Morocco, a culture that mirrored "the make-believe world of *A Thousand and One Nights*"[72]. If *jnūn* worked as an extended metaphor of the challenging relations between East and West and the author and his environment in *The*

---

[69] Shah 2006: 223.
[70] Crapanzano 1973: 162.
[71] Shah 2006: 334.
[72] Shah 2008: 9.

Caliph's House, in *In Arabian Nights* the author portraits the local society and culture through their oral tales.

On the existence of *JNŪN*: popular belief and symbolic connotations

In the works of Paul Bowles and Tahir Shah, the presence of *jnūn* and other cultural manifestations is as important as the reflection on their existence. Repeating some local opinions, Shah reflects that, since *jnūn* appear in the Qur'an, Moroccans will continue to believe in them. As part of the Islamic faith, they are the "backbone" of Moroccan culture[73]. The author maintains that one cannot live in North Africa "without being affected by ingrained superstition. It's everywhere"[74]. For him, living in Morocco implies a challenge; to learn to coexist with superstitions, "learn to appreciate the culture and to navigate through treacherous water"[75]. He responds by trying to adapt himself to this lifeway, respecting such superstitions "as an expression of a mature culture" even if he is unconvinced about their existence. Shah attempts to reach a middle ground, "a no man's land in which one believed but did not believe"[76], in a conscious exercise of suspension of disbelief.

On the other hand, Bowles's position towards the figure of the *jinn* seems more complex. He talked about the existence of *jnūn* in an interview in 1965: "I believe in the existence of them as projected by common belief… Obviously they do not exist outside the minds of people who believe in them"[77]. That is, he believed in the mystic participation that made possible that the rest of the "primitive" community believed in them. The emphasis is placed in the common belief: what gives the necessary strength to something previously impossible is the fact that everybody is willing to believe it. Quite similarly, for Westermarck *jnūn* were "personifications of what is uncanny in nature". He asserted that, by believing in *jnūn*, people were responsible for their existence, as they seemed "to have been invented to explain strange and mysterious phenomena"[78].

When asked if he believed in the *jinniya* 'A'isha Qandisha, Paul Bowles resorted to an explanation influenced by the "primitive mentality": he thought Moroccans believed in 'A'isha Qandisha, but he did not believe in 'A'isha Qandisha herself. "To me there's no difference between belief in a legend and belief in the thing itself. Once people believe in something, it becomes part of

---

[73] Shah 2006: 173-174.
[74] Shah 2006: 92.
[75] Shah 2006: 24.
[76] Shah 2006: 106.
[77] Caponi 1993: 17.
[78] Westermarck 1926, vol. 1: 389, 26.

the truth for them"[79]. In a similar way, Crapanzano argues that for Tuhami, 'A'isha Qandisha was as real as a human being, but she was real in a different way. She and the rest of *jnūn* were not mere projections of the Moroccan psyche, they were rather "elements in the idiom through which the Moroccan articulates his world"[80].

Bowles was not a mere collector of experiences and beliefs and he did not attempt to create a discursive framework to encapsulate the Other within. He was rather exploring the possibilities of myth and the relation between the unconscious and certain cultural manifestations, inspired by the works of Lévy-Bruhl. At the same time, he maintained a detached attitude towards traditional cultural manifestations, instead of enacting the "Rousseauesque fantasy"[81] of going native that some of his Western characters tried to experience with catastrophic consequences.

Nowadays, the belief in *jnūn* and the ailments caused by them is still widespread in Morocco. Such belief, especially deep-seated among the uneducated classes, can have perverse consequences, as Mohammed Maaruf has pointed out. According to him, the healing processes developed by religious brotherhoods to evict *jnūn* reproduce a dialectic of domination and submission, perpetuating a cultural discourse of master and disciple relations[82]. For Crapanzano, the belief in saints and *jnūn* enables "a radical shift of responsibility from self to the Other"[83], a mechanism that foments fatalism in Moroccan society. Compared to their views, Bowles's and Shah's approaches might seem patronizing and Orientalist, a way of presenting to their readership a manufactured, picturesque portrait of Morocco. While Shah seems to embody the naïve observer, eager to embrace Oriental eccentricity, Bowles would always maintain a distance with the culture he had known so intimately. However, theirs is always a respectful portrait. After all, as Crapanzano has pointed out, the subjective Other represented by anthropologists and by writers is "the empty space of desire that can be described only metaphorically"[84]. Partaking of the same subjects that professional anthropologists researched in Morocco, both authors show a conservationist attitude that aligns them with the discipline of anthropology, while at the same time popularizing Moroccan traditions for their Western readership.

---

[79] Caponi 1993: 105.
[80] Crapanzano 1980: 15.
[81] Caponi 1993: 77.
[82] Maaruf 2007: 5-10.
[83] Crapanzano 1980: 20.
[84] Crapanzano 1980: 9.

(Página deixada propositadamente em branco)

Purgatory in Los Pedroches. An Anthropological approach from the ethnographic analysis of a ceremony: *Ánimas Benditas* in Christmas Eve in Dos Torres

Ignacio Alcalde Sánchez
University of Córdoba
(orcid.org/0000-0003-0299-7265)

Abstract: This chapter presents an anthropological analysis of purgatory and its souls through the ethnographic research of a local ceremony in a small village of Andalusia. We observe the rite as a tool in the group link and a mirror of its cultural values, inside the religious approach. Therefore, it will cover an analysis about anthropology, religion and supernatural world from an ethnographic point of view.

Keywords: Purgatory, anthropology, religion, souls, ethnography, Los Pedroches.

> "People said dead people came to see them. They appeared. I believe it was because we were so hungry that hunger made them appear" (field research)

Here, we carry out a brief anthropological research on the approach of the soul and purgatory from an ethnographic work in a specific local ceremony. To introduce our objective, we will go over social anthropology through religion, beliefs and spirits, to arrive to group identity and the group link tools. We revolve around these main concepts in our ethnographic analysis to think about the world of death and its human conception from an anthropological point of view. The analysis focuses on the celebration of a rite in a placed festivity: Blessed Souls (*Ánimas Benditas*) on Christmas Eve in a small village, Dos Torres, inside Los Pedroches, in the province of Córdoba.

To begin with, our ethnographic research deals with Dos Torres, a small village with about 2500 inhabitants in the north of Córdoba (Andalusia), surrounded by similar small villages with a country way of life, which, all together, form an official region of Andalusia, Los Pedroches, a natural border among Andalusia, Castilla-León and Extremadura. They all celebrate a specific ceremony related to purgatory and its souls. In this celebration, people organize collections, give alms, sing, and pray for the souls to help them in the last step before the eternal rest. December 24th, Christmas Eve, is when this ceremony takes place, in which the souls of purgatory are the central character.

These ceremonies —rather similar to the purgatory conception to other ones found in other parts of the Andalusian geography, as the researches of

Muñoz Jiménez in Granada[1], Matarín Guil in Almería[2] or Sigüenza Martín and Collantes González in Cádiz[3] have already explained— show a very particular structure. The rite is widely rich and meaningful to represent the cultural concept hidden behind it, summarizing the main cultural aspects of this community. Here is the reason of its interest as an ethnographic object, as a tool for the analyses and comprehension of this community, especially in relation to religion and the group beliefs.

In that way, in our research, in the first part, we will introduce the general framework: the anthropology and the relation to religion, to the culture as a bridge. Then, we will analyse some of the main concepts of this relation. After that, in the second part, we will present some of the main ethnographic aspects to, finally, generate some conclusions.

Anthropology and religion

From an anthropological point of view, we define religion as the whole of beliefs related to supernatural aspects and facts of the non-natural power or entities. All these explanations of non-rational causes establish the different beliefs into religion, placed by this last one as a general frame that includes all these beliefs. We are aware that it is a limited vision and not an universal definition because in all cultures this binary distinction of natural and supernatural does not appear or, at least, it does not have the same meaning. However, we use it as a starting point to lay the foundations for the study and to establish the borders between religious and non-religious fields. In this way, we could analyse our object and show a study about the importance of the rites and the beliefs in the communal links (bonds).

Based on this primary definition, we can understand how a lot of explanations, narrations and practices are made around the supernatural events to have power over them, to manage or, at least, to internalize them. In anthropology, we observe it as an attempt to culturally subdue through the conceptualization of the events, to understand the incomprehensible. We name and subdue the unknown facts with words, rites and shared beliefs, trying to domesticate all the occurrences around us; in short, we dress with a cultural suit all the unknown events in order to face them.

In this way, religion would be considered as a socio-cultural institution that assembles these beliefs and stories and will provide the guidelines for the behaviour of the people who follow them. It sets itself up as one of the most important institutions inside the cultural communities, it increases its influence

---

[1] Muñoz Jiménez 2015.
[2] Matarín Guil 1996.
[3] Sigüenza Martín - Collantes González 2014.

to other aspects and, logically, it has been embedded in other important cultural spheres such as economy, politics or kinship systems.

Moreover, from anthropology —and avoiding a simple materialist point of view to find an only functionalist explanation of the cultural process, leaving other more effective analysis about the cultural phenomena as a complex perspective—, we can see that religion has some elemental social functions. Thereon, following some general definitions, we place religion as a safety tool in front of the unknown events, as a quiet place in front of anxiety, as an explanation of the incomprehensible of death or as a way to get over different internal conflicts[4]. Here, we will also remark on other group functions in which religion appears as social values in school, controller of taboos and shaper of the different relations (power, marriage, social roles…) within the members of the group. From this point of view, religion will become a whole element of identity and a link tool. Its rites, symbols and beliefs articulate an amalgam to build the *we* in opposite to the *others*. And in the same vein, in the pain about the family member's death, religion configures a *communitas*'s feeling that let the people dissolve their pain in the group fondness, strengthening the solidarity link in the group.

Here is where we can start to guess the usefulness of the rites and these ceremonies for anthropology and the ethnographic research, in order to understand the culture where they are covered. Religion and popular rites, as tools, link group cultural values. The rites and the religious ceremonies are configured as a group demonstration of shared cultural values and a mirror of the group identity.

On the other hand, from the anthropological study of religion, there are other two important aspects to remark for our study: the processes through which people manipulate this supernatural world and the importance of the intermediary, as an essential figure in the ceremonies.

The way we get these powers to act in our own interests, the mechanism to communicate with them or the mediation between the two worlds configure a continuum in the religious practices, from the most simple activities, as lucky charms or easy taboos, to complex communal traditions, as making time or places sacred, offerings, dogmas, sacred writings or some rites ceremonies. At the same time, this complex process also appears in the intermediary figures, from the non-permanent characters and specific roles (as magicians or healers) to the specialized intermediaries with a recognized social status, exclusive knowledge, an initial passage rite and a full time dedication.

This is the way magic and magical rites arise, and people participate in the process in which both worlds make contact. At this point, we can understand

---

[4] Jung 1938.

how the popular rites and ceremonies are inside official religious dogmas and beliefs, providing the last one with official meaning and ruling their development. At the same time, these rites are configured as the answers for the environmental questions, a shared answer highly embedded in their thoughts and in their culture.

In this context, and if we go closer to our research object, another capital concept will appear: purgatory. It is necessary to understand the main aspects of this idea because it is one of the most important elements in these ceremonies.

Purgatory was defined by J. Le Goff[5] as the third place of the Catholic tradition. It was a place created in the Middle Age as a crossing state in which the souls are in torment during an expiation trance of their sins. From this place, as Vigna Vilches[6] says, the souls come back to the living world to be in contact with the living, to send messages or to settle a debt, so they can leave their temporary state —as the liminal stage studied by A. Van Gennep in his rites of passage's analysis— and to come indefinitely into heaven and eternal rest.

Consequently, this place is configured as an intermediate platform between life and death, worlds in which we can communicate and intercede on them. It works as a consolation tool for the living because it can help them to get a better eternal rest and at the same time is used to stay in touch.

This purgatory, as Cuchet[7] described, is a painful and temporary suffering place that must be soothed by the living's mediation. It represents the last liminal step to finish this farewell rite. In this way, purgatory appears as a very important cultural creation. It is an intermediate platform made to exchange actions with the souls and to configure the death world in this culture. The way we configure it, in the group imagination, helps us, as anthropologists, understand the cultural approach in this community about the environment and the unknown events, as we said above.

Although this place was erased by the official history in the Catholic Church[8], few decades ago, it is still prevailing in a lot of areas. As we show here, purgatory is still in the popular beliefs and practices, shaping a specific place where they can turn to face the death of a community member. The official religion and unofficial religion do not always walk together, as we will show in the next section.

Finally, there is another key concept in this previous framework: the vocabulary used to name the souls and the different meanings around them. There are some words around this world that have not quite similar meanings and they need some explanation. Some of them are souls, revenants, ghosts, energies,

---

[5] Le Goff 1989.
[6] Vigna Vilches 2015.
[7] Cuchet 2005.
[8] Walsh Pasulka 2014.

spirits, saints, and so on. In this way, we use the same and usual Spanish word to refer to the souls in purgatory as the ethnography observation does: *ánimas*, like blessed souls, a word from the Catholic culture to represent this non-embodied spirit matched to a human being. This word let us stray away from other similar words which evocate different meanings. So, other words associated to non-dead people like ghosts, revenants or zombies, scare, or cultural constructions around the tragedy or some social breakups do not represent these souls neither the ceremonies about them, although the community know it. In the same vein, there are also other words used by them in other similar contexts. These are associated to non-natural events which are not named, some incomprehensible powers far away from the *ánimas*, that are very well known.

Thus, they use the *ánimas* concept in a similar way to saints or blessed souls. In that way they provide the dead souls with Catholic meaning, so too are they moving away from other aspects like scare or magic, usual representation like human shapes with human troubles or necessities and matching these souls to the dead people. In this way, they distinguish from other concepts that they can use as well although they do not do in these ceremonies, "the spirits or ghosts will be non natural powers, the *ánimas* are our deads, with name and surname"[9].

Ethnography

Within this theoretic context we can analyse the different practices developed in Dos Torres, in Los Pedroches (Córdoba), related to death and purgatory. We can include these ceremonies in the popular religion, which has been so well studied by Rodríguez Becerra[10] in his research about the conception of death and the different rites of passage in Andalusia. Following this research, we can observe that there are some rites about death related to the farewell process (shroud process, funeral vigil, funeral, condolences, eight days mass, one year mass…) but there are also other specific separated rites to reinforce these ones on specific days. In this village it specifically occurs on October 31st and November 1st (All Saints Day) and December 24th (Christmas Eve). We have chosen only the last one which is currently active with a very specific meaning and has an interesting procedure.

As we said above, the village is placed in a border land that confers the main aspects of its identity; as Hernández León[11] says, it is a recognized region composed by seventeen small villages with an economy based on agriculture and with a strong identity and character, due to the historic isolation that this area has been suffering along the last centuries.

---

[9] Extracted from fieldwork interviews.
[10] Rodríguez Becerra 2011.
[11] Hernández León 2014: 27.

Following Agudo[12] in his analysis about this countryside area, we see they keep a noticeable religious character which is shown in several popular parties, where the sacred meaning of the land and this farm profile will be clear, similar to other Spanish countryside areas, with unambiguous cultural and social functions.

In this social and historical frame, in spite of the great external pressure that provokes that some of these ceremonies are disappearing or being replaced, some of them still survive in a way that, far away to represent a static tradition consigned to oblivion, they are alive, shared and changed, adapting to the real and current demands, keeping the essential meanings and staying useful for the neighbours. Among them we will focus on one ceremony related to purgatory and the souls in it, the *Ánimas Benditas* in Christmas Eve, which remains a healthy tradition.

In Christmas Eve, groups of children walk around the village, singing the traditional carols and asking for the Christmas tips, and there are together with them some adult groups with a different yet typical song. These groups are called the *Ánimas Benditas*, like Blessed Souls or Saints, and they are the purpose of this ceremony: they walk around the whole village asking for an invitation for singing or praying. In this way, they get alms to pay the masses for the "blessed souls in purgatory", as Moreno Valero[13] says. Depending on the number of volunteers, there will be one or more groups to share the different neighbourhoods and go over the whole village. They are known as *Ánimas Benditas* and everybody opens their doors to let them pray or sing. These people raise funds and when they finish, they come back to the sacristy, where they put together all the money collected and it is given to the priest for "a fee in favour of the souls of purgatory"[14].

These groups always act in a ruled way. Firstly, they arrive to the houses with the typical shout "Blessed souls, to pray or to sing?" and the family take the choice. If they have suffered the death of a relative in the last years, and they are still keeping the established mourning, they will choose to pray the Lord's prayer and a *requiem*, otherwise, they ask for singing the typical song, which goes this way[15]:

---

[12] Agudo Torrico 1990.
[13] Moreno Valero 1995: 1.
[14] Moreno Valero 1995: 1.
[15] Translation by the author.

Esta noche celebra la Iglesia del Verbo divino la Natividad. Y también lo celebran las almas que salen de pena para descansar.	Tonight, the Church celebrates the Nativity of the Holy Word. As well, the souls, which get out of the torment, celebrate it to rest.
Venid y escuchad. Apliquemos todos el oído y oigamos los gritos que las almas dan.	Come and listen. Let all bring the ear and hear the shouts that the souls are shouting.
Supliquemos con humildes rezos y escuche los ruegos la divinidad.	Let us plead with humble prayer and so may the deity hear our pleadings.
Que las almas de nuestros hermanos alcancen el gozo de la eternidad.	May our brothers' souls get the joys of eternity.
Pedid e implorad. Por si alguno se encuentra penando, salga del tormento en la Navidad.	Plead and implore. If anyone is suffering, let he get out of torment during Christmas' times.
Celebremos gozosas las fiestas, tengamos presente esta gran verdad.	Let us celebrate with pleasure our party, and keep in mind this great truth.
Que el Mesías, nacido en Belén, logró redimirnos de nuestra maldad.	That the Messiah, who was born in Bethlehem, has redeemed us from our sins.
En su navidad, por la gracia del Verbo divino las almas que penan gocen libertad.	And in Christmas, for the Holy Word's grace, may souls which are in torment enjoy the liberty.

These lyrics, as Moreno Valero says[16], are sung in a typical southern choral rhythm and it is played with different traditional instruments, added by the neighbours, like guitars, wind instruments (trumpet, trombone, etc.) and percussions instruments (tambourines, small bells, triangles, etc.).

In that way, the family meets with the traditional act and they add some alms for the masses and the different helps to the soul in torment in purgatory, while they recognize the support of the group in this trance and the solidarity in that moment. The singing or the praying, sometimes both of them, complete these ceremonies so they remember their relatives on this day (Christmas).

Once we have described the general aspects about the ceremony, we can cross examine it with the main theoretic concepts exposed above. So, as we will explain in the last section, we can see clearly how the rite is used as a group tool for reinforcing group links and for promoting solidarity for each other. At the same time, they introduce a festive perspective to purgatory, singing about

---

[16] Moreno Valero 1995: 2.

this condition, similar to the way to intercede for the souls in it, giving alms or participating as an intermediary agent, to sing and get money for them.

We can see through this ceremony that neighbours make up the group, designating themselves as the intermediaries and the foremen of the souls in purgatory. It is especially interesting that the rest of neighbours are waiting for this group, with the rest of carols children group, to achieve this tradition, making a big difference between children and adults. So, they want to pay homage to their dead relatives, with the alms or the respectful prayer, especially where there have been a recent death – in that case the pray is an obligatory stop. In the same way, in other houses, where the song is repeated time after time with a festive approach, it means an homage and intermediary action involved in the festive character of that day. It is very different to the rest of the carols or groups with an external tradition. In the same vein, we can observe how this ceremony is far away from that meaning, the only lyrics, the adult singers and the formal pray in some situations transfer to this rite an absolutely different roll in the village.

To the end of the journey, the priest will be the one who takes care of the money and manage it for the next mass and different events (All Saints Day, candles maintenance, etc.), so it is a free activity that the neighbours want to realize for the rest of the community, like a shared tradition which is organized in a spontaneous way.

Last, in this brief ethnographic research, we must focus as well on an ethno-literary approach, so from this perspective we can see the utility of the usage of these popular lyrics, frequently used in Andalusia, in a typical rhythm taken from the *flamenco* culture and the choral groups. On one hand, it helps them to memorize the lyrics and teach it and, on the other hand, it helps to fit this death rite into a very merry and charming day; a very tragic situation as the *liminal* state of the souls, mainly, some family members in torment in Purgatory, is dealt with in a festive way. In this way, some expressions as "the shouts of the souls" or "if anyone is suffering, get out of the torment in Christmas" appear as usual expressions and they send a message about purgatory far from tragic meaning.

Following Moreno Valero[17], this conceptualization of purgatory is very similar than other nearby villages, where there are similar lyrics too, used in other ceremonies. So, in Villanueva de Córdoba, a closer village, the Blessed Souls brotherhood recites a prayer, like an announcement, in this way[18]:

---

[17] Moreno Valero 1995.
[18] Moreno Valero 1995: 3. Translation by the author.

Con pregones atentos piadosos estimamos la gran devoción, por las ansias, tormentos y fatigas que están padeciendo, por amor de Dios	With attentive merciful proclamations we appreciate the great devotion to the anxiety, torments and annoyance that they are suffering, for the love of God.
Si te quemas una mano, no digas "¡Dios, que me quemo!". ¿Qué será de aquellas almas que están en el fuego ardiendo?	If your hand gets burned, do not say "Oh, my God, I am burning!". What will it be about those souls burning in the fire?
San Jerónimo bendito vinieras para explicar lo que padecen las almas que en el Purgatorio están. (…)	Blessed Saint Jerome, we wish you would come to explain how much the souls suffer in purgatory (...)
A las ánimas benditas no se les cierra la puerta, en diciendo que perdonen se van ellas tan contentas.	Do not close the door to the blessed souls, just say "Forgive" and they will go away happy.

Here as well, we can observe how the relation between the spirits and the Blessed Souls' conception is normalized, madding a process to intermediate with them and help them in the eternal life searching.

In this vein, from the perspective of the countryside life and the different ceremonies that C. Lisón describes in his research about farm people in Galicia[19], we can understand as well how the ceremony is just the excuse to show and to link, through the cultural rules (as a cultural code of conduct), the whole community, such as the intermediary people and the affected families, the ceremony lets them shape the border of the pain, the way to express it, and even the relationship with the other dead community members.

Conclusions

As Muñoz Jiménez says, following Cuchet[20], the soul devotion is written inside an usual functional materialism without any complex, whose effect in the people is classified into three types: protection of the prayer's life, financial and legal interests and missing objects. And we could add to this list a fourth type: the relief and the individual satisfaction to help a dear (family) dead soul.

In that way, we see the structure of these functions in several rites, which let us know a procedure to help them. These rites combine, inside them, the knowledge and the way to use it to intercede on the souls' behalf. Inside the complex system that religion is, the rites are like the instructions to follow in our behaviour and the bridge between dead and alive world. In that rite, the lyrics, the choral group and the date configure the stage where the families can help the

---

[19] Lisón Tolosana 2004a, Lisón Tolosana 2004b.
[20] Muñoz Jiménez 2015: 2.

Ánimas Benditas, and at the same time, they meet the role of these souls inside the community, like non scaring or tragic entities or like community members who they must still help. The dead and living share a common place during this ceremony.

According to that, and as one of the most important conclusions, the rite has a very highly complex meaning and it will be developed in two parallel planes at the same time, with a feedback process, like two sides of a coin. In one way, following the official religion, the rite is celebrated according to the dogmas, rules and general structure (although nowadays it is not a formal stage, it is still a current concept for many people, specially to develop this kind of ceremony); on the other hand, following the *popular religion*, the rite will answer to the people demands, with a spontaneous tradition and non regular way. With such practices, at the beginning it appears as unconnected with the official religion but they are provided the meaning and rules from this last one. Nobody cares whether purgatory is or is not an official place, for them the ceremony holds meaning in a different way.

The popular ceremonies or rituals are regularized by the rules of the official religion. These popular ceremonies were, mostly, born in separated places of these religions but they are supplied with meaning and acculturated inside this big beliefs framework.

In that way we can observe how purgatory, a concept erased from official religion, is still alive in the popular tradition as a useful tool. Sometimes official and unofficial religion bear some differences, and in this way, it does not seem to be a big problem to fix one in another, in spite of this lack of formal feedback from the Catholic church.

Thus, these rites can fit inside the dogmas of the official religion. As Martínez Shaw[21] said, the popular culture mechanisms keep its traditional traditions where the official religion contents endanger its survival.

With respect to the specific ethnographic ceremony, we can observe some of the functions we analysed at the beginning, consoling the neighbourhood at the family member's lost, establishing solidarity link with the group members or just reinforcing the *communitas* feeling in the whole community within the participation of a group rite. At the same time, it achieves other secondary functions as involving a festive approach to this situation, playing the drama down to the death with songs and the group uproar, or expressing the solidarity and respect of the group in these specific homes with a deceased, with the formal and respectful group prayer, inside this special date as Christmas Eve.

At this point, the ceremony helps also to support the expense for the masses and the different fees that every family cannot afford. Cohesion, intergroup

---

[21] Martínez Shaw 1985.

solidarity and acknowledgement of the group symbols are displayed in these ceremonies.

The neighbours, constituted as the *Ánimas Benditas* group, are named as temporary intermediaries, without magic roles (like other ceremonies with healers or expiation), only as mediators with specific functions inside the ceremony. And they are cut off from other characters with religious meaning like the priest or similar ones. It is important to note that this is a non-official ceremony, so the actors are not the official religious people.

Because of that, this ceremony is close to popular belief and it is shared with everyone in the community, far away from the sacred meaning of other ceremonies related to purgatory, as the mass, that in this case, is the last step in this process, in the next days or weeks.

From this approach, we can see how purgatory is established like a platform where all the meanings and practices by the living people are made for the dead souls. It gives a shelter to the pain, at the same time it also articulates the way to help them or, at least, to place them in a located place, in a comprehensible place for the living. Purgatory will be like a socio-cultural institution inside the community where they can place the dead souls, it will get closer to the living world, especially with this kind of ceremony, and give meaning to the pain and homage practices in the community.

As we said above, the conceptualization of the spirits as *Ánimas Benditas* strays away from other words, almost similar but totally different in the treatment of the dead and beliefs, like ghosts or spirits. So, the teaching of these ceremonies to the next generations is done without important changes of meaning respect to these new concepts, with different approach from the cinema or the new ceremonies (like Halloween or similar ones). In fact, they share both ceremonies without any trouble; even they are playing in both of them. They can feel afraid from the stories in one of the ceremonies and then they can participate in the other ones in an usual way, establishing a totally different meaning between ghost, spirits and *ánimas*.

Every society has the spirits it ought to, the spirits according to its beliefs, environment and social and historical development. So, the spirits are like a mirror of the cultural values, conceptualized in several ceremonies, rites, beliefs and so on. From the Anthropology, we do not evaluate the truth of their conceptualization; in no one stage we are interested in it; however, we focus on the collective imagination, on the narrative explanation of them and the way people express it and practice it. The interesting aim in the ceremony is its history, the beliefs, its meanings, definitely, the social fact that it symbolizes, mainly when this rite is located in a capital place into the group identity.

Similar to the ethno-literature, we plan the anthropological analyses from the literary work of a community, as a starting point, walking in an opposite way that ethnographic science says, from imaginative world to the real world. Here

we can also pose the way from non-natural world to the natural one, so we will understand the manifestations like cultural metaphors, the *Ánimas Benditas* as a symbolic ceremony which illustrates the way of life of the group, in summary, the culture of this group.

Bibliography

Addison, J. (1712), "There is a kind of writing…", *The Spectator* 419, July 1.

Afzelius, A.A. (1872), *Volkssagen und Volkslieder aus Schweden*. Leipzig.

Agudo Torrico, J. (1990), *Las hermandades de la virgen de Guía en Los Pedroches.* Córdoba.

Aguirre, M. (2006), "Fantasmas trágicos: algunas observaciones sobre su papel, aparición en escena e iconografía", *CFC (G)* 16: 107-120.

Aguirre, M. (2009), "Some Ghostly Appearances in Greece: Literary and Artistic Sources", *Gerión* 27.1: 179-189.

Alatorre, A. (2003), *El sueño erótico en la poesía española de los Siglos de Oro.* México.

Alfieri, V.E. (1936), *Gli atomisti: Frammenti e testimonianze*. Bari.

Alonso Getino, L.G. (1927), *Vida y obras de Fray Lope de Barrientos*, Salamanca.

Amati, G. (1866), *Ubbie: ciancioni e ciarpe del secolo XIV*. Bologna.

Amendola, S. (2007), "Amore e orrore: la storia di Pausania e Cleonice", in J.Mª Nieto Ibáñez - R. López López (eds.), *El amor en Plutarco*. León, 231-244.

Anderson, G. (1976), *Theme and Variation in the Second Sophistic*. Leiden.

Anon. (2015), *One Thousand and One Nights: Complete Arabian Nights Collection*. Hastings.

Arango, M.A. (1980), "El gracioso. Sus cualidades y rasgos distintivos en cuatro dramaturgos del siglo XVII: Lope de Vega, Tirso de Molina, Juan Ruiz de Alarcón y Pedro Calderón de la Barca", *BICC* 36: 377-386.

Arellano, I. (2012), *Historia del teatro español del siglo XVII*. Madrid.

Arellano, I. (ed.). (2010, 6th ed.), *Francisco de Quevedo. Los sueños*. Madrid.

Arrighetti, G. (1973, 2nd ed.), *Opere: Epicuro* (introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e note). Torino.

Bailey, C. (1998, 2nd ed.), *Titi Lucreti Cari: De rerum natura libri sex* (prolegomena, critical apparatus, translation, and commentary), 3 vols. New York.

Barbieri, A. (2001), *Ricerche sul Phasma di Menandro*. Bologna.

Bastianini G. - Casanova, A. (eds.) (2010), *I papiri del romanzo antico. Atti del Convegno internazionale di Stud.* Firenze.

Beahm, G. (1995), *The Stephen King Companion* (rev. ed.). New York.

Becker, G.J. (1977), *Shakespeare's Histories*. New York.

Beecher, D. (2000), "Calderón's *La dama duende* and the theater of suspense", *RR* 24: 3-21.

Bermejo Barrera, J.C. - González García, F.J. & Reboreda Morillo, S. (1996), *Los orígenes de la mitología griega*. Madrid.

Bermúdez, M. (2012), *Breve historia de la filosofía*. Córdoba.

Bevan, E. (1926), "Classical ghosts", *Quarterly Review* 246: 60–74.

Boccaccio, G. (1968), *Corbaccio* (ed. T. Nurmela). Helsinki.

Boccaccio, G. (1992), *Decameron* (ed. V. Branca). Turin.

Bompaire, J. (1958), *Lucien écrivain. Imitation et création*. Paris.

Bonomo, G. (1953), *Scongiuri del popolo siciliano*. Palermo.

Bottari, G. (1818), *Lezioni sopra il Decamerone*. Florence.

Bottari, G. (1845), *Dialoghi sopra le tre arti del disegno*. Parma.

Botting, F. (1996), *Gothic*. New York.

Bowles, P. (1952, 2002), *Let It Come Down*. New York.

Bowles, P. (1955, 2003), *The Spider's House*. New York.

Bowles, P. (1972), *Without Stopping: An Autobiography*. New York.

Bowles, P. (2002), *Collected Stories and Later Writings*. New York.

Bremmer, J.N. (2002), *The Rise and Fall of the Afterlife*. London-New York.

Bremmer, J.N. (2015), "Ancient Necromancy: Fact or Fiction?", in K. Bielawski (ed.), *Mantic Perspectives: Oracles, Prophecy and Performance*. Gardzienic–Lublin-Warszawa, 119-141.

Brenk, F.E. (1975), "The dreams of Plutarch's *Lives*", *Latomus* 34: 336-349 [Reedited in F.E. Brenk (1998), "The dreams of Plutarch's *Lives*", in F.E. Brenk, *Relighting the Souls. Studies in Plutarch in Greek Literature, Religion and Philosophy, and in the New Testament Background*. Stuttgart, 336-349].

Brenk, F.E. (1977), *In mist apparelled. Religious themes in Plutarch's* Moralia *and* Lives. Leiden.

Brenk, F. E. (1987), "An Imperial Heritage: The Religious Spirit of Plutarch of Chaironeia", *ANRW* II 36.1: 248-349.

Brogan, K. (1988), *Cultural Haunting. Ghost and Ethnicity in Recent American Literature*. Charlottesville.

Brown, C.B. (2007), *Edgar Huntly*. Stilwell.

Calderón de la Barca, P. (1973), *Obras Completas: Comedias (*ed. Á. Valbuena Briones). Madrid.

Calderón de la Barca, P. (1999), *La dama duende* (ed. F. Antonucci). Barcelona.

Calderón de la Barca, P. (2010), *El encanto sin encanto*, en P. Calderón de la Barca, *Comedias. IV. Cuarta Parte de Comedias* (ed. S. Neumeister). Madrid.

Calderón de la Barca, P. (2013), *El galán fantasma* (ed. N. Iglesias Iglesias). Santiago de Compostela.

Camerotto, A. (1998), *La metamorfosi della parola*. Pisa-Roma.

Camerotto, A. (2009), *Lucian di Samosata. Icaromenippo o l'uomo sopra le nuvole*. Alessandria.

Camerotto, A. (2012), "Gli occhi e la lingua dello straniero: satira e straniamento in Lucian di Samosata", *Prometheus* 38: 217-238.

Camerotto, A. (2014), *Gli occhi e la lingua della satira. Studi sull'eroe satirico in Lucian di Samosata*. Milano-Udine.

Canali, L. (2000, 5th ed.) (trad.), *Properzio. Elegie*, Milano.

Caponi, G.D. (ed.) (1993), *Conversations with Paul Bowles*. Jackson.

Carmignani, M. (2009), "El *Satyricon* como novela: la sátira menipea y los nuevos descubrimientos papiráceos", *Circe* 13: 75-91.

Caruth, C. (ed.) (1995), *Trauma: Explorations in Memory*. Baltimore.

Casini, T. (1886), "Scongiuro e poesia", *ASTP* 5: 560-568.

Cavallero, C. (2010), "Supersticiosos y marranos. El discurso anti-mágico de Lope de Barrientos a la luz de la «cuestión conversa»", *CHE* 84: 61-90.

Cazés Gryj, D. (2013), "Construcción de la mentira sobrenatural en *La dama duende* y *El galán fantasma*", *Anuario calderoniano* 6: 61-73.

Celati, G. (1986), *Finzioni occidentali*. Turin.

Choudhury, R. (1996), "'Is there a ghost, a zombie there?' Postcolonial intertextuality and Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea*", *Textual Practice* 10.2: 315-327.

Chrysochou, P. (2011), "In-Between States: Twilight Horror in Jean Rhys' *After Leaving Mr. Mackenzie* and Djuna Barnes' *Nightwood*", *JCLs* 7.1: 139-151.

Churchill, G.B. (1976), *Richard the Third up to Shakespeare*. Totowa, NJ.

Cidade, H.A (1962), *Luis de Camões. Obras completas. Redondilhas e sonetos*. Vol. 1. Lisboa.

Clery, E.J. (1994), "Against Gothic", in V. Sage & A.L. Smith (eds.), *Gothic: Origins and Innovations.* Amsterdam, 34-43.

Clery, E.J. (2011), "The genesis of 'Gothic' fiction", in J.E. Hogle (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction*. Cambridge, 21-39.

Collison-Morley, L. (1912), *Greek and Roman Ghost Stories*. Oxford.

Colombo, J.R. (2002, 4th ed.), *Ghost Stories of Ontario*. Ontario – Oxford - NewYork.

Cordero, N.L. - La Croce, E. & Santa Cruz, Mª.I. (2015, 2nd ed.), *Los filósofos presocráticos: Empédocles, Anaxágoras, Leucipo, Demócrito. Obras* II. Madrid.

Cotarelo y Mori, E. (1896), *Don Enrique de Villena. Su vida y obras*. Madrid.

Crapanzano, V. (1973), *The Ḥamadsha: A Study in Moroccan Ethnopsychiatry*. Berkeley.

Crapanzano, V. (1980), *Tuhami: Portrait of a Moroccan*. Chicago.

Cribiore, R. (1996), "Gli esercizi scolastici dell'Egitto greco-romano: cultura letteraria e cultura popolare nella scuola", in O. Pecere - A. Stramaglia (eds.)*, La letteratura di consume nel mondo Greco-latino*. Cassino, 505-526.

Cuchet, G. (2005), *Le crèpuscule du purgatoire*. Paris.

Cuenca Muñoz, P. (1994), *Lope de Barrientos. Tractado de la divinança*, Cuenca. [Ph.D. available: http://eprints.ucm.es/3308/1/T18023.pdf].

Cuenca, L.A. de – Alvar Ezquerra, A. (2004, 2nd ed.), *Antología de la poesía latina*. Madrid.

Cuenca, L.A. de (1997), "Vacaciones", *ABC* 03/08/1997: 20 [reprinted in Cuenca 1999: 34].

Cuenca, L.A. de (1998) (ed.), *Las cien mejores poesías de la lengua castellana*. Madrid.

Cuenca, L.A. de (1999), *Señales de Humo*. Valencia.

Cuenca, L.A. de (2011), *En la cama con la muerte [25 poemas fúnebres]*. Sevilla.

Cuenca, L.A. de (2015), "Cinco poemas de Luis Alberto de Cuenca comentados por él mismo", in M.P. Celma Valero – M.J. Gómez del Castillo & C. Morán Rodríguez (eds.), *Actas del L Congreso Internacional de la AEPE (Asociación Europea de Profesores de Español). La cultura hispánica: de sus orígenes al siglo XXI*. Burgos, 29-41.

Cumont, F. (1945), "Virgile et les morts prématurées" *Publication de l'ENS, section des lettres* 2: 123–152.

Cumont, F. (1949), *Lux perpetua*. Paris.

D'Agostini, F. (2009), *Analíticos y continentales: Guía filosófica de los últimos treinta años*. Madrid.

D'Ancona, A. (1906), *La poesia popolare*. Livorno.

Dalzell, A. (1980), "Homeric themes in Propertius", *Hermathena* 129: 29-36.

Davis, C. (2005), "Ét at Présent. Hauntology, spectres and Phantoms", *French Studies* 59.3: 373-379.

De Armas, F.A. (1976), *The invisible mistress. Aspects of feminism and fantasy in the Golden Age*. Charlottesville.

De Armas, F.A. (1986), "En Madrid y en una casa: un palimpsesto de amores invisibles", in S. Neumeister (ed.), *Actas del IX Congreso de la AIH*. Frankfurt, 341-352.

De Armas, F.A. (1993), "Mujer y mito en el teatro clásico español *La viuda*

valenciana y *La dama duende*", *Lenguaje y textos* 3: 57-72.

De Vogüé, A. (1978-1980), *Grégoirele Grand, Dialogues*. 3 vols. Sources chrétiennes 251, 260, 265. Paris.

Deriu, M. (2017), «*Mixis*» e «*poikilia*» *nei protagonisti della satira. Studi sugli archetipi comico e platonico nei dialoghi di Luciano di Samosata*. Trento.

Derrida, J. (1993, 2006), *Specters of Marx. The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning and the New International.* New York.

Descartes, R. (2008), *Meditations of First Philosophy.* Oxford.

Devereux, G. (1976), *Dreams in Greek Tragedy, an Etho-Psycho-Analytic Study.* Berkeley.

Di Pinto, E. (2004), "El conflicto amoroso: algunas veras y burlas en el teatro del siglo XVII", in A. Cancellier - M. Ruta & L. Silvestri (coords.), *Scrittura e conflitto: Actas del XXII Congreso AISPI.* Messina, 129-140.

Diallo, K. (2013), "Los abusos de poder en la comedia barroca", in M. Insúa - F. Chmelzer (eds.), *Teatro y poder en el Siglo de Oro.* Pamplona, 67-80.

Dickie, M.W. (2014), "Does Homer doubt the existence of ghosts? *Iliad* 23. 103-104", *Papers and Monographs from the Norwegian Institute at Athens* 40.2: 3-8.

Diels, H. (1906, 2nd ed.), *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker.* Berlin.

Dimundo, R. (1990), *Properzio 4.7: Dalla variante de un modello letterario alla costante de una unità tematica.* Bari.

Dingwall, E. (1930), *Ghosts and Spirits in the Ancient World.* London.

Dodds, E.R. (1997, 8th ed.), *Los griegos y lo irracional.* Madrid.

Dowden, K. (2007), "Rhetoric and Religion", in I. Worthington (ed.), *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric.* Oxford, 220-235.

Dubel, S. (1994), "Dialogue et autoportrait: les masques de Lucien", in A. Billault (ed.), *Lucien de Samosate.* Paris, 19-26.

Dufallo, B. (2007), *The Ghosts of the Past.* Columbus.

Dupont, F. (1997), "Les tragédies de Sénèque, théâtre du corps et de la voix", in M. Rodríguez-Pantoja (ed.), *Séneca, dos mil años después (Actas del Congreso Internacional conmemorativo del bimilenario de su nacimiento).* Córdoba, 177-189.

Durán Mañas, M. (2010), "Influencia aristotélicia en los sueños de las *Vidas* plutarqueas de Alejandro y César", *CFC (G)* 20: 231-246.

Durkheim, É. (2003), *Les formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse.* Paris.

Ebner, M. – Gzella, H. – Nesselrath, H.-G. & Ribbat, E. (2001), *Lukian. Die Lügenfreunde.* Scripta antiquitatis posterioris ad ethicam religionemque pertinentia (SAPERE) iii. Darmstadt.

Edemariam, A. (2005), "Looking for Luisa", *The Guardian*, Saturday 7 May [Available: http://]www.guardian.co.uk/books/2005/may/07/ featuresreviews.guardianreview34 [05/20/11].

Edmonds, R.G. (2004), *Myths of the Underworld Journey: Plato, Aristophanes, and the 'Orphic' Gold Tablets*. Cambridge.

Eickelman, D.F. (1976), *Moroccan Islam: Tradition and Society in a Pilgrimage Center*. Austin.

El-Zein, A. (2009), *Islam, Arabs, and the Intelligent World of the Jinn*. Syracuse.

Eliot, T.S. (1963), "Shakespeare and the Stoicism of Seneca", in L. Lerner (ed.) *Shakespeare's Tragedies: A Selection of Modern Criticism.* London, 301-313.

Emmons, C.-F. (2003), "Ghosts: The Dead among us", in C.D. Bryant (ed.), *Handbook of Death and Dying.* Thousand Oaks, 87-95.

Escartín Gual, M. (2008), "Pandora y Eva: la misoginia judeo-cristiana y griega en la literatura medieval catalana y española", *Revista de lengua y literatura catalana, gallega y vasca* 13: 55-71.

Etty, J.L. (1900-1901), "Shakespeare's History, Studies in III. *Richard III*", *Macmillan's Magazine* 83: 15-22.

Falassi, A. (1977), "Il Boccaccio e il folklore", in M. Cottino Jones - E. Tuttle (eds.), *Boccaccio, secoli di vita*. Ravenna, 265-292.

Favreau-Linder, A.-M. (2015), "Le *Charon* de Lucien: un dialogue des morts?", in S. Dubel et S. Gotteland (eds.), *Formes et genres du dialogue antique.* Bordeaux, 197-209.

Fayad, M. (1988), "Unquiet Ghosts: The Struggle for Representation in Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea*", *MFS* 34.3: 437-452.

Felton, D. (1999a), *Haunted Greece and Rome. Ghosts Stories from Classical Antiquity*. Austin.

Felton, D. (1999b), "Folkloric Anomalies in a Scene from the "Mostellaria"", *QUCC* 62.2: 123-142.

Ferrater Mora, J. (1988), *Diccionario de Filosofía*. Madrid.

Fido, F. (1977), *Le metamorfosi del Centauro*. Rome.

Fitch, J.G. (2000), "Playing Seneca?", in G.W.M. Harrison (ed.), *Seneca in performance.* London, 1-12.

Fitch, J.G. (2002), *Seneca. Hercules, Trojan Women, Phoenician Women, Medea, Phaedra* (ed. and transl. by J.G. Fitch). Cambridge - London.

Fitch, J.G. (2004), *Seneca. Oedipus, Agamemnon, Thyestes. [Seneca] Hercules on Oeta, Octavia* (ed. and transl. by J.G. Fitch). Cambridge - London.

Freud, S. (1919), "The Uncanny", in *The Standard Edition of the Complete*

Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume XVII (1917-1919): An Infantile Neurosis and Other Works. London, 217-256.

Freud, S. (2009), "The Uncanny", in B. Nelson (ed.), *On Creativity and the Unconscious*. New York, 122-161.

Frisch, M.J. (1993), "Shakespeare's *Richard III* and the Soul of the Tyrant", *Interpretation* 20.3: 275-284.

Fumi, L. (1907), *Usi e costumi lucchesi*. Lucca.

Gager, J.G. (ed.) (1992), *Curse tablets and binding spells from the ancient world*. New York.

García Jurado, F. (2006), "Los cuentos de fantasmas: entre la literatura antigua y el relato gótico", *Culturas Populares. Revista Electrónica* 2. [Available: http://www.culturaspopulares.org/textos2/articulos/garciajurado.htm]

García Jurado, F. (2010), "El encuentro complejo entre Proust y Propercio. Literatura latina y estéticas de la modernidad", in L. Carriedo – Mª.L. Guerrero (eds.), *Marcel Proust: écriture, réécriture. Dynamiques de l'èchange esthétique*. Bruxelles, 95-113.

García-Monge Carretero, M.I. (2001), *Estudio y edición crítica del "Tratado del dormir y despertar" de Lope de Barrientos*. Madrid. [Available: http://eprints.ucm.es/tesis/fll/ucm-t25104.pdf]

García-Valdés, C.C. (ed.) (1993), *Francisco de Quevedo. Prosa festiva completa*. Madrid.

Geertz, C. (1968), *Islam Observed: Religious Development in Morocco and Indonesia*. Chicago.

Georgiadou, A. - Larmour, D.H.L. (1998), *Lucian's Science Fiction Novel* True Stories. Leiden-Boston-Köln.

Giancotti, F. (1998, 3rd ed.), *Lucretius: La natura*. Milano.

Godinas, L. (2006), "Fray Lope de Barrientos, Tractado de caso y fortuna", *Revista de literatura medieval*, 18: 9-70.

Godwin, J. (2000), *Lucretius: Selections from the* De rerum natura (edited with introduction and commentary). London.

Gómez, P. (2012a), "El aprendiz de rapsodo, o de cuando Homero cruzó la laguna Estigia (Lucianus, *Cont.* 7) ", *Emerita* 80.1: 13-29.

Gómez, P. (2012b), "Secrets de família: amor i poder als *Diàlegs de déus* de Llucià", in E. Vintró - F. Mestre & P. Gómez (coords.), Μελέτη. *Homenatge a Montserrat Jufresa*. Barcelona, 117-138.

Gómez Espelosín, F.J. (2013), *Memorias perdidas: Grecia y el mundo oriental*. Madrid.

Gómez, P. (2014), "Ecos del Olimpo en los *Diálogos marinos* de Lucian", en A. Pérez Jiménez (ed.), *Realidad, Fantasía, Interpretación, Funciones y Pervivencia del Mito Griego*. Zaragoza, 313-328.

Gonzàlez Julià, Ll. (2011), "Luciano ensaya la novela escénica: apariencia episódica y estructura unitaria de los *Diálogos de los muertos*", *Emerita* 79.2: 357-379.

Graesse, J.G.T. (ed.) (1850), *Jacobus de Voragine*, *Legenda aurea*. Leipzig.

Grau, S. (2015), "Las burlas del ascetismo en la biografía de los filósofos griegos antiguos: ¿un reaprovechamiento de materiales cómicos?", in J. de la Villa *et alii* (eds.), *Ianua Classicorum. Temas y formas del Mundo Clásico*. vol. 2. Madrid, 171-178.

Greer, R.A. – Mitchell, M.M. (2007), *The 'Belly-Myther' of Endor: Interpretations of 1 Kingdoms 28 in the Early Church*. Atlanta.

Günther, H.C. (2006), "The Fourth Book", in H.C. Günther (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Propertius*. Leiden – Boston, 353-398.

Guthrie, W.V. (1974), *The Presocratic Tradition from Parmenides to Democritus*. Cambridge.

Haleem, A. (ed.) (2008), *The Qur'an*. Oxford.

Hall, J. (1985), *Lucian's Satire*. New York.

Hamilton, A.C. (1967), "The Resolution of the Early Period: Richard III", *The Early Shakespeare*, The Huntington Library, 186-202.

Hansen, W.F. (1980), "An ancient Greek ghost story", in N. Burlakoff - C. Lindahl (eds.) *Folklore on two continents: Essays in honor of Linda Dégh*. Bloomington, 71–77.

Hanson, J.S. (1980), "Dreams and Visions in the Graeco-Roman World and Early Christiany", *ANRW* 23.2: 1395-1427.

Harman, G. (2012), *Weird Realism. Lovecraft and Philosophy*. Winchester.

Harmon, A.M. (1968), *Lucian*. Vol. II. London-Cambridge, MA.

Harmon, A.M. (1969), *Lucian*. Vol. IV. London-Cambridge, MA.

Harris, W.H. (2009), *Dreams and Experience in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge, MA – London.

Harrison, G.W.M. (2000), "*Semper ego auditor tantum*? Performance and Physical Setting of Seneca's Plays", in G.W.M. Harrison (ed.), *Seneca in performance*. London, 137-149.

Harrison, S.J. (2002), "Ennius and the prologue to Lucretius DRN 1 (1. 1-148)", *LICS* 1.4: 1-12.

Headlam, W. (1902), "Ghost-raising, magic and the underworld", *CR* 16: 52–61.

Helm, R. (1906), *Lukian und Menipp*. Leipzig [reimp. Hildesheim 1966].

Hernán-Pérez Guijarro, Mª.P. (2009), "Darío, Clitemnestra y Polidoro, personajes fantasma de la Tragedia Griega con algo que decir", *Fortunatae* 20: 31-47.

Hernández León, E. (2014), "Acerca de Los Pedroches", *Revista PH* 86: 26-33.

Henrichs, A. (1972), *Die Phoinikika des Lollianos. Fragmente eines neuen griechischen Romans.* Bonn.

Henrichs, A. (2010), "Fractured communications: Narrators, Narratives and Discourse in Greek Novels on Papyrus", in G. Bastianini - A. Casanova (eds.), *I papiri del romanzo antico. Atti del Convegno internazionale di Studi.* Firenze, 65-80.

Henry, R. (ed.) (1959-1991). *Photius, Bibliothèque.* 9 vols. Paris.

Herzberger, R.K. (2011), *A Companion to Javier Marías.* Rochester, NY.

Herzig, O. (1940), *Lukian als Quelle für die antike Zauberei.* Tübingen.

Hibbard, A. (2004), *Paul Bowles. Magic & Morocco.* San Francisco.

Hickman, R. (1938), *Ghostly Etiquette on the Classical Stage.* Cedar Rapids.

Hijmans B.L. Jr. *et alii* (1995), *Apuleius Madaurensis. Metamorphoses, Book IX* (Text, introd. and comm.). Groningen.

Hogle, J.E. (2002), "Introduction: the Gothic in Western Culture", in J.E. Hogle (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction.* Cambridge, 1-20.

Hopkins, K. (1983), *Death and Renewal. Sociological Studies in Roman History.* Vol. 2. Cambridge.

Hoppenstand, G. - Browne, R.B. (1987), *The Gothic world of Stephen King: landscape of nightmares.* Wisconsin.

Hornblower, S. (ed.) (2013), *Herodotus. Histories Book V.* Cambridge.

Hubbard, M. (1974), *Propertius.* London.

Huertas, C. (2012), "Parnell and Walpole, Pioneers of Gothic Literature: Translation Analysis of 'A Night Piece on Death' and the Prologue to *The Castle of Otranto*", in V. López-Folgado - M.M. Rivas-Carmona (eds.), *Essays on Translation. Multilingual Issues.* Hamburg, 25-42.

Hurley, K. (2007), "Abject and Grotesque", in C. Spooner – E. McEvoy (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Gothic.* London, 137-146.

Hutchinson, G. (2006), *Propertius, Elegies Book IV.* Cambridge.

Indick, B.P. (1985), "King and the literary tradition of horror and the supernatural", in H. Bloom (ed.), *Stephen King. Modern Critical Views.* Philadelphia, 15-26.

Janan, M. (2001), *The Politics of Desire. Propertius IV.* Berkeley – Los Angeles – London.

Jobbé-Duval, E. (1924), *Les morts malfaisants, 'larvae, lemures,' d'après le droit et les croyances populaires des Romains.* Paris.

Johnston, S.I. (1999), *Restless Dead. Encounters between the Living and the Dead in Ancient Greece.* Berkeley - Los Angeles - London.

Joshi, S.T. (2003), *The Weird Tale.* Holicong.

Joynes, A. (2001), *Medieval Ghost Stories.* Woodbridge.

Jufresa, M. (2003), "El teatre, metàfora de la vida a Llucià", *Ítaca* 19: 171-186.

Jung, C.G. (1938), *Psychology and Religion.* New Haven.

Karavas, O. (2005), *Lucien et la tragédie.* Berlin-New York.

Keith, A. (2008), *Propertius. Poet of Love and Leisure.* London.

Kemper, O. (1993), "How Ill this Taper Burns! Spirits, Revenge, Philosophers, and the Demonic Power of Rhetoric", *File: A Literary Journal* 2.4: 9-27.

Kilgour, M. (1995), *The Rise of the Gothic Novel.* Oxon.

King, S. (1977/2012), *The Shining.* New York.

Kingsley, P. (1999), *In the Dark Places of Wisdom.* London.

Kline, A.S. (2012) (trans.), *Sextus Propertius: The Elegies.* [Available: http://www.poetryintranslation.com/PITBR/Latin/Prophome.htm]

Knights, L.Ch. (1962), *William Shakespeare: The Histories.* London.

Knox, P.E. (2004), "Cynthia's Ghosts in Propertius 4.7", *Ordia Prima* 3: 153-169.

Kovacs, D. (1995), *Euripides.* Vol. II. London-Cambridge, MA.

Kragelund, P. (2008), "Senecan Tragedy: Back on Stage?", in J.G. Fitch, *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies. Seneca.* Oxford, 181-194.

Kristeva, J. (1982), *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection.* New York.

Kristovic, J. (ed.) (2001), *Classical and Medieval Literature Criticism.* Detroit.

Kytzler, B. (1989), *Geister, Gräber unde Gespenster: antike Spuksgeschichten.* Leipzig.

Laguna Mariscal, G. (1997), "La concepción sobre el más allá en la tragedia de Séneca", in M. Rodríguez-Pantoja (ed.), *Séneca, dos mil años después (Actas del Congreso Internacional conmemorativo del Bimilenario de su nacimiento).* Córdoba, 203-209.

Laguna Mariscal, G. (2000), "«En tierra, en humo, en polvo, en sombra, en nada»: historia de un tópico literario (II)", *Anuario de Estudios Filológicos* 23: 243-254.

Laguna Mariscal, G. (2002), "Jaime Gil de Biedma y la Tradición Clásica: evocación y apropiación", *Sincronía* Invierno 2002: 1-24. [Available: http://sincronia.cucsh.udg.mx/lagunainv02.htm]

Laguna Mariscal, G. (2005), "En conversación con los difuntos", *Blog Tradición Clásica* 5.2.05. [Available: http://tradicionclasica.blogspot.com.es/2005/02/en-conversacin-con-los-difuntos.html]

Laguna Mariscal, G. (2007), "De donde nadie regresa", *Blog Tradición Clásica* 31.5.07. [Available: http://tradicionclasica.blogspot.com.es/2007/05/de-donde-nadie-regresa.html]

Laguna Mariscal, G. – Sanz Morales, M. (2005), "Was the relationship between Achilles and Patroclus homoerotic? The view of Apollonius Rhodius", *Hermes* 133.1: 120-123.

Landau, M. (1869), *Die Quellen des Decamerone*. Vienna.

Lanz J.J. (2006) (intr. and ed.), *Luis Alberto de Cuenca. Poesía 1979-1996*. Madrid.

Laplana Gil, J.E. (1993), "Algunas notas sobre espectros y aparecidos en la literatura del Siglo de Oro", in A. Redondo (ed.), *La peur de la mort en Espagne au siècle d´or. Litérature et iconographie*. Paris, 81-98.

Le Goff, J. (1989), *El nacimiento del purgatorio.* Madrid.

Lecouteux, C. (1986), *Fantôme et revenants au Moyen Age*. Paris.

Leguina, J. (1992), *Tu nombre envenena mis sueños*. Barcelona.

Levin, C. (2010), "Dreams and Dreamers", in M. Hattaway (ed.), *A New Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*. Oxford, 598-610.

Lévy-Bruhl, L. - Clare, L. (trans.) (1923), *Primitive Mentality*. New York.

Lévy, C. (1997), "De Chrysippe á Posidonius: Variations stoíciennes sur le théme de la divination", in J.G. Heintz (ed.), *Oracles el prophéties dans L'Antiquité: Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg, 15-17 juin 1995*. Paris, 321-343.

Librán Moreno, M. (2011), "Fidelidad", in R. Moreno Soldevila (ed.), *Diccionario de motivos amatorios en la literatura latina (Siglos III a.C.-II d.C.)*. Huelva, 186-189.

Lisón Tolosana, C. (2004a [1979]), *Brujería, estructura social y simbolismo en Galicia*. Madrid.

Lisón Tolosana, C. (2004b [1979]), *Antropología cultural de Galicia*. Madrid.

Llosa Sanz, A. (2008), "Lección de magia: una fantasía didáctica medieval", *eHumanista* 11: 136-157.

Locke, L. – Vaughan, T. A. & Greenhill, P. (eds.) (2008), *Encyclopedia of Women's Folklore and Folklife*. Wesport, CT.

López López, A. (1991), "Cornelia, madre de la epistolografía latina", in A. Ramos Guerreira (ed.), *Mnemosynum C. Cordoñer a discipulis oblatum*. Salamanca, 161-173.

López Martínez, Mª.P. (1998), *Fragmentos papiráceos de novela griega*. Alicante.

Lovecraft, H.P. (1998), *Selected Letters III*. Wisconsin.

Lovecraft, H.P. (1999), "Cool Air", in S.T. Joshi (ed.), *The Call of Cthulhu and Other Weird Stories*. London, 130-138.

Lovecraft, H.P. (2000), *Supernatural Horror in Literature*, in S.T. Joshi (ed.), *The Annotated Supernatural Horror in Literature*. New York, 21-72.

Lovecraft, H.P. (2001), *The Case of Charles Dexter Ward*, in S.T. Joshi (ed.), *The*

Thing on the Doorstep and Other Weird Stories. London, 90-205.

Lovecraft, H.P. (2005), *Letters to Rheinhart Kleiner*. New York.

Luck, G. (1985, 2006 -2nd ed.-), *Arcana Mundi. Magic and the Occult in the Greek and Roman Worlds*. Baltimore – London.

Lugli, U. (2008), *Umbrae. La rappresentazione dei fantasmi nella Roma antica*. Genova.

M. Ward, A. – Heichelheim, F.M. & Yeo, C.A. (2016), *A History of the Roman People*. London – New York.

Maarouf, M. (2007), *Jinn Eviction as a Discourse of Power; A Multidisciplinary Approach to Moroccan Magical Beliefs and Practices*. Leiden.

Macalister, S. (1996), *The Greek Novel from Antiquity to the Byzantine Empire*. London-New York.

Macías Otero, S.M. (2015), "On the Threshold of Hades: Necromancy and *Nékyia* in some Passages of Greek Tragedy", *LEC* 83.1-4: 137-153.

Mack, J.E. (1970), *Nightmares and human conflicts.* Boston.

MacLeod, M.D. (1961), *Lucian.* Vol. VII. London-Cambridge, MA.

Marcovich, M. (ed.) (1997), *Iustini Martyrus Dialogus cum Tryphone*. Berlin.

Marías, J. (1994), *Mañana en la batalla piensa en mí.* Madrid.

Marías, J. (2003), *Tomorrow in the Battle Think on Me* (transl. M. Jull Costa). London.

Martín Alegre, S. (2001), "Nightmares of childhood: the child and the monster in four novels by Stephen King", *Atlantis* 23.1, 105-114.

Martínez Casado, Á. (1994), *Lope de Barrientos: un intelectual de la corte de Juan II*. Salamanca.

Martínez Casado, Á. (1996), "La situación jurídica de los conversos según Lope de Barrientos", *Archivo Dominicano: Anuario* 17: 25-64.

Martínez Sariego, M. – Laguna Mariscal, G. (2010), "La mitología clásica en la poesía de Luis Alberto de Cuenca (1971-1996)", *CFC (L)* 30: 381-413.

Martínez Shaw, C. (1985), "La historia de la cultura popular en l'Etat Moderna", in D. Llopart - J. Prat & L. Prats, *La cultura popular a debat*. Barcelona, 15-23.

Matarín Guil, M.F. (1996), "Creencia popular en las ánimas del purgatorio en los valles de los ríos Andarax y Nacimiento (Almería)", *Actas de las Primeras Jornadas de Religiosidad Popular*. Almería, 75-90.

Mazzotta, G. (1986), *The World at Play in Boccaccio's Decameron*. Princeton.

Mestre, F. - Gómez, P. (2001), "Retórica, comedia, diálogo. La fusión de géneros en la literatura griega del s. II d.C.", *Myrtia* 16: 111-122.

Mestre, F. - Gómez, P. (2009), "Power and the abuse of the power in the Works of Lucian", in A. Bartley (ed.), *A Lucian for our Times.* Cambridge, 93-107.

Mestre, F. (2003), "Anacharsis, the Wise man from abroad", *Lexis* 21: 303-317.

Mestre, F. (2012-2013), "Lucien, les philosophes et les philosophies", *Ítaca* 28-29: 63-82.

Mestre, F. (2013), "Llucià i la sàtira bizantina: *Timarió*", in J.A. Clua - F. Sabaté (eds.), *Usos i tradició de les literatures clàssiques a les literatures medievals.* Lleida, 61-72.

Migne, J.P. (ed.) (1884-1904), *Patrologiae cursus completus.* Series Latina. Paris.

Migne, J.P. (ed.) (1857-1904), *Patrologiae cursus completus.* Series Graeca. Paris.

Miles, R. (2011), "The 1790s: the effulgence of Gothic", in J.E. Hogle (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction.* Cambridge, 41-62.

Miller, J. (ed.) (1994), *In Touch, the Letters of Paul Bowles.* New York.

Miner, M.M. (1980), "Neither Mother, Wife, nor England's Queen: the Roles of Women in *Richard III*", in C.R. Swift Lenz - G. Greene & C. Th. Neely, *The Woman's Part: Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare.* Illinois, 35-55.

Mitchell, K. (2008), "Ghostly Histories and Embodied Memories: Photography, Spectrality and Historical Fiction in Afterimage and Sixty Lights", *Neo-Victorian Studies* 1.1: 81-109.

Moix, A.M. (2002), *24 horas con la Gauche Divine.* Barcelona.

Molina, T. de (1990), *Don Gil de las calzas verdes* (ed. A. Zamora Vicente). Madrid.

Molina, T. de (2000), *Bellaco sois, Gómez* (ed. digital V. Williamsen). [Available: http://www.comedias.org/tirso/bellso.html 7/06/2016]

Mommsen, Th. (2003, 2ª ed.), *Historia de Roma* IV, vol. 3, Madrid.

Mongin, J.P. (2013), *El genio maligno del señor Descartes.* Madrid.

Montaiglon, A. - Raynaud, G. (1872-1890), *Recueil général et complet des fabliaux des XIIIe et XIVe siècles.* Paris.

Morales Harley, R. (2012), "La *katábasis* como categoría mítica en el mundo greco-latino", *Káñina* 36.1: 127-138.

Morales Rivera, S. (2006), *Los pretextos de la culpa: Javier Marías, Juan José Millás y el compromiso de la novela postfranquista con el azar*, Diss. Harvard University.

Moran, P. (2007), *Virginia Woolf, Jean Rhys, and the Aesthetics of Trauma.* New York.

Morata Pérez, J.M. (ed.) (1995), *Luis Martín de la Plaza. Poesías completas.* Málaga.

Moreno Valero, M. (1995), "Costumbres acerca de los difuntos en Los Pedroches", *Gazeta de Antropología* 11: 1-16.

Morgado García, A. (1999), *Demonios, magos y brujas en la España moderna*. Cádiz.

Mossin, H. (1981), "The Existentialist Dimension in the Novels of Jean Rhys", *Kunapipi* 3.1: 143-150.

Most, G.W. (2014), "Some Ancient Posthumous Lovers", in B. Jussen – R. Targoff (eds.), *Love after Death: Concepts of Posthumous Love in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*. Berlin, 17-26.

Mudimbe, V.Y. (1988), *The Invention of Africa: Gnosis, Philosophy, and the Order of Knowledge*. Indiana.

Muecke, F. (1974), "*Nobilis Historia?* Incongruity in Propertius 4.7", *BICS* 21.1: 124-132.

Müller, L. (ed.) (1932), *In Luciani Philopseuden commentarius.* Eus Supplement vol. 13. Leopoli.

Muñoz, I. (2010), "Ciencia y religión en conflicto: fantasmas y sucesos paranormales en Plutarco", in L. van der Stockt - F. Titchener - H.G. Ingenkamp & A. Pérez Jiménez (eds.), *Gods, Daimones, Rituals, Myths and History of Religions in Plutarch's Works. Studies Devoted to Professor Frederick E. Brenk by the International Plutarch Society.* Málaga, 295-314.

Muñoz Jiménez, M.D. (2015), "El Rosario de Difuntos. El 'diálogo' con las almas del purgatorio a partir del caso de Quéntar (Granada)", *Gazeta de Antropología* 31.2: 1-19.

Munroe, A. (2015), "'Haunted and Obeah': Gothic Spaces and Monstrous Landscapes in Jean Rhys's *Voyage in the Dark*", *Studies in the Humanities* 42.1/2: 108-134.

Murray, A.T. (1984), *Homer. The Odyssey,* vol. I. London-Cambridge, MA.

Nagy, L. (2004), "Zurückkehrende Toten und Gespenster-Liebe", *Hungarian Polis Studies* 11: 57-80.

Nardi, E. (1960), *Case 'infestate da spiriti' e diritto Romano e moderno*. Milan.

Nardi, E. (1975/1976a), "Case infestate nella letteratura antica", *RAIB* 64: 87-98.

Nardi, E. (1975/1976b), "Il problema giuridico delle case infestate", *RAIB* 64: 99-109.

Nixon, S. (2007), *Cornelia. Mother of the Gracchi*. London – New York.

Nock. A.D. (1950), "Tertullian and the *Ahori*", *VChr* 4: 129–141. Reprinted at Nock 1972, vol. 2: 712-719.

Nock. A.D. (1972), *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World,* 2 vols. Oxford.

Ogden, D. (1999), "Binding spells", in V. Flint - R.L. Gordon - G. Luck & D. Ogden, *The Athlone History of Witchcraft and Magic in Europe*, vol. 2. *Ancient Greece and Rome.* London, 3-90.

Ogden, D. (2001), *Greek and Roman Necromancy*. Princeton.

Ogden, D. (2002a), *Magic, Witchcraft, and Ghosts in the Greek and Roman Worlds. A Sourcebook.* Oxford.

Ogden, D. (2002b), "Three Evocations of the Dead with Pausanias", in A. Powell – S. Hodkinson, *Sparta. Beyond the Mirage.* London, 111-135.

Ogden, D. (2004), "Eucrates and Demainete", *CQ* 54: 484-93.

Ogden, D. (2007), *In Search of the Sorcerer's Apprentice. The Traditional Tales of Lucian's* Lover of Lies. Swansea.

Ogden, D. (2008), *Night's Black Agents. Witches, Wizards and the Dead in the Ancient World.* London.

Ogden, D. (2009, 2nd ed.), *Magic, Witchcraft and Ghosts in the Greek and Roman Worlds. A Sourcebook*. New York.

Ogden, D. (2014), "Fantasmas romanos", in M. Aguirre Castro - C. Delgado Lincero & A. González-Rivas (eds.), *Fantasmas, Aparecidos y Muertos sin Descanso.* Madrid, 101-116.

Papanghelis T.D. (1987), *Propertius: A Hellenistic Poet on Love and Death.* Cambridge.

Paravisini-Gebert, L. (2002), "Colonial and Postcolonial Gothic: the Caribbean", in J.E. Hogle (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction.* Cambridge, 229-257.

Parker, A. (1991), *La imaginación y el arte de Calderón.* Madrid.

Parodi, E.G. (ed.) (1896), *Tristano Riccardiano*. Bologna.

Pedrosa, J.M. (2006), "Los fantasmas enamorados: Job, Vélez de Guevara, Calderón, Castillo Solórzano, Zayas, Feijoo, Cruz, Irving (y la tradición folclórica)", in O. Gorsse - F. Serralta (coords.), *El Siglo de Oro en escena. Homenaje a Marc Vitse*. Toulouse, 733-745.

Peeren, E. (2014), *The Spectral Metaphor: Living Ghosts and the Agency of Invisibility*. London.

Pelling, C.B.R. (1986), "Plutarch and Roman Politics", in I.S. Moxon - J.D. Smart & A.J. Woodman (eds.), *Past Perspectives. Studies in Greek and Roman Historical Writing.* Cambridge, 159-188.

Pelling, C.B.R. (1997), "Plutarch in Caesar's fall", in J. Mossman (ed.), *Plutarch and his Intellectual World*. Swansea, 215-232.

Pelling, C.B.R. (2010), "With thousand such enchanting dreams…: The Dreams of the *Lives* revisited", in L. van der Stockt - F. Titchener - H.G. Ingenkamp & A. Pérez Jiménez (eds.), *Gods, Daimones, Rituals, Myths and History of Religions in Plutarch's Works. Studies Devoted to Professor Frederick E. Brenk by the International Plutarch Society*. Málaga, 315-332.

Pelling, C.B.R. (2011), *Plutarch's* Caesar. Oxford.

Peña Rodríguez, F.J. (2009), "Rita Macau, una musa para Luis Alberto de

Cuenca", *Otro Lunes. Revista Hispanoamericana de Cultura* 8. [Available: http://otrolunes.com/archivos/08/html/unos-escriben/unos-escriben-n08-a17-p01-2009.html]

Pepe Sarno, I. – Reyes Cano, J.M. (2006) (eds.), *Pedro Espinosa. Primera parte de Flores de poetas ilustres de España*. Madrid.

Pérez-de-Luque, J.L. (2013), "Lovecraft, Reality, and the Real: A Zizekian Approach", *Lovecraft Annual* 7: 187-203.

Perito, E. (1901), "Il *Decameron* nel filosofo Pietro Aretino", *RCLI* 6: 17-25.

Petersen, J.M. (1984), *The* Dialogues *of Gregory the Great in their late antique cultural background*. Toronto.

Pitrè, G. (1885), "Lo sputo e la saliva nelle tradizioni popolari siciliane", *ASTP* 4: 223-236.

Planchas Gallarte, S. (2014), "Los fantasmas en *Ranas* de Aristófanes", *Littera Aperta* 2: 5-23.

Plato (1921), *Theaetetus. Sophist* (Translation by H.N. Fowler). London.

Plato (1925), *Lysis. Symposium. Gorgias* (Translation by W.R.M. Lamb). London.

Plato (1927), *Charmides. Alcibiades I and II. Hipparchus. The lovers. Theages. Minos. Epinomis* (Translation by W.R.M. Lamb). London.

Plato (1929), *Timaeus. Critias. Cleitophon. Menexenus. Epistles* (Translation by R.G. Bury). London.

Plato (2005), *Euthyphro. Apology. Crito. Phaedo. Phaedrus* (Translation by H.N. Fowler). London.

Plepelits, K. (1976), *Chariton von Aphrodisias. Kallirhoe* (eingeleit., übersetz, und erläütert). Stuttgart.

Plutarch (1921), *Lives* X, *Agis and Cleomenes-Tiberius and Caius Gracchus* and *Philopoemen-Flaminius* (English translation by B. Perrin), London.

Plutarch (1959), *Lives* II, *Themistocles-Camillus, Aristides-Cato Major* and *Cimon-Lucullus* (English translation by B. Perrin), London.

Plutarch (1967), *Lives* VI, *Dion-Brutus* and *Timoleon-Aemilius Paulus* (English translation by B. Perrin), London.

Plutarch (1967), *Lives* VII, *Demosthenes-Cicero* and *Alexander-Caesar* (English translation by B. Perrin), London.

Preisendanz, K. (1935), "Nekydaimon", *RE* 16.2: 2240–2266.

Prosperi, V. (2004), *Di soavi licor gli orli del vaso. La fortuna di Lucrezio dall'Umanesimo alla Controriforma*. Torino.

Putnam, H. (1981), *Reason, Truth and History*. Cambridge.

Radermacher, L. (1902), "Aus Lucians Lügenfreund" in T. Gomperz (hon.), M. Schwind (ed.), *Festschrift Theodor Gomperz dargebracht zum siebzigsten*

Geburtstag am 29. März 1902. Vienna, 197-207. Reprint, 1979.

Ramírez de Verger, A. (1989), *Propercio. Elegías* (int. and transl.). Madrid.

Redding, A. (2008), *Turncoats, Traitors, and Fellow Travelers.* Jackson.

Regàs, R. (2000), *Gauche divine.* Madrid.

Regn, G. (2014), "Eros and Eschatology. Phantasms of Postmortal Love in Petrarch", in B. Jussen – R. Targoff (eds.), *Love after Death: Concepts of Posthumous Love in Medieval and Early Modern Europe.* Berlin, 97-110.

Rhys, J. (1971), *After Leaving Mr Mackenzie.* Harmondsworth.

Rhys, J. (1987), *The Collected Short Stories* (edited by D. Athill). New York.

Riera, C. (1988), *La Escuela de Barcelona. Barral, Gil de Biedma, Goytisolo: el núcleo poético de la generación de los 50.* Barcelona.

Rísquez Madrid, A. (2010), *Edición crítica y comentario de "Clavis sapientiae": la llave del saber de Lope de Barrientos en la Edad Media española.* Madrid. [Available: <http://eprints.ucm.es/25745/1/T32286.pdf>.]

Rísquez Madrid A. (2011), "Lope de Barrientos: promotor del linaje Barrientos de Cuenca", *Lope de Barrientos. Seminario de cultura* 4: 243 - 260.

Rísquez Madrid, A. (2013), "Contentus terenalis: edición y presentación de la obra", in Mª J. Muñoz - P. Cañizares & C. Martín (eds.), *La compilación del saber en la Edad Media.* Oporto, 465 – 482.

Rísquez Madrid, A. (2014a), "Los Tratados de Lope de Barrientos: Boston, Public Library, ms. Ticknor D-7", in J.M. Baños - Mª F. del Barrio - Mª T. Callejas & A. López Fonseca (eds.), *Philologia, Universitas, Vita.* Madrid, 811 – 818.

Rísquez Madrid, A. (2014b), "La presencia del *Liber de proprietatibus rerum* de Bartolomé Ánglico en la *Clauis sapientiae* de Lope de Barrientos", in J. Ducos (ed.), *Encyclopédie médiévale et langues européennegs.* Paris, 283 – 298.

Rísquez Madrid, A. (2014c), "Géneros sapienciales en la Edad Media: florilegio y enciclopedia medieval", in Mª T. Callejas - P. Cañizares - Mª D. Castro - Mª F. del Barrio - A. Espigares & Mª J. Muñoz (eds.), *Manipulus studiorum.* Madrid, 837 – 844.

Rodríguez Baltanás, E.J. (1992), "Historia, folclore y literatura en *El diablo está en Cantillana* de L. Vélez Guevara", in F. Pedraza (ed.), *El redescubrimiento de los clásicos. Actas XV Jornadas de Teatro Clásico.* Almagro, 77-90.

Rodríguez Becerra, S. (2011), "Nuevas perspectivas sore la religiosidad popular o religión común de los andaluces", *Revista murciana de Antropología* 18: 31-41.

Rohde, E. (1925), *Psyche: The Cult of Souls and the Belief in Immortality among the Greeks,* trans. from the 8th ed. by W.B. Hillis. London (reprinted by

Routledge 2000).

Roldán Hervás, J.M. (2005, 3ª ed.), *Historia de Roma*. Salamanca.

Römer, F. (1987), "Vom Spuk zur Politik: Der Gespensterbrief des Jüngeren Plinius", *WHB* 29: 26–36.

Rossiter, A.P. (1989), *Angel with Horns: Fifteen Lectures on Shakespeare* (ed. G. Storey). London.

Ruiz-Montero, C. (1988), *La estructura de la novela griega. Análisis funcional.* Salamanca.

Ruiz-Montero, C. (2006), *La novela griega.* Madrid.

Ruiz-Montero, C. (2007), "Magic in the Ancient Novel", in M. Paschalis *et alii* (eds.), *The Greek and the Roman Novel. Parallel Readings.* Groningen, 38-56.

Ruiz-Montero, C. (forthcoming), "Oral tales and Greek fictional narrative in Roman Imperial prose", in C. Ruiz-Montero (ed.), *Orality and Greek Literature in the Roman Empire.* Cambridge.

Russel, W.M.S., (1981), "Greek and Roman Ghosts", in H.R.E. Davidson - W.M.S. Russel (eds.), *The folklore of ghosts.* Cambridge, 193–213.

Ryan, W.G. (1993), *Jacobus de Voragine. The Golden Legend. Readings on the Saints,* 2 vols. Princeton.

Sanz Morales, M. – Laguna Mariscal, G. (2003), "The relationship between Achilles and Patroclus according to Chariton of Aphrodisias", *CQ* 53.1: 292-326.

Savoy, E. (2011), "The rise of American Gothic", in J.E. Hogle (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction.* Cambridge, 167-188.

Scarlett, E. (2004), "Victors, Villains, and Ghosts: Filmic Intertextuality in Javier Marías's *Mañana en la batalla piensa en mí*", *RCEH* 28.2: 391-410.

Schmeling, G. (ed.) (2003, 2nd ed.), *The novel in the Ancient World.* Leiden.

Schmitt, J.-C. (1994), *Les revenants: les vivants et les morts dans la société médiévale.* Paris. [English trans. (T. L. Fagan): *Ghosts in the Middle Ages: The Living and the Dead in Medieval Society.* Chicago, 1998].

Schwartz, J. (1951), *Lucien de Samosate. Philopseudès et De morte Peregrini, avec introduction et commentaire.* Paris.

Schwartz, J. (1969), "Le fantôme de l'Académie", in J. Bibauw (ed.), *Hommages à Marcel Renard,* vol. 1. Brussels, 671-676.

Schwartz, L. (2004), "Las elegías de Propercio y sus lectores áureos", *Edad de Oro* 24: 323-350.

Segre, C. (1974), "Funzioni, opposizioni e simmetrie nella Giornata VII del *Decameron*", *Le strutture e il tempo.* Torino, 117-143.

Setaioli, A. (2000), *Facundus Seneca. Aspetti della lingua e dell'ideologia senecana*. Bologna.

Shah, T. (2006), *The Caliph's House: A Year in Casablanca*. New York.

Shah, T. (2008), *In Arabian Nights: A Caravan of Moroccan Dreams*. New York.

Shakespeare, W. (1981), *King Richard* III (ed. A. Hammond). London-New York.

Sherwin-White, A.N. (ed.) (1966), *The letters of Pliny: A Historical and Social Commentary*. Oxford.

Sigüenza Martín, R. - Collantes González, J.M. (2014), "La devoción a las ánimas del purgatorio en Cádiz: dos hermandades para su estudio", *Trocadero* 26: 1-25.

Simpson, P.L. - McAleer, P. (eds.) (2014), *Stephen King's Contemporary Classics: Reflections on the Modern Master of Horror*. Lanham, Maryland.

Sinicropi, G. (1975), "Il segno linguistico nel *Decameron*", *SsBoccaccio* 9: 169-224.

Smelik, K.A.D. (1979), "The Witch of Endor: I *Samuel* 28 in Rabbinic and Christian Exegesis till 800 AD", *VChr* 33: 160-178.

Smidt, K. (1982), "Plots and Prophecies - *The Tragedy of King Richard the Third*", in K. Smidt, *Unconformities in Shakespeare's History Plays*. London, 53-71.

Smith, A. (2007), "Hauntings", in C. Spooner - E. McEvoy (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Gothic*. London, 147-154.

Socas, F. (2011), "Magia en el amor", in R. Moreno Soldevila (ed.), *Diccionario de motivos amatorios en la literatura latina (Siglos III a.C.-II d.C.)*. Huelva, 251-257.

Spivack, B. (1958), *Shakespeare and the Allegory of Evil*. New York.

Stadter, P. (1995), "'Subject to the Erotic': Male Sexual Behaviour in Plutarch", in D. Innes – H. Hine & C.B.R. Pelling (eds.), *Ethics and Rhetoric: Classical Essays for Donald Russell on His Seventy-Fifth Birthday*. Oxford, 221-236.

Stephens, S. - Winkler, J.J. (eds.) (1995), *Ancient Greek Novels. The Fragments* (Text, transl., and comm.). Princeton.

Stern, J. (1989), "Demythologisation in Herodotus", *Eranos* 87: 13-20.

Stockton, D. (1979), *The Gracchi*. Oxford.

Stramaglia, A. (1999), *Res inauditae, incredulae. Storie di fantasmi nel mondo greco-latino*. Bari.

Strengell, H. (2005a), *Dissecting Stephen King: From the Gothic to Literary Naturalism*. Wisconsin.

Strengell, H. (2005b), "The Ghost: the Gothic Melodrama in Stephen King's fiction", *European Journal of American culture* 24.3: 221-238.

Suárez Martínez, L.M. (2008), *Aproximación al mundo clásico en la poesía de Luis Alberto de Cuenca.* León.

Suter, R. (1976), "The Dream Argument", *APhQ* 13.3: 185-194.

Thompson, S. (1932-1936), *Motif-index of folk-literature: A Classification of Narrative Elements in Folk-tales, Ballads, Myths, Fables, Mediæval Romances, Exempla, Fabliaux, Jest-books, and Local Legends.* 6 vols. Bloomington, Indiana.

Thurston, L. (2012), *Literary Ghosts from the Victorians to Modernism. The Haunting Interval.* London.

Torres Oliver, F. (2009), "Raíces góticas en Lovecraft", in F. Broncano - D. Hernández de la Fuente (eds.), *Cuadernos del abismo. Homenaje a H.P. Lovecraft.* Madrid, 103-121.

Traver Vera, Á.J. (2009), *Lucrecio en España*, 2 vols. Cáceres.

Traver Vera, Á.J. (2014), "*Templa serena* frente a *Acherusia templa*: la explicación materialista de los fantasmas en Lucrecio", *Littera Aperta* 2: 25-46.

Tubau, X. (2007), "Los sentidos internos en la prosa medieval castellana (a propósito de Alfonso X el Sabio y Juan de Mena", *Traditio* 62: 285 – 315.

Turner, V. (1983), "Liminar to Liminoid, in Play, Flow and Ritual: an Essay in Comparative Symbology", in J.C. Harris - R.J. Park (eds.), *Play, Games and Sports in Cultural Contexts.* Champaign.

Umbral, F. (1995), *Diccionario de Literatura.* Barcelona.

Usener, H. (1966, 2nd ed.), *Epicurea*. Stuttgart.

Varanini, G. (ed.) (1981), *Laude cortonesi dal secolo XIII al XV.* Florence.

Vázquez Montalbán, M. (1971), "Informe subnormal sobre un fantasma cultural", *Triunfo* 30/1/1971. [Available: http://www.vespito.net/mvm/gauche.html]

Velázquez Delgado, J. (2005), "La sombra de Descartes, el genio maligno y racionalidad Moderna", *La Lámpara de Diógenes* 6.10-11: 161-168.

Vélez de Guevara, L. (1976), *El diablo está en Cantillana* (ed. M. Muñoz Cortés). Madrid.

Vigna Vilches, S. (2015), "Has vist la llum? Diálogos contemporáneos con el mundo invisible en el Baix Empordà", *Perifèria. Revista de recerca i formació en antropología* 20: 149-172.

Vique Domene, M.ª del M. (2011), "El sueño como lugar de encuentro con la amada en la poesía del Siglo de Oro", *Philologica Urcitana* 4: 121-134.

Vitse, M. - Serralta, F. (1983), "El teatro en el siglo XVII", in J.M. Díez Borque (dir.), *Historia del teatro en España I.* Madrid, 473-706.

Vrugt-Lentz, J. ter (1960), *Mors immatura*. Groningen.

Walpole, H. (1766, 3rd ed.), *The Castle of Otranto. A Gothic Story.* London.

Walsh Pasulka, D. (2014), *Heaven Can Wait: Purgatory in Catholic Devotional and Popular Culture.* London.

Wardropper, B.W. (1978), "La comedia española del Siglo de Oro", in E. Olson, *Teoría de la comedia.* Barcelona, 181-242.

Waszink, J.H. (1947), *Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani* De anima. Amsterdam.

Waszink, J.H. (1954), "Biothanati", *RAC* 2: 391–394.

Watson, R.N. (1984), *Shakespeare and the Hazards of Ambition.* Cambridge, MA.

Wendland, P. (1911), "Antike Gesiter- und Gespenstergeschichten", in T. Siebs (ed.), *Festschrift zur Jahrhundertfeier der Universität zu Breslau, im Namen der schlesischen Gesellschaft für Volkskunde.* Breslau, 33-55.

Westermarck, E.A. (1926), *Ritual and Belief in Morocco.* 2 vols. London.

Whitehead, A. (2004), *Trauma Fiction.* Edinburgh.

Wilson, E. (1974), *Historia de la literatura española* 3. Barcelona.

Winkler, J.J. (1980), "Lollianos and the Desperadoes", *JHS* 100: 155-181.

Winterbottom, M. (1974), *The Elder Seneca, Controversiae, Suasoriae.* 2. vol. Cambridge - London.

Wiseman, T.P. (1974), *Cinna the Poet and other Roman essay*s. Leicester.

Wolfreys, J. (2002), *Victorian Hauntings. Spectrality, Gothic, the Uncanny and Literature.* New York.

Woltjer, J. (1987, 2nd ed.), *Lucretii philosophia cum fontibus comparata.* New York.

Wyke, M. (2002), *The Roman Mistress: Ancient and Modern Representations.* Oxford.

Yardley, J.C. (1977), "Cynthia's Ghost: Propertius 4.7 Again", *BICS* 24: 83-88.

Zadorojnyi, A.V. (1997), "The Roman Poets in Plutarch's Stories" in C. Schrader - V. Ramón & J. Vela (eds.), *Plutarco y la Historia. Actas del V Simposio Español sobre Plutarco.* Zaragoza, 497-506.

Zwierlein, O. (1986), *L. Annaei Senecae Tragoediae, Incertorum Auctorum Hercules [Oetaeus], Octavia.* Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit Otto Zwierlein. Oxford.

Zycha, J. (ed.) (1900), *Sancti Aureli Augustini* De fide et symbolo... Vienna.

(Página deixada propositadamente em branco)

Index locorum

(Página deixada propositadamente em branco)

Index rervm

Index nominvm

Authors

Consuelo Ruiz Montero is a Professor of Greek Philology at the University of Murcia (Spain). She has three main trends of research: Greek narrative, Greek rhetoric, and history of Greek language (late Greek). She has published three books about these topics and more than fifty papers on different aspects of the Greek novels. Currently she is editing a book on "Orality and Greek Literature in the Roman Empire", in Cambridge Publishers.

Dámaris Romero-González, Ph.D. in Classical Philology, is an Assistant Professor of Greek Philology at the University of Córdoba (Spain). She has published several articles and chapters on Plutarch, women in Antiquity and semantics of the New Testament. She has translated *The History of the Egyptian Monks* into Spanish with Israel Muñoz.

Pilar Gómez Cardó is a Professor of Greek Studies at the University of Barcelona. The topic of her PhD in Classical Philology was the iambic tradition and fable, and is the author of numerous articles and book chapters on Greek literature of the Roman imperial period, especially on Second Sophistic and novel. She is a member of the research group *Graecia Capta* from the University of Barcelona.

Daniel Ogden is a Professor of Ancient History and Greek at the University of Exeter (UK) and a Honorary Research Fellow at UNISA. His principal research areas are Greek religion, traditional narratives in antiquity and the Macedonian and Hellenistic Dynasties. He has published some books about these topics, including *Magic, Witchcraft and Ghost in the Greek and Roman Worlds*, *A Companion of Greek Religion* or *Alexander the Great. Myth, Genesis and Sexuality*. His most recent book is titled *The Legend of Seleucus* (2017).

Manuel Bermúdez Vázquez, Ph.D. in Philosophy, is a Professor at the University of Córdoba. His research fields are the history of the Philosophy, especially the Scepticism, and the rhetoric and the analysis of speech. He has published some books related to those topics, as *La fuerza de la duda: Francisco Sánchez el escéptico* (2013) and *Breve historia de la filosofía* (2012).

Miguel Rodríguez-Pantoja is a Professor of Latin Philology at the University of Córdoba, scientific organizer and editor of the Proceedings of the International Conference "Séneca, dos mil años después", commemorating the bimillenary of Seneca's birth (Córdoba, 1996). He is author of several studies about his work in general, his tragedies, the *Apocolocyntosis*, as well as an *Anthology*, with Spanish prosaic and poetic versions.

Ángel Jacinto Traver Vera holds a Ph.D. in Classical Philology (2009). His Doctoral Thesis, entitled "Lucretius in Spain", surveys the influence of the Epicurean poet on Spanish Literature from the Middle Ages to the present. He has published several articles on the Classical Tradition and has also collaborated on research projects. He is also a contributor to the *Diccionario de motivos amatorios en la Literatura Latina* (Univ. of Huelva, 2011).

Gabriel Laguna Mariscal is a Professor of Latin Philology at the University of Córdoba (Spain). He got his B.A. and Ph.D. in the Universities of Córdoba and Seville. He has been a visiting scholar in Cornell, Harvard and Indiana universities, and a Lecturer in the Universities of Extremadura and Córdoba. He has published in the fields of Latin poetry and the Classical Tradition.

Francisco José Rodríguez Mesa is a Lecturer in the Section of Italian Studies of the University of Córdoba. He got his PhD degree in 2012 with a dissertation on Petrarch and Petrarchism in Neapolitan 15th century poetry. His main research areas are Medieval and Early Renaissance poetry in Italy, short-story and its development from 14th century, and 18th century Italian opera librettos. He has published more than twenty papers in both national and international journals.

Antonia Rísquez is a PhD in Classical Philology and an Associate Lecturer at the University Pompeu Fabra (Barcelona, Spain). Also, she is graduated in Spanish Philology, Classical Philology and Romance Philology. She has researched in sapiential literature on Medieval Age in two main ways: the edition of works, for example *Clauis sapientiae* or *Contentus terrenalis*, and the study of genre, in papers as "La presencia del *Liber de proprietatibus rerum* de Bartolomé Ánglico en la *Clauis sapientiae* de Lope de Barrientos" and "Géneros sapienciales en la Edad Media: el florilegio y la enciclopedia medieval".

Ane Zapatero Molinuevo holds a BA in Psychology by the University of Deusto (specialisation on Clinical Psychology) aand a BA in Spanish Language and Literature at the University of the Basque Country (UPV). She was selected at the end of each degree for the "Talentia" programme by the Government of Biscay. She is currently studying a Master on Comparative Literature and Literature Studies at the UPV and holds a grant of the Basque Government.

Mónica Martínez Sariego is a Lecturer in Spanis hand Comparative Literature at the University of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria (Spain). She holds a BA and a PhD (European Doctorate) in Hispanic literature, a BA and a MA in English, French and Classical philology, as well as Literary Theory and Cinema. She has been visiting scholar in Paris IV-Sorbonne, Paris III-Sorbonne Nouvelle

(France), Köln (Germany) and California-Merced (USA). She is the author of papers in Spanish and Comparative literature, and Gender Studies.

Juan L. Pérez-de-Luque, PhD in English Philology, is a Lecturer at the Department of English Studies of the University of Córdoba (Spain). He has been visitor researcher at the universities of Nottingham (UK) and Brown (USA), and has published several articles and chapters on H.P. Lovecraft and Edgar Allan Poe, paying special attention to the ideological implications of their narratives.

Cristina A. Huertas Abril belongs to the Department of English and German Philologies of the University of Córdoba (Spain). She works mainly within Translation Studies, IC Studies and English as a Foreign Language. She teaches at Master's level at UCO, UCA and UIMP, has participated in interdisciplinary teaching innovation projects, and has taught several specialization courses on Translation Studies. She is a member of the Research Group PAI-HUM 947 'Science, Text and Translation'.

María J. López is a senior lecturer at the English Department of the University of Córdoba. She is the author of *Acts of Visitation: The Narrative of J.M. Coetzee* (Rodopi 2011) and the co-editor of "J.M. Coetzee and the non-English Literary Traditions" (special issue of *European Journal of English Studies* 20.2 [2016]). She has published in *Journal of Southern African Studies*, *Journal of Commonwealth Literature*, *English Studies*, *Journal of Literary Studies*, *English in Africa*, or *English Studies in Canada*.

María Porras Sánchez holds a Ph.D. in English Literary and Cultural Studies. She is an Associate Professor in the Department of English Literature at the Complutense University of Madrid (Spain). She combines her teaching and research with her work as a literary translator and copyreader for publishing houses such as Editorial Siruela and HarperCollins. She has taught at Aberystwyth University and she has also worked as an arts administrator at the Instituto Cervantes headquarters in Madrid.

Ignacio Alcalde holds a Ph.D. in Social and Cultural Anthropology. He is a Lecturer of Social Anthropology at the University of Córdoba (Spain). His research fields are the socio-cultural institutions, mainly the gated institutions (juvenile prisons), and the ethnographic writing.

Volumes publicados na Coleção Humanitas Supplementum

1. Francisco Oliveira, Cláudia Teixeira e Paula Barata Dias: *Espaços e Paisagens. Antiguidade Clássica e Heranças Contemporâneas. Vol. 1 – Línguas e Literaturas. Grécia e Roma* (Coimbra, Classica Digitalia/CECH, 2009).

2. Francisco Oliveira, Cláudia Teixeira e Paula Barata Dias: *Espaços e Paisagens. Antiguidade Clássica e Heranças Contemporâneas. Vol. 2 – Línguas e Literaturas. Idade Média. Renascimento. Recepção* (Coimbra, Classica Digitalia/CECH, 2009).

3. Francisco Oliveira, Jorge de Oliveira e Manuel Patrício: *Espaços e Paisagens. Antiguidade Clássica e Heranças Contemporâneas. Vol. 3 – História, Arqueologia e Arte* (Coimbra, Classica Digitalia/CECH, 2010).

4. Maria Helena da Rocha Pereira, José Ribeiro Ferreira e Francisco Oliveira (Coords.): *Horácio e a sua perenidade* (Coimbra, Classica Digitalia/CECH, 2009).

5. José Luís Lopes Brandão: *Máscaras dos Césares. Teatro e moralidade nas Vidas suetonianas* (Coimbra, Classica Digitalia/CECH, 2009).

6. José Ribeiro Ferreira, Delfim Leão, Manuel Tröster and Paula Barata Dias (eds): *Symposion and Philanthropia in Plutarch* (Coimbra, Classica Digitalia/CECH, 2009).

7. Gabriele Cornelli (Org.): *Representações da Cidade Antiga. Categorias históricas e discursos filosóficos* (Coimbra, Classica Digitalia/CECH/Grupo Archai, 2010).

8. Maria Cristina de Sousa Pimentel e Nuno Simões Rodrigues (Coords.): *Sociedade, poder e cultura no tempo de Ovídio* (Coimbra, Classica Digitalia/CECH/CEC/CH, 2010).

9. Françoise Frazier et Delfim F. Leão (eds.): Tychè *et* pronoia. *La marche du monde selon Plutarque* (Coimbra, Classica Digitalia/CECH, École Doctorale 395, ArScAn-THEMAM, 2010).

10. Juan Carlos Iglesias-Zoido, *El legado de Tucídides en la cultura occidental* (Coimbra, Classica Digitalia/CECH, ARENGA, 2011).

11. Gabriele Cornelli, *O pitagorismo como categoria historiográfica* (Coimbra, Classica Digitalia/CECH, 2011).

12. Frederico Lourenço, *The Lyric Metres of Euripidean Drama* (Coimbra, Classica Digitalia/CECH, 2011).

13. José Augusto Ramos, Maria Cristina de Sousa Pimentel, Maria do Céu Fialho, Nuno Simões Rodrigues (coords.), *Paulo de Tarso: Grego e Romano, Judeu e Cristão* (Coimbra, Classica Digitalia/CECH, 2012).

14. Carmen Soares & Paula Barata Dias (coords.), *Contributos para a história da alimentação na antiguidade* (Coimbra, Classica Digitalia/CECH, 2012).

15. Carlos A. Martins de Jesus, Claudio Castro Filho & José Ribeiro Ferreira (coords.), *Hipólito e Fedra - nos caminhos de um mito* (Coimbra, Classica Digitalia/CECH, 2012).

16. José Ribeiro Ferreira, Delfim F. Leão, & Carlos A. Martins de Jesus (eds.): *Nomos, Kosmos & Dike in Plutarch* (Coimbra, Classica Digitalia/CECH, 2012).

17. José Augusto Ramos & Nuno Simões Rodrigues (coords.), *Mnemosyne kai Sophia* (Coimbra, Classica Digitalia/CECH, 2012).

18. Ana Maria Guedes Ferreira, *O homem de Estado ateniense em Plutarco: o caso dos Alcmeónidas* (Coimbra, Classica Digitalia/CECH, 2012).

19. Aurora López, Andrés Pociña & Maria de Fátima Silva, *De ayer a hoy: influencias clásicas en la literatura* (Coimbra, Classica Digitalia/CECH, 2012).

20. Cristina Pimentel, José Luís Brandão & Paolo Fedeli (coords.), *O poeta e a cidade no mundo romano* (Coimbra, Classica Digitalia/CECH, 2012).

21. Francisco Oliveira, José Luís Brandão, Vasco Gil Mantas & Rosa Sanz Serrano (coords.), *A queda de Roma e o alvorecer da Europa* (Coimbra, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra, Classica Digitalia/CECH, 2012).

22. Luísa de Nazaré Ferreira, *Mobilidade poética na Grécia antiga: uma leitura da obra de Simónides* (Coimbra, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra, Classica Digitalia/CECH, 2013).

23. Fábio Cerqueira, Ana Teresa Gonçalves, Edalaura Medeiros & JoséLuís Brandão, *Saberes e poderes no mundo antigo. Vol. I – Dos saberes* (Coimbra, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra, Classica Digitalia,2013). 282 p.

24. Fábio Cerqueira, Ana Teresa Gonçalves, Edalaura Medeiros & Delfim Leão, *Saberes e poderes no mundo antigo. Vol. II – Dos poderes* (Coimbra, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra, Classica Digitalia, 2013). 336 p.

25. Joaquim J. S. Pinheiro, *Tempo e espaço da paideia nas* Vidas *de Plutarco* (Coimbra, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra, Classica Digitalia, 2013). 458 p.

26. Delfim Leão, Gabriele Cornelli & Miriam C. Peixoto (coords.), *Dos Homens e suas Ideias: Estudos sobre as* Vidas *de Diógenes Laércio* (Coimbra, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra, Classica Digitalia, 2013).

27. Italo Pantani, Margarida Miranda & Henrique Manso (coords.), A*ires Barbosa na Cosmópolis Renascentista* (Coimbra, Classica Digitalia/CECH, 2013).

28. Francisco Oliveira, Maria de Fátima Silva, Tereza Virgínia Ribeiro Barbosa (coords.), *Violência e transgressão: uma trajetória da Humanidade* (Coimbra e São Paulo, IUC e Annablume, 2014).

29. Priscilla Gontijo Leite, *Ética e retórica forense:* asebeia *e* hybris *na caracterização dos adversários em Demóstenes* (Coimbra e São Paulo, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra e Annablume, 2014).

30. André Carneiro, *Lugares, tempos e pessoas. Povoamento rural romano no Alto*

Alentejo. - Volume I (Coimbra, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra, Classica Digitalia, 2014).

31. André Carneiro, *Lugares, tempos e pessoas. Povoamento rural romano no Alto Alentejo.* - Volume II (Coimbra, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra, Classica Digitalia, 2014).

32. Pilar Gómez Cardó, Delfim F. Leão, Maria Aparecida de Oliveira Silva (coords.), *Plutarco entre mundos: visões de Esparta, Atenas e Roma* (Coimbra e São Paulo, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra e Annablume, 2014).

33. Carlos Alcalde Martín, Luísa de Nazaré Ferreira (coords.), *O sábio e a imagem. Estudos sobre Plutarco e a arte* (Coimbra e São Paulo, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra e Annablume, 2014).

34. Ana Iriarte, Luísa de Nazaré Ferreira (coords.), *Idades e género na literatura e na arte da Grécia antiga* (Coimbra e São Paulo, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra e Annablume, 2015).

35. Ana Maria César Pompeu, Francisco Edi de Oliveira Sousa (orgs.), *Grécia e Roma no Universo de Augusto* (Coimbra e São Paulo, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra e Annablume, 2015).

36. Carmen Soares, Francesc Casadesús Bordoy & Maria do Céu Fialho (coords.), *Redes Culturais nos Primórdios da Europa - 2400 Anos da Fundação da Academia de Platão* (Coimbra e São Paulo, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra e Annablume, 2016).

37. Claudio Castro Filho, *"Eu mesma matei meu filho": poéticas do trágico em Eurípides, Goethe e García Lorca* (Coimbra e São Paulo, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra e Annablume, 2016).

38. Carmen Soares, Maria do Céu Fialho & Thomas Figueira (coords.), *Pólis/Cosmópolis: Identidades Globais & Locais* (Coimbra e São Paulo, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra e Annablume, 2016).

39. Maria de Fátima Sousa e Silva, Maria do Céu Grácio Zambujo Fialho & José Luís Lopes Brandão (coords.), *O Livro do Tempo: Escritas e reescritas. Teatro Greco-Latino e sua recepção I* (Coimbra e São Paulo, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra e Annablume, 2016).

40. Maria de Fátima Sousa e Silva, Maria do Céu Grácio Zambujo Fialho & José Luís Lopes Brandão (coords.), *O Livro do Tempo: Escritas e reescritas. Teatro Greco-Latino e sua recepção II* (Coimbra e São Paulo, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra e Annablume, 2016).

41. Gabriele Cornelli, Maria do Céu Fialho & Delfim Leão (coords.), *Cosmópolis: mobilidades culturais às origens do pensamento antigo* (Coimbra e São Paulo, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra e Annablume, 2016).

42. Nair de Nazaré Castro Soares, Cláudia Teixeira (coords.), *Legado clássico no Renascimento e sua receção: contributos para a renovação do espaço cultural europeu.* (Coimbra e São Paulo, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra e

Annablume, 2016).

43. Françoise Frazier & Olivier Guerrier (coords.), *Plutarque. Éditions, Traductions, Paratextes* (Coimbra e São Paulo, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra e Annablume, 2017).

44. Cláudia Teixeira & André Carneiro (coords.), *Arqueologia da transição: entre o mundo romano e a Idade Média*. (Coimbra e São Paulo, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra e Annablume, 2017).

45. Aldo Rubén Pricco & Stella Maris Moro (coords.), *Pervivencia del mundo clásico en la literatura: tradición y relecturas*. (Coimbra e São Paulo, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra eAnnablume, 2017).

46. Cláudia Cravo & Susana Marques (coords.), *O Ensino das Línguas Clássicas: reflexões e experiências didáticas*. (Coimbra e São Paulo, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra e Annablume, 2017).

47. Breno Battistin Sebastiani, *Fracasso e verdade na recepção de Políbio e Tucídides* (Coimbra e São Paulo, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra e Annablume 2017).

48. Christian Werner, *Memórias da Guerra de Troia: a performance do passado épico na* Odisseia *de Homero*. (Coimbra e São Paulo, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra e Annablume, 2018).

49. Paola Bellomi, Claudio Castro Filho, Elisa Sartor (eds.), *Desplazamientos de la tradición clásica en las culturas hispánicas*. (Coimbra e São Paulo, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra eAnnablume, 2018).

50. V.M. Ramón Palerm, G. Sopeña Genzor, A.C. Vicente Sánchez (eds.), *Irreligiosidad y Literatura en la Atenas Clásica*. (Coimbra e São Paulo, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra e Annablume, 2018).

51. Luiz César de Sá Júnior, *Escrever para não morrer: retórica da imortalidade no epistolário de Damião de Góis*. (Coimbra e São Paulo, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra e Annablume, 2018).

52. José Luís Brandão & Paula Barata Dias (coords.), *O Melhor é a Água: da Antiguidade Clássica aos Nossos Dias*. (Coimbra e São Paulo, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra e Annablume, 2018).

53. Tereza Virgínia Ribeiro Barbosa, Matheus Trevizam, Júlia Batista Castilho de Avellar, *Tempestades clássicas: dos Antigos à Era dos Descobrimentos*. (Coimbra e São Paulo, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra e Annablume, 2018).

54. Lorena Jiménez Justicia & Alberto J. Quiroga Puertas (eds.), *Ianus. Innovación docente y reelaboraciones del legado clásico* (Coimbra e São Paulo, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra e Annablume, 2018). 157 p.

55. Carmen Soares, José Luís Brandão & Pedro C. Carvalho (coords.), *História Antiga: Relações Interdisciplinares. Fontes, Artes, Filosofia, Política, Religião e Receção* (Coimbra, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra, 2018). 421 p.

56. Carmen Soares, José Luís Brandão & Pedro C. Carvalho (coords.), *História Antiga: Relações Interdisciplinares. Paisagens Urbanas, Rurais & Sociais* (Coimbra, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra, 2018). 463 p.

57. Isabella Tardin Cardoso, Marcos Martinho (eds.), *Cícero: obra e recepção* (Coimbra, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra, 2019). 239 p.

58. Delfim Leão, José Augusto Ramos, Nuno Simões Rodrigues (coords.), *Arqueologias de Império* (Coimbra, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra, 2018). 381 p.

59. Breno Battistin Sebastiani, Fernando Rodrigues Jr., Bárbara da Costa Silva (coords.), *Problemas de Historiografia Helenística* (Coimbra, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra, 2019).

60. Dámaris Romero-González, Israel Muñoz-Gallarte, Gabriel Laguna-Mariscal (eds.), *Visitors from beyond the Grave: Ghosts in World Literature* (Coimbra, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra, 2019).

The monograph deals with the topic of ghosts in universal literature from a polyhedral perspective, making use of different perspectives, all of which highlight the resilience of these figures from the very beginning of literature up to the present day. Therefore, the aim of this volume is to focus on how ghosts have been translated and transformed over the years within literature written in the following languages: Classical Greek and Latin, Spanish, Italian, and English.

CECH Centro de Estudos
Clássicos e Humanísticos
da Universidade de Coimbra

1 2 9 0 UNIVERSIDADE Ð
COIMBRA

I
IMPRENSA DA UNIVERSIDADE DE COIMBRA
COIMBRA UNIVERSITY PRESS
U