

Musiał, Danuta; Gillmeister, Andrzej

Evocatio deorum as an example of a crisis ritual in Roman religion

Graeco-Latina Brunensia. 2018, vol. 23, iss. 2, pp. 95-107

ISSN 1803-7402 (print); ISSN 2336-4424 (online)

Stable URL (DOI): <https://doi.org/10.5817/GLB2018-2-7>

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/138773>

Access Date: 17. 02. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

***Evocatio deorum* as an Example of a Crisis Ritual in Roman Religion**

Danuta Musiał & Andrzej Gillmeister

(Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń; University of Zielona Góra)

Abstract

This work is an attempt to describe the Roman ritual of evocation in the anthropological category of crisis ritual. The authors, analyzing the evocation of Yahweh carried out by Titus during the siege of Jerusalem, present this rite as an example of the activity of Roman 'redemptive hegemony', and one of the elements involved in the transformation of Roman religion which tried to answer the new calls connected with the transformation of the Roman state. They remain aware however that in this case we are discussing a ritual activity directed towards the Roman citizens themselves.

Keywords

evocation; crisis ritual; redemptive hegemony; Roman religion; siege of Jerusalem

In Classical Ancient times, war, like all human activities, underwent a process of ritualisation. Cult practices associated with war served above all to assure victory, predictions of which were searched for in signs sent by the gods. The gods authorized or legitimised all stages of conflict from declarations of war to the re-establishment of peace. Outside the realms of myth, they did not take active part in military activities, although they were the beneficiaries of victories and the victims of defeats. Spoils of war and sacrifices made in gratitude enriched the temples, but on the conquered enemy lands places dedicated to the gods were usually destroyed, even against traditionally ascribed rules (Rutledge 2007; Tarpin 2013). However war was not directly waged with the gods, just as war was not carried out in their names – religious wars being an invention of monotheism, as convincingly argued by Jean-Pierre Castel (2016).

There was a deeply rooted conviction in polytheism that the animosity of the gods could affect the fates of humans for many generations. In the Roman tradition presented by Virgil, the anger of Juno directed at Troy and Aeneas is the main force directing events on the territory of Italian soil. The animosity of the gods was overcome only during the war with the Veii, when it was Camillus who persuaded her to come over to the side of the Romans, the descendants of Romulus. This activity by the Roman leader shows that a lack of interest in the opponents' gods would also be an irresponsible waste, in a situation in which it might be possible to strengthen your military potential by gaining their support.

The conviction that the safety of the people was dependent on the favour of the patron gods was part of the religious universe of the ancient world, but the protection of the gods was not unconditional. In ritual religions ensuring this protection required people to carry out particular, defined cult practices, which were indispensable for the preservation of balance between the worlds of the people and the gods. The occupation and destruction of the city disturbed this balance, being the cause of a 'ritual crisis'. In Greek tragedy the gods deserted the defeated, since in the destroyed city they had not obtained the cult which belonged to them.¹ We find a similar thought in the words of Aeneas (*Aeneid* 2,351):

All the gods whom this kingdom had stood now have departed (*excessere*) and our sanctuaries and altars have been abandoned.

Servius in his commentary on this sentence from the *Aeneid* explains that the gods departed (*excessere*) as they were called upon (*evocabantur*) before the attack, in order to avoid the sin of sacrilege (*propter vitanda sacrilegia*).²

1 Aesch. *Sept.* 218; Eur. *Tro.* 23–27.

2 Horsfall (2008: pp. 19, 291–292). C. Ando connects this explanation with the Romans' ritualisation of the act of war itself (Ando 2008: p. 129).

I. *Evocatio deorum*

Every town was protected by one god or another, but the Romans (unlike the Greeks) attributed particular power and meaning to the relationships between the patron gods and the territory along with its inhabitants. In the opinion of Plutarch, the Romans knew

certain evocations and enchantments affecting the gods, by which the Romans also believed that certain gods had been called (*ἐκκεκλησθαι*), forth from their enemies.³

This is a clear reference to the cult of the Roman ritual *evocatio*, which was foreign to the Greek practices.

According to traditional understanding, *evocatio* is a military ritual aimed at persuading a foreign god to leave the city which was under his protection, in return for the promise of consecrating new cult places in Rome. In the past these rites had been considered exceptional, limited in space (Italia) and in time (the defeat of the Italic people).⁴ The discovery in the early 1970s of an inscription from Isaura Vetus changed the attitude of many researchers to the issue of *evocatio*. In fact some of them are inclined to admit that the Roman ritual of *evocatio* was practiced more often than is normally considered to be the case. An indirect confirmation of this opinion is the fact that knowledge about the ritual was rooted in the tradition of Late Antiquity.⁵ Alan Blomart proposed a widening of the definition of *evocatio* beyond the context of war, suggesting that we should speak rather of gods who were summoned, not through the rigid/codified process of *evocatio*. Confirmation is rare in comparison to the appearances of the verb *evocare* in the sources (Blomart 1997; 2000; 2013).

There are few direct mentions of this practice in the sources. Apart from Livy's rhetorical description (5,21–22) concerning the events, from the borders of myth and history, associated with bringing to Rome the cult of Juno, the guardian god of the Etruscan Veii people, our most significant piece of evidence is the account of Macrobius (3,9,7–8), which is equally hard to interpret. The author of *Saturnalia* cites the prayer (*carmen*), with the help of which P. Cornelius Scipio invited the guardian gods of Carthage to come over onto his side, offering them *templa* and *sacra* in Rome. The publication in 1973 of the inscription commemorating the conquering of the town of Isaura Vetus in Asia Minor by the Romans (75 BC) constitutes support for its authenticity.⁶ This, unfortunately only fragmentarily preserved, text contains traces of evocation formulas in a version close to Macrobius' account. The most important similarity is based on the

3 Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 61 (279a), transl. Babbitt (1972). On translation *evocare* – *ἐκκαλεῖν* see Blomart (2000; 2013).

4 Wissowa (1912: p. 313); Latte (1960: p. 125).

5 Beard & North & Price (1998: pp. 132–134); Lenski (2008).

6 A. Hall, who discovered and published the inscription, stated that it referred to 'a ceremony similar to *evocatio*', see Hall (1973: pp. 568–571). Unequivocally in favour of identification with *evocatio* e.g. Le Gall (1976); Alvar (1985); some have doubts, e.g. Orlin (1997: p. 15, n.13); Gustafsson (2000: p. 61). Discussion of opinions: Ferri (2010c).

formulas for naming the summoned god: *si deus si dea* and SEI DEVS SEIVE DEAST.⁷ This was quite important because avoiding even potential sacrilege had significant meaning in the Roman political theology. The success of *evocatio* was hence dependent on the correct summoning of the protector gods, whose nature the Romans often didn't entirely know, or they suspected that the real name tutelary deity was kept secret. It is for these, we could say, technical reasons, that the pontiffs guarded not only the name of the protector god of *Urbs*, but also the sacral name of Rome. It was believed that betraying the name would lead to a situation in which Rome would find itself at the mercy of enemies, and that is why it was not spoken.⁸ It seems however improbable that in this case the fulfillment of *votum* required the transference of any cults to Rome. This would mean that the 'summoning' of foreign gods was of a more universal nature than has been previously thought, and that this practice should not be confined entirely either to the framework of ritual, or to the early republic. This does not however mean that it was not to some degree formalised, because we can list certain constant elements of *evocatio*, e.g. *votum* or summoning prayers.⁹ It seems that, as we have already mentioned, a lasting element of *carmen evocationis* was the formula *sive deus sive dea*. The mentions in the sources referred to above, particularly the inscription from Isaura Vetus, point to this.

If we accept that evocation was practiced in the first century BC, there is no reason to doubt that it was also practiced later.¹⁰ In this context, above all the evidence of Pliny is worthy of attention, when he mentions (citing Verrius Flaccus) the ritual of the god (*evocari deum*), informing the reader that this ritual was a part of the pontiffs' teachings (*durat in pontificum disciplina id sacrum*) (Plin. *HN*. 28.4.18). The presence of the pontiffs is noticeable in the sources. Publius Servilius Vatia Isauricus also belonged to the college of the pontiffs when he conquered Isaura Vetus (Ando 2008: p. 132). They accompanied Titus conquering Jerusalem. According to Pliny the foreign god was promised a cult 'with the Romans' (*apud Romanos cultum*), not in Rome.

II. *Evocatio* as a Crisis Ritual

Evoking the gods, like all ritual practices in Rome, was a part of *mos maiorum*, and it does not matter whether we limit its use to war situations, or whether we treat it in the wider context of the *interpretatio Romana* of foreign cults. The author of the definition contained in *De verborum significatu* counts as foreign (*peregrina sacra*) both cults 'summoned' (*evocatis diis*) during an attack on the city and those arriving for various religious reasons during peace time. He distinctly differentiates between the reasons for their arrival (Fer-

7 Noel Lenski draws attention to the fact that a synoptic analysis of the evidence (Liv. 5.21; Macrobian *Sat.* 3.9; Serv. *ad Aen.* 2.351; Plin. *HN* 28, 4; Plut. *Quest. Rom.* 61 [278f-279a]) and the inscription confirms the existence of *carmen evocationis*, Lenski (2008: pp. 239-243).

8 About the protector gods of Rome e.g.: Basanoff (1947: pp. 17-31); Lancellotti (2010: p. 42); Ferri (2010a: pp. 101-128); Orlin (2010: p. 37).

9 Cf. Ferri (2008: p. 43); Champion (2017: p. 204).

10 Beard & North & Price (1998: pp. 132-134); Hekster (2010).

ri 2008: p. 21). As examples of the second category he mentions the cults of particular gods: Magna Mater, Ceres and Aesculapius.¹¹ The circumstances show that calling on the help of these three gods took place in situations which were particularly difficult for the Romans. The cult of Aesculapius was to be a remedium for the plague, but we also need to remember the war which was happening at that time with the Samnites. The bringing of the cult of Magna Mater needs to be investigated within the wider context of the religious crisis during the Second Punic Wars. A delegation from the Senate arrived at the sanctuary of Ceres in Henna in Sicily during times of severe internal crisis caused by the murder of Tiberius Gracchus (Spaeth 1996: pp. 73–78).

It was Gabriella Gustafsson who drew attention to the fact that *evocatio* may be connected with the crises which assailed Rome. She works from the assumption ‘that the historical narratives about ritual practices generally termed *evocatio* and *devotio* are all about unique events and can, therefore, not be made to fit into static «categories»’ (Gustafsson 2015: p. 368). In further analyses, Gustafsson makes use of the concept of ‘crisis rituals’ taken from anthropology and religious studies, which in our opinion opens up an interesting research field. The anthropological perspective opens new horizons to researchers. Before we return to the category of ‘crisis rituals’ it is worth reminding ourselves of the term which gave rise to it, ‘social drama’, created by Victor Turner (1969; 1982). Turner created this category based on Gennep’s concept of ‘rite de passage’, which he broke down into three stages: separation rituals, liminal rituals and rituals of incorporation. Liminal rituals formed part of the most important changes in the lives of members of the community. Turner built up these categories by analysing rituals which appeared in moments of social crisis and assisted the maintenance of collective balance and unity. Generally speaking – to bring the category into Roman terms – they were associated with the appearance of *prodigium*.

Turner specified four phases of the social drama: people moving, the crisis associated with that disturbance of the normal functioning of society, controlling safety, and in the last phase – the reintegration of the social structure (Turner 1982: p. 107). As we see, the practice of *evocatio* and *devotio* were associated with the second stage of social drama, and there we may also find a place for ‘crisis ritual’.

It’s worth referring to performative studies here. As we have already noticed, the ritual *evocatio* is interpreted as an activity by its very nature dynamic, for use if needed. Laying emphasis on the performative aspect of the ritual enables us to see its meaning in a much wider perspective than if we were to use only the static picture painted by literary sources. And this in turn enables us to escape binary oppositions, which in Roman religion took the form of oppositions between foreign and native gods. This was noticed above, in the short discussion of the arrival in Rome of Magna Mater, Ceres and Aesculapius. The search for the help of foreign gods in crisis situations, which constituted a threat to the community, was rooted in tradition and was an integral part of the Roman religious system. By the way, the category of ‘foreign’ gods is one of the most unclear and confusing in all research on Roman religion. It’s enough to mention

¹¹ Festus 268 L., commentary Ferri (2006).

that Magna Mater was ‘invited’ to Rome as a god of the ancestors through the Trojan tradition, and not as a god of the enemy. The Romans, at least in the first century BC, seemed to have no problem with expressing disinclination towards the castrated priests of the goddess, while simultaneously recognising the cult as a native one.

The performative approach also renders noticeable the dynamic character of the ritual in the centre of which the performative act is found, the fact that Roman religion had undergone changes and was formed by those features which enabled it to be updated, and better suited the challenges facing the citizens’ community. From this perspective, the basic measure of the authenticity of the rituals performed, that is *mos maiorum*, appears not only as an alibi for the bringing of changes to the citizens’ religion (usually efforts were made to justify the introduction of new gods by the results of consultations with the Sibylline Books or the *evocatio* rite). Richard Schechner, one of the classic authors of performative studies, invented the term ‘behaved behaviour’, meaning the re-updating of symbolic systems (Schechner 1985: p. 35). In our opinion this is also a significant ingredient of the full definition of *mos maiorum*. The new phenomenon was introduced into social circulation in its traditional form and, all the more importantly, also with its traditional meanings. It comes as no surprise when Cicero states that the highly celebrated *ludi Megalenses* festivities in the honour of Magna Mater constituted an example of the godfearing nature of the ancestors (Cic. *Har. Resp.* 24).

Returning for a moment to the term ‘crisis ritual’. This is obviously a contemporary construction and has limited application to ancient reality. It can’t be denied, however, that it fulfills its organisational function very well. Gabriella Gustafsson noticed that in our analysis of accounts concerning *evocatio* it is striking that each of these is ‘distinctly unique, and even though it is reasonable to suppose that conquests and other military actions were ritualised to some extent, it seems unlikely that there were ever any written scripts or oral traditions that formed the basis of such rites’ (Gustafsson 2015: p. 368). Can we accept, then, that *evocatio* and *devotio* were not fixed rituals? It seems so. A little earlier we paid attention to the performative dimension of the rituals and their constant updating. In our opinion, crisis rituals confirm our constations. It has been correctly noted that this type of ritual activity cannot be rigidly codified, because it has to be immediately adapted to the present situation. It seems to us that in the case of the *evocatio* ritual, analysed as a crisis ritual, we are dealing with a process of ritualisation, that is a way of acting which distinctly differs from others in its aim, which is to create a kind of closed circle (cf. Bell 1997: p. 81). We are dealing with the creation of ritualized agents (priests, military leaders, emperors) who, thanks to their ritually possessed powers, could update the traditional repertoire of ritual activities characteristic of a particular society, and then use that ritual in a defined situation. Characteristic features of ritualisation strategies are their elasticity and practicality (Bell 1992: pp. 89–93; 1997: pp. 81–83).

Evocatio should always be analysed in particular situations – cultural, political and above all ritual. Only this approach enables us to see the complex reality made up of many ritual kinds of ‘actions’. In other words, understanding why ritualized actions were created and who their agents were, enables us also to see how relationships were constructed between authorities – in this case the conquering Romans – and the conquered

people, with regard to *evocatio* and other activities, e.g. *devotio* or consultation with the Sibylline Books (cf. Bell 1997: p. 82). We can, then, in this context define the practice of summoning the gods with the help of the term used by Egon Flaig – *Konsensusritual* (Flaig 1995: p. 90). One of the main effects of *evocatio*, like every crisis ritual, was the reestablishment of the stability of society, even if in fact ritual practices created a new reality, rather than renewing the old one. In the case of Rome the consensual character of this rite is one of the conditions enabling us to draw the conclusion that the ritual was directed largely towards its own citizens.

III. The Siege of Jerusalem

One of the most interesting cases of ‘gods leaving’ besieged towns of which we find traces in the sources is the information given by Tacit about God leaving Jerusalem when it was besieged by the Romans:

The doors of the inner shrine were suddenly thrown open, and a voice of more than mortal tone was heard to cry that the Gods were departing (*excedere deos*).¹²

Tacit had no doubt that this was a *prodigium* foretelling the victory of Titus, but the Jews, not understanding its meaning, tried to interpret it to their advantage. Tacit’s information corresponds with the accounts of Flavius Josephus in *Bellum Judaicum* about God’s leaving the temple (np. 5.367; 5.412; 6.127). One of the accounts (6.299) seems to refer to the *prodigium* mentioned by Tacitus:

The voice in the temple, the priests on entering the inner court of the temple by night, as their custom was in the discharge of their ministrations, reported that they were conscious, first of a commotion and a din, and after that of a voice as of a host, “We are departing hence” (*μεταβαίνομεν ἐντεῦθεν*).¹³

Christiane Saulnier has already drawn attention to the fact that this sentence contains traces of the ‘forgotten *evocatio*’. In her opinion the formula ‘summoning the gods’, known from Latin sources, was spacious enough to allow for the use of unknown names for the gods, or names which were ‘not to be spoken’, as in the case of Yahweh (Saulnier 1989). This opinion gradually gained supporters, and its widest justification was presented by Mark Kloppenborg and Mireille Hadas-Lebel.

Kloppenborg emphasizes that ‘the destruction of the temple was deliberate and part of Roman strategy. But behind (...) Titus’s actions in ordering the destruction of the temple lies the basic belief that the separation of the conquered from their tutelary

12 Tac. *Hist.*, 5.13.2 (transl. Church & Brodribb 1942).

13 Joseph. *BI*, 6.299–300 (transl. Whiston 2003). The motif of the departure of God is known to the Jewish tradition, but the words of Josephus seem far from the vision of God leaving the first temple presented, for example, in the *Book of Enoch* (89.56).

deity and the destruction of the cultic site are necessary elements of conquest', which is why the ritual of summoning 'probably was performed'. The enigmatic account given by Josephus is no surprise to him, as a wider mention would require an admission that 'the Romans were able to provide enticements for the Jewish deity to leave the temple' (Kloppenborg 2005: p. 444).

Hadas-Lebel considers that confirmation of the carrying out of the *evocatio* ritual lies in the words of Josephus and Titus directed to the defenders of the temple at various stages of the siege (5.367; 5.412; 6.127). In her opinion, Titus' words, spoken before the last onslaught, are however particularly suggestive:

I call the gods of my fathers to witness and any deity that once watched over this place for now I believe that there is none – I call my army, the Jews within my homes, and you yourselves to witness that it is not I who force you to pollute these precincts.¹⁴

It's hard not to agree with Hadas-Lebel, who perceives in these words a formula for prayer reminiscent of *carmen evocationis* in the version quoted by Macrobius (3.9.7–8). She draws attention to the fact that Josephus certainly had a limited understanding of Roman ritual practices, hence it was hard to expect him to describe them with precision. Another reason for his reticence regarding *evocatio* could be the desire to free Titus from blame for the destruction of the temple. The above-cited words addressed to the defenders show rather that God departed the city due to the attitude of the Jews themselves (cf. Hadas-Lebel 2006: pp. 75–110).

There is no reason to doubt that Yahweh was perceived by the Romans as a guardian god of Jerusalem. The consequences of *evocatio* could obviously not be the acceptance of the Jerusalem cult by the Romans, there is no reason to treat the *evocatio* of Juno of Veii as a model for the imperial period. The *evocatio* of Juno Caelestis led by Scipio Africanus already showed that it was not necessary to build a temple for the called upon god in Rome. This could refer to e.g. the moving of the statue or symbol of the god, as in the case of Cybele. As Gustafsson noticed, doubting as she did in the truth of the account, the *evocatio* ritual was complex and should be investigated with its deeper mythological associations in the framework of theological justifications for political activities, or in this case – military ones (Gustafsson 2000: p. 161). The inscription from Isaura Vetus shows that in historical reality several solutions were possible. In the case of Yahweh, we may be dealing with a substitute for taking on the temple cults. This concerns the cult vessels brought to Rome from the temples and carried in the triumphal procession from the Capitol to the temple of Jupiter, later immortalised on Titus' arch. Vespasian ordered that they be placed in the temple of Pax erected in the year 75 (Joseph *BI* 7.161–162). In the eyes of the Romans they could have represented the Jewish God.¹⁵ From the point of

14 Joseph *BI* 6.127. (transl. Whiston 2003); Hadas-Lebel (2009: pp. 477–479).

15 Magness (2008); Hadas-Lebel (2009).

view of the Romans *evocatio* would be a logical and understandable activity ('logisch und verständlich'), as emphasized by Adalberto Giovannini.¹⁶

IV. *Evocatio* as an Agent of Redemptive Hegemony

The situation evoked by Josephus could point to yet another function of *evocatio*. Catherine Bell invented the term 'redemptive hegemony' (Bell 1992: pp. 83–88). She noted that 'lived ordering of powers' in practice means that domination, meaning here a moral order, or an order of prestige, or one associated with social consciousness, is not a single, one-off event, nor is it simple. To fit a given situation, this order must be re-created, renewed, or even opposed to the previous practices. There is a visible similarity here to the crisis ritual, which also did not have a definitively fixed shape, and attempts to enter it into the framework of citizens' religion, were aimed at taming a rite performed *ad hoc*. We were dealing with a similar situation in the above-mentioned cases of the use of the Sibylline Books. It is significant that redemptive hegemony embraces a whole range of practices. Bell herself admits that the term she uses is 'awkward', but on the one hand it gives a good sense of the natural character of ritual practices, while on the other it provides a nuanced, if not impartial, updating of the interpretation of the order of dominance (Bell 1992: p. 84). Redemptive hegemony also points to the functioning of the agent whose activity appears within the framework of the system. It is true that in every witness account of a case of *evocatio* and *devotio*, the ritual actions are carried out by an exceptionally scrupulously designated person. According to Macrobius, only the *imperator* had the power to 'summon' gods and to 'sacrifice' the city (Macr. *Sat.* 3.9.9). Even if the ritual *devotio* is referred to, we consider that an analogical principle held in the case of *evocatio*. The two rituals differed from each other and had different aims, but were connected by one fundamental feature – they both aimed towards direct interference in *rerum divinarum*. In any case, bearers of the title *imperator* are shown in the sources to be the only ones to perform *evocatio*: Scipio Aemilianus, C. Servilius Isauricus and Titus. From Josephus Flavius's account we can conclude that Titus was hailed as *imperator* by soldiers in the courtyard of the Jerusalem temple during the ceremony of making offerings in the honour of the symbols of the legions, which took place during the last phase of the battle for the temple.¹⁷

Redemptive hegemony treated as activity oriented towards actions and practices designed to fit a particular situation, and through this placed into a possible ritual framework, has the task of forming the reality of the community, rather than describing or reflecting it. The Romans did not lead religious policies in the later Christian understanding of the word. Many decisions in this field were taken as responses to particular situations (Champion 2017: p. 203). A perfect example of this is provided by the ritual consequences of the death and burial of Julius Caesar. An important ingredient

¹⁶ Giovannini (1996: p. 26). Cf. Rives (2005).

¹⁷ Joseph *BJ* 6.316; Suet. *Tit.* 5.3; Kloppenborg (2005: p. 423).

of redemptive hegemony is the assumption, not literally expressed, that it constitutes a strategy of the agent realised in a particular place and time, with a particular aim, and something that Bell calls 'trajectory of the acts'. In the Roman practice of *evocatio* one more thing is characteristic – the 'trajectory of the acts' was directed towards the interior of the Roman community, which became as a result an organism open to new influences and new members.

V. Conclusions

We consider that the understanding of the practice of *evocatio* in terms of ritual crisis or redemptive hegemony strengthens the opinion that it was basically a prayer, whose purpose was to request that the gods change their positions. Two aspects of this change are relevant here. In some cases a change in place was requested, and sometimes a change in the legal status of a conquered town or country (Blomart 1997: p. 107). The first category undoubtedly includes the *evocatio* of the god Terminus and the goddess Iuventas from the Capitol to other parts of Rome in order to make room for the expansion of the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, and also the *evocatio* of Vulcanus outside the city walls, mentioned by Vitruvius.¹⁸ The second is presented by, at the very least, the *evocatio* of Yahweh from the Jerusalem temple. The redemptive hegemony of Rome did not require the physical transference of a cult. In fact this only happened when a city conquered by the Romans lost its political status and had to contend with the consequences of *devotio*. In other cases, when the terrain became a part of the Roman administrative system, it was not necessary. In other words, the symbolic nullification of the sacred boundaries of conquered towns by *evocatio* made it possible to include them in the ritual structure of the imperium.

Treating the practice of *evocatio* widely, not only as a defined ritual but as any invitation for a god to inhabit Rome, also as a result of consultation with the Sibylline Books (in this case the agent is collective – i.e. the Senate working through *collegium viri sacris faciundis*), we can state that this practice had a three-fold meaning: political, theological and legal. On one hand, as a result of *evocatio* Rome confirmed its rights over a given terrain, or declared relationships with it in practical and/or symbolic dimensions.¹⁹ In the theological dimension, precisely the one connected with redemptive hegemony, Rome guaranteed itself and the new inhabitants of the empire the maintenance of *pax deorum*, which would have been one of the basic tasks of the state. Redemption in ancient Rome had a practical meaning and was associated with the success of the empire, which was the source of the safety of its inhabitants. It was an expression of the creation of a religion for the empire, although it was oriented towards its first citizens.

18 Liv. 1.55; Vitr. 1.7.1; Blomart (1997: p. 101).

19 Cf. Blomart (1997: p. 103).

Bibliography

- Alvar, J. (1985). *Materiaux pour l'étude de la formule sive deus sive dea*. *Numen*, 32, 236–273.
- Ando, C. (2008). *The Matters of the Gods. Religion and the Roman Empire*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Babbitt, F. C. (Transl.). (1972). *Plutarch's Moralia in sixteen volumes* (The Loeb classical library, 305). Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Basanoff, V. (1947). *Evocatio. Étude d'un rituel militaire Romain*. Paris: Presses Univ. de France.
- Beard, M., North, J., & Price, S. (1998). *Religions of Rome, 1: A History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bell, C. M. (1992). *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bell, C. M. (1997). *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Blomart, A. (1997). Die *evocatio* und der Transfer "fremder" Götter von der Peripherie nach Rom. In H. Cancik, & J. Rüpke (Eds.), *Römische Reichsreligion und Provinzialreligion* (pp. 99–111). Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Blomart, A. (2000). Les manières grecques de déplacer les héros: modalités religieuses et motivations politiques. In V. Pirenne-Delforge, & E. Suárez de la Torre (Eds.), *Héros et héroïnes dans les mythes et les cultes grecs* (pp. 351–364). Liège: Centre International d'Étude de la Religion Grecque Antique.
- Blomart, A. (2013). Adapter l'ancien pour faire du nouveau: la réinterprétation de traditions païennes (*evocatio* et *devotio*) en contexte chrétien (IVe–Ve s.). *Chaos e Kosmos*, 14 [retrieved 17.11.2018 from http://www.chaosekosmos.it/pdf/2013_10.pdf].
- Castel, J.-P. (2016). *Guerre de religion et police de la pensée: une invention monothéiste?* Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Champion, C. B. (2017). *The Peace of the Gods. Elite Religious Practices in the Middle Roman Republic*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Church, A. J., & Brodribb, W. J. (Transl.). (1942). *The complete works of Tacitus* (The modern library of the world's best books). New York: The Modern Library.
- Ferri, G. (2006). L'*evocatio* romana: i problemi. *Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni*, 30(2), 205–244.
- Ferri, G. (2008). *Evocatio* romana ed *evocatio* ittita. *Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni*, 74, N.S. 32(1), 19–48.
- Ferri, G. (2010a). *Tutela segreta ed evocatio nel politeismo romano*. Roma: Bulzoni.
- Ferri, G. (2010b). *Tutela urbis: il significato e la concezione della divinità tutelare cittadina nella religione romana*. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Ferri, G. (2010c). Una testimonianza epigrafica dell'*evocatio*? Su un'iscrizione di Isaura Vetus. In S. Antolini, A. Arnaldi, & E. Lanzillotta (Eds.), *Giornata di studi in onore di Lidio Gasperini* (pp. 183–194). Roma: Università di Roma.
- Flaig, E. (1995). Entscheidung und Konsens. Zu den Feldern der politischen Kommunikation zwischen Aristokratie und Plebs. In M. Jehne (Ed.), *Demokratie in Rom? Die Rolle des Volkes in der Politik der römischen Republik* (pp. 77–128). Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Le Gall, J. (1976). *Evocatio*. In A. Balland et al. (Eds.), *L'Italie préromaine et la Rome républicaine. Mélanges offerts à Jacques Heurgon* (pp. 519–524). Paris: Boccard.
- Van Gennepe, A. (1909). *Les rites de passage*. Paris: Nourry.

- Giovannini, A. (1996). Die Zerstörung Jerusalems durch Titus: Eine Strafe Gottes oder eine historische Notwendigkeit? In G. Gottlieb, V. Dotterweich, & P. Barceló (Eds.), *Contra quis ferat arma deos? Vier Augsburger Vorträge zur Religionsgeschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit: zum 60. Geburtstag von Gunther Gottlieb* (pp. 11–34). München: Vögel.
- Gustafsson, G. (2000). *Evocatio deorum: Historical and Mythical Interpretations of Ritualised Conquest in the Expansion of Ancient Rome*. Uppsala: Uppsala University Library.
- Gustafsson, G. (2015). Verbs, Nouns, Temporality and Typology: Narrations of Ritualised Warfare in Roman Antiquity. In O. Bernd-Christian, S. Rau, & J. Rüpke (Eds.), *History and Religion: Narrating a Religious Past* (pp. 355–370). Berlin – München – Boston: de Gruyter.
- Hadas-Lebel, M. (2006). *Jerusalem against Rome*. Leuven – Dudley, MA: Peeters.
- Hadas-Lebel, M. (2009). Flavius Josephus comme témoin des rites de victoire romains. *Mélanges de l'école française de Rome*, 121(2), 473–479.
- Hall, A. (1973). New Light on the Capture of Isaura Vetus by P. Servilius Vatia. In *Akten des VI. Internationalen Kongresses für griechische und lateinische Epigraphik München* (Vestigia, 17; pp. 568–571). München: Beck.
- Hekster, O. (2010). Reversed Epiphanies: Roman Emperors Deserted by Gods. *Mnemosyne*, 63(4), 601–615.
- Horsfall, N. (2008). *Virgil, Aeneid 2: a commentary. Mnemosyne. Supplements, Monographs on Greek and Roman language and literature*. Leiden – Boston: Brill.
- Johnston, P. A. (2015). *Saevae memorem Iunonis ob iram. Juno, Veii, and Augustus. Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 55(1–4), 167–178.
- Kloppenborg, J. S. (2005). Evocatio Deorum and the Date of Mark. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 124(3), 419–450.
- Lancellotti M. G. (2010). *Dea Caelestis: studi e materiali per la storia di una divinità dell'Africa romana* (Collezione di studi fenici, 44). Pisa–Roma: Fabrizio Serra editore.
- Latte, K. (1960). *Römische Religionsgeschichte*. München: Beck.
- Lenski, N. (2008). Evoking the Pagan Past: “Instinctu Divinitatis” and Constantine’s Capture of Rome. *Journal of Late Antiquity*, 1(2), 204–257.
- Magness, J. (2008). The Arch of Titus at Rome and the Fate of the God of Israel. *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 59(2), 201–217.
- Orlin, E. M. (1997). *Temples, Religion and Politics in the Roman Republic*. Leiden: Brill.
- Orlin, E. M. (2000). *Foreign Cults in Rome: Creating a Roman Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rives, J. (2005). Flavian Religious Policy and the Destruction of the Jerusalem Temple. In J. Edmondson, S. Mason, & J. Rives, *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome* (pp. 145–166). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rutledge, S. H. (2007). The Roman Destruction of Sacred Sites. *Historia: Zeitschrift für alte Geschichte*, 56(2), 179–195.
- Saulnier, Ch. (1989). Flavius Josephus et la propagande flavienne. *Revue Biblique*, 96(4), 545–562.
- Schechner, R. (1985). *Between Theater & Anthropology*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Spaeth, B. S. (1996). *The Roman goddess Ceres*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Tarpin, M. (2013). Morale ou droit? La capture des objets sacrés à Rome. In M.-C. Ferriès, &

- F. Delrieux, *Spolier et confisquer dans les mondes grec et romain* (Collection Sociétés, Religions, Politiques, 23; pp. 81–100). Chambéry: Université de Savoie.
- Turner, V. (1969). *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*. London: Routledge.
- Turner, V. (1982). *From Ritual to Theatre: the Human Seriousness of Play*. New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications.
- Whiston, W. (Transl.). (2003). *The works of Josephus: complete and unabridged* (new updated ed., 17. printing). Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson.
-

Prof. dr. hab. Danuta Musiał / dmusiał@umk.pl

Department of Ancient History and Archival Sciences
Nicolaus Copernicus University, Faculty of History
Ul. Władysława Bojarskiego 1, 87-100 Toruń, Poland

Prof. dr. hab. Andrzej Gillmeister / A.Gillmeister@ih.uz.zgora.pl

Department of History of Science and Culture
University of Zielona Góra, Faculty of Humanities
Al. Wojska Polskiego 69, 65-762 Zielona Góra, Poland

