JUPITER, MARS, QUIRINUS

GEORGES DUMEZIL

GEORGES DUMÉZIL

JUPITER, MARS, QUIRINUS

Essay on the Indo-European conception of society and the origins of Rome

In memory of

MARIE-LOUISE SJOESTEDT

INTRODUCTION

I. — *The Indo-Europeans*.

During the third and second millennia BC, the most important event in recent human history took place: from a region that seems to have been located between the Hungarian plain and the Baltic Sea, waves of conquering troops who spoke roughly the same language set out in all directions. What had happened? The disintegration of prehistoric empires? Food or climate shortages? Innate imperialism, a confused call of destiny, the rapid maturation of a privileged human group? We will never know. But the fact remains: in the space of a few centuries, these daring horsemen enslaved the whole of Northern, Western, Southern and South-Eastern Europe; the former inhabitants disappeared, assimilated or formed small pockets that slowly disappeared, leaving only the Basques at the end of the Pyrenees and small, highly original peoples in the Caucasus as evidence of their existence. In Central Asia, some pushed on to Turkestan, where their kingdoms would last for nearly ten centuries after the beginning of our era, despite Chinese pressure and the turmoil caused by the Turks and Mongols. Some, very early on, and others after them, rushed into Asia Minor; others occupied Iran and made their way to India: a thousand years before Christ, they were in the Punjab and already looking towards the Ganges, where the Greeks of Alexander's time would find them settled.

With reference to the area thus covered, the unknown people from whom so many branches have sprung have been given a composite name by modern scholars, one that is purely symbolic and appeals more to the mind than to the imagination: they are the *Indo-Europeans*. The Aryans are also said

also called the *Aryans*, by virtue of concordances, the main one of which will be pointed out later[1].

Their victorious conquests did not go completely unnoticed, at least at their points of arrival: throughout the Near East, the newcomers rubbed shoulders with, clashed with and sometimes subjugated ancient, highly civilised societies, which had long kept records and whose inscriptions bear witness to the upheaval. The conquerors themselves partly adopted the customs and conveniences of the vanquished or their neighbours and began to engrave: between the Black Sea and Syria, we now know and read the cuneiform archives of the Hittite kings, masters of one of these empires of the second millennium BCE. But one fact dominates all the details: wherever they settled, these armies lost contact with the forces operating in other regions, even nearby ones. All the more reason why they did not recognise as kin those who, in a previous migration, had already trodden the soil where they settled. Languages diverged. History, myths and cults became localised. Customs evolved. In short, no sense of community with the original inhabitants survived, and successive invaders treated their closest cousins and the most unfamiliar natives with equal indifference. Later, here and there, when Athenian philosophers or Roman grammarians reflect on this, they will admire, for example, that the *dog* and *water* have almost the same name in Phrygian and Greek, or that so many Latin words sound so similar to Greek words with the same meaning: they will conclude nothing, except that it is a matter of borrowing or the constancy of the human machine.

And the game continues, this time in broad daylight: the Germanic tribes overwhelm the Roman Empire and give Europe a new face. Fleets set out to conquer Africa and

India, the new worlds of the East and West, and the islands of distant seas. Unscrupulous colonists hastily depopulate and repopulate part of the Americas and all of Australia. After fleeting successes, Arab and Turco-Mongol competitors are eliminated: Algiers, Cairo and Baghdad fall into vassalage, and Siberia speaks Russian. Apart from a few rare foreigners — Finns, Hungarians, Ottoman Turks — who managed to gain acceptance and become naturalised without losing their language, Europe "speaks Indo-European" and, through its emigrants, makes everything that matters on three other continents and half of the fourth "speak Indo-European". Today, beyond the fratricidal struggles that are perhaps the painful birth pangs of a stable order, there is only one corner of the planet where a voice could rise up against this triumph. But it would undoubtedly come too late.

For all sorts of reasons related to the internal and external conditions of scientific development, it was not until the early[19th]century that Western grammarians discovered the crucial fact that Sanskrit from India and the languages of Iran, Greek, Latin, the Germanic languages, the Celtic languages, the Slavic and Baltic languages, are only forms taken, in the course of divergent evolutions, by a single prehistoric language which is defined in relation to them as Latin is in relation to Italian, French to Spanish, Portuguese, etc. The notion of "Indo-European languages" was born. A century of admirable work, in which all the universities of Europe collaborated, made it possible to refine and nuance this concept, and today we have a clear idea of what "common Indo-European" was at the time of the great migrations that broke it up. The most recent research even gives us a glimpse of the earlier evolution through which the

common language had reached this final state, of which our modern languages are various modifications.

Of course, there are other aspects to the question besides the linguistic one. First, there is the ethnic aspect, which various schools of anthropology have also been studying for a century using their own methods. Let us recall the most general result of this research: the Indo-Europeans belonged to the white race and included representatives of the three main types of man then settled in Europe, with a marked predominance of the Nordic type.

Then there is the cultural aspect, which is directly related to our own studies.

<p style="text-align:center">*
* *</p>

II. — *The religion of the Indo-Europeans*.

Linguistic unity does not necessarily imply political unity; in any case, it implies a significant unity of civilisation: consider pre-Alexander Greece, which never formed a state but which, despite differences in dialect and customs, was constantly conscious of and determined to 'speak Greek' and 'live Greek'. It is certain that the people who spoke the Indo-European language shared a minimum of material and moral civilisation. It is legitimate, in particular, to speak of 'the Indo-European religion', it being understood that this unity did not imply uniformity and that each canton, like later each Greek valley, each city in Latium, each Norwegian fjord, coloured the common good in its own way.

In the [mid-19th] century, scholars enthusiastically attempted to reconstruct, through comparison, not only the language but also the religion of the Indo-Europeans

and, above all, what was then considered the essential part of any religion: mythology. The undertaking was premature and failed. The philologists and linguists who devoted themselves to it did not yet have the new knowledge of man, the broadened and rejuvenated humanism that was built up, slowly at first, then at a dizzying pace, through the methodical exploration of the various branches of our species. The situation is better today: ethnography and anthropology have made it possible to observe, in all their vividness, the forms that religion takes in societies whose civilisation is comparable, in terms of level and elements, to that of the Indo-Europeans; on the other hand, psychology and sociology have shed light on the internal mechanisms of these paganisms, their conditions of equilibrium, the functions they perform, and the developments that await them. Work has therefore resumed over the past twenty years, mainly in France and Germany, but also in Sweden, Holland and Belgium, while guarding against the two initial illusions. We no longer believe   Indo-European "primitive"; we know that neither their civilisation nor their language allows us to reach a "beginning", an absolute zero; that both, on the contrary, bear the mark, the burden and the fruit of a rich past that our vision can hardly trace back to. On the other hand, we no longer believe that myths are ingenious and vain symbols invented from scratch by bards to express their admiration for the wonders of nature, nor are they the more or less conscious puns of prehistoric philologists; Solar myths, storm myths, 'personified epithets' and other products of 'language diseases' are now given their rightful place, which is not a great one; we know that religion presupposes, expresses, regulates and coordinates much more complex needs and efforts.

III. — *Myths, rites, religion, society.*

Reserving the origin and essence of religions for philosophy, and sticking to external observation, we can take the following definitions and principles as given:

1° A myth is a narrative that users feel has a habitual, albeit arbitrary, connection with a positive or negative observance, regular behaviour, or guiding principle of a society's religious life. Far from being disinterested inventions, or even free inventions of the imagination, myths are inseparable from social life as a whole: they explain, illustrate and protect against neglect or hostility, liturgies, techniques, institutions, classifications and hierarchies, specialisations of common work, on the maintenance of which the well-being, order and power of the community and its members are supposed to depend. It is therefore impossible to study myths without studying the forms of magical-religious, political-religious, economic-religious, etc., activity in the societies under consideration. In particular, whenever a narrative appears in constant connection with a ritual, we must examine whether this connection is essential: it most often is, and at the same time we know what the main meaning of this narrative, this myth, was for its users.

Myth therefore remains, contrary to what was believed a century ago, the supreme religious phenomenon, giving meaning and efficacy to others, and "comparative mythology", in this sense, retains its primacy; out of respect for the early researchers, we can even retain this name to designate the new   form   of study comparative   of   religions   Indo-

European religions. But modern "comparative mythology" is only possible if it incorporates all phenomena related to myths at every level of its structure, i.e. practically the whole of sociology. This makes the value of our studies easier to understand: when it comes to historical human groups, it is their entire physiology and anatomy that are exposed in myths, sometimes schematised or idealised, but clearer, more graspable, and more philosophical than they are when considered only in the accidents of history. And when it comes to prehistoric human groups, the analysis of myths reconstructed by comparison, understood in this way, provides the only means of objective knowledge.

2° In the life of a society, there are few important "ritual moments" that have only one function, only one meaning: a sacred gesture tends to be as powerful and as fruitful as possible, tends to be total. It is certainly legitimate to speak, for example, of "purification rites", but we must not forget that those who practise them also seek, through these same rites, to make their fields and herds prosper, to obtain long life, to harm their enemies, etc. The same is true of myths, with the added circumstance that the natural play of imagination and association of ideas enriches them even more easily. It is therefore rare for a myth to have only one meaning. And this is where, very often, it is legitimate to restore a secondary role to the old naturalistic interpretations: the Indian Indra is certainly not the personification of the storm; he is the divine projection of the warrior class; nevertheless, his celestial battles were certainly assimilated to atmospheric phenomena involving clouds, storms and rain. The mythologies of America and Africa constantly show

constantly, openly, without the need for interpretation, these simultaneous movements, these harmonics of the imagination on various levels.

3° Depending on the genius of the peoples, myths, which are linked to rituals, are oriented towards the marvellous or the plausible, presuppose a world different from ours, or present themselves as stories, as ancient or even recent history. Here, the narrative involves gods, fabulous heroes, monsters; there, simply characters believed to be 'historical': national heroes, enemies of the human type. In both cases, however, they fulfil the same needs and deserve the same name. In the Indo-European world, Rome, apart from the easily detectable Greek influences, represents the extreme form of this type of historical mythology. Leaf through this infinitely precious book, this veritable treatise on religious sociology, unparalleled in classical antiquity, that is Ovid's *Fasti*: each festival, each ritual gesture is justified by one, two, or three stories, almost all of which are presented as history; yet they are myths, just like those we read, unfortunately cut off from any ritual support, in Hesiod's *Theogony* or in the "divine poems" of *the Edda*.

4° Myths do not always die out at the same time as the political or economic forms of life and religious rites that they initially helped to maintain disappear under various influences. Irish mythology thus survived Christianisation. But it turned sometimes into legends (linked to historical or geographical names), sometimes into tales (anonymous), and if it had not been, from the first centuries of its decline, recorded in writing by clerics happily attached to traditions, it would not have been

It has become eroded, trivialised, three-quarters covered by the clichés of international folklore. It is a big question whether the themes of fairy tales originated in ancient times from degenerate myths or whether, for the most part, they represent a genre of imaginative production that has always been autonomous. But what is certain is that this lively form of popular literature, in all climates, quickly invades, disfigures and devours myths whose specific social function no longer defends their originality. Mythologists must not lose sight of this evolution; often, in fact, a text provides them with a myth that has already fallen into disuse but whose folkloric degeneration is only at an early stage.

5° It is only late in the day, literarily speaking, among peoples already equipped with philologists or in religions with imperative dogmas, that we see the emergence of mythological *corpora*, 'a mythology', in which all the myths are organised without contradictions at the cost of retouching and compromise. Even these efforts remain largely ineffective on lived religion. However, even in the most backward circles, even in Australia, we are justified in superimposing the notion of
"mythology" to the plurality of myths: however contradictory they may be, they remain nonetheless interdependent; supernatural beings from the same group and of the same type appear in them, the same proper names (of places, beings, etc.) link one story to another, and the same social and cosmic institutions, either explicitly or implicitly, guide all the stories; if users have confidence in the effectiveness of a particular myth, it is, for many, because they feel, because they know that it is not isolated: a shifting but sufficient coherence is maintained all the more easily because, on each occasion, it is a single myth that matters, that is recited in detail, the mass

of all the others forming a muted but useful, though necessarily confused, orchestration. This feeling of "things of the same kind, related" is enough to constitute, above the myths, a mythology, an organism whose fragments must be isolated with caution.

<div align="center">
*
*   *
</div>

IV. — *Starting point: the religions of the Indo-Iranians, the Celts and the Italiotes.*

The unity of language, we said, presupposes a minimum commonality of civilisation, particularly of religion. The subject of our study is therefore not illusory: by comparing the religious equilibriums attested in the various societies speaking Indo-European languages, we can hope to reconstruct at least fragments of the ancient common religion, in the same way that linguists, by comparing the grammars and vocabularies of Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, etc., reconstruct a large part of the common Indo-European language.

However, it could be that this material is inaccessible and impossible to study; it could be that, as societies evolved from the fragmentation of prehistoric society, the ancient balance changed so much that traces of the past are imperceptible or unrecognisable; as language is less subject to revolutions, reforms and radical overhauls than religion, it could be that, while continuing to speak two still related forms of Indo-European, the Vedic Indians and the Latins of Rome, for example, had completely renewed their systems of rites and myths, to the point of leaving no room for comparison.

In fact, the "initial minimum of common civilisation" was considerably altered everywhere when the Indo-European tribes, dispersing to the four corners of the earth, from the Atlantic to Turkestan, from Scandinavia to Crete and the Indus, overlapped or mingled with foreign peoples whose civilisation — we are thinking of the Aegean world, Anatolia, Mohendjo Daro—conquered them over time

while, as conquerors, they imposed the essence of their language.

Nowhere, therefore, can we be certain that historically attested religions arose from a simple and linear evolution of the Indo-European religion. Everywhere we find ourselves in the presence of new equilibriums, some of which are largely made up of non-Indo-European materials; the facts inherited from our common prehistory are now only remnants, reduced or distorted according to the necessities of the new perspective. Is discovering these facts in their hiding places and under their disguises not an insoluble and even unapproachable problem?

It is only a difficult problem. And here is the particular circumstance that provides a means of addressing it.

Between the prehistoric Indo-European unity and the separate histories of the Indians, Persians, Scythians, Greeks, Latins, Gauls, Irish, etc., the examination of linguistic facts has made it possible to establish that there were, during migration and sometimes even close to the point of arrival, partial intermediate units: for example, there was an Indo-Iranian unity in the far east and a looser unity in the far west, bringing together the future Celts and the future Italians. This is crucial: what we know about ancient non-Mediterranean Europe and southern Russia suggests that, between the Indo-European unit and these partial units, the migrating peoples did not encounter any
"great civilisation", nor therefore any great religious systems, as happened later further south; it is therefore likely that "Indo-European religion" was not completely disrupted during this period. On the other hand, as these partial units are more recent, relatively close even

the first "separate" documents, it is likely that, despite the upheavals that followed, the observable remnants of the last common state, the memories, at least in terms of religious vocabulary, will still be abundant and grouped together, so that the old balance may be glimpsed beneath the new. This is particularly true of the Indo-Iranian partial unit: the religion of *the Avesta* is not that of *the Vedas;* yet the correspondences in religious vocabulary (names of divine beings, men, sacred objects and acts, even formulas) are very numerous and striking. It is clear, regardless of the method of our studies, that the identification and classification of vocabulary correspondences will play a very important role. The fact that a considerable Indo-Iranian religious vocabulary can be achieved almost effortlessly is reassuring.

There is better. One of the chances, perhaps the best chance from our studies, is the fact, noted first by Mr. Kretschmer, then fully highlighted by Mr. Vendryes (*Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris*, XX, 1918, pp. 265-285), that quite a number of words relating to religion appear both among the Italiotes, the Celts, and in the Indo-Iranian group, and appear only there. Mystical terms such as those denoting "faith" in the efficacy of sacred acts, ritual and moral purity, ritual accuracy, offerings to the god and the god's approval, divine protection, prosperity, the word meaning the recitation of formulas, the names of men charged with sacred functions, and even several names of major or minor gods, are thus only found on the two opposite margins of the domain covered by the Indo-European languages. This singular distribution can be explained, as

pointed out by Mr. Vendryes, by a sociological rather than linguistic concordance: while among other peoples of the family, priests play only a minor role in society, a role as "workers" among others, the Indian Brahmins, Iranian Magi, Celtic Druids, the pontifical college (flamines and pontiffs) in Rome constitute powerful priestly bodies, interested custodians of traditions. Consider the vast effort of memory required of young Brahmins and druid students: it is no coincidence that the root *weid- 'to know' is found in both the name of *the Vedas* and that of the dru-(*v*)*id-*.

This circumstance ensures that remnants of the oldest unity exist and are directly knowable. It enables the linguist to point out to the historian of religions concepts which, designated here and there by the same ancient words, are likely to still contain some of the same ancient material.

<p style="text-align:center">*
*　*</p>

V. — *The problem of social and religious frameworks.*

Supported by this fixed point, the new comparative mythology has been conducting its initial explorations for twenty years. Initially uncertain and clumsy, it has corrected, refined and brought them together in an already vast synthesis in which particular views are mutually checked and which does not appear artificial to discerning minds.

The most apparent facts, those that quickly became the focus of research, relate to "Sovereignty". By this we mean the set of rites and myths concerning the magical and legal administration of the world and of

society, the great celestial gods and their representatives, the kings, as well as the mythical ministers and priests or earthly magistrates who assist the Sovereigns in their office. It seems, in fact, that the various Indo-European peoples, at least those among whom large priestly bodies survived, preserved with particular fidelity those aspects of religion that fell within the scope of these presidential and guiding functions[2].

But we must not forget that a religion—and these two words have already appeared several times in the preceding discussion—is a *system*, a *balance*. It is not made up of random pieces and parts, with gaps, redundancies, and scandalous disproportions. If we dared to venture a definition, like so many others before us, albeit an external one, we would say that a religion is a general and coherent explanation of the universe that sustains and animates the life of society and individuals. Therefore, if we do not want to grossly misunderstand the form, scope and specific function of any particular cog in the wheel of a religion, it is urgent to situate it precisely in relation to the whole. Even if this initial image needs to be revised later, we must first draw the main lines of the entire religious architecture that we are studying or reconstructing. Otherwise, since any god is more or less called upon to deal with all areas of human life, there is a risk of attributing to the god being studied, whoever he may be, things that belong to him only accidentally; we will focus on the margins of his domain or even beyond, and we will fail to recognise his fundamental purpose. In short, contrary to a common illusion, contrary to a highly revered precept of false prudence, monographs cannot be constituted with any assurance that when the overall order

as a whole has been recognised. Or, if one prefers a more moderate approach, the study of the framework and that of the details, the study of the organism and that of the tissues, must be pursued in parallel, each constantly correcting and improving the other.

We have keenly felt this necessity in more than one respect in our studies of the sovereign gods, and also in reading excellent books recently published in Germany and Sweden on the same subject[3]. Failing to locate exactly the
"Sovereign" among the political mechanisms and religious representations of the Indo-Europeans, we felt carried away, and we saw others carried away to indefinitely expand his domain, which is certainly not entirely illegitimate since the sovereign god, in the final analysis, has sight and access everywhere, but which distorts the correct perspective since, beyond certain limits, in certain areas, he acts only in interference or collaboration with other divine specialists more immediately interested, whereas in his central zone he operates directly. At the very time when we were treating Varuna as a sovereign god, elsewhere a large treatise was written on the agrarian and economic activities of the same character; and they were not wrong; but where is Varuna's *proper centre*? Is it in sovereignty or in fertility, which has no shortage of qualified divine representatives? Among the Germanic peoples, Odhinn seems to patronise magicians, royalty, some military activities, and several authors have emphasised his affinity with agriculture: again, where is his *centre?* Conversely, any specialist god, in certain circumstances, steps outside his domain and even takes on the airs of a sovereign god: thus Mars, the warrior, also takes care of the fields and livestock, to the point that   some historians of the religion Roman make of

livestock farming and agriculture as its primary function, while others, based on considerable evidence, see in *Mars Pater* the oldest Italic "great god" from whom *Jupiter* only later usurped some activities: here again, where is the *centre?*

These uncertainties and many others like them have led us to attempt to establish, before any further detailed investigation, the general framework and main features of Indo-European religion. And since, among semi-civilised peoples, the conception of the world and that of society, the hierarchy of gods and that of men are most often parallel, this research amounts to defining, both at the same time and indifferently, how the Indo-Europeans conceived the division and harmony of their social body and how they adjusted the provinces of their main gods. This is the work we undertook in 1937-1938[4]and to which we devoted the year 1940-1941.

<div align="center">*
* *</div>

VI. — *Comparative method and specific philologies.*

We will not set out the rules governing our approach here: what little needs to be said on the subject is explained in the Indo-European section of *Histoire des Religions* by Messrs Gorce and Mortier (Quillet publishers), which is still awaiting publication and from which we have also borrowed some of the above ideas.

Nor will we dwell on the difficulties we have encountered from either linguists or philologists: we have nothing but gratitude for both, for it is healthy that a new discipline,

and a method in formation should initially encounter resistance, attacks and insults. As almost everyone is acting in good faith, agreement is reached, with each party rectifying what was excessive or illusory in their positions and gaining a clearer awareness of their limitations and legitimate power. The nascent "comparative philology" has nothing but respect for the "separate philologies" which, for their part, are quicker than we dared hope to refrain from judging its place too harshly.

There is one point, however, that must be emphasised, for it is here that the most misunderstandings have arisen and may still arise. Many specialist philologists – Indianists, Latinists, etc. – consider it prudent and necessary to reserve comparison for a second stage of research; they intend first to deal with their files, assess the texts, interpret the various testimonies, compose a probable image of the most ancient, even prehistoric, forms of religion and, more generally, of the society that constitutes the subject matter of their philology, and to do so in complete sovereignty, using only internal and external criticism, informed by what they know, guess or sense of the genius of the people in question, as revealed to them by the philological study of the texts. Each of the specialists expects their peers, the specialists from other Indo-European provinces, to do the same. Once Indian, Latin, Germanic and other philologies have freely constructed an image of the most ancient forms of social life and religious representations of the various peoples they deal with distributively, *and only then*, will the comparatist be allowed to take these results and compare them, without having to significantly alter them using his own methods. They thus conceive of the work as superimposed layers and clearly distinct stages

: pure philology at the base, and "separate philologies" (in our case, "separate mythologies"); then, at the superstructure, comparison.

This programme is based on an understandable illusion: it was, after all, that of the Hellenists who, a century ago, were irritated by the intruders who were bizarrely called "comparative grammarians"; they had constructed, from within Greek, using Greek materials, plausible systems to explain the opposition between *esti* "he is" and *eisi* "they are", and these systems seemed to them far more reassuring than the "hypotheses" that recognised the Sanskrit opposition between *asti* "he is" and *santi* "they are" and the similar Latin and German oppositions between *est* and *sunt*, *ist* and *sind*. The comparatists were right, however. The same applies to our subject matter: it is not from within a particular Indo-European society that we can reliably determine what, in its mature state, stems from a more or less recent innovation and what has been retained from the ancestral heritage; it is not the historian of a particular Indo-European society who, based on what history alone teaches us, can conjecture about prehistory: in the balances he observes, the oldest elements are often reduced to very little and diverted from their original function; how, by what intuition, could he foresee and, above all, demonstrate their former scope and value? The comparatist, on the other hand, has an objective means of assessment: identifying coincidences between two related societies, and coincidences in groups rather than isolated ones. If we recognise, embedded in a specifically Indian equilibrium and a specifically Roman equilibrium, for example, a single series, sufficiently original,

of elements supporting homologous relationships between them, there is a presumption of antiquity for these elements, of inheritance from a common prehistory, and the more complex and delicate the group of elements considered, the stronger the presumption will be; if a third equilibrium, specifically Scandinavian or Irish, for example, presents the same group of singular elements, the proof is almost certain. Basically, the comparative method in religious matters is the same as in linguistic matters: it alone allows us to go back with confidence and objectivity into prehistory through the simultaneous use of archaïsmes (   ),   bizarreries (   ) and   (des "irregularities", say the grammarians), of all the traces which, here and there, within each particular equilibrium substituted for the common prehistoric equilibrium, bear witness to this distant past, but only on condition that they are cross-checked, confirmed, interpreted and sometimes restored from outside.

Consequently, comparison and a comparative mindset must be applied *from the outset*, from the moment sources are collected and assessed, and from the moment documents are read and classified. By proceeding in reverse, the isolated Indianist on the one hand and the isolated Latinist on the other risk constructing two images of the prehistory of their fields in which the common points will not then appear clearly, or will even have been neglected because of their apparent insignificance in the Indian historical balance and in the Roman historical balance. This has happened several times.

This observation is not meant to be presumptuous. The comparatist will also recognise his own weaknesses: simply because he is obliged to familiarise himself with a large number of specialities, he is not comfortable in any of them and is liable to make mistakes in the details of his reading, translations,

interpretations, in the use of bibliographies, and finally in the expression of those errors and clumsiness that, by corporate tradition, philologists love to celebrate joyfully. Even if he avoids these gross pitfalls, he remains in any case less well equipped than his philologist colleagues to exploit and push to its fullest consequences any principle of explanation for which he may have had the initial merit. The ideal would be to establish, as has been done in linguistics, a constant symbiosis between specialists and comparatists; and if ever a single man could combine both qualities and be entirely competent in all areas where comparison is required, perfection would be achieved. For now, let us content ourselves with mutual tolerance and assistance, which is already very close to association. Let the comparatist explore the subjects: philologists, if they are willing to take his outline seriously, will make better use of it than he himself.

*
* *

VII. — *Explanation of the book.*

Those who have been observing our work for several years will have no difficulty in following the progress of the present research. Given the providential circumstance mentioned above[5] , it is once again at the confluence of data from the Far East and the Far West that the first solid foundation on which we will build is formed: this book is devoted, for the most part, to clarifying and developing the analogy that can be observed between the triple hierarchy of Brahmanic society (priests, warriors, herders-farmers) and the triple hierarchy of the most august of the Roman priesthoods (flamines of Jupiter, Mars, Quirinus), with everything related to both

mythical and philosophical concepts, religious and political practices.

However, while Indian facts, as well as closely related Iranian facts, are well known and readily accessible, Roman facts, most of which are fossilised and poorly understood even by the ancients themselves, require lengthy treatment. We will therefore summarise in a single introductory chapter what needs to be known about Indian castes, Iranian classes and their religious and philosophical extensions, striving, at the risk of dryness, to highlight their systematic aspects. Then, in the light of these certain data, we will study the Roman survivals, gradually verifying that the analogy between the triple flaminate and the triple Indo-Iranian society is not external but essential.

We will thus first examine the three gods served by the three flamines, and the social and cosmic functions of these gods (Chapter II), then the situation of the three major flamines in religious and political life in historical times. This latter study, provided that it shows through a summary examination of the social organisation of the Celts that the social organisation of the Indo-Iranians remained closest to the common Indo-European type, will shed some light on the particular evolution of the pre- and proto-Romans, and will in particular give reasons to believe that the
"civic" conception of social life replaced a "classificatory" conception on the banks of the Tiber that was very similar to that of the Indo-Iranians, a conception of which the triple flaminate is only the priestly reflection and the most apparent vestige (chapter III).

This will lead us to investigate whether other vestiges of this functional class organisation remain, and in particular whether the three primitive tribes of Rome (Ramnes,

Luceres, Tities), which the ancients could no longer interpret, were not in fact based on the principle of functional classes: we believe that this can be verified with complete philological rigour (chapter IV).

But the Romans explained the union and collaboration of the Ramnes, Luceres and Tities by a legend, the famous abduction of the Sabine women and the war, followed by an agreement, between the Romans and the Sabines: from the perspective we are exploring, this legend is obviously not history, but a myth, in the sense defined [above6]; it is therefore worth considering whether, in other parts of the Indo-European domain, the collaboration of functional classes is not justified by comparable myths: this is indeed the case; the Germanic myth is even exactly superimposable on the Roman myth, and the Celtic and Indian myths are similar (chapter V).

The last two chapters (VI and VII) gather Roman traces of two other concepts related to functional classes in various Indo-European societies but which, in Rome, are irrevocably dissociated from them (ancestral brothers, talismans); they cannot claim to be as demonstrative as the previous ones. Finally, the conclusion, summarising all the results, raises several important questions without addressing them.

Our new readers may feel somewhat weary or irritated in following us, and we may seem to be tackling head-on or alternately mixing or crossing two different problems, or at least two different levels of the problem: first, an interpretation and systematisation of Roman documents concerning the oldest organisation of society, then a comparative reconstruction

of the social forms of the Indo-Europeans. They will be right, but they will quickly understand that this method is the only practicable one: the Roman data on origins can only be interpreted by reference to Indo-Iranian, Celtic, Germanic, or Indo-European facts that can be deduced by comparison; compensatorily, these same Roman data are necessary not only to complete but also to push Indo-European induction a little further. Each of the two approaches helps and conditions the other, with the "Indo-European dossier" providing the "Roman dossier" with means of comparative analysis, and the "Roman dossier" providing the "Indo-European dossier" with elements of synthesis that are also comparative. And these exchanges of services do not turn into a vicious circle, since neither dossier fraudulently returns to the other, naked and raw, the materials it has received, but offers them back in an elaborate form, enriched with extensions and valences that are both points of verification and starting points for development. Such is always, moreover, the originality of the comparative method: it does not advance towards certainty by a straight ascent, piling Ossa on Pelion or drawing theorems from one another in the form of a sliding ladder, but by a concerted set of oblique efforts, multiplying the bases, bringing together probabilities which, taken in isolation, would not hold.

Later, when Celtic, Germanic and other data have been interpreted with the same attention that is given here to the Roman domain, it will be possible to prepare a more harmonious, more unified and also more dogmatic presentation. At this stage, the shortcomings of the research cannot be concealed. May the spectacle of this misery inspire

charitable minds to take on some of the work that is unfinished or only just begun here!

Reflections on particular difficulties (pp. 182 ff.), side notes (e.g. pp. 115 and 194, notes on Irish and Roman "formulary") are inserted into the development; readers eager to reach a conclusion may skip them without inconvenience; others will gain a more accurate view of the subject.

<div align="center">*
*   *</div>

VIII. — *Comparative mythology and Roman history*.

The picture we paint of the early days of Rome and the meaning we attribute to the accounts in the first and second books of Livy sometimes surprise historians. However, we should hasten to note that they themselves, very wisely, mark the limits of their discipline or even formulate the complex questions that we attempt to address here through comparison   M. Carcopino, Mr Homo, on many occasions, have pointed out that origins elude the historical method *in the strict sense* and that, from within Roman history alone, a reliable critique of the earliest legends is hardly conceivable. Twenty years ago, Mr Piganiol showed that researching the origins of Roman society amounts to measuring the contribution of two elements: the indigenous people and the conquerors, the Mediterranean peoples who remained in place and the Indo-Europeans who came from the north.

One could not put it better. But these two elements are inaccessible to us in themselves, and even if their result is known, it is only known as modified by a long evolution: thus the historian is exposed to many illusions when he tries,

using only his own methods, to divide prehistory between the two. Our effort tends to fix at least one of the two elements, to provide a precise, objective image of the Indo-Europeans, in which each feature is duly justified.

The usefulness of such a service is no longer generally disputed. The difficulties arise from the fact that it necessarily transcends itself. From the distant Indo-European prehistory reconstructed by comparison, we bring systems of concepts, very precisely myths, which overlap too closely with certain legends relating to Roman origins for the coincidence to be fortuitous: these legends are therefore also, in the sense previously defined, myths. Such were, in a previous book, the legends about the lives and institutions of Romulus and Numa, and also the legends about the war of the Romans against Porsenna, both illustrating an old bipartite doctrine of sovereign action. Such are, in the present book, the legends about the first relations between the Romans and the Sabines, about Romulus and Tatius, about the abduction of the Sabines and the fusion of the peoples, all legends justifying the ancient functional tripartite division of Roman society.

Historians react. It is difficult for them not to see in these traditions about the royal era anything more than fictional accounts supporting concepts, customs, cults, and features of political or religious organisation that were more or less well preserved in later Rome. In particular, the relations between the Romans and the Sabines, this alliance between Romulus and Tatius, which Mr Piganiol recognises as a key event in the ancient history of the West, can they be dismissed as events, as *facts*, and seen only as the form taken in Rome by what, among the Germanic peoples, is presented as war, then the fusion of the Aesir gods and the Vanir gods

Vanes, that is to say, a traditional, pre-Roman narrative, dressed only in Roman clothing, justifying the coincidence, the collaboration within the same society of the upper classes (priests and warriors) and the rural class?

We cannot be both judge and jury. Looking comparatively at the data gathered here, we cannot in good conscience conclude otherwise than we do; we see no way of associating history with the explanation more generously than is done on pages 148 et seq. In making this admission, we willingly take into account the distortion or, if you will, the blindness that results in each of us from the legitimate but intensive application of a method. It is likely that, in a few years' time, either through mutual corrections or through the arbitration of third parties, the historians of Rome and ourselves will achieve what seems to us at present desirable but inconceivable: a *mythical and historical* interpretation of the legends that we courteously dispute. We know that good minds are working on this: sensitive to our reasons but freer than us and better equipped to use all the Roman data, men such as Mr Jean Bayet and

Mr Basanoff, will mark the departure from our rights and our excesses. For the moment, we did not even consider it useful to blunt the edge of a thought in progress: even if it meant provoking more intense resistance, we formulated as clearly as possible our solutions and the difficulties that others seem to encounter. The discussions that will follow, at least we hope, will be facilitated by this.

<div align="center">

*

*   *

</div>

IX. — *Transcriptions*.

The few quotations that have been made in ancient languages other than Latin and Greek are written in a very simplified form. Except in Latin, where we dare not go against custom, long vowels have been marked with a circumflex . *Italic* characters in a word written in *Roman* characters, and vice versa, mark particular phonemes: *th, dh* (Iranian, Old Norse) are equivalent to the voiceless and voiced spirant *th* in English; *kh, gh* (Iranian) are the voiceless (German ach-laut) and voiced (Berlin *g*) spirant gutturals; *t, d, n* (Sanskrit) are cacuminal consonants; *h* and *m* (Sanskrit) are the "visarga" (breath) and "anusvâra" (nasalisation of the preceding vowel); *sh* (Sanskrit, Iranian) is the French *ch* (a simple *c* also denoting the French *tch*); *r* (Sanskrit, Avestan, Indo-European) and *l* (Sanskrit, Indo-European) are *r* and *l* vowels. The asterisk *, as is customary in linguistics, precedes any reconstructed form.

1. See pp. 112 ff.

2. See our essays *Ouranos-Varuna*, 1934 (A. Maisonneuve); *Flamen-Brahman*, 1935 (Geuthner); *Mitra-Varuna, essay on two Indo-European representations of Sovereignty*, 1940 (Leroux).

3. H. Güntert, *Der arische Weltkönig und Heiland*, Halle, 1923; H. Lommel, *Die alten Arier, von Art und Adel ihrer Götter*, Frankfurt am Main, 1935; G. Widengren, *Hochgottglaube im alten Iran*, Uppsala and Leipzig, 1938.

4. See *La préhistoire des flamines majeurs*, in *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, CXVII, 1938, pp. 188–200.

5. See above, pp. 22 ff.

6. See above, pp. 15 ff.

7. However, the long vowel could not be marked in *Tyre* or at the beginning of proper names (*Odhinn*, *Aditya*).

CHAPTER ONE

The three Indo-Iranian social classes.

I. *Caste in ancient India*.

India is the land of castes par excellence. In even the smallest society, dozens of them coexist and oppose each other. Hereditary and closed off by the matrimonial system, they hold individuals in a network of obligations and prohibitions which, under the pretext of purity, paralyse them, separate them from most of their fellow human beings, and from which they cannot free themselves without losing their rank and risking their rights and opportunities.

This coagulated dispersion, which partly explains India's destiny, is certainly not a legacy of Indo-Iranian times. It formed, then intensified and became widespread over the centuries, sheltering only under the name of a very different traditional system: the division of every Aryan group into three *varnas*, three 'colours', three major castes if you will, corresponding to three distinct and hierarchical bodies whose collaboration is necessary for the life of society: firstly, the priests (*brâhmana*), then the warriors (*kshattriya* or *râjanya*), and finally the farmers and herders (*vaiçya*). It is only this three-caste system that will be discussed here, and not its subsequent ramifications.

If we disregard the first nine books of the Rig Veda, we can say that the tripartite division of *Aryan* society in India underlies all forms of literature, all modes of activity and all the conceptual mechanisms it reflects. A fourth, heterogeneous division is generally added to this, that of *the Shudras*, who are no longer *Aryans* but,

at least originally, indigenous people subjugated by the conquerors; they are juxtaposed with the other three groups only as a foil, to better highlight the essential unity of these sacrificers, these wielders of weapons, these providers of milk, meat and grain who, unequal among themselves, are equally and jointly the masters of all the rest. Finally, on the margins of the classification, shifting, free, sometimes despised, sometimes honoured, suspicious but necessary, there are also various kinds of artisans. We will not examine their unique situation here.

With varying degrees of certainty, the texts agree in presenting the three *Aryan* classes as "castes", already hereditary, impenetrable to marriage and fortune, closed and rigid. Very early on, a brief repertoire of legends recorded cases where an individual, bringing his descendants with him, was able to pass harmlessly from one caste to another: the conditions for these changes of equilibrium are so exceptional that they cannot constitute precedents for ordinary mortals. On the contrary, much more numerous traditions, accounts of catastrophic conflicts or commendable collaborations, establish that each man must remain in the caste into which he was born, observe its duties, and behave towards the other two according to rules laid down by the traditional code of precedence.

At certain times and in certain places, this hierarchy may have softened, if not been overturned: there are reasons to believe that the warrior caste, on more than one occasion and for varying lengths of time, before, during and after the Buddhist crisis, disputed the priestly caste's spiritual leadership of society. The great Indian epics, aristocratic literature, contain some expressions that elsewhere would be declarations of principle in this regard.

Given India's extraordinary ability to reconcile contradictions, and given the enormous volume of texts, these subversive expressions can be considered statistically and systematically negligible. With satisfactory approximation, we can therefore express the categories through which India has conceived its social life while remaining faithful to the tripartite formula.

The classic statement of this can be found, for example, at the beginning of *the Laws of Manu*[1]. It is worth noting the strong religious and moral bias of the entire system, with the second and third Aryan castes combining their specific functions of military service or rural labour with specific duties towards the gods and priests; as for the Shudras, their heterogeneity is striking:

"*He* [*the Creator*] *gave the* Brahmins *sacred teaching and study, the celebration of sacrifices for themselves and for others, the privilege of giving and receiving;*

"*The protection of the people, sacred giving, offering and study, and control of the senses are the lot of* the Kshatriya;

"*The protection of cattle, sacred giving, offering and study, trade, lending and ploughing belong to* the Vaiçya;

"*As for the* Çûdra, *the only task assigned to him by the Sovereign Master is to serve the preceding castes without offending them.*"

This formula, as we said, appears everywhere except in the first nine books of the Rig Veda, which are older than the tenth. Does this mean that the social tripartite division did not make its

appeared in India only at the dawn of history, that it is a specifically Indian creation, which can be dated, if not absolutely, at least in relation to the texts we read? Not at all. While no passage in the first books of the oldest hymnal presents the system as developed as this stanza in the last, they contain at least the seed of it, and more than the seed: witness the often-quoted verses of Rig Veda, IV, 50, 8, where *brahman, râj, viç*, that is to say, the very roots of the later names of the castes, are brought together, precisely in order to define their relationships and their precedence. And above all, a comparison with Iranian societies, the twin sisters of Vedic society, leaves no room for doubt: not in the form of rigid and impenetrable castes, of course, but as the ideal model for any society, in its legends even more than in its practice, Iran proposes, meditates on, refines and complicates this same triple figure of society that India took very seriously but certainly did not invent.

<p style="text-align:center">*</p>
<p style="text-align:center">*   *</p>

II. — *Social classes in ancient Iran.*

Nearly three quarters of a century ago, Fr. Spiegel highlighted this convergence of Iranian and Indian traditions[2]. But very recently, attention has been drawn back to the social classes of Iran, and several authors have taken an interest in the subject, adding to the documentation and improving the interpretation. despite some differences in detail, the significance and scope of which should not be exaggerated, they agree with each other and with Spiegel on the essentials, namely the antiquity and "Indo-Iranian" character of the system[3] .

Mazdean Iran, as reflected in texts from various periods and orientations, divides society into three

or four superimposed states, the fourth and last, where it appears, being formed by all the artisans. In the Avesta, with the exception of a single text that also mentions the Artisan, *hûiti*, there is only mention, in descending order of importance, of the Priest, *âthaurvan*, *âthravan*[4], the Warrior, *rathaê-shtar*[5], and the Breeder-Farmer, vâstryôfsh *uyant*[6].

The hymns known as *gâthâ*, which are the least clear but oldest parts of the Avestan compilation and which represent Zoroaster's own thinking, also recognise only the pure tripartite division, but with specific names[7]. In the first millennium AD, the Pahlavi texts generally refer to four classes, the first three bearing names that are scholarly adaptations (rather than spontaneous phonetic developments) of the Avestan names (*asrôn, arleshtar,* vâstryôsh), while craftsmen are referred to as hu-tukhsh, an authentically Pahlavi word meaning

"industrious". Finally, authors of the period who were of the Muslim faith and who drew their information from Pahlavi books, not all of which have been preserved, maintained the same tradition, sometimes with innovations that are easy to identify, such as replacing or supplementing the "pagan" priests with a class of scribes and bureaucrats[8]. One of the most reliable witnesses is the illustrious Persian poet Firdousi of the 10th[e] , the illustrious Persian poet Firdousi: under altered names, which Christensen and Benveniste have managed to restore to their true form, slavishly transcribed from Pahlavi, he recounts how the legendary king Djamshed (the *Yima* of the Avesta, the *Yama* of India) established a hierarchy of *asravân* or priests[9] , the *arteshtar* or warriors, the vâstryôsh or farmers, and the *hutukhshî* or artisans. Here is how Firdousi presents them[10] :

"*First, the class of those called* *asravân; *know that they are devoted to religious ceremonies.* [Djamshed] *separated them from the rest of the people and assigned them the mountains to celebrate their worship, to devote themselves to divine service and to stand before the luminous Sovereign.*

" *From the other side se placed those whom we call* *arteshtar. *They fight like lions, shine at the head of armies and provinces. It is through them that the royal throne is protected, through them that the glory of valour is maintained.*

"*Know that* *vâstryôsh *is the name of the third class. They pay homage to no one. They plough, plant and harvest themselves; no one reproaches them for what they eat. They are not serfs, though they are clothed in rags, and their ears are deaf to slander.*

"*The fourth is called* *hutukhshî. *Greedy and arrogant, they engage in all trades and their souls are always troubled.* "

A faithful witness to tradition, Firdousi still clearly contrasts the three upper classes, for which he has only temporal and moral praise, with the fourth, clearly considered disgraced and heterogeneous.

Whatever the nuances, and even the differences, between the forms that Zoroastrianism has taken in various eras, and whether Mr Nyberg is partially or fully correct in the radical thesis he has been developing since 1937, there is no doubt that all these testimonies, broadly speaking, form a single whole: the Persian and Arabic texts depend on the Pahlavi texts, which themselves depend on the Avestan texts, which, on this particular point, do not appear to be in conflict.

Mr Benveniste has just shown[1] that an inscription by the defeated king of Marathon, the Achaemenid Darius, independent of all our texts except for the religious milieu in which the oldest ones were formed, does not directly present the same division but — readers who delve further into this work will soon understand both the interest and the insignificance of this nuance — a parallel tripartite division of the risks facing society: "May Ahura-Mazdâh, says the king, protect this country from the enemy army, from poor harvests, from falsehood[12] ! " These are obviously the three scourges—invasion, famine, and impiety (lying being the greatest sin in all Mazdeism)—which, each threatening one of the three social functions and one of the three organs corresponding to them, together constitute the totality of foreseeable evil. If the Mazdeism of the Achaemenids is not Zoroastrian, this testimony alone proves that Zoroaster did not invent the tripartite conception of society. If, as has been argued recently, it was in fact a variety of Zoroastrianism that we learn about from the cuneiform archives of the Great Kings, Mr Benveniste's remark would certainly be of less interest; at the very least, it would guarantee that, even in Zoroastrianism, the tripartite division of society is a very ancient concept. In any case, the concordance between Indian and Iranian facts, each supporting the other, would dispel any doubts that might arise and compel us to go further back: Zoroaster and the whole of Iran on the one hand, and the Rig Veda and the whole of India on the other, merely maintained an earlier tradition, an Indo-Iranian conception of society.

*
* *

III. — *Social functions among the Scythians.*

A part of the Iranian world that had been neglected for too long has come to bear witness to the same thing with great precision: we are referring to the Scythians, those populations   that we   are forced   to call   strangely   the

"Europeans of Iranian descent" since their language is indisputably linked to the dialects spoken mainly in Iran and since, equally indisputably, they were already settled in Europe and had long been separated from their Asian cousins when the Great King imprudently attacked them and when, a little later, the excellent Herodotus described their customs and recorded some of their fables.

These restless peoples, known, feared and sometimes admired in the Greco-Roman world and our Christian Middle Ages under the names of Scythians and Sarmatians, then Alans and Roxolani, did not, like the Persians or Parthians, found a lasting empire or leave any written monuments. However, we can learn about them in two ways: firstly, through the ethnographic notes that ancient authors, notably Herodotus in his fourth book, devoted to them; and secondly through the abundant and original treasure trove of epic tales preserved to this day by a Caucasian people who are the authentic heirs of the Alans, the Osses or Ossetians, some of whom still call themselves the *Iron*, which, strictly speaking, means "Iranians" or *Aryans*. Now, a legend recorded by Herodotus and confirmed by modern Ossetian traditions asserts that this aberrant colony of the Indo-Iranian group "conceived" its social structure according to the same formula as the other two. This point must be examined carefully, firstly because it is the newest element in an old dossier, because it confirms the pan-Iranian character of the tripartite social conception, and also   because   a   detail   of the interpretation   raises   a

difficulty that is undoubtedly only apparent and will be discussed later.

According to Herodotus (IV, 5-6), this is how the Scythians described the origins of their nation, "the youngest in the world": "The first man to appear in their country, which until then had been deserted, was named Targitaos; he was said to be the son of Zeus and a daughter of the river Borysthenes (now the Dnieper)... He himself had three sons, Lipoxais (variant Nitoxais), Arpoxais and, lastly, Koloxais. During their lifetime, golden objects fell from the sky onto the land of Scythia: a plough, a yoke, an axe and a cup. At this sight, the eldest hurried to pick them up; but when he arrived, the gold began to burn. He withdrew and the second son stepped forward, but without any more success. The first two having thus renounced the burning gold, the third son arrived, and the gold went out. He took it with him and his two brothers, seeing this sign, abandoned the entire kingship to their youngest brother. From Lipoxaïs were born those of the Scythians who are called the race (γένος) of *the Aukhalai;* from the second brother Arpoxaïs, those who are called *Katiaroi* and *Traspies* (var. *Trapies, Trapioi*); and from the last, the king, those who are called *Paralalai;* but all together they are called *Skolotoi* after the name of their king; *Skythai* is the name given to them by the Greeks. Herodotus adds a little further on that, in his time, these objects were solemnly paraded through the Scythian kingdoms every year.

The celestial and royal gold that descends at the moment when society is organised and which the kings later keep carefully is neither a shapeless block nor a random object; it materialises in four significant objects: a *plough*, a *yoke*, an *axe* and a *cup*. What are these if not the instruments and emblems of the main social activities, the very ones that form the basis of the Indo-Iranian class system?

Let us leave the yoke aside for the moment: the plough is undoubtedly associated with agriculture; the axe, along with the bow, is the national weapon of the Scythians[13] ; as for the cup that descends from the sky, it is likely to have sacred value, to be a liturgical or magical instrument. On this last point, there are many and varied assumptions; first of all, there is the extreme importance of drink offerings in Indo-Iranian and already Indo-European worship; above all, there is the importance of the cup in the myths and rituals of the Scythians themselves: for example, in the second legend that Herodotus recounts about their origin[(14)] , Heracles gives the mother of his sons a bow and a golden cup tied together; elsewhere, mention is made of the annual feast of the Scythian warriors[15] , a feast at which cups of honour are used to distinguish those who have killed enemies from those who have not; a little further on[(16)]   there is mention of the colossal bronze vase, obviously religious, which King Ariantas is said to have had made and consecrated at a place called the Holy Roads, between the Borysthenes and the Hypanis. Finally, the Osses also know that their heroes of ancient times, whom they call the Nartes (and who live, in legends, in the manner of the Scythian ancestors), shared a marvellous cup (the *Nart-amonga* or *Uasamonga* "Revealer of Nartes"), from which one could draw indefinitely without ever emptying it, or which filled itself as soon as it was empty, or which carried itself to the mouths of the most valiant, and some accounts describe the rivalries of the principal Nartes heroes for the possession or custody of this common treasure[17]. All these ritual cups suggest a value similar to that of the burning golden cup that fell from the sky in the time of the sons of Targitaos: alongside the instruments of agriculture and combat, it was the instrument par excellence of worship and magic that descended at that solemn hour.

While the symbolism of the legend is clear, a slight uncertainty remains because Herodotus lists four objects for three functions. Mr Christensen, who was the first to interpret it correctly in 1918, reduces the four objects to a triad by considering the yoke and the axe as the characteristics of two types of warriors, one fighting on a chariot and the other on horseback. Without being able to provide proof, it seemed more satisfactory to us not to separate the yoke from the plough and to attribute it, like the plough, to farmers. Mr Benveniste (1938) agreed with our opinion, supporting it with philological reasons that are not yet demonstrative. However, a variant of Herodotus' account, which neither Mr Christensen, Mr Benveniste nor ourselves have yet used, puts an end to the debate: in the speech in which the Scythians seek to dissuade the great Alexander from attacking them, Quintus Curtius Rufus inserts the following sentence: "Know that we have received gifts: a yoke of oxen, a plough, a spear, an arrow, a cup; we use them with our friends and against our enemies. To our friends we give the fruits of the earth that the oxen's labour provides us with; with them we also offer libations of wine to the gods; as for our enemies, we attack them from afar with arrows and from close up with spears" (*Dona nobis data sunt, ne Scytharum gentem ignores, jugum boum, aratrum, hasta, sagitta, paiera. His utimur et cum amicis et adversus inimicos: fruges amicis damus, boum labore quaesitas; paiera cum iisdem vinum diis libamus; inimicos sagitta eminus, hasta comminus petimus*). It is not known where Quinte-Curce got this detail: it is certainly not from Herodotus, as the detail is too different and it would be difficult to understand the substitution of the arrow and spear for the axe in the original text. But wherever it comes from, whether from an ethnographic historian other th   r Herodotus   and   now   lost   or   from a   account

from Alexander's companions, Quinte-Curce's testimony contains several lessons: firstly, since ancient times and undoubtedly according to the interpretation of the Scythians themselves, their "sacred objects", whatever their number, were understood as symbols and accessories of three social functions (the cup for religion, two weapons for battle, two ploughing tools for agriculture); secondly, the yoke must indeed be interpreted as a plough yoke and not as a war chariot yoke; finally, we must not overemphasise the details of the texts, in particular we must not attach more importance to the duality of agricultural tools (in Herodotus and Quinte-Curce) than to that of weapons (in Quinte-Curce alone)[18].

Earlier, we mentioned a fragment of the epic tales that the Ossetians have preserved about their heroes of ancient times, the Narts. They know that these heroes were divided into three "families", each with its own speciality: one of farmers, one of intellectuals, and one of warriors. Here, for example, is a phrase taken from popular tradition, which a learned Ossetian, Mr Tuganov, was right to highlight: "The Boriatä were rich in herds; the Alägatä were strong in intelligence; the Akhsärtägkatä distinguished themselves by their heroism and vigour, they were strong men"[19]. This is exactly the Indo-Iranian state of affairs in its clearest and simplest form, with livestock farming not yet having given way to agriculture. The details of the epic tales broadly justify this tradition. The "intellectual" character of the Alägatä takes on a particularly archaic form: they are ignorant of wars and exploits and appear only in one circumstance, albeit a frequent one; it is in their house that the solemn drinking parties of the Nartes take place, those drinking parties where the

miracles of the Magic Cup occur and the prestige of the chiefs is made and unmade. Among all semi-civilised peoples and some others (notably the Persians, according to Herodotus), drinking parties and wisdom go hand in hand, and the Brahmins who organise the soma orgies help us to understand the Narte alliance between the cup and the spirit.

*
*   *

IV. — *Theory and practice.*

Thus, without any discernible influence of one on the other, the three great provinces of the Indo-Iranian world are familiar with the principle of social division into priests, warriors and herders-farmers. This means that they inherited it from their prehistory.

To what extent did the principle influence practice? India is the only country to have truly based its social organisation on it. Even so, this hardening of attitudes seems to have taken place only at the dawn of historical times. The Iran known to the Greeks and Romans was indeed ruled by a powerful priestly class, but the rest of society does not appear to have evolved into castes, or even clearly defined classes. In the Avestan books, the verses that speak of the tripartite division give the impression of rhetorical formulas rather than references to a living mechanism, and this feeling persists for all the epochs, even, it seems, for the religious 'restoration' of the early Sassanid reigns. As for the functional division of the Scythians, it is this that has given rise to the discussions referred to above, which we will leave for further examination[20]; but it can readily be acknowledged at this stage that, even if the sons of Targitaos are to be understood as ancestors of

"classes" rather than "peoples", these classes do not seem to have played a greater role in real life than in Iran.

Was the common prehistoric state of affairs closer to the Indian state than to the Iranian state? Yes, undoubtedly, since India did not undergo the early and profound reforms that undeniably took place in Iran. But it is impossible to be more precise. While this conclusion may disappoint the historian, the mythologist has what is essential for him: he knows how these societies, whatever they may have been, never ceased to represent their ideal structure.

<p style="text-align:center">*
*   *</p>

V. — *Classes, functions and their gods.*

It must be added immediately: and the order of the world. Even the least philosophical of the so-called "primitive" peoples cannot conceive of their social being without at the same time conceiving, in homologous and interdependent systems , the other real or conceptual organisms of their experience and also the universe that contains them all. India, since its earliest reflections, has never ceased to meditate on trinitarian harmonies, and there are specific reasons to believe that this game began much earlier.

Behind the three social organs, she has always clearly defined, in the abstract and in concrete terms, their three *functions;* witness this stanza from the Rig Veda, VIII, 71, 12, a stanza and hymn to Agni that Mr. Benveniste has just very aptly commented on: the god is invoked for all imaginable help; this generality is expressed by the formula:
"Agni in prayers first, Agni in battle, Agni for the prosperity of the field!" (agnim *dhîshu prathamam, agnim arvaty,* agnim *kshaitrâya sâdhase*). With a

and nuances in the use of cases (the locative for the first two Goods, a dative of intention for the third), this is the positive counterpart of the tripartite analysis of Evil that we read earlier, in Old Persian, on an inscription by Darius ("the enemy army, the bad harvest, the lie") and which Mr. Benveniste has pointed out as an echo in a Vedic ritual treatise, where the same Agni is prayed to protect the sacrificer "from subjection, from error in sacrifice, from bad food". Good administration of sacred Energy and Knowledge, of Warrior Vigor, of Fertility, — Magical and legal Power, Victory, Abundance: such has been, from the beginning, the "watchword" of these societies, just as the hierarchical subordination of Priests, Warriors and Breeders-Farmers is their "formula of composition".

Then, behind these social bodies and their functions, watching over and protecting them, there are important *deities* who naturally vary throughout the ages and also, within the same era, according to the intentions of ritualistic and rationalising priests who have a large number of gods at their disposal and the ability to imagine others without limit (Brhaspati, etc.): ancient India entrusts the administration of the Sacred as such to a couple of great sovereign gods, *Mitra* and *Varuna* (often, in dual form, *Mitra-varunâ*), Mitra representing the legal, regulated, exact aspect of operations, while Varuna represents the magical, inspired, terrible aspect[21]. The administration of Warrior Vigor is the work of the dazzling god *Indra* and a divine figure who may have been autonomous at first but who, from the earliest hymns, is almost confused with him, *Vrtrahan* ("the Destroyer of Resistance" or "the Slayer of Vrtra"). As for Fertility, Abundance and Wealth, they have less stable patrons

stable, more numerous, and often collective (a group of deities designated by a common name: the *Viçvedevâh*

"All the Gods", or the "Marut", etc.), which cannot be defined so quickly. From human sacrifice to the most humble offerings, there are many "groups" in Vedic rituals and commentaries where the deities representing the whole or the essence of the world or society are classified according to the human groups or interests they patronise. One of the most archaic of these analytical and exhaustive formulas is found at the beginning of a ritual that is important among all others: the preparation of the *ahavanîya* fire altar, which alone occupies three of the fourteen books of *the Çatapatha Brâhmana* and is considered equivalent to Creation. one of the first operations consists of 'ploughing' the chosen site: the officiant makes four symbolic furrows at right angles (SW-SE, SW-NW, NW-NE, NE-SE, without ever turning his back to the east) with the plough; the opening of each furrow is accompanied by the same formula inviting the

"cow of abundance" to satisfy the needs of all living things, and this prayer is made with reference to what could be called   les   " dieux   caractéristiques "   (for, as   says   le   texte,

"Agriculture is (profitable) to all the deities"):

"Produce (like milk) their desires, cow of abundance, to Mitra-Varuna, to Indra, to the two Açvin, to Pûshan, to creatures and [plants]!" Like the first class by Mitra-Varuna and the Warriors by Indra, the Breeders-Farmers are represented here by the two *Açvin*, also called *Nâsatyâ*, the third divine estate, doctors of the gods, givers of health and fertility[23] , and by Pûshan, god of herds and specialist in abundance[24] .

This grouping formula is venerable: through its first four terms, it not only recalls the fact that, in

the soma sacrifice, the three offerings of the first pressing are consecrated successively — the "couple" framework being generalised this time and Indra taking the lead — to *Indra-Vâyu*, *Mitra-Varuna*, and the two *Açvin*, but we can be sure that it dates back to the distant Aryan past. In the[14th]century BCE, the future conquerors of the Punjab and India, still in the process of migration, came into contact with a powerful empire in Asia Minor, that of the Hittites, of which we still have some cuneiform archives. A treaty was concluded. The king of the Hittites and the king of the Aryans of Mitanni each swore by their gods. Those invoked by the Aryans are precisely, and in the expected hierarchical order, Mitra-Varuna, then Indra, then the Ashvins under their old name of Nâsatyâ: (ilani) *Mi-it-ra-ash-shi-il* (ilani) *U-ru-w-na-sh-shi-el* (ilu) *In-da-ra* (ilani) *Na-sha-at-ti-an-na*[25]. The king thus commits the society he presides over to the utmost: the two gods of legal and magical power, then the god of victorious strength, then a pair of lesser gods associated with fertility represent, at his side, the priests, warriors, herders and farmers, that is to say, 'the whole' of the Arya.

Early reformed Mazdean Iran made the Indo-Iranian Ind-(a)ra and Nâsatyâ into archdemons, and the name Varuna disappeared; only the ancient gods *Mithra* (Sanskrit *Mitra*) and *Vrthragna* (Sanskrit *Vrtrahan*) remain. On the other hand, the great god *Ahura Mazdâh* is surely only a periphrastic designation for Varuna (the Indian Varuna is also *the Asura*, "the Lord" par excellence) and, moreover, a fairly common Avestan compound, *Mithra-Ahura*, exactly parallel to Sanskrit *Mitravarunâ*, attests that Iran, before Mazdeism, before subordinating Mithra to Ahura Mazdâh, knew the pair of equal Sovereign Gods that we still see functioning freely in the Veda. As for

as for *Vrthragna*, he continues, under Ahura-Mazdâh and alongside Mithra, to patronise victory and its agents, the warriors. But no Avestan formula recalls the tetrad of the Arya of Mitanni.

Mr Schaeder[26] , followed by Mr Nyberg in a series of landmark articles[27] , showed that Iran's other major religion, Zervanism, was no less ancient than Mazdeism and originated from a different, undoubtedly more conservative interpretation of the common ancient Iranian heritage. There were also mixtures and compromises between the two orthodoxies, and the Avesta bears numerous traces of this. However, in the first century BCE, Antiochus I of Commagene, a ruler who practised what Mr Nyberg aptly calls "Zervanising Mazdeism", erected statues to four deities, which an accompanying inscription defines both by their Iranian names and by one or more Greek synonyms. These are: 1) *Zeus-Oromazdes* (i.e. Ahura-Mazdâh), 2) *Apollo-Mithras* (i.e. Mithra)-Helios-Hermes, 3) *Artagnès* (i.e. Vrthragna)-Heracles-Ares, 4) "my homeland Commagene, which nourishes all". Under the pair of sovereign gods thus appears the warrior god, then a local and collective goddess described as a nurturer: this is again, with impressive fidelity, the old tetrad by which, just now, the Arya of Mitanni, then the Arya of India, summarised their tripartite society for us. This inscription from Commagene, so conservative, may lead us to wonder whether the Zervanite and Manichean tetrads, whose similarity has been demonstrated by Schaeder and Nyberg, do not more or less directly date back to this Indo-Iranian prehistory. We are thinking in particular of the Manichean tetrad which, under a Great God (Bagh, *Zarvân* or *Allâh* depending on the language, Pahlavi or Arabic, of the documents)

and his Light (Pahlavi *rôshn*, Arabic *nûr*), still ranks his Power (Pahlavi *zôr*, Arabic *qûwa*) and an entity representing the whole Church.

<p style="text-align:center">*
*   *</p>

VI. — *Society, the universe and colours.*

Through a classificatory process comparable to that of Chinese thought, India has related the three organs of society, their functions and their gods to all kinds of hierarchies.

These relationships, sometimes childish, sometimes meaningful, range from Vedic metres and melodies to the woods used to make walking sticks or bowls, and from species of livestock to organs of the body, providing material for speculation in subsequent ages and continuing to proliferate. We will have many opportunities to cite this or that correspondence. Let us limit ourselves here to two, one profound, the other more superficial, for which Iran offers an equivalent and which must undoubtedly be attributed to the oldest Aryan speculation.

Classical India associates the three, or, when the çûdra are included, the four castes with the three gunas or 'qualities', which were originally the 'elements', or more precisely the 'threads (to be woven)", and whose intertwining, according to Samkhya philosophy, forms the fabric of being: *sattva, rajas, tamas*, which in philosophical language can be translated as Goodness, Passion, Darkness, which by juxtaposition or composition constitute all reality, or rather all appearance. In a fine article in *the Journal Asiatique*[28], Émile Senart gave the most serious reasons for thinking that the gunas are an ancient concept and that, before any abstraction, they concretely and mythically designated the three superimposed zones and

unevenly lit parts of the universe that are already familiar to Vedic hymns, *sattva* being the luminous sky, *rajas*[29] being the subdued light of our horizon, our immediate atmosphere, and *tamas*[30] finally being the dark, subterranean part of the world. Very early on, and even directly, without the intervention of the three gunas, Indian speculation placed the three social states in parallel with the three zones of the universe: as early as *Rg Veda*, X, 90, in this archetypal text describing the genesis of castes from the dismembered body of the primordial human victim (the Male, *Purusha*), the castes are born superimposed (str. 12): the Brahmins come out of the victim's mouth, the warriors from his arms, and the farmers from his thighs (or, in a variant, *Atharva Veda*, XIX, 6, 6, "from the middle"). And then, in parallel, the three superimposed parts of the world are born (str. 14): the distant sky (dyauh) is born from the head, the air of the zone where we live (*antariksha*) is born from the navel, and the earth (*bhûmi*) is born from the feet. In the *Çatapatha Brâhmana* (II, 1, 4, 11 ff.), the creator produces things and beings in triads, using three magic words: bhûh!

"earth", bhuvah! "atmosphere", *svar!* "sky"; naturally, the first triad created is that of the named things: Earth-Atmosphere-Sky ("because, the text adds, these worlds form the Whole"), and the second that of the

"Principles of social classes": *Brahman* (neutral), *Kshattra Viç* (it should be noted that the relationship between worlds and classes is reversed here and less satisfactory: *Brahman* is born from the word "Earth", *Viç* is born from the word "Heaven"). India will quickly nuance and complicate this immediate harmony with twists and turns: for example, the triad of Heaven-Atmosphere-Earth will still be found in symmetry with the triad *of Brahman-Kshattra-Viç* when we realise that both are "related" to triads such as the three Vedas or the three letters of the sacred syllable ôm (*a-u-m*).

More superficial, but nevertheless important since it justifies the name "colours" (*varna*) constantly given to the castes, we note the attribution of a characteristic colour to each caste: white is the Brahmin (and, indeed, the Brahmin wears white clothes: Manu, IV, 35), red is the Kshatriya warrior, yellow is the Vaishya herdsman and farmer, and, when it appears here, black is the non-Aryan Shudra. The Indians surely felt between these colours and not only the castes but also the gunas just mentioned, a relationship that was at least symbolic, which later texts state or suggest: red, in particular, was interpreted as "passionate", as "blood red", black as a sensitive translation of *the lamas,* which contrasts with the serene clarity of *sattva*. Should these poetic reflections be traced back to Indo-Iranian times?

A "Mazdean Zervanite" text, whose importance was demonstrated by M. Nyberg[31] and, after him, M. Geo Widengren[32], associates the tripartite division of society (priests, warriors, peasants) and social "missions" (wisdom, combat, food), the cosmic tripartition (the luminous and uncreated sky where God initially resides, the atmosphere, the earth) and finally the functional symbolism of colours (white for priests, probably red for warriors, blue for peasants). Here is an excerpt from the *Bundahishn* in M. Nyberg's French translation:

"Ormuzd himself donned a white garment (*spêt*), the robe worn by priests (*brahmak i âsrônîh*), for all wisdom resides in priests, who guide all men and from whom the world learns. Ormuzd's own work was creation; but creation can only be achieved through wisdom; that is why he donned the garment of the wise, which is that of the priests.

"He also donned the good atmosphere (*vâi i vêh*), a robe of gold and silver adorned with precious stones and all kinds of red colours *(? âlgônakân)*, the garment of warriors (*brahmak i artêshtârîh*), whose task is to pursue enemies in order to crush adversaries and protect creatures. It is as it is said: The proper work of the atmosphere is to chase away the antagonists who are found in both creations, in that created by the Holy Spirit as well as in that created by the Evil Spirit. (Thus Ormuzd clothed himself in the atmosphere) so that, leading his troops into battle, it would favour the creation of Ormuzd by destroying that of the Evil Spirit...

"... Ormuzd also donned blue clothing (khshênen), the garment worn by peasants (*brahmak i vâstryôshîh*); for their specific mission is to provide the earthly world (*gêhân*) with good food. This is because peasants were created to duly exploit the earthly world."

These similarities in both the general structure and the details of the parallels (with the difference in colour for the peasant: blue in Iran, yellow in India) can only be explained if the sacred science of the undivided Aryas had already determined the cosmic and conceptual resonances of the social tripartition: Vedic and post-Vedic Indians, Mazdean or Zervanite Iranians owe them not only their taste for philosophy but also the frameworks and, in part, the very substance of their philosophy[33].

1. I, stanzas 88-91.

2. *Eranische Altertumskunde*, III, 1878, pp. 551 ff.

3. A. Christensen, *The First Man and the First King in the Legendary History of the Iranians, Lundell Oriental Archives*, XIV, 1, Uppsala, 1918, pp. 137 ff.; 2, Leiden, 1934, pp. 47, 67, 102; G. Dumézil, *The Indo-Iranian Prehistory of Castes, Journal Asiatique*, 1930, 1, pp. 109-130; E. Benveniste, *Social Classes*

social classes dans la tradition avestique, J. As., 1932, 2, pp. 117-134; *Les Mages dans l'ancien Iran, Publ. de la Soc. des Et. Iran.*, n° 15, 1938, pp. 6-13; *Traditions indo-iraniennes sur les classes sociales, J. As.*, 1938, 2, pp. 529-550; H. S. Nyberg, *Die Religionen des alten Iran*, Leipzig, 1938, pp. 89-91.

4. Cf. one of the Vedic priests, *the Atharvan*.

5. Literally "chariot driver": cf. Vedic *rathé-shthâ*, an epithet exclusive to the warrior god Indra.

6. From *vastra* "pasture, agriculture, peasantry" and fshu- "to have cattle": Sanskrit *paçu*, Latin *pecu*(*s*), etc.

7. Benveniste, *J. As.*, 1932, pp. 121 et seq.

8. *J. As.*, 1930, 1, pp. 111–112.

9. According to Mr Christensen's reconstruction, more probable than the reading of the manuscripts preserved and interpreted by Mr Benveniste, *âmûzyân*.

10. Translation by Mohl modified by M. Benveniste, *J. As.*, 1932, 2, pp. 132-133.

11. *J. As.*, 1938, 2, p. 543.

12. *Imâm dahyâum Ahuramazdâ pâtuv hacâ hainâyâ hacâ dushiyârâ hacâ draugâ.*

13. Cf. Herodotus, VII, 64.

14. IV, 9-10.

15. IV, 66.

16. IV, 81.

17. See our *Légendes sur les Nartes*, Paris, 1930, pp. 136 ff.

18. M. Benveniste writes about the objects listed by Herodotus (*art. cit.*, p. 532): "Such clearly symbolic material cannot include useless objects: the nature of symbols is to express only the essential." Quintus Curtius's variant proves that this requirement is excessive; there can be redundant symbolism, and we will soon find other examples of this (p. 227).

19. See *J. As.*, 1930, 1, pp. 136 ff.

20. See below, pp. 150 ff.

21. See our *Mitra-Varuna, essay on two Indo-European representations of sovereignty*, 1940.

22. *Çatapatha Brâhmana*, VII, 2, 2, 12 = *Vâjasaneyi Samhitâ*, XII, 72.

23. See below, p. 176.

24. Pûshan perhaps more accurately represents, at the bottom of the social hierarchy, the çûdra, cf. *Çatapatha Brâhmana*, XIV, 4, 2, 25.

25. Forrer, *Zeitschr. d. deutsch. morgenländ. Ges.*, 1922, pp. 250 ff.

26. *Urform und Fortbildungen des manichäischen Systems*, Leipzig, 1927, pp. 135 ff.

27. *Questions de cosmogonie et de cosmologie mazdéennes, Journal Asiatique*, 1929, 1931.

28. 1915, 2, pp. 151 ff. *Rajas and the Indian theory of the three gunas;* cf. *La théorie des gunas et la Chândogyaupani shad*, *Etudes Asiatiques*, II, 1925, pp. 285 ff.

29. The same word as the Greek *Erebus*, the Armenian *erek* 'evening' and the *Rökr* "twilight" in Scandinavian mythology: Indo-European *$reg^w es$-.

30. Cf. Russian *tëmnyj* 'dark', etc.

31. *J. As.*, 1929, 1, p. 230 ff.

32. *Hochgottglaube im alten Iran*, in *Upsala Universitets Arsskrift*, 1938, 6, pp. 207, 210, 247 ff.

33. Cf., in a completely different vein, J. Przyluski, *Une cosmogonie commune à l'Inde et à l'Iran, Journ. Asiat.*, 1937, 2, pp. 481 ff.

CHAPTER II

Jupiter, Mars, Quirinus.

I. — *Râj and Brahman, Rex and Flamen Dialis.*

Social tripartition was therefore common to the Indo-Iranians before their dispersion. Did it not go back even further? Was it not a family tradition preserved from Indo-European ancestors?

The dossier that has just been briefly reviewed provides some clues in this regard. In India, the primary social function is dual in nature, with omnipotence being both magical and legal, and it is presided over by a divine couple: the magician *Varuna* and the jurist *Mitra*. This same bipartite conception of omnipotence dominates all Indo-European mythologies: consider, among the Germanic peoples in particular and among the Romans, the pairs of antithetical and complementary gods or sovereign heroes such as *Odhinn* and *Tyr* (*Wôdhanaz* and *Tîwaz*), *Romulus* and *Numa, Jupiter* and *Dius Fidius*, and also to the pairs of legal concepts, ritual scenarios, moral behaviours, epic or pseudo-historical narratives that echo them in literature and in life. If the first of the three Indo-Iranian social functions so clearly dates back to Indo-European times, is not the same true of the entire system?

Another comparative consideration, both linguistic and sociological, points in the same direction. The social system of the oldest Indians is presided over by the *râj* or *râjan* 'king', and the first of the three castes is that of *the brâhmana*, a word derived from the older *brahman*. These are two Indo-European words, the first of which is found in Rome (*rêg-*) as well as among the Celts (Gaulish *rîg-;* Old Irish *rîg-*, in the nominative singular *rî*), and

the second only in Rome (*flamin-*). It has also been shown[1] that the very close relationship between *the* Roman *rex* and the highest-ranking of the flamines, the *flamen dialis*, is reminiscent of that recognised in India between any *râj* and his domestic Brahmin: these concordances define a dual organ, whose constituent parts, connections, functions and names (*rêg-, *bhlgh-(*s*)men-) date back to Indo-European. Since neither the *râj* nor the Brahmin can be separated from the three-caste system, the certain antiquity of their names and relationships constitutes a second presumption as to the pre-Indo-Iranian, already Indo-European, origin of the social tripartite division.

Therefore, based on a methodological principle that has been repeatedly justified by experience, it is in the far west of the Indo-European world, among the Italiotes and the Celts, that we should first look for the closest counterparts of any element or system presumed to be archaic that we have first observed in the far east, among the Indo-Iranians: we have read [above2] the reasons for this eccentric distribution of survivals. And since it is in Rome that, alongside the *rex* and under the *rex*, a group of priests appears, the *flamines*, whose name is the phonetic equivalent of the Sanskrit *brahman*, let us provisionally neglect the Celts and question the Romans. But first, let us situate the Brahmin completely in relation to *the râj* and both in relation to the three castes, for the Brahmin chaplain of the Vedic king (*purohita*), no more than the *flamen dialis* associated with the Roman king, exhausts the "type" of his priesthood: the *brâh-manyam* and the *flamonium*, taken as a whole, are not defined solely by reference to the *râjyam* and the *regnum*.

The Indian pair *râj-purohila*, 'king-chaplain', naturally draws its two components from the social hierarchy,

since this constitutes the whole of society. But these components are not taken at the same level.

The *râj* is, in principle, only a *râjanya*, that is, a man of the warrior class, extracted from that class by the royal anointing given to him successively and in descending order of dignity by the representatives of the three classes; The word "removed" is only accurate, like any word applied to things in India, in a statistical sense, because in many respects the king remains linked to the second class, and his relationship with his subjects in the first class, the Brahmins, gives rise to contradictory statements and rituals: during the anointing ceremony itself, the consecrating Brahmins present their new king to the crowd and proudly add: "Our king, we Brahmins, is Soma (the personified sacrificial liquor)!" By doing so, they intend to escape the duty of submission. But another part of the ritual symbolically promotes the king to the status of Brahmin, which allows him to be extracted from it, to transcend it, to dominate it along with the rest of the world. And epic literature, though full of declarations about the primacy and superhuman nature of Brahmins, nonetheless often presents the king as superior to the whole of society, including the priesthood.

As for the Brahmins, they are doubly committed to the caste system: first, because they are at its head, and second, because the sacred science, both theoretical and applied, over which they have a monopoly, contains its justification and ensures its proper functioning. In particular, they provide not only the permanent "double", the king's chaplain, but also the priest required for any sacrifice offered by any Aryan sacrificer of any caste.

II. — The ordo sacerdotum *and the three major flamines*.

Roman society, as far back as we can trace it, is of such a different type that it seems futile to look for any seed or remnant of social classes defined by their function. But let us quickly seize upon a mechanism which, although not related to the division of society, nevertheless offers a striking analogy with the Indian caste system and social functions.

The *rex-flamen dialis* pair is not isolated either. While it does not establish a social hierarchy, it forms the head of a priestly hierarchy, whose immutable order is known to us through a tradition that is undoubtedly ancient and defined — an archaic feature.

— by the precedence to be observed during feasts; this is *the ordo sacerdotum* as described in detail by the lexicographer Festus (*s. v.*): *Maximus videtur rex, dein Dialis, post hunc Martialis, quarto loco Quirinalis, quinto pontifex maximus. Itaque in convivio solus rex supra omnes accubat. Licet Dialis supra Martialem et Quirinalem; Martialis above the next; all above the pontiff. Rex because he is the most powerful; Dialis because he is the priest of the whole world, who is called Dium; Martialis because Mars is the parent of the city's founder; Quirinalis because he is the partner of the Roman Empire, Curibus adscito Quirino; pontifex maximus because he is the judge and arbiter of divine and human affairs.* "It is the *rex* who is regarded as the greatest (of priests), then comes the *flamen Dialis*, after him the *Martialis*, in fourth place the *Quirinalis*, in fifth the *pontifex maximus*. Also, at a meal, the *rex* sits alone above all the priests; the *Dialis* above the *Martialis* and the *Quirinalis;* the *Martialis* above the latter

; and all of them above the *pontifex*: the *rex*, because he is the most powerful; the *Dialis* because he is the priest of the universe, called *Dium;* the *Martialis* because *Mars* is the father of the founder of Rome; the *Quirinalis* because *Quirinus* was called from Cures to be associated with the Roman Empire; the *pontifex maximus* because he is the judge and arbiter of divine and human affairs. If we reserve the fifth rank for the *pontifex maximus*, whose case must be examined separately (it seems that in Rome the *pontiffs*, technicians of an important **art3**, took on the aspect "sacred science" of the highest priesthoods, leaving the flamines with only the aspect of "sacrifice", whereas the Brahmins, like the Druids, combine the two), and if we disregard the *rex* who presides over them all simply *quia polentissimus*, we are left with the system of the three major flamines, defined by the three gods they serve, *Dium* (usually, in the animate gender, *Jupiter*), *Mars, and Quirinus*.

*
*   *

III. — *Jupiter, Mars, Quirinus*.

This triad is one of the relics of historical Rome: it has ceded all relevance to the Capitoline triad, Jupiter Optimus Maximus, Juno Regina, Minerva; but it survives in a few traditions relating to the distant past, and in a few rituals considered particularly archaic. Now, wherever it is encountered, we see that the social body of Rome is interested in it as a whole, and that it must therefore be defined exhaustively , either to protect it entirely, to commit it unreservedly, or to maintain it without fissures. We will examine some of these cases in detail later, but we must mention them briefly here.

The talisman to which the fortune of Rome is attached, *pignora imperii*, is *the ancile*, the shield that fell from the sky under King Numa. The priests who guard and handle it, the Salii, are *in tutela Jovis, Martis, Quirini* (Servius, *Commentary on the Aeneid*, VIII, 663).

In the face of a formidable military threat, the Roman general resorts to *devotio:* he devotes himself to the Manes and to the Earth, himself and the regular and auxiliary troops of the enemy; it is an all-powerful charm, which transforms the *devotus* into a fantastic leader, a kind of Wild Hunter before whom the opposing army dissolves in panic. At the beginning of the consecratory formula he recites — his head veiled, one hand raised under his toga to his chin, standing with a javelin at his feet — the *devolus* invokes Bellona, mistress of war, and the Lares, spirits of the soil of the homeland. he then invokes, under collective names, all the gods who may be involved in the operation: the *Novensid* and *Indigite* gods of Rome, the gods who have *potestas* over his troops and those of the enemy, and the Manes gods. But first, at the head of all this, he invokes *Janus*, the particular god of the Chief and of 'beginnings', *and the old triad*. This is what the famous Decius does in a story in which Livy takes great care to describe the exact ritual (VIII, 9: *Jane, Jupiter, Mars Pater, Quirinus, Bellona*, etc.).

When Rome made diplomatic commitments through treaties, it would solemnly send special priests, known as *fetiales*, to its partners. Their rituals bore clear evidence of great antiquity: they invoke *Jupiter* with the epithet *Lapis* (a fetish stone, an accessory to the most solemn oaths, which was kept in a sanctuary of Jupiter), then *Mars*, then *Quirinus* (Polybius, III, 25, 6: Ῥωμαίους δὲ Δία Λίθον κατά τι παλαιὸν ἔθος, ἐπὶ δὲ τούτῳ Ἄρην καὶ τὸν Ἐνυάλιον).

Annually, following a custom that dates back to Numa, founder of the cult of Fides, the three major flamines, the *Dialis*, the *Martialis*, and the *Quirinalis,* together offer a sacrifice to this goddess (Titus Livius, I, 21, 4). The ritual symbolism clearly expresses what is expected of this process: not only do the priests of the three gods sacrifice together, which is unique in their ceremonial, but also, to get to the temple, they solemnly cross the city in the same carriage. The aim is therefore to place under the protection of Fides the unity and cohesion of three "things" that Jupiter, Mars and Quirinus patronise distributively.

The concordance of these various customs already delimits the domain in which we must seek these 'things': they are either *three groups of men* whose union constitutes the social body, or *three forces* whose harmony enables this social body to live, act and react. In both cases, morphologically or physiologically, these are the elements whose synthesis is Rome. What are these elements?

In an initial draft of this work, while proposing the principle of explanation that will be developed, we felt we had to eliminate as incompatible with it or with each other the previous interpretations put forward by the ancients or by modern scholars: the historical interpretation of Festus that we read earlier (Mars father of *the conditor urbis*, Quirinus from Cures), then the topographical interpretation by the districts of Rome (Capitol, Palatine, Quirinal; or other similar formulas), and finally the interpretation by "synœcism" and by the three primitive tribes of Rome (*Ramnenses, Luceres, Tatienses*). It is always imprudent to make such a decisive judgement, and the comparatist should leave this peremptory tone to others, for numerous experiences have already shown that his most healthy and effective role is to

to reconcile what at first appears irreconcilable: there must be a grain or a mirage of truth in any explanation proposed by a good mind; when several explanations clash, it is only necessary to rediscover the probable organisation of the elements of truth, each of which, interpreted hastily and without regard for the others, and generally weighed down by questionable deductions, has been the seed of a theory. A little reflection will allow us to salvage, within the framework of comparative considerations, almost all the interpretations given so far of the first Roman triad: they were not false, but incomplete and poorly arranged.

<p align="center">*
*   *</p>

IV.— *Jupiter and magic, Mars and combat.*

Let us first consider the three gods individually and in pairs.

The formula by which Festus defines the god of *the flamen dialis* is excellent: *quia universi mundi sacerdos, qui appellatur Dium*. We can only refer to chapter

IV of *Mitra-Varuna*, where it was shown, in the theological province of Jupiter and Fides or Dius Fidius — Jupiter, deity of Romulus, Fides, deity of Numa —, the equivalent of the terrible and regulated Omnipotence represented in India by the Magician Varuna and Mitra, the

personified "Contract". The inanimate form used by Festus, *Dium*, and the formula *universus mundus* with which he glosses it, remind us that these gods of omnipotence are, to some degree, like the Greek Ouranos, namesake and counterpart of the Indian Varuna, the vast Sky, head and king of the cosmic organism (Οὐρανὸς πρῶτος τοῦ παντὸς ἐδυνάστευσε κόσμου, say

the first words of Apollodorus' Mythological *Library*).

   To fully understand the essence of these "sovereign gods", particularly the sovereign gods who are magicians, the best approach is to consider them in legends where they seem to double as gods of another speciality, from another area: the warrior gods; the resulting differential definition is more concrete. We have thus achieved good results by comparing the behaviour of Varuna and Indra, Ouranos and Zeus, Odhinn and Thor, when they want to defeat an adversary: we have tried to summarise this in a few pages of *Myths and Gods of the* Germanic Peoples5(The Germanic Gods), the essence of which is as follows. First, India: "Varuna, who sits enthroned at the top of the sky, sees everything and punishes those who sin against ritual accuracy, or who threaten him, or who displease him. But he punishes them without battle: he 'binds' them with a sudden, instantaneous grasp, which they cannot resist. There are therefore no myths of battles surrounding Varuna, who is nevertheless the most invincible of the gods. His great weapon is his *'mâyâ* d'Asura', his sovereign magic, creator of forms and prestige, which also allows him to administer and balance the world. This weapon most often takes the form of a lace, a knot, or bonds (pâçâh), whether material or figurative. In contrast, the warrior god is Indra, the fighting god, the god who wields lightning, the hero of countless duels, of risks faced, of victories won." Then for Greece: "In Greek cosmogony, the antithesis between the first ruler of the world and the thunderous god is exactly the same. Zeus fights, wages difficult wars, long balanced, he wounds, he kills. Ouranos does not fight, there is no trace of struggle in his legend, although he is also the most terrible and the least

easily dethroned of the kings: with an infallible grip, he immobilises, or more precisely "binds", his potential rivals, who are nevertheless the most vigorous of all, and chains them to the underworld." Finally, in Norse mythology, the behaviour of the sovereign god and magician Odhinn is as different as possible from that of the professional fighter, the champion god Thôrr:

"Odin is certainly the patron, the leader of warriors in this world and the next. But neither in *the* Prose *Edda* nor in the Eddic poems does he fight himself, and this peculiarity has not been sufficiently noted. When he intervenes in battles, his technique is not that of a warrior. Snorri explains very well how Odhinn's victories are victories without struggle, we would readily say without merit: he has a whole series of magical "gifts", the gift of ubiquity or at least of instantaneous transport, the art of disguise and the gift of unlimited metamorphosis, and finally and above all the gift of blinding, deafening and paralysing his opponents and rendering their weapons ineffective. We see him clearly emerging in the battles of men with a spear against which the sword of the warrior breaks, whose death he has, sometimes out of kindness, decided, and who, unable to defend himself, is killed by his opponents (Sigmund, for example, at the end of chapter XI of *the History of the Vôlsungar*); but he acts not as a combatant but as a kind of fate or magician overturning the spirit of the battle and the chances of victory; far from being a "war god" proper, he intervenes only to distort the normal course of battle... The traditions surrounding Jupiter and Mars allow us to make the same observations in Rome: both, with equal effectiveness, intervened in battles on behalf of the Romans, but through very different means.

Jupiter saved the city almost at its birth, in serious circumstances, the fundamental connection of which with the triad that interests us we shall soon [se6]. The Sabines, masters of the Capitol, were pressing the Roman army, which was in a state of panic. Romulus addressed Jupiter: "Put an end to the Romans' fear, stop their shameful flight!" Instantly, the Romans' courage returned. They stopped, counterattacked and overthrew their conquerors. In gratitude, Romulus dedicated a temple to Jupiter under the name of "Stator" (Plutarch, *Romulus*, 18; Livy, I, 12). This was a purely magical intervention, not a military one, an act of an all-powerful sorcerer, not an invincible warrior: at the call of the earthly leader, the cosmic master exerted an immediate hold over all the men on the battlefield, reversing the normal order of events and overturning the outcome of the struggle[7].

On the contrary, it was by the normal means of the combatant that Mars intervened on behalf of the Romans in a battle at the beginning of the 3rd century BCE, and in such a natural way, despite his heroism and success, that he was at first unrecognised[8]. The consul C. Fabricius Luscinus had to save the city of Thurium, which was under heavy pressure from the Bruttians and Lucanians. The armies were facing each other, but the Romans did not dare to attack. "A young warrior of exceptional height first urged them to gather their courage. Then, finding them still hesitant, he seized a ladder, crossed the enemy line, ran to the opposing camp, set up the ladder, climbed onto the vallum, and shouted in a formidable voice that the step to victory had been taken, *factum victoriae gradum*! Immediately, a violent battle ensued, with no result at first. "But the same warrior, knocking down the enemies with the force of his weapons, left the Romans with no choice but to slaughter them or take them prisoner." The next day, the consul

distributed the rewards: the one who so richly deserved the victor's crown could not be found. "It was then discovered and believed that *Mars Pater* had helped his people in this circumstance (*cognitum pariter atque creditum est Martem Patrem lune populo suo adfuisse*). Among other clear signs of this intervention, they cited the helmet with two plumes that adorned the warrior's head. So, on Fabricius' orders, a *supplicatio* was addressed to Mars, the troops crowned themselves with laurels and, with great enthusiasm, bore witness to this *auxilium*."

This beautiful contrast highlights the originality of the magician Jupiter's methods in battle. It also helps to prove that Mars is a warrior whose technique is superhuman only because it pushes the resources of ordinary *juvenes* to the extreme. This proof is not superfluous, as a fairly large number of modern critics have disputed that Mars was constitutionally a warrior.

This strange opinion, which goes against the most certain feelings of Roman users, can be explained in part by an intellectual movement of which there are other examples: when ethnologists highlight a type of religious phenomenon that had previously gone largely unnoticed, there is sometimes a rush of ill-informed enthusiasm that, across all fields, wrongly seeks to find similar facts. A fashion takes hold in every philology, made all the more tyrannical by the fact that very few philologists are in a position to judge for themselves the exotic documents, at least those foreign to their speciality, on which they base what they adopt as an obvious doctrine: the former craze for solar or dazzling myths, yesterday's craze for totemism clearly show what such

, and we must add, although the benefits this time largely outweighed the damage, the craze for agrarian, vegetal, seasonal interpretations of the Mannhardt school. And so Mars became for some a rural god, for others (because of Mamurius Veturius) an agrarian demon who died in autumn and was resurrected in spring. The real problem then seemed to be this one, which is completely unsolvable and is a good example of the false problems with which philology gratuitously overloads itself: how did this rural figure evolve into a slayer? And amusing hypotheses have been put forward, for example about the plough horse transforming into a steed and dragging its god along in its metamorphosis. It is only fair to recall that great Latin scholars have constantly protested against this .

In reality, Mars, the god of war, is *also* invoked for the prosperity of animals and fields, and mainly to ward off demonic and atmospheric plagues: which is still, mythologically, a warrior's duty, and which is well suited to a god whose rank in the triad, as we shall soon see, is related to "the between worlds", to "the top of the earth". But this does not justify placing the character's centre of gravity outside his usual domain of violence, war and victory. Using only the resources of Latin philology and common sense, G. Wissowa demonstrated this once and for all.

*
*   *

V. — *Mars and war, Quirinus and peace*.

If Jupiter is thus the celestial magician, Mars is the earthly warrior   driven   to extremes   of   his   type,   what   is

Quirinus? The difficulty here is compounded by the fact that the feelings of the ancients no longer provide any clear indication. For all Latins, Quirinus ceased to be an autonomous figure; they only attribute any substance to him when, under his name, they are thinking of another figure: either Romulus or Mars himself, with whom he has been controversially assimilated. Etymological fantasies and misinterpreted historical traditions about the Sabine origin of both the name and the god complicate the matter without guiding the investigation. It is therefore not surprising that modern scholars show a certain degree of confusion and that the most competent among them, Wissowa for example, declare interpretation impossible. One of the aims of this book is precisely to interpret Quirinus and to demonstrate the effectiveness of the comparative method in this hopeless case.

The reader will have guessed that our working hypothesis is that the third god of the triad was originally the god of the third social function – fertility, abundance – associated with or rather subordinate to the magician Jupiter and the warrior Mars. This hypothesis immediately brings order to what we know about the ancient cult of Quirinus and the service of his flamen. But first of all, it gives meaning to two sentences by Servius that we were a little too quick to declare absurd and that should have been given attention, even apart from the new considerations that guide us, since Servius takes pains to distinguish and contrast Mars and Quirinus, whom common usage, on the contrary, confused. Servius thus provides, which is always valuable, the differential definition we mentioned earlier in relation to Jupiter Stator and Mars appearing before Thurium. Of course, to destroy this testimony, it will be pointed out that Servius is a late author whose source we often, and here in particular, do not know. That will not suffice.

Servius was a scholar, an archaeologist who, in any case, knew more than we do. And we have good means of supporting his statement, starting with the "intentions" of the two passages from Virgil that he comments on.

At the beginning of *the Aeneid*, I, 292, the master of men and gods reveals to Venus the distant destiny of Rome. He comes from to mention Caesar, the prestigious conqueror, "charged with the spoils of the East". Immediately after him, wars will end and peoples will lay down their arms; and Jupiter names the rulers of this happy age: *Remo cum fratre Quirinus...* "Quirinus" is therefore used as a synonym for "Romulus", but it is Augustus that Virgil wants to refer to. It is indeed Augustus whom Servius refers to in his commentary, translating "Remus" as Agrippa, friend and son-in-law of the prince. This passage introduces, without elaborating on it, a common theme among Augustan poets: after Caesar's *military* glory comes, with Augustus, the *peace* of the golden age. And that, explains Servius, is why Augustus is referred to here as 'Quirinus', through Romulus, who is suggested but not named (and whose name, moreover, could not end the hexameter): *Mars enim cum saevit Gradivus dicitur, cum tranquillus est Quirinus; denique in urbe duo ejus templa sunt, unum Quirini intra urbem quasi custodis et tranquilli, aliud in Appia via extra urbem prope portam quasi bellatoris vel Gradivi.* 'Mars is called Gradivus when he is in a rage; when he is peaceful, Quirinus. He has two temples in Rome: one inside the city, as Quirinus, that is, as guardian and peaceful god; the other on the Appian Way, outside the city, near the gate, as god of war, that is, as Gradivus." Thus Quirinus is defined, like Augustus in opposition to Caesar, as "tranquillus" in opposition to the god "saevus", as the peaceful one in opposition to the

warrior, and if we insist on maintaining the usual assimilation of Quirinus with Mars, we must say, defying common sense, that he is a "quiet Mars": this is what Servius did. Let us abandon this absurdity and remember that when he differs from Mars, that is to say, when he takes on what was once his true personality, he embodies peace as opposed to war. (Let us note in passing that in the same note Servius recounts a historical detail whose mystery may perhaps be clarified: in their adulation, he says, the Roman people offered Octavian the choice between three names, so that he could call himself Quirinus, Caesar, or Augustus, as he wished; in order not to offend anyone, he adopted the three names successively, *at different times*: first he called himself Quirinus, then Caesar, and finally and definitively Augustus. The decision undoubtedly has a deeper meaning: by calling himself Quirinus, then Caesar, then Augustus, Octavian ascended to the most majestic sovereignty — *augustus* meaning σεϐαστός and deriving *from augur*, the ultimate "dial" word — slowly and gradually, through a triad whose first term is Quirinus and whose second, a flattering substitute for Mars, contrasts with Quirinus as Mars himself does. Is this not an archaeological reconstruction and political use of the old, outdated triad of Quirinus, Mars, and Jupiter? This would not be an isolated case: the first Julii, Augustus in particular, were keen to legitimise themselves in this way, to dress up their personal pretensions as historical necessities, their innovations as restorations. Suetonius (*Augustus*, 7), giving roughly the same tradition with different explanations, says that Octavian was successively nicknamed Thurinus, then Caesar, then Augustus, and it appears from this text that "Thurinus", alluding to his family's place of origin or his father's minor successes against fugitives in the region of Thurium, was given to him in a derisive manner by his enemies and that, noting the insult,

he declared that he saw nothing but honour in the term: "Thurinus" is therefore probably just a parody of "Quirinus" attested by Servius).

In Book VI of *the Aeneid*, verse 860, in another group of prophecies imbued with the same courtly atmosphere—concerning the two Marcelluses, the pathetic young man (*tu Marcellus eris...*) and his ancestor charged with the third and final spoils of war in Roman mythology—Virgil again mentions the name of Quirinus: it is to this god that the third opime spoils were to be offered by virtue of an immemorial law involving our triad, as the first were offered to Jupiter and the second to Mars[9]. And it is undoubtedly to praise Augustus' pacification that Virgil chooses here to compare him to the young Marcellus, dear to the prince's heart, the only one of all the Marcelli of the past whom tradition allows us to associate with Quirinus of the triad, Quirinus insofar as he is distinct from Mars and Jupiter. Servius is thus justified in attaching to this verse a note similar to the previous one, with the same apparent absurdity and the same valuable teaching: *Quirinus aulem est Mars qui praeest paci et intra civitatem colitur, nam belli Mars extra civitatem templum habuit*: "Quirinus is Mars insofar as he presides over peace and is worshipped within Rome; for Mars, as the god of war, had his temple outside Rome." We understand that, when he was autonomous, Quirinus opposed Mars bellator in that he presided over peace.

This testimony about the gods is reinforced by another, with the same meaning, about men: the Romans, in their peacetime occupations as opposed to those of war, are called *quirites*, a name that is surely formed from the same root, otherwise obscure, as *Quirinus*. And we know the great success that

Julius Caesar achieved on the day when, haranguing his unruly *milites*, he insulted them by calling them *quirites:* that was all it took to make them return to their duty as soldiers[10]. Let it not be argued that the opposition *between quirites and milites* is only attested to relatively late, just like the opposition between the peaceful Quirinus and the warlike Mars: Julius Caesar, in such a serious circumstance, would not have loaded this word with meanings that were not immediately, unanimously, imperatively, and in a sense historically understood by his soldiers; on that day, as in many other circumstances, he drew on tradition.

It seems, moreover, that Varro had already emphasised the parallelism between the two oppositions, that of the gods and that of men, when he wrote[11]: *Mars ab eo quod maribus in bello praeest..., Quirinus a quiritibus:* the "males" certainly have no place in the name of Mars, but Mars is clearly opposed to Quirinus, just as the *mares in bello*, i.e. the *milites*, are opposed to *the quirites*.

<p align="center">*
*   *</p>

VI. — *Quirinus and grain.*

But what were these "functions of peace" that defined Quirinus in ancient times? What we know about the cult of the god and the ceremonies in which his flamen participated provide the answer: they were functions related to agriculture.

On 17 February, the *Quirinalia* is celebrated, a plebeian festival that "coincides" with Fools' Day, *stultorum feriae*, which, through its rites and myths, is the day of grain roasting. Mr Louis Delatte, who has just devoted a beautiful

monograph[12] , clearly demonstrated both the archaism and the importance of this solemnity; to do so, he simply had to follow Ovid (*Fasti*, II, 513 ff.). Not practising the art of milling, the ancient Romans dried the grains, mainly spelt, roasted them and crushed them coarsely with a pestle; this allowed them to preserve them for consumption as needed, either in flatbread or porridge; Roasting was truly "the preliminary operation for any secular or religious use" of spelt. It cannot be a coincidence that such a precise and vital act takes place on the very day of the year dedicated to Quirinus: it clearly touches on the very essence of the god.

The *flamen quirinalis* performs three interventions in the liturgical cycle, the diversity of which has puzzled critics and led Wissowa to put forward the following unfortunate hypothesis: as the personality of Quirinus faded over the centuries, his priest became, in a sense, unemployed, a jack-of-all-trades, and was charged with ensuring the worship of other deities who were very much alive but lacked priests. This process would be strange: the *flamonium*, all the offices of the flamines, minor and major, are archaic priesthoods, which sometimes fall into ruin but do not rejuvenate themselves; when Rome needs new priests, it creates them without difficulty, it does not divert the old course of sacred power; finally, the deities worshipped by the *flamen quirinalis* do not yield to Quirinus in antiquity and are no more alive than he is. Let us be more humble and cautious: let us admit that the offices of this flamen are indeed his own, that they do indeed define the "province" of the god, and instead of denying the connections, let us seek to understand them. It is not difficult to see what these offices have in common. Let us set aside the *Larentalia,* which we will understand better later

[13]; the *Consualia* and *Robigalia* are primarily concerned with the life of grain.

Consus, often associated with Ops, is surely an agrarian god; his name alludes to grain put into reserve; he has a very old altar in the Cirque valley, at the foot of the Palatine Hill: an underground altar, a kind of *mundus* that is only opened during festivals, perhaps a reminder of the ancient practice of storing grain underground; his festivals are agrarian: offerings of the first fruits of the harvest, peasant tournaments, mule races, while horses and donkeys crowned with flowers enjoy a day off... However, on 21 August, together with the Vestals, it is the *flamen quirinalis* and no other who offers the sacrifice to Consus.

Robigus (or Robigo) protects grain from rust—no doubt because he is Rust itself; the vowel *o* in his name (as opposed to *ruber*) is no less rural than his definition. His festival falls on 25 April, and again it is the *flamen quirinalis* alone who sacrifices. In a page of excellent folklore, [Ovid14] recounts how, dressed in white, the priest leads a procession and, upon arriving at the place of sacrifice, recites a long prayer that the narrator poeticises: first comes the description of the beautiful ears of corn and the evocation of the perils of agriculture, winds, rain, frost, excessive sun; then comes the prayer: May the god Rust keep his rough hands away from the harvests! If he must attack something, let it not be the tender ears of corn, but cruel iron! Let him attack what threatens life, swords and evil javelins: there is no need for any of these; let the world enjoy the leisure of peace!

Nec teneras segetes, sed durum contere ferrum, Quodque

potest alios perdere perde prior.

Use swords and harmful weapons. There is
no need for them: let leisure rule the world!

This development is clearly in line with the Augustan policy mentioned above: like Virgil in *the Georgics*, Ovid preaches, sings, one might say incants peace, the new golden age. But could the poet have risked this explanation of a ceremony that all his contemporaries knew, could he have put this paraphrase of the "peace-war" opposition into the priest's mouth, if such exploitation and paraphrase had contradicted the traditional meaning of the ceremony and the priest?

Thus Quirinus is a peaceful god who opposes Mars as the *Quirites* oppose the *milites*, and what interests him in peace are the grains that the plebs roast at *the Quirinalia* and that the *flamen quirinalis* honours in summer at the underground altar of Consus after protecting them from rust at *the Robigalia* in spring. Quirinus is indeed the one we expected at the last level of the triad: the god of agricultural prosperity complementing the warrior strength of Mars and the magical omnipotence of Jupiter.

Conclusion: the triple *flamonium* and its gods are based on the same classificatory principle as the Indo-Iranian tripartite division of society. And , when the diplomatic priests, in order to bind the state as a whole, invoke Jupiter, then Mars, then Quirinus in solidarity and in the usual order, they are doing exactly what the king of the Aryans did a thousand years earlier on his march to India, when he placed his diplomatic word under the guarantee of Mitra-Varuna, Indra and the Nâsatyâ.

*
* *

VII. — *Social functions, the universe and colours*.

We have seen that Iran, like India, and no doubt in memory of a common past, associates social hierarchy with the superimposed order of the world: sky, near atmosphere, earth. It seems that Rome knew a similar harmony.

At the head of the triad, Jupiter and his near-homonyms — Dius, Dium — are so obviously perceived as "Heaven" that there is no need to dwell on the point. At most, we might note that the Romans, ever positive, did not push this heaven into the distant extremes as the Indians did; their heaven was the atmosphere: Jupiter thundered and struck with lightning, whereas in India it was not Varuna or Mitra, but Indra, a second-rate god, who was the god of lightning.

Conversely, at the bottom of the triad, the *flamen quirinalis* has an affinity with the "near underground" and subterranean beings that can only be partly explained by his agricultural functions: not only does he officiate at the underground altar of Consus[15] , but he also sacrifices the 23 décembre sur cet autre *mundus* (Wissowa) qu'est le "tomb" of Larenta, an ancient deity whom we will soon see linked to Quirinus[16]; on the eve of the capture of Rome by the Gauls, it was again he, the *flamen quirinalis*, and not, as one might have expected, the chief priest of the state, the *dialis*, who was charged with burying the sacred objects underground (*defo-dere*, Livy, V, 40). Finally, judging by the ritual of Iguvium, the Umbrians knew a triad parallel to the Roman triad, composed of *Jupiter*, *Mars Pater* and *Vofionus:* the latter name can be explained by the Italic and Indo-Iranian root of the Latin

vov-eo, vo-tum; it undoubtedly refers to what was, in Rome, the most energetic form of *votum*, *devotio* (literally meaning "downwards"), which consisted precisely in dedicating a man to the underground gods and, if he did not die, burying his effigy.

Mars remains. Between Jupiter and Quirinus, he also shows an affinity for an area of the world, and this is, as we would expect, for the intermediate zone, for the surface of the earth (his *campus* is not cultivated: the ripe harvest that covered it was thrown into the Tiber at the very moment it became the Campus Martius) and for borders (*amburbium, ambarvalia*); and insofar as he is interested in agriculture, it is of course in his capacity as defender, and the enemies of the harvest against whom he "stands as a barrier", at least those who can be located, are the "bad weather", demons of the lower atmosphere (*ut tu morbos visos invisosque vidueritalem vastitudinemque calamitates intemperiasque prohibessis defendas averruncasque*).

The sky (not too far away), the top of the earth with the (lower) atmosphere, and the subsoil (not too deep), that is to say, the three parts of a universe limited to the immediate interests of man, are therefore the domains in which Rome has Jupiter, Mars and Quirinus act respectively. Would this "superimposed" representation of the triad would it not correspond to the global, anonymous division of the Roman gods (a division of little importance, but which there is no reason to consider as "a joke by Plautus taken seriously by Servius") into superior gods, intermediate gods and inferior gods *(superi, medioxumi, inferi;* or *numinacaelestia, media, terrestria:* Servius, *Comm. to the Aeneid*, III, 134 and VIII, 275). It seems that an old ritual, that of the observation preceding the declaration

of war (Livy, I, 32), directly attests to this correspondence.

We have seen [0]that, in order to conclude peace, the fetial priests call upon Jupiter Lapis, Mars and Quirinus as witnesses to the end of hostilities, as they are also simultaneously involved (Polybius, III, 25, 6); similar patronage is expected for the symmetrical operation. In reality, *the indiclio belli* is a more nuanced operation; the god of law and peaceful life on the one hand, and the god of violence on the other, are equally but not simultaneously interested in it. The fetial operates in four stages: two kinds of negotiations followed by two kinds of acts. He first goes to the people against whom Rome is complaining and pursues a thirty-three-day attempt at conciliation. If he fails, he concludes with a statement of fact. Returning to Rome, he consults his compatriots. If the majority is in favour of war, he returns to the border of the now enemy people and pronounces the specific formula for declaring war, *bellum indico facioque*. The act of observation and the act of declaration are the two sacred moments of the procedure; both threatening, they are nevertheless very different in spirit and letter. The second is irrevocable: putting his words into action, the fetial symbolically throws the first offensive weapon, the iron-tipped or fire-hardened and bloodied spear, *hastam ferratam aut sanguineam praeustam,* onto enemy territory*;* he invokes no god, but his arm speaks for him: the spear, *hasta*, is Mars and Mars alone who unleashes his fury. At the moment of observation, on the contrary, it is still a legal act, within the framework of an embassy; war is not inevitable, a final reprieve begins; the first words of the fetial are to invite the divine powers to take note that the partner people are unjust, do not pay their dues, *populum illum injuslum esse*

neque jus persolvere, and its conclusion, avoiding any formal mention of war, merely announces that, in their homeland, the Elders will deliberate on the means of obtaining their rights, *quo paclo jus nostrum adipiscamur;* so it is not surprising to find the first and third gods of the triad in place, the almighty Jupiter and the 'tranquil Quirinus (described as *Janus Quirinus*, which emphasises his peaceful nature[19]), but not Mars, who is kept in reserve to do his irreparable work when the time comes.

But immediately after invoking the two non-warrior representatives of the triad by name for his finding of injustice, the fetial adds the invocation: "and all the heavenly gods, and you earthly gods, and you gods below... " *(audi Jupiter et tu Jane Quirine, deique omnes caelestes vosque terrestres vosque inferni audite. Ego vos testor populum illum injustum esse*, etc.). The appeal to the three superimposed groups of gods thus doubles the appeal to what is, despite everything, despite the significant and threatening gap imposed by circumstances, the triad of Jupiter-Mars-Quirinus. Is it not because it is to some extent equivalent to it? And because, thanks to its collective and anonymous nature, it makes it possible to fill the gap without unleashing the powers of war, to summon Mars without evoking him?

Several converging clues therefore suggest that the sacred science of the Romans, like that of the Indians and Iranians, drew a parallel, and therefore a connection, between the hierarchy of social functions (magic, war, fertility) and the vertical division of the world (sky, above the earth, underground). This agreement seems even more significant when we note that, in Rome too, symbolic colours — the same as in India and Iran — are linked to the first two social functions: the flamines are distinguished by white (the

special cap of *the dialis* is called *albogalerus*), and red is the colour of the general's *paludamentum* as well as the clothing of the *rex*, Romulus[20].

<div align="center">*
*   *</div>

It is time to consider the three men who project the three components of the divine triad onto the earth. What is the place of the flamines in worship and in society? What insights does the comparison between the two homologous priesthoods, the ethical *flamonium* and the opulent *brâhmanyam*, provide into Indo-European prehistory and the specific evolution of the Romans, the Latins and their close ancestors*?*

1. *Flamen-Brahman, Ann. du Musée Guimet, Bibl. de Vulgairsation*, vol. LI, 1935, ch. II; cf. *Mitra-Varuna*, ch. I.

2. See above, p. 23.

3. See below, p. 127.

4. *The Prehistory of the Major Flamines, Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, CXVIII, 1938, p. 193.

5. Paris, 1939, pp. 21 ff., 27 ff.

6. See below, p. 144.

7. Cf. *Mitra-Varuna*, p. 33.

8. Valerius Maximus, 1, 8, 6, on whom Ammianus Marcellinus relies, XXIV, 4. 24.

9. See below, p. 189.

10. Suetonius, *Caesar*, 70; Tacitus, *Annals*, 1, 42; Lucan, V, 358.

11. *De lingua latina*, V, 73.

12. *Research on some movable feasts in the Roman calendar*, II, *Fornacalia*, in *classical antiquity*, V, 2, Liège, 1936.

13. See below, p. 95.

14. *Fasti*, V, 960 ff.

15. Βωμὸν ὑπὸ γῆς κεκρυμμένον, Plutarch, *Romulus*, 14.

16. *Ad sepulcrum Accae*, Varro, *De lingua latina*, VI, 24.

17. See, for example, Cato, *De re ruslica*, 140: *agrum lustrare*.

18. See above, p. 76.

19. See below, p. 193. The variant *Juno* for *Janus* is indefensible.

20. Ἁλουργῆ μὲν γὰρ ἐνεδύετο χιτῶνα καὶ τήβεννον ἐφόρει περιπόρφυρον, Plutarch, *Romulus*, 26.

CHAPTER III

The three major flamines.

I. — *The flamines*.

Jupiter, Mars, and Quirinus thus patronise the three social functions which, in India, are the prerogative and essence of the three Aryan castes: magical and legal omnipotence, military strength, and fertility. And the list of the three *flamines majores* subordinate to *the rex* corresponds to the social hierarchy, which, under the *râj*, enumerates the *brâhmana*, the *kshattriya* and the *vaiçya*.

Before examining the similarities and differences more closely, it is important to understand what each of the flamines majores is in relation to the social function patronised by their god: the flamine *martialis*, for example, is not a warrior, the *quirinalis* is not a farmer; neither of them are technical priests, but simply two sacrificers, one serving the great warrior god, the other the great nurturing god. The flamines, therefore, resemble each other more than they resemble their respective gods.

"employers", and they form, if not a closed college sufficient unto itself, at least a kind of flaminical order, an order of sacrificers: to such an extent that under the three *flamines majores* there are the twelve *flamines minores* serving special cults, and still another apparently unlimited number of flamines without rank, each attached to a priestly, political, municipal, industrial, or other college. This is reminiscent of the principle and functioning of the Brahmin caste, with the proviso, however, that each flamen is distinctly and definitively attached to a specific god and social service, while each Brahmin is able to

offer sacrifice in all circumstances to any god and for the benefit of any Aryan sacrificer.

Let us now compare the two systems.

<div align="center">

*

*   *

</div>

II. — *Indian society and Roman society*.

A first set of significant differences stems from the evolution of social structures in India and Rome. The Indian system is based on a classification of the three parts of society, with each Aryan belonging, in principle once and for all and by birth, to one and only one of the three groups: Brahmins, warriors, and farmers. The Roman system, on the other hand, at least in the form in which it is known to us, classifies and hierarchises only the three social functions, the three modes of activity, magical-religious, military and agricultural, whose collaboration is necessary for communal life; in particular, the *quirites* and *milites*, far from being opposed as two classes of men, are in fact the same men, but considered at different times, depending on whether they serve in peace or war, depending on whether they belong to the *tranquillus Quirinus* or *Mars bellator;* Similarly, although from a functional point of view there is a hint of a 'flaminal order', all the flamines, including the *dialis*, are nonetheless appointed; they do not occupy their positions by right of birth. More generally, the Indian system of three classes is suited to a royal society, of an almost feudal type, where hierarchy and the permanence of hierarchy through heredity are essential, whereas *the ordo flaminum* and the divine triad that supports it appear in a state of citizens; *ordo* and triad give the impression of being survivals in the same way as the *rex sacrorum.*

himself: the reality of political and religious life in Rome lies elsewhere, and the great divine triad that dominates Roman history is not that of Jupiter, Mars and Quirinus, but the one that replaced it, associating Juno and Minerva with Jupiter. In other words, in Rome, the *rex*, the flamines and their hierarchy were very early on minimised and fossilised, while Vedic and post-Vedic India amplified the power of *the râj*, developed the prestige of the Brahmins and hardened the three ancient classes into castes.

These differences in social organisation are significant, but they are the kind that comparatists expect, that they would be concerned not to observe, and that cannot be used as an objection to comparison. They are as valuable as the similarities: they allow us to understand, in broad terms, how two societies that were once related, then separated, subjected to different influences and with different destinies, both maintained and rejuvenated a common prehistoric tradition.

As for whether it was Roman society or Indian society that innovated in the divergence, the question is not left to the whim of more or less plausible assessments, for Celtic societies provide objective reasons for a decision. But before addressing this, let us examine another set of differences between the Indian and Roman systems, differences relating to the place of the Brahmin and the flamen in the caste hierarchy and in *the ordo sacerdotum*. These can be summarised in two contrasts:

1° The word "flamen" is attached to the three levels of the tripartite classification (*fl. dialis, fl. martialis, fl. quirinalis*) instead of being significant for only one, the first (*brâhmana*, as opposed to *kshattriya* or *râjanya* and *vaiçya*);

2° Compensatorily, the flamen is nowhere at home: even priestly activity, for the most part, escapes him in favour of the pontiffs, while the entire Indian priestly class was very early on given the generic name of Brahmin.

These contrasts are less significant and less irreconcilable than the previous ones. For both, it is possible to detect in India either the beginnings or traces of balances comparable to those prevailing in Rome. Let us consider them in turn.

*
*   *

III. — *The three functions and their flamines, the three castes and the Brahmin.*

It is a consistent doctrine in the ritual treatises of India that any man who offers a sacrifice, regardless of his caste,   and   for the   time   of the   sacrifice,   must   be   called "brahmin". Thus the *Kâtyâyana Çrautasûtra*, VII, 4, 12 states: "Even *vaiçya* or *râjanya*, he (the lay sacrificer) is called *brâhmana*[1] ", and the commentator insists: "The formula: This Brahmin has been consecrated for the sacrifice (i.e. has undergone the preparatory rite of *dîkshâ*) must be used for the sacrifice of a *Vaiçya* and a *Râjanya*, and not the words: This *Kshattriya*, this *Vaiçya* has been consecrated[2] ". The *Çatapatha Brâhmana*, III, 2, 1, 40, after giving the same rule, provides a rather confused beginning of an explanation, but the best of all the commentaries is given in *the Aitareya Brâhmana*, VII, 19 ff., although (the issues dealt with in Book VII explain this limitation sufficiently) it only refers to the relationship between the *brâhmana* and the *kshattriya* and not between the *brâhmana* and the *vaiçya*. But the generalisation is immediate and

legitimate. Here is the text, which is also important in other respects, particularly for the "symbolism" of social classes:

Prajâpati created sacrifice. After sacrifice, the *Brahmin* (neutral) and the *Kshatriya* (neutral) were created (these are the principles of the first two castes, or their activities). After them, two kinds of creatures were formed, those who eat and those who do not eat the oblation. Behind the *Brahmin* came those who eat the oblation, behind the *Kshatriya* those who do not eat it. Those who eat the oblation are the Brahmins (*brâhmana*), those who do not eat it are the *râjanya*, the *vaiçya*, and the *çûdra*. The sacrifice went away. The *Brahmin* and the *Kshatriya* followed it, the *Brahmin* with his own instruments (*âyudhâni*), the *Kshatriya* with his own instruments. The *Brahmin's* instruments are those of sacrifice, the *Kshatriya's* are a chariot, a breastplate, a bow and arrows. The *kṣatriya* returned without having found the sacrifice, which had turned away, frightened by the *kṣatriya's* instruments. Meanwhile, the *brahmin* followed (the sacrifice), caught up with it, overtook it and intercepted it. Thus found and intercepted, the sacrifice stopped and, recognising its own instruments, approached the *Brahmin:* that is why today the sacrifice belongs to the *Brahmin*, to the *Brahmins*. Then the *Kshatriya* followed the *Brahmin* and said to him, "Call me (to participate) in this sacrifice." The *Brahmin* replied: "Good, leave your own instruments there, approach the sacrifice with the *Brahmin's* instruments, in the form of the *Brahmin*, having become *a Brahmin*." The *Kshatriya* said: "Good," left his own instruments there, approached the sacrifice with those of the *Brahmin*, in the form of the *Brahmin*, having become *a Brahmin*. That is why today, even a *kshattrya*, when he sacrifices, leaves his own instruments there, approaches the sacrifice with those of the *Brahmin*, in the form of the *Brahmin*, having become *a Brahmin*[3]".

And *the Aitareya Brahmana*, VII, 23, 24, explains at length how the sacrificing *kshattriya* can indeed, for the duration of the sacrifice, be promoted to brahmin without any disadvantage (for example, in his relations with the gods of the second caste, especially Indra), and then how, after the sacrifice, he can be restored to his caste without further disadvantage (for example, in his relations with the gods of the first caste, notably Agni).

Thus, in India, not only, as the Greek Arrian rightly observed, can no sacrifice be offered unless the agents of the sacrifice are priests, Brahmins, but also, for the duration of the sacrifice, in order for the sacrifice to be possible and effective, the layman for whose benefit the Brahmins sacrifice is himself artificially promoted to Brahmin. On the occasion of any sacrifice, "hybrids" are thus formed, either from the first and second castes or from the first and third castes, all bearing the fictitious and temporary name of "Brahmin". This is similar to the extension of the Latin name *flamen* to the second and third social activities in these "hybrids" known as the *flamen martialis* and the *flamen quirinalis*.

*

*   *

IV. — *The flamen and the Brahmin*
among the priests.

Brahman (masculine) was used very early on to refer to priests of all kinds, and its derivative *brâhmana* refers to any member of the priestly caste, while the *flamen dialis*, despite his prominent place in the hierarchy, is neither the eponym of all priesthoods nor even the most active of the priests of the Roman state. Here again, consideration of an Indian fact

diminishes the gap, and we can assume that this time it was India that was the most innovative.

It should be noted that each of the three priests called flamines represents what the Indians, who were more philosophical, referred to as neutrals, as animated but non-personified abstractions, "the *Brahmin*", "the *Kshatriya*", etc., that is to say
The "essence" of each caste. We said earlier that flamines are not specialists or technicians: the *martialis*, for example, is not a strategist; leading armies through the unexpected is the job of other magistrates whom he does not even accompany; he really only intervenes through sacrifices. One gets the impression that the *flamen martialis* and the *flamen quirinalis* each have the task of expressing and maintaining the permanent essence of one of the social functions, through strict, traditional worship and a severe, equally traditional lifestyle, over which current events have little influence. It is therefore easier to understand why their common name *flamen* is a masculine noun *in the neuter form* — like *brahman* and *kshattra*.

These reflections remain true for the first of the flamines, the *dialis*. It is not he but the pontiffs, and in particular the *pontifex maximus* (   ) and the *pontifex*   (   ) who   actively administer
"currently", the religious life of the city; it is not he but the pontiffs who record the major events on a daily basis, who draw up the annual calendar and announce the festivals of the month, who assist the magistrates in ritual acts, who advise the senate on religious matters, and who provide this parade for the unexpected that is the *procuratio prodigiorum*. The *flamen dialis* does not intervene in the vagaries of historical life; on the contrary, he represents the permanence of the state, he is its immutable essence in personal form. All   his   activity,   positive   and   negative, is.   turned   to

to keep pure and strong this essence that others, mainly pontiffs, take it upon themselves to use distributively and variably: he maintains it through his way of life, a life itself frozen in well-defined rules of traditional purity, — by the scrupulous celebration of an immutable and continuous cult, — by the periodic performance of archaic purificatory ceremonies, — and finally and perhaps most importantly by his mere presence in Rome, from which he does not even have the right to be absent. In short, he presides over the religious life of the state and identifies with it, but he does not direct it.

This kind of presidential isolation of *the flamen dialis* among priests who are more active but less honoured is reminiscent of an anomaly in Indian sacrifice and ties in with what is surely an ancient meaning of the word *brahman*.

In Vedic, *brahman* (masculine) has two meanings: most often, as *brâhmana* will be, it is a generic name for a priest; but sometimes, in a narrower sense, it is one of the five, or seven, or later sixteen priests whose gathering is necessary for the celebration of the soma sacrifice. Let us consider this specific *brahman*, a member of the sacrificial team.

Throughout the ceremony, while the others are busy singing, reciting, pressing, lighting, and consecrating, the *Brahmin* neither speaks nor acts[4]. He only intervenes if a mistake has been made, in order to correct it. And yet he is the most august figure in the team, as attested by the rank assigned to him during the consumption of the sacred liquor (separated from all the other priests, last in line, even after the beneficiary of the sacrifice), and the old rule highlighted by H. Oertel, which once required that half of the sacrifice fees be given to *the Brahmin*, despite his silence and inaction, with the other priests sharing only the other half. As the "physician" of the sacrifice, to some degree

consubstantial with the sacred that the other priests implement, he is both heterogeneous to these other priests and above them: his situation is comparable to that of *the flamen dialis* in relation to all Roman *priests*, especially the *pontiffs;* all the more comparable in that the *flamen dialis* is also, if not the "physician" of each particular sacrifice, at least that of the entire religious life of the state, which others administer, but of which he alone has sufficient virtue to constantly eliminate impurities.

The above considerations are sufficient to make it probable that it was through a specifically Indian evolution that *brahman* came to refer typically to all kinds of priests, since India retains a very clear trace of a more limited and more powerful use of the word, close to the Roman usage: masculine *Brahman* must have initially referred to those priests who were not only manipulators, but also the incarnation, the living reserve of the sacred. All Indo-European priests undoubtedly had another name, which was replaced on both sides by new formations: *brâhmanâh, sacerdotes*.

<center>*
*　*</center>

V. — *The social classes of the ancient Celts.*

The two differences noted above between the use and extension of the word "brahmin" and those of the word "flamen" are thus reduced to very little: India provides intermediate forms, and in the second case at least we can see the starting point of the evolution. What remains are the differences outlined at the beginning of this chapter, which go beyond Brahmins and flamines and concern the entire social organisation. An examination of the Celtic world allows us to assert that it was

Rome that altered and, , corrected the Indo-European social system to the point of rendering it unrecognisable, whereas the Indian system of "castes" merely reinforced it.

Celtic society was organised under the *rîg- with the same divisions as Indo-Iranian societies. This is easy to verify by supplementing the information provided by Caesar on Gallic society (altered only at the bottom of the hierarchy) with medieval Irish traditions (presenting a hierarchy altered at the top, following the decline of Druidism).

Caesar (*Gallic Wars*, VI, 13) encountered two well-established classes in Gaul, *duo genera hominum "qui aliquo sunl numero et honore"*, that of *the druids* — priests, scholars, judges — and that of *the equites*, the military and landowning aristocracy; the rest of society, ruined and demoralised by debt, reduced to seeking slavery, was no longer organised.

In medieval Ireland, if the memory of the druids (*drûi*, pl. *drûid(e):* undoubtedly formed, despite the irritated retraction of the great Thurneysen, from the Indo-European root *weid- "to know" and *dru-* intensive) has remained alive, and while epic literature suffices to attest to the scope and importance of their order in pagan times, they naturally no longer belong in the picture of a Christianised society, where the Church has moreover taken over some of their privileges. However, among the rest of the free men, all literature, both Christian and pagan, agrees in distinguishing two classes: the military nobility (*flaith*, Gaulish *vlatos* 'chief' on a coin of the Remi)[5] , the sole owners of the land, and the cattle breeders, literally "free men who own cows", *bô airig*.

This word *aire* (gen. sg. *airech*, nom. pl. *airig*) is worth noting in passing; it refers to all members of the free men, all those who participate in the election of the king, all those protected by the law, all those who participate in assemblies (*airecht*) and large seasonal banquets; it therefore implied a broad but appreciable form of nobility (hence the adjective *airegda* "eminent", the abstract *airechas* "high rank"; we even read in the laws *aire feda* "a noble tree"): in short, by its precise meaning and its developments, it is the equivalent of the Indian *arya, ârya*, the common name for the three classes "that count", who feel and declare themselves to be united in nobility and kinship despite the taboos that separate them   ,   the equivalent   also   of   name   national   of the
"Iranians", from Iran (derived from the genitive plural *Airyânâm*), and those of the Osses who still call themselves "Iron". Now, the Irish *aire* can phonetically extend an ancient **aryako-*, superimposable on the Sanskrit adjective *ârya-ka-* derived from *arya*. It is therefore likely that we have here one of those encounters between religious, legal and political vocabulary that attest to the faithful preservation of the oldest traditions among the Celts on the one hand and the Indo-Iranians on the other[6]. At the same time, this confirms the antiquity of the social tripartite division: before any spontaneous corruption (Gaul), before conversion to Christianity (Ireland), a Celtic **rîg,* like an Indian *râj,* presided over a society of "Aryans" divided into three classes: priest-magicians and jurists, military nobles, and herders.

<p style="text-align:center">*
*   *</p>

VI. — *Social foundations and various representations among the Celts.*

Did the Celts, like the Indo-Iranians, superimpose on this tripartite division the   of   speculations   philosophical   ?   We

have little information about Druidic thought in general, which everywhere and to the very end refused to use writing and disappeared without leaving any traces other than those preserved by Irish monks in epic and gnomic literature[7] ; but it does indeed seem that Celtic philosophers went beyond the status quo and conceived, at least, a harmonious arrangement of functions that transcended social classes. At least, that is what an examination of a number of formulas and traditions suggests. When a text seeks to define an unknown country, or the conditions for prosperity in any country, or the characteristics of a happy reign, it is the mould of the three functions — magic and law, strength, abundance, in a variable order — that imposes itself. Here are two cases among many others: a simple literary description and an apparently traditional formula.

At the beginning of a beautiful pagan tale, which slips in a few Christian concepts (such as sin) with the promise of the country's imminent evangelisation, a ravishing woman who is not of this world comes to stir up trouble in the soul of young Conle, son of King Conn of the Hundred Battles. She describes the afterlife to him: "I have come from the Land of the Living," she says, "where there is no death, no sin, no fault (*i-nna bî bâss na peccath na immormus*), — we eat eternal meals without service (*tomelomm fleda bûana cen frithgnom*), — there is harmony between us without strife (*câin chomracc lenn cen debuilh*)[8]". The originality of this wonderful country is therefore that there is no need for work, no "function", no division; but the author can only express this indistinct happiness by dividing its negation: no death, no fault, no effort to feed oneself, no combat;

Immortality and Virtue, Abundance, and Security are spontaneous goods there.

When an Indian poet wants to briefly praise a king without reservation, he reviews the three functions in three words: thus, at the beginning of the *Raghuvamsa*, King Dilipa deserves to be called the father of his subjects "because he ensures their good conduct, protects them, and feeds them"[9]. This process, which is not mere rhetoric but reflects a thoughtful conception of needs and duties, is also common in Irish texts, where it is notably the origin of an interesting expression. M. T. O'Maille[10] and R. Thurneysen[11] have made it probable that the epic traditions about Queen Medb, or rather about the two Queen Medbs, dress up in history an old theory of the acquisition of Supreme Kingship and an old ritual of enthronement of the Supreme King (*ard-rî*) of Ireland: the two Queen Medbs are either personifications of sovereignty, or in any case givers of sovereignty; both have multiple successive husbands, to whom they grant this dignity by the mere fact of their marriage. But at least one of them, Medb of Cruachan, regularly requires three qualities from the candidate, which are stated in several texts using a consistent formula, albeit with a slight variation in the order of the terms, a formula that is likely to retain a liturgical expression: he must be, she says, *cen êt cen omun cen nêoit*
"without jealousy, without fear, without greed". The last two conditions are self-explanatory, and Medb comments on them excellently at the beginning of *Tâin Bô Cuâlnge*[(12)]: Medb's husband, *the ardrî*, must be as brave in war and as generous with his possessions as she is, and therefore possess the maximum "essence" of the second and third social functions, Warrior Virtue and

Abundance. As for the first condition, *cen ét*, 'without jealousy', it can be explained if we consider one of the most certain features of the Indo-European mystique of Sovereignty, as illustrated, for example, by the Greek fable of Ou-ranos, sovereign god, magical king of the world, and the Ouranides: offensive violence from suitors and heirs, defensive violence from the reigning sovereign, endless dynastic and extra-dynastic rivalries leading to *hubris* and cruelty, much to the chagrin of the subjects[13]. Moreover, Medb, Sovereignty incarnate, at the beginning of the *Táin*, comments on this requirement as aptly as the other two: my husband must not be jealous, she says, for "I have never been without a man in the shadow of another": here we are reminded of the priest-king of Nemi, haunted day and night by the thought of the successor who watches him and perhaps follows him. Being "without jealousy", moreover, is no less essential to an office that essentially belongs to the first social function in its non-magical but legal aspect: the office of judge, arbitrator, legislator. Thus this epic formula, which undoubtedly extends the traditional definition of the good king, can be analysed according to the triad of social functions.

India and Iran "see" their priests in white and their warriors in red, and Rome shows traces of this symbolism of colours. It is also familiar to the Celts: Cûchulainn and many other warrior heroes are regularly dressed in red in the epic, while druids wear white for their offices both in Gaul[14] and in Ireland[15] .

<center>

*

*   *

</center>

VII. — *Brahmins and druids in society.*

It would be contrary to the purpose of this study to dwell on a specifically Celtic aspect of the problem; but we must point out how closely the relationship between the *râj* and Indian kingdoms and the Brahmin caste parallels, in great detail, the relationship between the *rîg* and Celtic kingdoms and the Druidic order; this comparison will serve to highlight the originality of the Roman facts.

The Druidic order and the Brahmin caste are supranational; they transcend the boundaries of the kingdoms between which the Aryan 'world' and the
Celtic "world" Celtic 'world' are divided at any given moment; they exist above political divisions, on the margins of history; they do not belong to a particular 'homeland', but to an entity that can be roughly called 'nationality' or 'race'. In relation to them, and far from conditioning, possessing or producing them, particular kingdoms and societies are secondary.

India, which describes Brahmins as "visible gods" and
"human gods[16] " has found striking formulas to express this logical anteriority of the Brahmin in relation to any human group in which he lives: famous verses from the IIIbook of *the Mahâbhârata* declare that the name "city", *nagara*, should be given to places where Brahmins abound, and to those alone, whatever they may be, whether cattle parks or simple forests. Therefore, individually or collectively, Brahmins willingly cross borders: they go where their knowledge and skills are most appreciated. And when kingdoms collapse, it is not a catastrophe for them: they survive them and, if he understands his interest, the victorious *râj* will shower the "earthly gods" with honours and gifts, whom the defeated *râj* undoubtedly honoured

insufficiently. If Brahmins are often seen to intervene in political conflicts, it is either because they have personal grievances to avenge, or because one of the warring princes is their benefactor and has managed to win them over to his side.

Druidism possessed the same outward appearance and superiority with regard to kingdoms: Caesar emphasised its pan-Celtic and unitary character[17] , and Ireland, which, in a formula attributed to the hero Cûchulainn in the epic, contrasts ordinary men, rural dwellers who are not gods, with druids, who are gods[18] . In the final days of paganism, Ireland still had these great stateless druids, whose services were eagerly sought by warring kings and who sometimes took the side of justice, but more often took the side that offered them the greatest advantages. One of the most famous was the druid Mog Ruith, who crossed Ireland to come to the aid of the King of Munster, who had been reduced to his last extremity by the High King Cormac, himself aided by powerful magicians. Mog Ruith only intervened after signing a formal, very long and, moreover, exorbitant contract with the Munster people; from then on, he loyally put all his prestige at their service and refused Cormac's proposals, who would have liked him to change sides[19]. The same text gives a little earlier[20] testimony to "the druidic international": at the beginning of the invasion of Munster, Cormac's druids left the camp and spoke amicably with their colleagues from the besieged kingdom. Finally, did not the "druidic school" of the king of the Ulates supply druids to the other kings of Ireland, his rivals and chronic enemies?

But in India, as among the Celts, it is in the king's interest to attach Brahmins and druids to himself, and in particular to hire a kind of chaplain; each *râj* thus has his

purohita, who devotes all his magic to him, frees him from all defilement, advises him, and lives close to him, showered with honours, "walking first in the king's house" as a Vedic hymn says and as his name means (*purah* "before", *hita* "placed"). Similarly, every *rî* in Irish epic poetry has his own druid (sometimes several), who is an interpreter of omens, advisor, protector, helper, inseparable companion, feared and respected[21]. The respect goes as far as in India: it was one of *the geasa*, one of the "prohibitions" of the King of the Ulates, for example, to speak in any circumstance before being invited to do so by his "chaplain", and this trait is reported to us in relation to the proud King Conchobar, who submits to it obediently[22]. And we are reminded of what a contemporary rhetorician of Trajan said of the continental Celts: "Without their druids, the kings could do nothing and decide nothing; the druids were the effective leaders, and the kings were only their servants and officers."

This solidarity and, at the same time, this peaceful competition for primacy between the king and the priests, and through them between the first two social classes, gave rise to similar developments among the Celts and the Indians.

For example, both sides know, exceptionally, of individuals who combine both eminent qualities: just as there have been a few hybrids "Brahmin-kings", so too was the Galatian Dejotarus both *rex* and *augur*[23], and the formidable Cathbad mac Rossa, father of Concho-bar, was both "druid and professional warrior[24]".

Another encounter: in his conception of *the mahâpurusha*, the "great man" marked by marvellous signs, so well

studied by Emile Senart, India accepted a kind of equivalence between the "great king" and the "great sage"; it became a dogma of Buddhism that Buddhas are born, depending on the era, from a Kshatriya family or a Brahmin family[25] , and tradition has it that, at the very moment of Sâkyamuni's birth, he was given the choice between the two.

"Brahmins who know the future" prophesied that if he remained in the palace, he would become a Universal King, and if he renounced the world, he would be a Perfect Sage[26]. And we know all the vain pleas and desperate tricks that the young man's father resorted to in order to make him choose temporal kingship. The Celtic world combined the same elements in the same alternative: witness Munchai, daughter of the druid Dil, to whom her father had predicted, on the eve of her delivery, that the child would be a "worthy druid" if she gave birth that night and that, if she gave birth the next day, he would become king and his children and relatives would rule over the two provinces of Munster. The heroic young mother sat on a stone all night, and the child was not born until morning; his head was flattened, but he became a great king, Fiacha Muillethan[27].

We cite these few facts to show how, starting from almost similar social conditions, the reflection and imagination of the two peoples led to parallel constructions. However, it is important to note one significant difference: the Celts always remained below the caste system. Admittedly, their thinking was moving in that direction, as evidenced by the verses in which the *Têcosca* — those collections of "Advice" which are like drafts of the "Laws of Manu" with their heavy couplets of sixteen syllables — recommend that sons remain faithful to their fathers' professions: let the carpenter's son be a carpenter, and the son of a blacksmith a blacksmith, and so on for the

sons of the soldier, the potter, the doctor, the flute player, the sailor, the farmer[28] …; witness also the justification they give for this opinion[29] : "It is from spawning that the salmon comes, it is from the valiant young man that the king comes", *is don bratân dothaet eô, is don maccân dothaet rî*. However, nowhere did the social tripartite division ever become rigidly compartmentalised: the Irish *bô aire*, by becoming wealthy under certain conditions, could rise to the class of *flaith;* as for the druids, they were no more necessarily sons of druids in Ireland than in Gaul, where Caesar describes a recruitment process in which heredity, if not by law then in fact, is not even mentioned: young people who are noble, gifted or ambitious flock to schools and are trained equally, regardless of their origin. On this point, as on so many others, the Celts were undoubtedly conservative: the Indo-Iranian classes, before evolving into castes beyond the Indus, and also the functional social groups referred to in Iranian literature of all periods, were not necessarily completely rigid; wealth, merit and natural gifts maintained a healthy elasticity within the tripartite framework.

<div align="center">

*

*   *

</div>

VIII. — *Pontifex.*

There is no need to dwell on the differences between Roman public life and the picture just sketched. The "collegiality" of *the rex* and the first among the flamines should not be misleading: in Rome, what is first, what dominates, possesses and produces everything, including sacred men, is the city, *urbs, civitas*. The flamines, the *dialis* in particular, can only be understood in relation to Rome: the *dialis* is "captured" (*captus*) and "inaugurated" by Roman officials, in the name of Rome, within the closed group of Romans; he loses

any meaning as soon as he loses contact with Rome and the Romans. Let us recall the "taboos of residence" that afflict him: not leaving the city, or even sleeping away from his bed for three nights in a row; not riding a horse so as not to be tempted to stray too far. Let us recall the definition given by Livy (I, 20): the *dialis* was instituted by Numa

"so that the offices pertaining to the royal function would not be abandoned during the many absences that wars would impose on the king". In short, if we imagine, and if history indeed presents foreigners chosen as *reges* (Numa himself, Tatius, Servius, not to mention the Tarquins), a non-Roman flamen would be nonsense. What could be more opposed to the fluidity and internationality of the Brahmin or Druid corps, or to the formula by which India defines the city, *nagara*, in terms of the Brahmins?

On this point, Rome was certainly innovative. While retaining, as well as India, the two Indo-European terms *rêg-*,

bhlghsmen-, and the corresponding dual political-religious reality, while keeping the imprint of the three social functions clear in its triple *flamonium*, it changed the balance of the system: its originality and strength lay in having been Roman rather than Latin from very early on, in having placed the small "homeland" above the vast "nationality" from the outset, and in having attached less importance to what could distinguish its citizens from one another than to what united them in opposition to any foreign group. While the Indians and the Celts and, in a completely different context, the Greeks were constantly diverted from imperial design and political unification because the best, the wisest and most intellectual among them already lived in a unity of thought and civilisation that was sufficient for them, and which perhaps seemed superior to them, Rome initially closed in on itself and claimed

that it claimed to draw all values worthy of respect, effort and sacrifice. And while India and Greece could only change masters, while the Celts vanished, Rome conquered half of the old world.

When did this evolution take place? No tradition suggests that, in prehistoric times, there was a diffuse priesthood floating throughout the Latin world that could be said to be more Latin than, for example, Roman or Arian or Fidenate or Lanuvian. There were indeed federative Latin priesthoods until well into recorded history: these were not international priesthoods[30].

Must we go back to the time when the future Romans, the future Latins, were still migrating? Perhaps. It remains appealing, as it has been for a long time, to derive the characteristic features of Roman society, its exclusivity, its sense of discipline, not so much from the living conditions of the first settlers near the Tiber but from the forgotten times when their ancestors camped – in the most literal sense of the word, since the quadrilateral camp of the Roman legions, with its two intersecting roads, still reproduces the layout of these old settlements – in the pile-dwelling cities of the Po Valley. It was perhaps there that the Indo-Europeans, from whose bloodline the Brutus, Publicola and Caton families were to emerge, acquired the tyrannical notion of the *respublica*. Recently Mr C. Bonfante showed what significant traces, both negative and positive, pile-dwelling life had left in the Roman vocabulary[31]: *pagus* (cf. *pango* 'to plant, to stick' and *palus*, from **pag-slo-* 'stake') substituted for the old name of the village (Greek κώμη, Gothic *haims*, Lithuanian *kaimas*, etc.); *murus* (from **moiro-*, cf. North-West Germanic **mairiya-* "stake") and *moenia* substituted for the old name of the earthen wall (Greek τεῖχος, Sanskrit *dehi*, etc.); the transition to the meaning of "bridge" of the

Indo-European word meaning "path" (Sanskrit panthâh, etc.); *porta* meaning "door", *angiportum* meaning

"alleyway", whereas the Indo-European **prtu-, *pertu-* (Old Norse *fjördhr* "fjord", Gaulish *ritu-* "ford", Avestan *prtu*

"port", etc.) and the Latin *portus* itself refer to points of passage or landing by water; *fundus, fundare, fundamentum* can only be understood if a flooded valley "bottom" has been exploited for cultivation or construction; *vadere* taken in the general sense of "to go" (since Ennius), whereas *vadum* and the corresponding Germanic words refer only to a "ford". Mr Bonfante's list could be extended further: for example, the name for "threshold" (*limen*), that for "path" bordering an estate and, consequently, for

"boundary" (*limes:* cf. in the camp, the *limes decumanus* and the *limes transversus*) perhaps *limus*

"mud" rather than the adjective *limus* "oblique".

But the most important thing for our study is the fact that
Mr Bonfante agrees with Eugen Taiibler[2] and which is indeed plausible: it was in these stations on stilts that the fortune of *the pontifex*, literally the "bridge builder", began, that is to say, the specifically Roman priest who, without taking away the precedence of *the rex* and the major flamines, nevertheless became the head of religious life in Rome in their place. Thanks to the scholarly and mystical nature, as well as the economic, military and religious importance, of building a bridge over the surrounding moat, the *pontifex* would have acquired a considerable position in the administration of the sacred, just as, among the Vedic Indians, for similar reasons but in a different setting, another type of craftsman, the *rathakrt*, the "chariot maker", seems to have played a major social and perhaps religious role alongside the Brahmins and Kshatriyas. This probable prehistory of the

pontifex suggests that the first limitations of *the flamonium* should be traced back to the same embryonic phase of Rome*:* it was probably then that a band of Indo-Europeans began their reform by nationalising the traditional high priesthoods, imprisoning them within the trapezium of their moats and the number of their families, and also subjecting the wandering and pretentious magicians, brothers of the druids and Brahmins, who until then had only lent themselves to its service.

<p style="text-align:center">*</p>
<p style="text-align:center">*   *</p>

Until now, through the divine triad and the triple *flamonium*, we have seen only religious reflections of a tripartite conception of social life. We must now address the heart of the matter: was this conception ever actually translated into reality? Were the pre-Romans or proto-Romans, not content with defining Jupiter, Mars and Quirinus with their three functions, did they divide themselves politically, like the Indo-Iranians and the Celts, into *sacerdotes*, *milites* and *quirites who were not interchangeable*, that is, into three permanent classes of Priest-Lawyers, Warriors and Breeders-Farmers?

1. "*Brâhmana*" *ity eva vaiçya-râjanyayor api.*

2. *Vaiṣya-rājanyayor api yajñe* "*dīkshito'yam brāhmanah*" *ity eva vaktavyam, na* "*dīkshito'yam kshattriyo vaiçyo vâ*".

3. *Tasmâd apy etarhi kshattriyo yajamâno nidhâya eva svâny âyudhâni* brahmanah *eva âyudhair brahmano rûpena brahma bhûtvâ yajñam upavarttate.*

4. *The silence of the Brahman-priest during the sacrifice, Journ. of the Amer. Orient. Soc.*, XV, 1893, pp. 248 ff.

5. A word that contains the same root as *the* German *Gewalt* 'force, violence', the Russian vladêt' 'to dominate', and the Kuchan name for king, *walo*, gen. *tânte.*

6. See above, p. 23.

7. See our article *La tradition druidique et l'écriture, le Vivant et le Mort*, in *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, CXXII, 1940, pp. 125–133.

8. J. Pokorny, *Conle's abenteuerliche Fahrt, Zeitschr. f. celt. Philologie*, XVII, 1928, p. 195

9. I, 24: *Prajânâm vinayâdhânâd rakshanâd bharanâd api.*

10. *Medb Chruachna*, in *Zeitsch. f. celt. Philologie*, XVII, 1928, pp. 129 ff.

11. *Göttin Medb? ibid.*, XVIII, 1930, pp. 108 ff.

12. Version edited by Windisch, Leipzig, 1905, pp. 6-7.

13. See our *Ouranos-Varuna*, 1934, pp. 71 ff., *Myths and Gods of the Germans*, 1939. Chapter III: *The Perils of the Sovereign.*

14. Pliny, *Natural History*, XVI, 49; XXIV, 103.

15. See the texts collected by d'Arbois de Jubainville, *La civilisation des Celtes*, 1899, p. 112 and note.

16. *Manushyadevâh: Çatapatha-Brâhmana*, II, 2, 2, 6, etc.

17. *The Gallic War*, VI, 13.

18. *Batar ê a-ndêe in t-aes cumhachta ocus andêe in t-aes trebaire*: in the *Côir Anmann*, § 149.

19. *The Siege of Druim Damhghaire*, ed. and trans. by M.-L. Sjoestedt, *Rev. Celt.*, XLIV. 1927, pp. 57 ff.

20. Pp. 31 ff.

21. See d'Arbois de Jubainville, *La Civilisation des Celtes*, pp. 106 ff.

22. *Mesca Ulad*, ed. and trans. by M. Hennessy, *Todd Lecture Series*, 1882, p. 12:
"It was forbidden for the Ulates to speak before their king, and it was forbidden for the king to speak before the druids," *ôen do gessib Ulad labrad ria na rîg, ocus ôen do gessib in rîg labrad ria na druidib.*

23. Cicero, *De divinatione*, I, 15.

24. *Sech ba drui side ba fennid*, in *Scêla Conchobâir meic Nessa, Eriu*, IV, 1910, p. 22.

25. *Lalitavistara*, ch. 3, etc.

26. V. Burnouf, *Introduction à l'histoire du bouddhisme indien*, 1876, pp. 306, 316; Oldenberg, *Le Bouddha*, trans. Foucher,[3rd]ed., 1921, p. 84 and note.

27. *Côir Anmann*, § 42, in Stokes' *Irish Texts*, III, 1897, pp. 306 ff.

28. *Advice to a Prince*, ed. and trans. by Tadhg O'Donoghue, *Eriu*, IX, 1921-23, pp. 43 ff., stanzas 28-33.

29. *Ibid*. st. 34.

30. Of course, we must make an exception here for augurs, since a legend such as that of Attus Navius seems to bear witness to a time when one qualified as an augur by natural gift, and when the body of augurs of a city accepted and annexed a "gifted" person who presented himself, wherever he came from. But the augur, however important and ancient he may be, is not the principal priesthood of the state, and it is precisely his artistic nature and the importance

of personal gifts in its practice, enabled it to maintain for a long time a freedom that other priesthoods had lost.

31. *Atti del istituto veneto di scienze, lettere ed arti*, CXVII, 2, Venice, 1937, pp. 53-70.

32. *Terremare und Rome*, in *Sitzb. d. heidelberger Akad. d. Wiss.*, 1931-32, 2. *Abh*., pp. 67 ff.

CHAPTER IV

Ramnes, Luceres, Tities.

I. — *The primitive Roman tribes*.

According to unanimous tradition, Rome was divided into three *tribes* from the time of its founder. Everything that has been said previously compels us to investigate whether these tribes are related to the tripartite division of social functions: just as the flamines inherited from Indo-European times are believed to have been 'instituted' by Numa, it could be that a social tripartite division that predated the birth of Rome was nevertheless considered to have been 'instituted' by Romulus.

In truth, the Romans who told us about them no longer knew exactly how to understand the tribes: they no longer had any application in historical times, except in the fossilised division of the knights into three pairs of centuries, each named after one of the three primitive tribes.

These names — *Ramnes, Luceres, Tities* or *Tatienses* — were strange: those who knew Etruscan did not hesitate to link them to that language[1] and they were right, because the inscriptions reveal Etruscan gentile names, in the indigenous language or Romanised, such as *Ramnius* and *Ramennius, Luχre* and *Lucernius, Titie* and *Titius*[2] . This means that the names did not date back beyond the Etruscan period, the Tarquins. And it seems that foreign rulers made a systematic effort to erase the Romans' memory of their origins and their oldest organisation: it was under the Tarquins that the Capitoline triad — *Jupiter, Juno, Minerva* — which many ancient writers denounce as a translation of a Tuscan triad, was replaced by the old triad *Jupiter, Mars,*

Quirinus, who from then on lost all vitality. Undoubtedly in connection with this religious reform, Tarquinius Priscus claimed, according to tradition, to "change" the system of the three tribes; according to some, he wanted to found, alongside the old ones, three new tribes bearing his name and that of his principal lieutenants; according to [Cicero3], he attempted to change the very names of the old tribes; others remain vague about the project; but all agree that Tarquinius had to abandon it due to the victorious intervention of the famous augur Attus Navius: Roman honour was saved. Except as cheaply as it would be a few centuries later, when history claimed that Camillus had avenged the destruction of Rome by exterminating the Gauls and recapturing the spoils and ransom: the Etruscan consonance of *Ramnes*, *Luceres*, *Tities* — the very names that, according to Cicero, Attus Navius would have saved.

— proves sufficiently that "the Tarquins" or the political masters they represent did indeed achieve their goal; they at least imposed Etruscan names on the three tribes and undoubtedly did more than that: if the Romans of Cicero and Livy's time no longer knew what the primitive tribes were, it was undoubtedly because the Tarquins had irrevocably altered the formula; and if the explanation that seemed most likely to the ancients and moderns is a topographical interpretation related to the neighbourhoods or hills of Rome, it is undoubtedly because, starting with the Tarquins, the reformed tribes, counterfeits of the primitive tribes, were in fact topographical divisions: a reform that could be expected from the Etruscan leaders, city dwellers, urban planners, the true founders of the city as a city. But this proves nothing about the origins. Fortunately, legends are less vulnerable than customs and often, as discreet or joyful widows, they survive them. It is enough to confess them well

. Cicero, historians and poets know a beautiful legend about the origin of the tribes.

<center>

*

*   *

</center>

II. — *Romans, Sabines, Etruscans in the settlement of Rome.*

We say "a beautiful legend" and not several: some critics have exaggerated the differences between authors; they are no more significant than those observed in any folk tradition from one variant to another. The majority of texts, for example, show Tatius and Romulus, or Romulus alone, establishing the tribes after the Sabine War and following the reconciliation of the two peoples; if, therefore, exceptionally and perhaps for simple reasons of[4] , Dionysius of Halicarnassus does not link the institution to the Sabine War, it is because he freely used and dissociated the traditional narrative, and it would be imprudent to use this anomaly to suppose a second narrative, as legitimate as the first, from which the Sabines and Sabines would have been excluded.

Since it is generally agreed that the account in *De republica*, II, 8, is the purest form of the legend, let us first listen to Cicero: Titus Tatius, Romulus' Sabine colleague, is here only the witness to the institution (*Talio vivo*), with all the initiative (*descripseral*) coming from the founding hero; Romulus, therefore, after the successful conclusion of the war against the Sabines and the merger of the two peoples, divided the newly strengthened society into three tribes, giving one his own name, another the name of Tatius, and the third that of a certain Lucumo who had been his ally against the Sabines and who had fallen in battle (*populum et suo et Tatii nomine et Lucumonis, qui*

Romuli socius in sabino praelio occiderat, in tribus tres... descripserat).

All ancient authors confirm Cicero: the *Ramnes* (or *Ramnenses* or *Ramnetes*) are regularly linked phonetically to Romulus, the *Tities* (or *Tatienses*) to Titus Tatius, and the *Luceres* (or *Lucerenses*) to Lucumo. There is some disagreement on this last point, with Livy stating that he does not know where the name Luceres comes [from5] , and Plutarch deriving it from the common noun *lucus* 'sacred wood' designating the Roman ['asylum'6] . However, apart from these two authors, all mention *the* eponymous *Lucumon*[7] , an ally of Romulus, generally describing him as Etruscan, in accordance with his name.

Thus, in the minds of the Romans, the three tribes are the trace of a contractual fusion of peoples, a phenomenon that the ancients placed at the origin of many of their cities and called "synoecism". The first settlers from Alba and the new Sabine immigrants are represented by the Ramnes and the Tities. As for the third tribe, it was certainly embarrassing, since the synœcism described in the legend involves only two peoples, the Romans and the Sabines; but this was resolved by admitting that it represented a third ethnic element, only very inferior in number to the other two, a military band rather than a people, a "large company" in the pay of an Etruscan chief rather than a society organised under a true king. The ethnic explanation was easily combined with the topographical explanation: it was not difficult to identify   the   hills   and districts   of   Rome   where   had
'camped', first in war and then in peace, the three protagonists of the story.

Some modern scholars have rejected this tradition outright, without knowing what to replace it with. Others have accepted it with

with varying degrees of reservation, emphasising sometimes the ethnic aspect, sometimes the topographical aspect of the explanation, and sometimes reducing it to the latter aspect alone. The presence of the Luceres continues to cause confusion: some therefore admit that, in the mists of time, the Romans merged at least two chronologically and essentially distinct peoples into a single synoecism. Mr André Piganiol writes, for example: "We admit that the alliance between Romulus and Tatius, which is the main event in early Roman legend, symbolises the federation of the Ramnes of the Palatine Hill and the Tities (or Tatienses) of the Capitoline Hill, the Albans and the Sabines. And the Luceres will be identical to the army that Lucumon, according to Roman tradition, installed on the Caelian Hill; but while the Romans date this event to the beginning of the royal period, we date it to the Umbrian-Tyrrhenian invasion at the end of the sixth century, and we would readily admit that the historical name of Lucumo is that of the king of the Caelian Hill, Tullus Hostilius[8] "

None of these constructions is entirely satisfactory. Not that we wish to dispute that Rome assimilated foreigners on several occasions. But if the Roman state based its major divisions on these accidents, we are faced with a difficulty that Mr Piganiol himself formulated[9] :

"It will be objected," he says, "that the memory of these great ethnic distinctions is almost obliterated among the Romans: yet none should have remained more vivid, since the history of the three tribes provided the key to the entire history of the primitive institutions. We would respond that there must indeed have been a concerted effort to make the Romans forget their origins. It is remarkable that the only surviving trace of the three primitive tribes is found in a minor detail of military organisation: in historical times, only the three

Twin centuries of horsemen (*sex suffragia*) retained the outdated names of *Ramnes, Tities* and *Luceres*. Were these names not systematically abolished? Even within these centuries, men were grouped into *lurmae*, where members of different tribes appeared side by side, so preoccupied were people with merging these three tribes together. It is therefore likely that a great effort was made in Rome, probably since the time of the Decemvirate legislation, to make citizens forget the primitive distinction between their races, and it is probable that the pontiffs were the best agents of this policy.

All this is indeed plausible. After the initial
social "mixing" that the Tarquins seem to have carried out, the Republic, for other reasons, had to further disrupt the old structures, and the pontiffs' policy must have gone in this direction. But this is not enough. There is an element of explanation in the very legend of the institution of the three tribes that has not been highlighted.

<p style="text-align:center">*
* *</p>

III. — *Propertius*, IV, I, 9-32.

The first elegy in the fourth book by Propertius, a patriotic poet and archaeologist, is entitled *De urbe Roma*. It naturally opens with a description of the humble beginnings of the city. We cannot resist the pleasure of copying this text, which is, moreover, of great importance. After a few verses that establish the theme by applying it to the site, a long discussion of the first inhabitants begins:

> ...*Qua gradibus domus ista Remi se sustulitolim*

[10]   *Unus erat fratrum maxima regna focus.*

Curia, praetexto quae nunc nitet alla senalu

    Pellitos habuit rustica corda patres.

Buccina cogebat priscos ad verba quiritis,

    Cenlum illi in prato saepe senatus eral.

[15]   *Nor did sinuous sails hang in the theatre,*

    nor did the solemn pulpit bear crocuses.

No one cared to seek out foreign gods,

    When the native crowd trembled with sacred awe.

And celebrate the annual Parilia with hay,

[20]   *As now the Curio lustra are renewed with*

horses. Vesta, crowned, rejoiced with poor

donkeys,

    Ducebant macrae vilia sacra boves.

Small pigs were washed in the troughs, The

    shepherd and the sheep were washed

                with straw.

[25]   *Verbera pellitus setosa movebat arator,*

    Where Fabius has the sacred rites of Lupercus.

Nor did the rough soldiers radiate in their

    armour, They mixed the heat of battle with

    naked sweat.

First, Lygmon laid down his praeloria,

[30]   *Tatio was a great man among the sheep. From*

here came the Tities, the Ramnes, the Luceres, and

the colonists,

    Quatuor hinc albos Romulus egit equos...

   "On the slope where Remus' poor [10] *house once*
stood, the two brothers had a single home, an
immense kingdom!

"The Curia, whose splendour today covers an assembly in togas praetexta, contained only senators dressed in skins, rustic souls.

"It was the trumpet that summoned the ancient citizens to their meetings: a hundred men in a meadow, such was often their Senate.

[15]   "*No* velum *undulating over the depths of a theatre, no stage exuding the solemn scent of saffron.*

"No one cared to seek out foreign gods: the crowd trembled, attached to the ancestral cult.

"Every year, by lighting a fire [20] *of hay, we celebrated the festivals of Palès, which nowadays mark the beginning of a five-year period with the mutilation of a horse.*

"Vesta was poor and found pleasure in donkeys crowned with flowers; emaciated cows carried worthless objects in procession.

"Fattened pigs were enough to purify the narrow crossroads, and the shepherd, to the sound of the pipe, offered the entrails of a sheep as a sacrifice.

[25]   "*Clad in skins, the ploughman brandished his hairy straps: this is where the Fabii, the frenzied Luperci, took their rites.*

"Still primitive, the soldier did not sparkle under terrible weapons; they fought naked, with spears hardened in fire.

> *"The first camp* (praetorium: *the part of the camp around the general's tent) was established by a commander wearing a leather cap, Lygmon. And Tatius' wealth was largely in his sheep.*
>
> *"It was from this origin that the* Tities, *the* Ramnes, *and the* Luceres *colonists were formed; it was from there that Romulus launched his quadriga of white horses..."*

The train of thought is clear: it leads to the final couplet as its natural conclusion, and this couplet, before mentioning Romulus in the triumphal apparatus of a *rex*, lists the three tribes with their traditional names[10]. The *hinc...* in verse 31 clearly indicates the relationship of the three tribes to what precedes: as usual, the *Tities* are derived from *Titus Tatius*, to whom verse 30 alone is devoted, and the *Luceres* from *Lygmon* (i.e. Lucumo), whose name crowns verses 27-29. As for the *Ramnes*, symmetry and tradition require that they be linked to the picture painted in verses 9 to 26 of Roman society before the mention of Lygmon and Tatius, a picture introduced in verse 9 by the name of *Remus* (in the absence of Romulus, reserved for the apotheosis of verse 32). Thus, the piece is composed of fragments of unequal length: 18 verses describing the life of the future *Ramnes*, then three verses presenting the eponym of *the Luceres*, and finally a single verse characterising the eponym of *the Tities*.

The reader will easily see that this description, presentation and characterisation excellently define the three Indo-European social functions. To begin with the end, Tatius is distinguished by his wealth of sheep, Lygmon is the first military leader to establish his *praetorium*, and the men of Remus

appear only in the two areas of activity that best illustrate the first social function: deliberations of the Senate (lines 11-14) and religious festivals and ceremonies (lines 15-26). Admittedly, all the festivals and solemnities that appear from verse 15 to verse 26 are rural, just as the first military leader, Lygmon, wears only a leather cap in verse 29: this is natural, since the general theme of the poem is precisely the humility of Roman origins and the antithesis between primitive simplicity and later refinements. But it is nonetheless significant that sheep, pigs, oxen, even hay and the shepherd himself are mentioned in this long development only in terms of their religious purpose or orientation (*celebrare, ducere vilia sacra, lustrare compila, lilare exta*), with no reference whatsoever to what, on the contrary, fills the only verse devoted to Tatius' sheep: *magna pars rerum*, wealth. Chance and caprice could not have guided the poet's hand so harmoniously and so firmly: Propertius was undoubtedly unaware that the three tribes had been functional, juxtaposing priests, warriors and herders-farmers; but the tradition he echoes still represented, without understanding the meaning of these connections, *Tatius* and the "colonists" *Tities* — *coloni* meaning here

"peasants" or "immigrants" — as herders, *Lucumo* and the *Luceres* as warriors, and the rest of society, the *Ramnes*, as primarily concerned with government and religion.

However novel this explanation may seem to Latin scholars, Propertius' text allows for no other. Even if we did not have the comparative reasons we have for seeking in early Rome the equivalent of the three social classes of the Indo-Iranians and Celts, it would still be impossible for us not to see the clear intentions of the

poem; in particular, it is impossible for us to agree with L. Holzapfel[11] that Propertius, in line 31, does not place the Luceres and the Ramnes on the same level as the Tities in relation to one of the three parts of the preceding table. Moreover, verifications are possible, and new perspectives will open up, which will take us far.

<center>

*

*   *

</center>

IV. — *The Ramnes*.

Few texts contain the word *Ramnes* in isolation*:* in *Ars Poetica*, v. 342, Horace is said to take the *celsi Ramnes*, traditionally translated as "the disdainful Ramnes", as a type of the golden youth of the equestrian order, alluding to the system of the six *suffragia of equites*, the last refuge of the names of the defunct tribes. This is indeed probable, and teaches us nothing.

On the other hand, a poet who is no less of an antiquarian and no less steeped in scholarly intentions than Propertius, Virgil, used the word *Ramnes* (gen. *Ramnitis*) in an instructive manner[12]. He uses it as the name of a man, whom he describes as *superbus Ramnes*, an eminent figure in Turnus's retinue; and if we doubted that Virgil had a purpose, we need only note that Ramnes's principal companion, the only one who is named, perhaps his squire, who is killed just before his *dominus*, is called Remus: the Latin reader could not help but think of the pair Romulus and Remus, and for his part, the poet could not have better emphasised the "Italic" character of the army facing the Trojans than by giving distinguished fighters the most illustrious names in Roman mythology. It is easy to understand why Remus is unmasked, but Romulus is disguised as his

synonym Ramnes: Remus, a lesser lord in every respect, is not the eponym of Rome, and the poet could not decently name a pre-Roman Romulus, especially to show him as the victim of an inglorious throat-slitting. But that is not the point. How does Virgil define this Ramnes?

Rex idem et regi Turno gratissimus augur

"Both king and augur, highly esteemed by King Turnus".

"King and augur": this is the traditional definition of Romulus[13] whose *lituus*, the augural staff, has been piously and even miraculously preserved. And it is also the definition we would expect of a "Ramnes" in the common sense of the name: political primacy with religious activity. Virgil thus confirms the picture that Propertius gave us of the early existence, that is, the function, of the "Ramnes viri".

*
*   *

V. — *The Luceres.*

For the Luceres and Lucumo, Propertius' clear definition is in line with tradition. Dionysius of Halicarnassus (II, 37) describes the Etruscan Λοκόμων, who came to Romulus' aid against the Sabines, in these terms: "a man of action and illustrious in matters of war"[14]. The Romans imagined this Lucumon as a renowned bandit leader[15], sometimes confusing him with Caelius Vibenna, who seems to have been a hero not only in Roman history but also in Etruscan epic poetry itself: a skilled warrior and mobile conqueror, such as were common in Celtic and Germanic antiquity

Germanic antiquity, and as ancient Italy, like Rome itself "before the legion", must have known. All this reinforces the testimony of the poet, who, in fact, goes even further, since he seems to deny that the "Romans before Lucumon" had any knowledge of the camp (*praetoria* for *castra*), a fundamental element of Roman military art, of which "Lygmon" was truly the inventor, the specialist in the full sense of the word.

*

* *

VI. — *The Tities and the gods of Tatius*.

But it is the interpretation of the Tities as "breeders-farmers" that will prove to be by far the most fruitful.

It is immediately understandable that the words *Quirinus* and *Quirites* are unanimously considered by the ancients to be of Sabine origin, sometimes with, sometimes without etymological reference to the city of Cures, where Tatius was said to have originated: could the god of the third social function have had any other nationality than that of the rural component of society? When the *Pervigilium Veneris*, v. 71, summarises the old legend in three lines of doggerel: "It was Venus who brought about the marriage of the people of Romulus with the Sabines: hence the Ramnes and the Quirites", the poet is quite right: *Quirites* is the legitimate, coextensive, perfect substitute for *Tities*.

Then the two texts by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, II, 50, and Varro, *De ling. lat.*, V, 74, on the deities introduced to Rome by Tatius take on their full meaning. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, in a striking diptych, shows Romulus and Tatius, who became colleagues after the war and the synoecism, each establishing the cults of his preference, dare we say now: of his function. Romulus founded only one, that of

of Jupiter Stator (Ὀρθωσίῳ Διί), celestial god and sovereign, almighty magician whose value has been mentioned . Tatius, on the contrary, establishes a long series, the original Latin names of which are as follows: first *Sol, Luna, Saturnus, Ops;* then *Vesta, Volcanus, Diana, Quirinus;* and finally others, for which the historian declares that he has given up trying to find Greek equivalents. Varro's list is complete: according to the Annals, he says, Tatius *vovit Opi, Florae, Vedio, Jovi Saturnoque, Soli, Lunae, Volcano et Summano, itemque Larundae, Termino, Quirino, Vortumno, Laribus, Dianae, Lucinaeque*. Of these sixteen deities, eight are rural, agrarian or seasonal (*Ops, Flora, Saturnus, Larunda, Terminus, Quirinus, Vortummus, Lar es*), two (*Sol* and *Luna*, the former having his temple on the *collis quirinalis* as *Sol Indiges*) are celestial bodies to which Roman religion did not attach great symbolic significance, retaining only their seasonal or monthly function; two (*Lucina, Diana*) preside over pregnancy and childbirth: in various ways, all these specifications clearly relate to the social function of abundance and fertility; among the remaining deities, the presence of Vedius, god of the underworld[17] , and Volcanus, originally the god of fire as dangerous and destructive; only Jupiter and Summanus, sovereign gods[18] ; it should also be noted that Jupiter, whose Greek equivalent did not cause Dionysius any difficulty, is missing from his list, and that Varro's text itself introduces each of these two gods, and only them, in an original way, Jupiter leaning on Saturnus, Summanus paired with Volcanus: an indication, no doubt, that they appear here only as complements to their two associates; Jupiter, who brings rain, and Summanus, who throws lightning bolts at night, obviously affect the seeds of Saturnus and the fires of Volcanus, respectively. In any case, statistically speaking, the list of

cults founded by Tatius contrasts sharply with the single cult of Jupiter Stator founded by Romulus, just as the third social function contrasts with the first, just as plant and animal fertility contrasts with sovereign magic, just as, in the sky, the humus of the earth contrasts.

From a completely different perspective, we agree here with several of the findings of Mr Piganiol's analysis[19]. We certainly cannot accept that the "chthonic cults" of Rome are the exclusive survival of the Mediterranean substratum, when the Indo-Europeans themselves brought only

"the worship of the sky". All our observations attest to the fact that this is a complex, comprehensive religion brought by the peoples of the North; indeed, it is as difficult to conceive of a purely "Uranian" religion that disregards the earth as it is to conceive of a purely "Chthonic" religion that disregards the sky: it is the universe that any society must explain and control; how, after all, could the Indo-Europeans, who cultivated cereals and whose heirs have preserved the old names for ploughing and the plough everywhere, have arrived in Italy without agrarian cults?

But Mr Piganiol had the most accurate sense of what distinguishes the two types of worship in their internal economy. It is fair and fruitful, for example, to [note20] that "while chthonic worship is dispersed among numerous local deities, sky worship retains a remarkable monotheistic character". We would only remove the word

"topical" as too limiting, since Saturn is undoubtedly not "the same great agrarian god" as Quirinus, nor simply his Capitoline variant. The characteristic feature of the gods of the third social function is always and everywhere their multiplicity, which sometimes leads to confusion and instability in mythology, if not in worship. We have recalled

[21] this statement from an ancient Indian text: the first function, that of the Brahmin, corresponds to a single god; the second, that of the warriors, corresponds to multiple but individual gods, whose value lies in their own strength, in their person; the third function, that of the farmers and herders, corresponds to gods multiplied to the second power, all the groups of "group gods", all those whose value lies in "being numerous". This is another, more systematic result of the tendency in Rome to fragment the "Quirinal" essence of the third function, while continuing to concentrate the "diale" and "martiale" essence of the first two. Perhaps this difference can be explained by the inequality of the social volumes involved in these various levels of worship: there are always more peasants than warriors and, in general, more warriors than priests.

The same trend accounts for the anomaly that surprised Wissowa[22], and also Sir J. G. Frazer[23]: the multiplicity of offices of *the flamen quirinalis*. On the contrary, it is natural that this priest should be divided between serving "chthonic" or agrarian deities such as Larenta (probably the same as Larunda in Varro's Sabine list), Robigus and Consus.

<p style="text-align:center">*
*　*</p>

VII. — *Functional interpretation and ethnic interpretation.*

This last name reminds us that it was during the festivals of Consus that the Sabine women were abducted. But before assessing the significance of this new encounter in the next chapter, let us clearly state a difficulty that at first glance seems considerable , and , which may not exist .

How can the *functional* definition of tribes be coupled with an *ethnic* conception*?* How does the *organic* division of society, inherited from Indo-European times, appear, on the banks of the Tiber, complicated by *local* distribution*?*

We could simply refer to our previous work: Romans think historically and geographically; their imagination is not philosophical or fantastical, but concrete and down-to-earth; their mythology is dressed up as the city's recent or ancient 'past', not as fables about the other world. Whenever we have identified the counterpart of a myth from India or Scandinavia in Rome, we have found it inserted into the Annals, in the account of internal strife or wars, often dated, often linked to a member of an authentic *gens*, to a perhaps real person. What elsewhere is a monster or demon is in Rome simply an enemy, a people or a king, an enemy taken from among the most ordinary enemies. Horatius the Cyclops and Mucius the Left-handed are the counterparts of the Germanic pair of the one-eyed god and the one-armed god, and their dual adventures form the bulk of what annalists know about the conflict between the nascent republic and the Etruscans. Mucius lost his right hand not in the jaws of a monster but in a fire, in front of the praetorium of the very human Porsenna. In response to the nurturing goddesses of the Celtic world, there is Anna Perenna, a goddess indeed, but one whom the Romans hastened to rejuvenate, so to speak, into an old woman who was deified only for having fed the plebs in the 5th century BC during the secession on the Sacred Mount.century BC, during the secession on the Sacred Mount. What could be more plausible in itself than the institutions of Romulus and Numa? And yet it was easy to show that the slightest actions of these two kings

combine to form two complementary images, those of the two halves of Sovereignty which, in India for example, are expressed in the magician god Varuna and the lawyer god Mitra. For the problem we are dealing with here, it is therefore not unexpected to see Rome putting real names, names of peoples taken from its most familiar experience, on a theory of functions that would otherwise have been too abstract for its mind. Since, in reality, Rome certainly incorporated both the Sabines and the Etruscans, and since, on the other hand, the Sabines were on the whole a rural people and the Etruscan ' ' had left Rome with bitter military memories, it is easy to understand why the warrior function and the productive function were embodied by tradition in the Etruscans and the Sabines, in the people of Lucumo and the people of Tatius, national honour demanding that the former function — *celsi Ramnes, superbus Ramnes*

— remained in the hands of the pure Romans, the people of Romulus and Remus. This does not imply a synœcism in the strict sense of the word, nor that at any time all the Tities were of Sabine origin and all the Luceres of Etruscan origin. It merely implies a stylisation, within the framework of the old functional tripartite division, of the ethnic movements that took place in the early days of Rome, and a total assimilation of the Sabines and Etruscans into what was only approximately their speciality. Is this too much to ask of the mental agility of the ancient Romans?

But in this case, there are reasons to believe that the Indo-Europeans themselves paved the way for the Romans. Indeed, the ambiguity that puzzles us is found in many other parts of the domain, particularly among the Germanic and Celtic peoples. This will be discussed in the next chapter. For now, let us simply note that among the

Scythians: it is this ambiguity that has provoked the discussions referred to at the beginning of this book[24].

After describing the descent of the marvellous objects symbolising social functions (plough and yoke, axe, cup), the vain attempts of Kolaxaïs' two elder brothers to seize them and the latter's success, Herodotus (IV, 5 and 6) adds that, faced with the evidence of the heavenly sign, Kolaxaïs received from his brothers the relinquishment of total kingship, and he concludes abruptly with genealogical information: "From Lipoxaïs were born (γεγονέναι) those of the Scythians who are called the race (γένος) of the Aukhatai; from the second brother, Arpoxaïs, those who are called Katiaroi and Traspies (var. Trapies, Trapioi); and from the last, the king, those who are called Paralatai; but all together they are called Skolotoi after the name of their king; Skythai is the name given to them by the Greeks."

Until Mr. Christensen, this division of the Scythians into Aukhatai, Katiaroi, Traspies and Paralatai was understood as a geographical division, each of these "nations" (γένη) having occupied a defined territory. Mr Christensen was sensitive to the parallelism between the four objects that fell from the sky to symbolise the three social functions and the four γένη descended from the three sons of Targitaos, and he proposed to see in this story the combination of what he calls a "social legend" (i.e. justifying an internal division into classes) with, he says, "the ethnic legend widespread especially among Indo-European peoples, which traces the peoples back to three brothers[25]".

We ourselves have proposed a more radical interpretation, excluding any ethnic element and understanding the γένη as simple social classes; our arguments are set out at length in the *Journal Asiatique*[26]: first, the

fact that neither Herodotus himself in his subsequent description of the Scythians, nor later historians and geographers (except Pliny in a text that undoubtedly depends on this chapter of Herodotus) mention these "nations" again; then the contradiction that the legend would contain if the two brothers of Kolaxaïs, after abandoning τὴν βασιληίην πᾶσαν to him, that is to say, not suzerainty over vassals but undivided kingship, gave birth to "nations"; finally, the fact that in the following chapter (IV, 7) Herodotus does indeed speak of a fragmentation of the lands of the Scythians into three "kingdoms", but only in the second generation, not under the brothers of Kolaxaïs, who seem to have been forgotten, but under his sons: "If we insist," we wrote, "on giving the four γένη a geographical value, we are faced with the following conundrum: two divisions would have overlapped and intertwined, one ethnic and the other political, one into four nations under Kolaxaïs and his brothers, the other into three kingdoms under the sons of Kolaxaïs. This is very complicated for a legend of origin. And what meaning could a geographical division into coexisting nations, which did not coincide with an equally geographical division into kingdoms, have in barbarian antiquity? If the legend had understood Aukhatai, Katiaroi, etc., to mean nations, it would either have made these nations descend from the first kings, the sons of Kolaxaïs, or it would have named their own founders, Kolaxaïs and his brothers, as their first kings; in any case, the two divisions would have become one, and we would not have two generations of mythical respondents.

These arguments left Mr. Benveniste unmoved, and we readily admit that they are only arguments. Sticking to an exclusively ethnic interpretation, he countered them with[27] reflections that do not convince us either

convince us any more, and in which one could easily find evidence to reinforce our argument. But these debates are fruitless: the objective lesson to be learned is that this page of Herodotus is unclear. On the other hand, the ambiguity of the Roman tribes and the very similar ambiguity that we will soon see in other European peoples suggest that we should not force ourselves to choose between a functional interpretation and an ethnic interpretation of the genealogy of the first Scythian kings, however incompatible our   reason may find them to be.   Should we fall back   on the opinion   of

Mr Christensen: like the Roman tradition that inspired Propertius, Herodotus' informants and the tradition of the Scythians themselves had to combine the two concepts as best they could, taking care, with the instinctive caution of all folklore, not to expose the contradiction.

<center>*</center>
<center>*   *</center>

But why is the idyllic agreement between the Romans and the Sabines, between Romulus and Tatius, conceived as the conclusion of a painful war, which itself opened with the no less idyllic festival of Consus?

1. Varro, *De Lingua Latina*, V, 55.

2. W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte laleinischer Eigennamen, Abh. d. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen, N. F.*, V, 2, 1904, pp. 218, 182, 248.

3. *De republica*, II, 20.

4. II, 7: ἐρῶ δὲ πρῶτον ὑπὲρ τοῦ κόσμου τῆς πολιτείας "I will *first* speak of the political institutions of Romulus...".

5. I, 13: *Ramenses ab Romulo, ab Tito Tatio Tilienses appellati, Lucerum nominis et originis causa incerta est;* Titus Livius speaks here only of the centuries of knights; but two other chapters, I, 36 and x, 6, prove that he also attributes the foundation of the tribes to Romulus.

6. *Romulus*, 20: τοὺς μὲν ἀπὸ Ῥωμύλου Ῥαμνήσης, τοὺς δὲ ἀπὸ Τατίου Τατιήσης, τρίτους δὲ Λουκερήσης διὰ τὸ ἄλσος, εἰς ὃ πολλοὶ, καταφυγόντες, ἀσυλίας δεδομένης, τοῦ πολιτεύματος μετέσχον· τὰ δ᾽ἄλση λούκους ὀνομάζουσιν.

7. Festus, known as *Lucerus*, King of Ardea.

8. *Essay on the origins of Rome*. 1916, pp. 245 ff.

9. *Op. cit*., p. 246.

10. A variant in verse 31, *Luceresque Soloni*, alluding to the town of Solonium, where Lucumo is sometimes said to have originated, does not alter the substance of the matter.

11. *Die drei ältesten römischen Tribus, Klio*, I, 1901, p. 231, n. 3.

12. *Aeneid*, IX. 324 ff.

13. Plutarch, *Romulus*, 22.

14. Ἀνὴρ δραστήριος καὶ τὰ πολέμια διαφανής.

15. *Dux nobilis... cum sua manu*, Varro, *De ling. lat*., V, 46.

16. See above, p. 81.

17. See the *flamen quirinalis* and the "underground" rites, above, p. 95.

18. See *Milra-Varuna*, p. 51 ff.

19. *Essay on the origins of Rome*, pp. 114 ff.

20. *Op. cit*., p. 116.

21. *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, CXVIII, 1938, p. 196, n. 2.

22. See above, p. 91.

23. See his commentary on Ovid's *Fasti*, vol. III, pp. 412–413.

24. See above, p. 57.

25. *The First Man and the First King...*, I, 1918, p. 137.

26. 1930, I, pp. 117 ff.

27. *Journ. Asiat*., 1938, 2, pp. 534 ff.

CHAPTER V

The War of the Sabine Women.

I. The Aesir and the Vanir.

A small book has recently been devoted to showing that the Germanic peoples also experienced the tripartite division of social and ^{cosmic} functions[1]. The ancient Scandinavians in particular distinguished three religious 'levels', which are expressed in many circumstances by triads in which the great Eugen Mogk, at the end of his life, was all too willing to see the mark of the Christian Trinity. Broadly speaking, omnipotence, in its two aspects of magic and law, is the domain of *Odhinn* and *Tyr* (or *Ullr*), surrounded by a staff of officials, just as in India Mitra-Varuna are surrounded by the Adityas; fighting power is represented by *Thôrr;* the function of fertility and abundance is ensured by gods who are united, with one or the other taking centre stage: *Njördhr,* who bears the same name as the goddess *Nerthus* of the continental Germans, whose "fertility ritual" Tacitus described so well, his son *Freyr* and his daughter *Freya*. In the pagan temple of Uppsala, for example, Adam of Bremen saw statues representing the three deities, whose functions and attributes he explains clearly: Odhinn, Thor, and Freyr.

These three tiers of gods, which complement and interact with each other, are not homogeneous. The first two, the Almighty Gods and the Champion God, belong to the same family, the *Aesir*[2], named after the old name that we know was given by the Goths to the "semidei" *(ansis)* and which is common Germanic[3]: *Odhinn* is said to be *Asaôdhinn.*

"Odhinn of the Aesir", *Thor* is known as *Asathorr* "Thor of the Aesir". On the contrary, *Njördhr*, *Freyr and Freya* are *Vanes*[4] , belonging to this group of deities whose name is possibly

be related to the Latin *Venus* and who are undoubtedly the agents of fertility and prosperity[5] .

The Aesir and Vanir form two families, or rather two distinct nations. We learn about them from Snorri, who, at the end of the twelfth century, systematically collected traditions that were in danger of being forgotten. His *History of the Ynglingar* (that is, first and foremost, of the oldest dynasty of Uppsala, said to have descended from Yngvi-Freyr) begins with a scholarly geography and an equally scholarly prehistory: it lists the continents and distant lands and populates them with mythical beings. We should not dismiss these early chapters as uninteresting, nor conclude that the fantastical setting implies artificial content. Since the pagan gods are presented here as kings and landowners, it was necessary to place them in the real world. And since Odhinn was the universal ruler, and in particular of the other world, it was enough to place him far away, at a distance that was as good as infinity, in Greater Sweden (Russia) or, as Saxo Grammaticus did in Latin at around the same time, on the Bosphorus. No doubt Snorri and Saxo did not even invent this: from the time when paganism flourished, questions of location must have been asked in these terms, at least among educated and imaginative people.

According to Snorri, the Aesir and Vanir have neighbouring but different homelands: the former are based at the mouth of the Don River, on the theoretical border between Asia and Europe, while the latter live further east, beyond the Don. Less learned Scandinavians were probably not as precise, but they certainly conceived of the habitats of their gods, and those of the giants, as mirroring their own societies: whatever the prestige of Freyr or the power of Odhinn, their "worlds" could only consist of "enclosures" (*gardhr*) occupied

by "great families". Any other form of dwelling would have been unthinkable, and would not have satisfied the followers of the religion, who needed to identify with their gods. *Asgardhr*, where the Aesir sleep and eat, like their neighbours' *Vanaheimr*, and like *Jölunheimr*, where the rich Thrymr, prince of the giants, reigns, are built and furnished in the image of the most opulent houses. The ancient Scandinavians

"saw" the gods as the peasants of modern Dalarna "see" the characters of the two Testaments and paint them on the fabrics of their rooms or churches: clothing, dwellings, carriages, mounts, and of course feelings and judgements, are transposed without correction from earth to heaven. The poet Erik Axel Karlfeldt beautifully captured the naivety of his province in a famous poem, *The Ascension of Elijah:*

> *Saint Elijah ascends to the land of*
>
> *heaven In his shiny carriage;*
>
> *He wears a beautiful funeral hat and a fur coat, he holds a whip in his hand:*
>
> *Against his knees, he has placed his green umbrella...*

Snorri's *Edda* shows us the giant Hrungnir so heated by the race that he carelessly passes through the fence of the Aesir's dwelling...

There is therefore a land of the Vanes and a land of the Aesir that closely resemble the lands of men. Njördhr and Freyr are Vanes, while all the other major gods are Aesir. But here's what's surprising: Njördhr and Freyr live among the Aesir, assimilated and equal in rights, to such an extent that they are generally, although Vanir, included under the collective designation of Aesir. Better still: when Snorri, evhemerising the lives of these characters, describes

the successive kings of the Aesir, it is Njördhr and his son Freyr, these gods of fertility, these foreigners, these immigrants, who take over from Odhinn and rule over their warrior and magician hosts.

<div align="center">*</div>
<div align="center">*   *</div>

II. The war between the Aesir and the Vanir.

This unusual situation is the result of a very interesting mythical event: what can two neighbouring peoples, whether Romans and Sabines or Aesir and Vanir, do but fight? The Aesir and the Vanir, after waging a long war with alternating successes, finally concluded a treaty and, according to the inflexible custom of the North, exchanged hostages. The hostages given by the Vanir were Njördhr with his son Freyr and his daughter Freya. They came to the Aesir and assimilated so completely that they changed their sexual morals, for until then, among the Vanir, Njördhr had his own sister as his wife, a practice that was forbidden in his new home. On the other hand, Freya taught the Aesir the special magic of the Vanir, and Odhinn appointed all three of them as "priests of the temples[6]". The Aesir did not regret this reinforcement: when Freyr came to power, he brought the country legendary peace and prodigious wealth. A shorter account can be found in Snorri's Prose *Edda*, and references to this war can be found in various texts.

Modern scholars have interpreted the war between the Aesir and the Vanir in several ways, which Jan de Vries rightly considers equally improbable[7]: for some, it is a figurative account of a religious revolution that brought new gods, either the Aesir or the Vanir; for others, it is

a memory of the conflicts and final agreement between the Indo-European invaders who worshipped the Aesir and the indigenous people who worshipped the Vanir. Jan de Vries pointed out that the "wars of the gods" are rarely to be interpreted, on a human level, as invasions or revolutions; that the "cult of the Aesir" and the "cult of the Vanir" are likely to be contemporary; and that probably "the mythical battle merely reflects the organic opposition of the two halves between which, at a primitive stage of civilisation, clans are so often divided".

What we now know about the triad of social functions among the Indo-Europeans and in Scandinavian mythology points us towards a different, but closely related, concept. It is probably not a question of
"tribal halves" or "phratries", but rather functional classes, more or less distinct in practice, but clear in theory and in the legends that justify them. Not only must the "cult of the Aesir" and the "cult of the Vanir" be contemporary, but they are also interdependent, complementary and inseparable, as are religious sovereignty and military strength on the one hand, and fertility on the other. The myth recounts a war, certainly, but its centre of gravity lies in the lasting treaty that concludes it, which establishes the current order of the world and society by establishing 'normal' relationships between the divine patrons of social functions. And the war here undoubtedly serves only to introduce the treaty, just as in the myths of Creation chaos is first mentioned only to highlight the order that follows it, or as in the legends intended to exalt royalty (Prthu), Indian philosophers begin by depicting the intolerable distress of a land without a king: expressing logical relationships in dramatic form, myths readily 'realise' for

then "repair" the misfortunes that the corresponding rites, institutions, and moral precepts are simply intended to avoid.

<div align="center">

*

*   *

</div>

III. The war between the Romans and the Sabines.

This interpretation, which is probable in itself, is made necessary by comparison with the Roman legend that recounts the war, then the agreement and merger of the Romans and the Sabines. The analogy is so complete that the two stories can only be explained in parallel: therefore, there is no other explanation than the one just presented.

We are familiar with this famous story: Romulus, having founded Rome with his band, realises that he needs women to bear children. As the neighbouring peoples, notably the Sabines, were reluctant to give their daughters to these adventurers, he 'invented' the god Consus, to whose festival he invited the Sabines with their wives and daughters, and during the festivities, he and his companions abducted the virgins and matrons. This led to a long, difficult and indecisive war, which the Sabine women ended by throwing themselves between the two sides. They reconciled them so well that both sides decided to form a single people. The Sabines settled in Rome, introducing the name *Quirites* and their own cults; Tatius became king of the new Rome in collegiality with Romulus; and no internal strife ever divided the two peoples so strangely united.

Let us compare this account to the war between the Aesir and the Vanir, taking into account everything we have learned previously about the functional, 'Quirinal' nature – fertility and abundance – of the Sabines and their king Tatius.

Like the Vanir and the Aesir, the Sabines and the Romans are, at the beginning of the story, not only neighbouring nations but "specialised" nations, and when Freyr reigns among the Aesir and Tatius in Rome, they will both ensure fertility and abundance, in contrast to the other two, both embodied in their former adversaries. (It should be noted in passing that in both Scandinavian and Latin traditions, the functional definition and ethnic distribution of the elements of society, divine in the former and human in the latter, are combined and according to the same pattern).

Thôrr the warrior is an Aesir in the same way as the magician Odhinn: and likewise Lucumo, the eponymous "warrior" of the Luceres, fights on the same side as Romulus, eponym of the Ramnenses, against Tatius, eponym of the Tities. The distinction thus established between the third function or class and the first two, and the natural alliance recognised between the latter two, are in accordance with Indian doctrine, as explained in *Mitra-Varuna*[8]: Brahmins and Kshatriyas, who in other respects are opposed to each other, are, in contrast to their inferior brothers the Vaishyas, defined jointly as "the two forces", *ubhe vîrye*, and indeed operate as allies.

Like the war between the Aesir and the Vanir, the war between the Romans and the Sabines ended without a decision. Both wars are only of interest because of the treaties that ended them. And these treaties, with their unequal scope and two different legal fabrications (here the release of hostages who are immediately naturalised, there the complete and immediate fusion of one people into another), achieve the same essential result: introducing into the community where the first two functions (and mainly the first) were already embodied, either the most important members (Njördhr, Freyr, Freya), or,

around its leader (Tatius), the entire community representing the third function.

In both cases, the leader or leaders of the introduced community reign over the receiving community: Njördhr, then Freyr, reign *after* Odhinn, as is natural in the dynastic and successive perspective of *the History of the Ynglingar;* Tatius reigns as a colleague *with* Romulus, no doubt, as has long been supposed, as a prefiguration of the double consulate of the historical era.

While Romulus established only the cult of "his" god, the almighty magician Jupiter Stator[9] , Tatius' arrival in Rome was accompanied by a proliferation of new cults; not political or military cults, but agrarian, fertility and chthonic cults, fragmented into small local and functional units. Similarly, as soon as they were welcomed among the Aesir, the Vanir gods were established as "temple priests" by Odhinn himself, the sovereign god whose study of place names showed, as might be expected, that the political and centralised cult was poorly represented on the ground; and if they are thus made "temple priests", it is not, of course, to serve the cults of the Sovereign and the Warrior, but to acclimatise their own cults, the agrarian cults of the Vanes, which are by nature infinitely fragmented, clinging to the random accidents of the terrain; it is the magical processes of the Vanes, says Snorri formally, that Freya introduces, this magic known as *seidhr*, which Odhinn himself will later use, and whose probable links with fertility and abundance have been demonstrated by M. J. de Vries[10]. It should be remembered in this regard that, in the eyes of the Romans, the Sabines always remained master magicians[11], to the point that Varro, according to Festus-Paulus, wanted to derive their name from the Greek verb σέϐεσθαι "to worship the gods"[12].

Thus, the two stories are not only analogous in their general meaning. All the details of the mechanisms coincide, with the margin of difference that one would expect between two societies as differently evolved as Rome and Scandinavia. One could amuse oneself by taking these reflections further: noting, for example, the null (Thôrr) or very secondary (Lucumo) role of the representatives of the second social function, the Strong, in this *sui generis* war that mainly pits the first and third functions, the Magicians (Odhinn, Romulus) against the Prosperous (Njördhr and Freyr, Tatius); and consequently emphasising the strangeness of a situation where social "functions" are disrupted, or not yet established, where the representatives of each function depart from what will soon become their attributes, where in particular the Vanes and Sabines (Tatius of Cures, Acro of Cenina) appear as men of war: a kind of "chaos", as mentioned above, preceding a "creation".

It is more important to emphasise how coherent the entire Roman legend now appears: we understand why it is at the festival of the agrarian and 'Quirinal' Consus[13] that Romulus invites the future Tities: the agrarian, the 'Quirinal', is their essence. We understand why, needing women to have children, Romulus addresses the future Tities: fertility is their function. We understand why the Sabine women, first abducted, then won over and finally "peacemakers", play the main role in this strange war: the Sabine women are the most useful part of the Sabines. We understand why all the detailed versions end with a list of extraordinary honours and privileges granted to matrons, why tradition traces the institution of the most solemn marriage ritual (the story of the Sabine Hersilia) back to these tumultuous nuptials: marriage, the mother of the family, is the means and the organ of regulated fertility.

most solemn marriage ritual: marriage, the mother of the family, is the means and the organ of regulated fertility. Thus, the story of the war between the Romans and the Sabines does not merely establish the relationship between the third function and the other two in the abstract; it shows it, from beginning to end, in full activity in one of its essential provinces, that of **human** fertility[14].

<center>*</center>
<center>*   *</center>

IV. *The war between the Tuatha Dé Danann and the Fomôre.*

The results of comparing Germanic and Latin traditions on the war between the Aesir and the Vanir and that between the Romans and the Sabines undoubtedly shed light on the balance of an important fragment of Irish mythology.

We know that what we might very roughly call the ancient Indo-European gods appear in Ireland, humanised, under the name of "People of the Goddess Dana", *Tuatha Dê Danann*: this is one of the races that successively occupied Ireland, the penultimate one to be precise; it had to give way to humans and since then has remained invisible, dwelling in the tumuli of the plains and on the banks of rivers; they are fairies, both male and female. In this new situation, all the Tuatha Dé Danann are, of course, "underground" and all of them, whoever they may be, grant their favourites gifts in which the prosperity of the soil plays a major role[15]; in a sense, therefore, the Tuatha Dê Danann have become, globally and confusingly, the guarantors of what we will call, , in the perspective of the present book, the
"third function" social and cosmic. But this was not the case in the fabulous times when they conquered and

ruled Ireland. The five principal ones had specialities, which coincided with those of the five great gods that Caesar identified in Gaul in an excellent text, which has withstood the criticism of several Celtic scholars who failed to understand it: on the day of the battle to be discussed shortly, these five great gods are the magician Lug, "god of all crafts", the druid god Dagda, the champion god Ogma; then, clearly inferior, the god of medicine Diancecht and the god of blacksmiths Goibniu; the representatives of Fertility, Agriculture, Livestock, etc., are completely absent, as it is unreasonable to deduce that Dagda had a specifically agricultural character from an isolated expression in *the Côir Anmann*[16]. Similarly, in Caesar's Gallic list[(17)] , under their Latin names, neither Mercury, "inventor of all arts" and patron of commerce and profit, nor Apollo the physician, nor Mars the warrior, nor Jupiter who assumes *the imperium caelestium*, nor Minerva the artisan (that is to say, undoubtedly, in the order in which Caesar lists them, the equivalents of Lug, Diancecht, Ogma and Dagda and a female counterpart to Goibniu) can be considered to govern Fertility. Gela is confirmed by other Irish texts; for example, one of those describing the Tuatha Dê Danann at the time they came to conquer Ireland under the leadership of their king Nuada expresses it thus[18]: "They had their own god of Druidism (*dia draidechta*), namely Eochaid Ollathir, also called the great Dagda, for he was a good (*dag*) god (*da*); they had strong, bold military leaders (*taisig*) and men skilled in every craft." There is no trace of the "third function".

And yet, as we have seen, ancient Irish society, under the druids and the military nobility, did indeed have a third class, that of the Breeders, the *bô airig*, free men

defined by their possession of cows (*bô*), and pig farming, no less than cow or sheep farming, and agriculture, no less than livestock farming, occupy their normal, very considerable place in the texts describing the life of the island's kingdoms. It would therefore be implausible that this third class, agriculture and livestock farming, did not have their mythical counterpart. They do indeed have one, but, like Sabinus Tatius in Rome, like the Vanes Njördhr and Freyr among the Aesir, this counterpart is, among the Tuatha Dê Danann, an 'assimilated foreigner', and the service of abundance and fertility that he renders to the Tuatha Dê Danann is the result of an agreement concluded following a terrible war. Analysis of Germanic and Latin sources allows us to assert that, on this point as on so many others, Irish mythology was very conservative, and we can see that here again, as was undoubtedly the case among the Scythians, and certainly in Rome and Scandinavia, ethnic fabrication is combined with functional conception.

Alongside the Tuatha Dé Danann, Irish mythology features other supernatural "races", notably the Fomorians, whose demonic nature is widely recognised, but who nonetheless intermarried with the Tuatha Dé Danann. A famous tale[19] tells that when King Nuada lost an arm in battle, the Tuatha Dé Danann chose the Fomorians' Bress to replace him; that Bress oppressed them and, in his greed, starved them to the point that they drove him out; that Bress returned to attack them at the head of a powerful army of Fomorians; that the Tuatha Dé Danann, thanks to Lug's magical and technical leadership and despite heavy losses, were victorious; and that Bress was finally taken prisoner. At this point, a remarkable scene takes place[20]: Lug discusses with Bress the conditions

under which he might be granted mercy. Lug is demanding. Bress successively offers, without this ransom being deemed sufficient, that the cows of Ireland always have milk, then that the land of Ireland yield one harvest per season; he finally obtains his freedom by giving this precious recipe, which the text, written by a strong mind, describes as a ruse (*celg*): "Let the men of Ireland plough on Tuesday, sow on Tuesday, reap on Tuesday!"

The one who has power over the prosperity of Ireland's farmers and herders, over milk and furrows, is therefore not one of the Tuatha Dê Danann, for they are only magicians, warriors or craftsmen; it is Bress, one of the Fomôre. And this power manifests itself, becomes "actual", through an agreement after the battle: the same situation as in the Scandinavian and Roman legends studied in this chapter.

Let us hasten to recognise that the analogy is less complete between the Irish and the Germanic and Latin peoples than between the latter two groups. This is because the myth of the Battle of Mag Tured, to put it simply but clearly, corresponds not only to the war of the Romans against Tatius and the Sabines after the abduction of the Sabine women, but also to that of the Romans against Porsenna and the Etruscans after the expulsion of the Tarquins; not only to the war of the Aesir against the Vanir, but also to that of the Aesir against demonic monsters such as the wolf Fenrir[21]: it is in Mag Tured, in fact, that we *also* see the couple of the one-eyed chief and the one-armed chief ( ) playing out, parallel to the couples of Horatius Cocles and Mucius Scaevola, and Odhinn and Tyr. The Irish thus respond with a single myth to two myths that the Germans and Romans present as distinct and which, in fact, are functionally different: on the one hand, a struggle between two elemental groups, divine or human, called upon to

to reconcile, to collaborate definitively, to merge more or less completely and thereby establish the normal hierarchy and form of society; on the other hand, a struggle between the whole of society, divine or human, fully formed, and another society, demonic or human, which will always remain external to it and, despite temporary agreements, hostile. This is why Bress is a 'demon'; why the war between the Tuatha Dé Danann and the Fomorians does not end in reconciliation but in the total victory of one of the adversaries; why, as a result, the final agreement is not the sincere and voluntary treaty that we see between the Aesir and the Vanir, between the Romans and the Sabines, but a kind of blackmail by the victors to which the vanquished respond with cunning; This is why, finally, although the foreigner Bress does reign at a certain point over the Tuatha Dé Danann, as Tatius did over the Romans and Freyr over the Aesir, this reign does not result from the agreement and does not follow the war, but on the contrary precedes and provokes the war, King Bress starving and ruining his subjects, that is to say, behaving first in opposition to the function (fertility and abundance) that, later, defeated and imprisoned, he will have to ensure. It is nonetheless true that the final role of the foreigner Bress in Tuatha Dê Danann society is to fill the surprising gap mentioned above: the absence of a great Tuatha Dê Danann at the head of pastoral and agrarian services.

In *Mitra-Varuna*[22], reasons were given to believe that the Welsh, too, had combined the theme of "the One-Eyed and the One-Armed" with that of "the war for Abundance", and in much the same way as the Irish: at least this is what is suggested in the *Mabinogi of Lludd and Llewelys* (where Lludd is the equivalent of the Irish Nuada), a text that is, in fact, late and highly romanticised; and there is

also worth noting in this regard the end of *the Mabinogi of Manawyddan*, where abundance is also restored to the island of Britain through a "progressive blackmail" of the victor over the vanquished, very similar to that to which Bress is subjected. The fact that, in first-century BC Gaul, Caesar knew of no "great god" presiding over fields and flocks suggests that the Gauls, like the insular Celts, completed their mythical representation of social functions in the same way: those who watched over milk and ears of corn were undoubtedly demons or minor genies, enslaved and held at the mercy of the "great gods".

<div align="center">

*

*   *

</div>

V. *The quarrel between Indra and the Asvins.*

Indianists and Iranists will find myths in their fields comparable either to Germanic and Roman myths or to Celtic myths recounting the establishment, through war and treaty, of the necessary balance between the first social functions and the third.

In the *Journal Asiatique*[23] we recalled some legends of the Osses, descendants of the Scythians, about the quarrels between two of the three Nartes families, the Warriors and the Herders, with the "Intellectuals" appearing to remain aloof; it is remarkable that a daughter of one family married into the other (in one variant, it is a daughter of the "Herders" married into the "Warriors", but in another variant, it is the reverse) tries, like the Sabine women, but without success, to prevent war between her parents and her husband's family; several variants end with the almost complete extermination of one family by the other, but at least one text, following

a revenge that settles the score, ends in a kind of unstable equilibrium.

In its theoretical statements, India strongly emphasises the heterogeneity of the third caste, the Vaiçya farmers and herders, in contrast to the "two forces", the Brahmins and warriors, whose solidarity is, on the contrary, affirmed[24]. Mythically, we must place here the quarrel that initially opposed *Indra* and all the gods on one side and the two *Ashvins* or *Nasalyas* on the other, before their pact of collaboration[25] : in the form given to the legend by the *Çalapatha Brdhmana* (IV, 1, 5), the gods refuse to allow the Açvin to participate in the sacrifice because they live among men, as friends of men, busy healing. But the Açvin impose themselves on them, saying: "Your sacrifice is headless; invite us, and we will tell you (what to do)!" The gods invite them; the Achvins, in accordance with the pact, complete the sacrifice and, in the distribution of priestly roles among the gods, are henceforth placed as manipulating priests (*adh-varyu*), as opposed to reciting and presiding priests. In the epic, the gods' arguments are the same, but more harshly expressed, and the story is more dramatic: the Açvin (now called Nâsatya and Dasra) were originally çûdra gods, meaning that they were not even part of the regular arya divine society: doctors of men and gods, *(deva)bhishajau*, they were simple "craftsmen". Indra replies to the sage Cyavana, who wants to force him to allow them to drink soma: "These two are despised by us, how c they become drinkers of soma? They are not the equals of the gods[26]!" But Cyavana terrorises the gods, creating from the very substance of the sacrifice the monster Intoxication, as big as the world, which reduces them to mercy. All then beg Indra

to grant the terrible sage's request, which he does. From then on, the Açvin will be *somapâyin*, drinkers of soma, and Cyavana dismantles the monster Drunkenness into pieces that he distributes among drink and women, gambling and hunting[27] .

We saw above[28] that, as early as the fourteenth century BC, the Aryans, ancestors of the conquerors of India, inserted the Nâsatyâ-Açvin as the third term, after Mitra-Varuna and Indra, in the divine triad that patronised and summarised society in the manner of Jupiter, Mars and Quirinus: they were then the gods of the third estate, which is well suited to all the activities of these two brothers, who are not only doctors, but also preside over marriage, the mating of humans and animals, and give youth, longevity, wealth, prosperity and abundance of children. The epic goes further and, under the pretext of their status as doctors, makes them çûdra, a purely Indian concept: this at least emphasises the element of 'social class',
'social function' of the conflict.

This is not the place to study these Indian facts for themselves: they will become clearer through comparison with Latin and Germanic facts. They will also raise new questions: for example, in the Vedic hymns, the Asvins are specifically drinkers of *madhu*, or mead, while the great gods are drinkers of *soma*. Does this imply a division of secular and sacred drinks between the social classes of the prehistoric Aryans? *Madhu* is an Indo-European drink (Old Slavic *medŭ*, Old High German *metu*, Old Icelandic *mjödhr*, Old Irish *mede* 'mead'); *soma*, on the other hand, is a specifically Indo-Iranian preparation (Avestan *haoma*), and therefore more recent. It would be necessary to examine whether, among the Western Indo-Europeans, the use of mead and beer, for example, involved a similar distribution[29]. But the research promises to be disappointing. In mythology

In Germanic mythology, mead is a transformation of the blood of Kvasir, itself formed from the "communal spittle" with which the Aesir and Vanir sealed their peace; this liquor is therefore not only posterior to the entry of Freyr and the great Vanir into the society of the Aesir, it is also its consequence. However, it does not seem — on the contrary — to be specifically the drink of the Vanir as opposed to the Aesir: although in Snorri's *Ynglingar History* we see Freyr's son drowning in a vat of mead (which has long been interpreted as a euphemised cult scene), there are more numerous and more important legends that make mead the drink of Odhinn[30]. Celtic customs are even less clear. As for the Indo-Europeans who descended on the Mediterranean, the adoption of wine changed their liturgies and vocabularies: in Greek, μέθυ refers to several types of intoxicating beverages, mainly wine, never mead; and Latin may only have a trace of *the* ancient **medhu-* in the name of the goddess of the earth's exhalations, not intoxicating but suffocating, *Mefitis*.

<div align="center">*
* *</div>

VI. *Tatius and Numa*.

Some modern commentators on Roman fables have been too quick to describe Tatius and Numa as "doublets". The kinship between the two characters is certain, but it leaves the autonomy of each intact; they are by no means duplicates.

Both are, of course, "Sabine kings" of Rome and both originate from Cures; both are great founders of cults; and Numa married Tatia, daughter of Tatius. But nothing can be concluded from this, except that, in the mythology   historical   of the Romans   ,   that is to say   in   the

justification by "precedents" that the Romans gave to their organisation and their conception of social relations and social virtues, their functional places were contiguous and also suggested a "Sabine" location. What were these places?

Tatius represents the third social function—fertility, abundance—below the magico-religious and legal power of the and military force; on the human level, he is the counterpart of Quirinus, *subordinate* to Jupiter and Mars. Numa, within the first social function, represents legal power, benevolent and peaceful, complementary to the magical power, terrible and violent, represented by Romulus; on a human level, he is the counterpart of Fides and Dius Fidius, *companions* of Jupiter[31]. Consequently, Tatius and Numa do not belong to the same level or the same group of religious representations: Tatius, juxtaposed with Romulus and Lucumo, represents one of the three functions, the third and last, of the social hierarchy; Numa, juxtaposed with Romulus, represents one of the two antithetical, complementary and hierarchically equivalent aspects of the first function.

It is easy to predict that, in the pair of Almighty figures, the "benevolent" one (Numa, Fides) will have more affinities with the human or divine representatives of Fertility and Abundance (Tatius, Quirinus) than the "terrible" one, who is, on the contrary, easily deported to the domain of warlike Force (Mars is the father of Romulus). But these affinities will lead to contacts that will never be confused. Numa will indeed be a Sabine like Tatius, and his conduct will sometimes agree with that of Tatius, but even then the inner motives for these behaviours will not coincide. For example, peace is no less important to Tatius and Quirinus

than it was to Numa and Fides, but it must be understood that, in both cases, the reasons were fundamentally different. Peace was necessary for the cultivation of fields, the growth of herds and families, and all forms of enrichment (except, however, plunder): Quirinus was therefore in favour of peace, *tranquillus;* Tatius and the Sabines, after the abduction, try to avoid a war that could be fatal to their wives and daughters, the agents of their own fertility[32]. On the other hand, war is the opposite of legal relations: Fides, with the *fetiales*, therefore does her utmost to save peace in honesty, and if Numa wants to detach the Romans from war, it is because it breeds injustice[33]. Thus Quirinus and Tatius desire peace out of self-interest, while Fides and Numa desire it out of principle, by definition, so to speak. Ritual and legend provide us with easy means of control.

The cults established by Numa and Tatius are different. Numa essentially founded the cult of Fides and other cults of similar meaning, while Tatius introduced to Rome what might be called the circle of Quirinus, which has been enumerated and described above[34]: none of the deities in this circle are oriented towards Fides, and the vast majority patronise fertility in general or the cultivation of the soil; the male counterpart of Fides, Dius Fidius, according to the ancients who must have known this from a reliable source, is the Roman form of what, for the Sabines, was *Sancus:* yet Tatius has nothing to do with this god, does not acclimatise him to Rome, does not seem to know him. It is also said that Numa and Tatius established the cult of *Terminus*, "the Boundary": but the list in which Tatius' Terminus appears[35] (flanked by the underground Larunda and Quirinus) suggests that he did not have the moral resonance of Numa's Terminus, whose beautiful definition is contained in this

phrase: "Boundary stones, when respected, curb power, and when torn down, bear witness to [injustice"36] ; on *Terminus*, Numa and Fides therefore had the point of view of the justice of the peace, Tatius and Quirinus that of the owner. And, provided the operation was successful, Tatius saw no great disadvantage in allowing a boundary stone to be moved to his advantage. At least, that is what the story of his death suggests, in which he appears so unconcerned with the law, so dishonest, that it is Romulus who, by contrast, emerges as the defender of justice.

Ambassadors from Laurente to Rome were murdered by relatives and friends of Tatius who wanted "to forcibly take away what they had" (ἀφαιρεῖσθαι τὰ χρήματα βίᾳ); Romulus believed that the perpetrators of such a grave crime should be punished immediately (ἔργου δὲ δεινοῦ τολμηθέντος ὁ μὲν Ῥωμύλος εὐθὺς δεῖν ᾤετο κολάζεσθαι τοὺς ἀδικήσαντας), while Tatius, on the contrary, dragged out the proceedings. According to Plutarch, this was the only occasion on which the two kings disagreed. Losing patience, the victims' parents took justice into their own hands: one day, while the two kings of Rome were jointly offering a sacrifice at Lavinium, they killed Tatius in front of the altar and, as befitted a just man (ὡς δίκαιον ἄνδρα), they escorted his colleague away, showering him with kind words. Romulus refrained from avenging the dead [man37].

Can anything be imagined that is more contrary to the spirit and practice of Numa, to the very spirit of any form of legitimate power? Tatius is neither a moral king nor the terrible sovereign embodied by Romulus; he has neither a sense of justice nor a sense of greatness; he is merely a peasant temporarily misguided into power; none of the self-serving, literally down-to-earth cults that cover the Roman soil compel him to punish relatives and friends who, even through

duel and murder, even by killing those "men of Fides" par excellence, the ambassadors, have succeeded in increasing their wealth.

<p style="text-align:center">*</p>
<p style="text-align:center">*   *</p>

VII. Difficulties.

Under these circumstances, one wonders how Tatius, in the Roman fable, can appear as king. This is indeed a problem, but the solution is not to be found in Rome, since the Vanir Njördhr and Freyr, after the war between the Aesir and the Vanir, also appear as kings of their former adversaries, and in a less ephemeral manner than Tatius, who died after five years of reign and was not replaced, while Freyr founded the soon-to-be human and promising Yngling dynasty. The subsequent history of Rome, with its dual consulate, only explains why King Tatius is conceived as the *colleague* of King Romulus; it does not explain why this eponym of the Tities, this representative of the last social function, is *king*. We have just seen, if not the justification for this trait, at least the proof that the Germans and Latins were not alone in charging their legends with it[38]. But, by way of parenthesis and diversion, and to raise all the "aporias" at once, let us state the most significant one right away: the fact that the god of Tatius, Quirinus, was assimilated, contradictorily moreover, sometimes to Romulus, sometimes to Mars.

We are reduced to conjecture. The only certain fact is that, as the Romans very early lost a clear understanding of the definition of Quirinus, this god must have been subject to rejuvenation and interpretation. But these two assimilations are, logically, des moins attendues :

Romulus belongs to the first function, that of omnipotence; his god is Jupiter; and, while we understand that his father is Mars[39] , we do not see that he has anything to do with the fertility and wealth that Quirinus originally patronised. As for Mars, we have seen above[40], in a differential definition with numerous variations, that he is, in law, the opposite of Quirinus. Here are a few thoughts that shed some light on these two paradoxes. Of course, this is no longer a matter of Latin philology or comparative philology as precise as that which we are attempting to implement in this book, but rather hypotheses that we do not currently see any way of testing.

Romulus 'became' Quirinus immediately after his death, through his death: Ovid, before describing the rites of roasting the grains that form the essence of *the Quirinalia* on 17 February, first recounts the myth of the 'birth' of Quirinus: it is that of the death and apotheosis of Romulus, followed by the apparition in which he commands the "*Quirites*" to no longer mourn him but to worship him, as a pious crowd, under the new name of *Quirinus*[41]. Plutarch records the same metamorphosis: Romulus, dead, appears to a Roman and promises to assist Rome with his benevolence as "god Quirinus"[42]. This is also the common view in tradition. However, Quirinus, through his social function (fertility, protection of grain) and undoubtedly through his cosmic location (lower part of the universe: see above, p. 94), is associated with the underground; in two circumstances (the cult of Larenta, the cult of Consus), we have seen the *flamen quirinalis* called upon to officiate at an underground altar where Wissowa recognised two kinds of "mundus", openings to the other world; among the gods that Tatius introduces to Rome around Quirinus, we have noted Vedius[43] , who is undoubtedly the

like Vejovis, the infernal counterpart of the celestial Jupiter; it is not surprising to encounter these "Plutonian" traits in a god of fertility and abundance. Therefore, when we read that this underground Quirinus is simply the new persona assumed after his death by the first king, Romulus, we immediately think of the frequent evolution that, in the most diverse mythologies, has transformed a "first king" or a "first man", or simply a "great king", into a "king of the Underworld"; The Iranian Yima, for example, was a first king: since his death, he has welcomed all the dead to his vast underground domain, and the Indian Yama has passed in the same way from the role of first dead man to that of ruler of the dead, Pluto. For the Icelandic Snorri, Odhinn is a first king who, after his death, became the king of the enclosure where warriors who fell on the battlefield go. Could the relationship between Romulus and Quirinus be of the same order? In this case, it is not as a Jupiter-like sovereign, as a representative of terrible omnipotence, that Romulus would have been assimilated to Quirinus, but simply as the first king. For this interpretation to be plausible, it would be necessary to establish that Quirinus was not only chthonic, subterranean, but properly infernal in character: however, no text retains any trace of Quirinus being assigned to the presidency of the dead in general or of a particular category of the dead, and as very little is known about the earliest beliefs of the Romans regarding the destiny of the dead, there is little chance that this hypothesis can be verified.

For the paradoxical assimilation of Quirinus to Mars, from *tranquillus* to *bellalor*, we will simply copy a few lines from *Myths and Gods of the* Germans44, as the problem arises symmetrically Scandinavia the

undeniable warrior aspects of Freyr, who is essentially, however, the god of fertility and, even more so than Quirinus, the regent of peace:

"These confusions are only embarrassing if one reasons on words, forgetting life. Among men, war prepares, guarantees and ensures peace; similarly, the mythical struggle of the god *Bellator* against the animate and inanimate scourges of agriculture is necessary for the peasant; and it was precisely this service that the Roman peasant asked of Mars: only Mars, ruler of the earth above, could provide him with the atmospheric elements necessary for his success, as necessary as the underground elements that seem to have been the province of Quirinus. Conversely, the warrior's success is conditioned by the smooth running of the "rear"; consuming men, wealth and food, the campaigns waged by the armies of a sedentary society depend largely on the regularity of levies, tributes and harvests: Quirinus supplies Mars. In particular, he gives him his *quirites* to transform them into *milites*, and this has undoubtedly always been the case in Indo-European societies: the 'warrior class' was not alone in waging war; it supervised, drove and commanded the crowd of the third estate, whose necessity made warriors. It is unlikely that, even in Vedic India, or at least pre-Vedic India, the kshattriyas were the only ones to fight battles: the vaiçyas collaborated with them.

Could the solidarity, both real and figurative, of battle and harvest have brought Mars and Quirinus so close together that they became indistinguishable? Did the levelling of the old functional classes and the fact that, in Rome, the *milites* were strictly identical to *the quirites* lead to the identification of the gods who originally presided over

each of the two distinct classes? Since the same men were, depending on the circumstances, either soldiers or civilians, did it seem necessary that the god of war and the god of peace were also just two alternating aspects — Mars Gradivus, Mars Quirinus — of the same god? We can add nothing useful to these remarks, which we feel are insufficient.

<center>*</center>
<center>*   *</center>

VIII. Social functions and various representations among the Romans.

We now know enough to assert that prehistoric Romans conceived of their society, and undoubtedly the world, in the same functional, tripartite framework as the Indo-Iranians, Celts, and Germanic peoples. The following two chapters are devoted to two particularly interesting extensions of this conception. Before addressing them, we will briefly mention a few others that Latin scholars and historians of Rome will develop, if they deem it appropriate.

Firstly, in terms *of institutions*. If we are correct, it will be difficult to regard the centuries *of equites* paired with the three tribes as primitive: from our perspective, the Roman *equites*, like the Celtic *equites*, must originally have belonged to the second class, to Mars alone, and not to Jupiter, master of *the priests,* or to Quirinus, master of *the Quirites*. The attested state of affairs can therefore only be the result of one of those reforms that systematically dismantled the old frameworks. Perhaps this was a change from the Etruscan period, since tradition attributes to Tarquinius, if not an upheaval of the tribal system, then at least a reorganisation

of the centuries. This would give us a hypothetical but probable and precise starting point for the history of the equestrian order , which G. Bloch, sixty years ago, already happily dissociated from that of the senatorial order.

On the other hand,   part   l'origine   de   la   plèbe,   dans   le sens   que
Mr Piganiol indicated (based on the Sabine component of the Roman population) may be clarified by the functional interpretation of the Sabines.

It will also be necessary to examine whether the functional tripartite division sheds light on certain remarkable *concepts* of the Romans.

We know, for example, that opime spoils, i.e. spoils taken from an enemy leader by a Roman general in single combat, are associated with the triad Jupiter, Mars and Quirinus by one of two competing traditions (the older of the two, no doubt, as the other only mentions Jupiter). An ancient law, the *Lex Pompilia*, or more accurately a prediction, foresaw only three such trophies for the entire lifetime of Rome and prescribed that they be offered successively and in the usual order to the three gods. Docile, history has indeed given Roman generals only the three occasions announced: Romulus, victor over a Sabine king, dedicated his trophy to Jupiter; Cossus, still in the legendary era, in the 5th century, stripped a Veian king for the benefit of Mars; finally, Marcellus, in the last quarter of the 3rd century, served Quirinus at the expense of a Gallic king[45].

We can only speculate on the original meaning of such a tradition: this limitation to three spoils in relation to the triad of gods of social functions, this spell cast at the beginning of Roman history as if to give it a rhythm of three impulses and as if, from

a certain point, it had to be fixed in a triumph sponsored by Quirinus, is very strange. Given that Jupiter, Mars and Quirinus seem to have presided not only over the three social functions but also over the three parts of the universe, perhaps Rome was thus promising itself a gradual and exhaustive conquest of the world: in historical language, as always in Rome, we would have the equivalent of myths such as that of the three successive steps by which Vishnu and, in his imitation, the newly consecrated king, and, in other respects, all sacrificing, conquers for the gods or for men or for himself first the sky, then the atmosphere, and finally the earth46. But other interpretations are of course possible.

The tradition was too firmly established for Augustus to insert himself into it and use it to "demonstrate" his "Quirinal" mission: the nomenclature of the three Spoils was, as is well known, exhausted long before the end of the first century. We have seen above how Virgil subtly managed to attach to the third consecrator, the "Quirinal" Marcellus, this other Marcellus, a much-lamented shadow, whom Augustus intended as his successor47; but this was only a literary device, with no political significance. Augustus did not, however, give up on this kind of support. Only the triad of the Spoils left him no room, so he used and undoubtedly partly constructed a parallel tradition.

A few decades before Actium, Varro(48) , listing the inner gates of Rome, came across the gate known as the Gate of Janus and, according to the annalist Piso, reported that this gate, by virtue of an institution established by Numa Pompilius, must be opened in times of war and closed in times of peace, and that, according to tradition, it had only been closed twice, once under Numa himself, and the other during the consulate of T. Manlius after the end of the

First Punic War. This tradition was probably not very popular: Varro does not refer to it as something universally known but cites his source; we will never know whether it was a gate or a temple; and besides, if the Romans had really been concerned in previous centuries with applying Numa's rule, they would have had plenty of opportunities to close the gate more than twice: the "little stories" that are Julius Obsequens' annual records of prodigies contain more than one chapter that ends with the words: *pax domi forisque fuit*, "peace reigned in Rome and abroad " (ch. 10, 49), *lotus annus domi forisque tranquillus fuit*, "the whole year passed without war in Rome and abroad" (ch. 51).

But this very negligence allowed Augustan politics to seize upon such a dormant tradition: no longer able to offer Quirinus opime spoils, the prince at least proceeded, this time with great solemnity, to a third closing of the door or temple of Janus. One need only read the lines in which Livy mentions this glorious act to sense that, in his mind and undoubtedly in the minds of those who staged the spectacle, the "system" of the three Closings was modelled on that of the three Spoils: the temple of Janus, he says (I, 19), "was closed only twice after the reign of Numa: once during the consulship of T. Manlius, after the end of the First Punic War; the second time – and the gods have given our era the opportunity to witness this spectacle – by the emperor Caesar Augustus, peace having been restored on land and sea".

Tradition did not allow Augustus and his contemporary writers to limit the number of Closures to three in advance, even by an apocryphal prediction, but Livy's expression suggests quite clearly that the third is a

completion, and this emphatic statement is practically equivalent to a prophetic limitation on the number of Dépouilles. With this reservation, moreover, the symmetry between the Closures and the Dépouilles is striking: the same triadic presentation, the same "Pompilian" patronage, same scope in application ranging from one of the founding kings to recent history, and finally the same profound meaning if we note that Numa is the archetypal king-priest, that the *gens* Manlia is one of the richest in traditions and martial pretensions, and that Augustus liked to appear, and precisely as a bringer of peace, as a new Quirinus. What seems to confirm the interpretation proposed here is the care with which Janus is described as *Quirinus* in most of the documents relating to the Augustan closure, or the three Augustan closures, for this last closure is so

"the right one" that it is itself triple, Augustus not limiting himself to completing but renewing and summarising in his growth the course of Roman history, just as the individual, say the poets of the biological sciences, recapitulates in broad strokes the previous life of the species. Suetonius writes[49] : "The temple of Janus Quirinus, which had been closed only once and twice since the founding of Rome until his time, Augustus, in a much shorter period of time, having ensured peace on land and sea (*terra marique pace parla*), closed it three times." Horace[50] praises Augustus for closing what he calls *Janum Quirini*. Finally, the name is certainly official since it is engraved in Latin and Greek in the Testament, with Augustus boasting of having closed (*Janum*) *Quirin*(*um*)... Πύλην Ἐνυάλιον (*Janus* being rendered only by πύλη "door, *janua*")[51].

Finally, we will consider several archaic *formulas*. Admittedly, there is no need to look for traces of functional division in most triple formulas, whether alliterative or not, classificatory or synonymic, which the early Romans seem to have been no less fond of than the Celts[52]. Nevertheless, like Darius and the Veda[53], like the Irish *Têcosca* and Queen Medb [herself54], Rome was able to retain certain traditional ways of describing society, its needs and its dangers according to the three functions. We will mention only two of them.

First, we can better understand the old overlapping formulas, each of which is like two-thirds of a complete statement: *Senatus Populusque Romanus* and *Populus Romanus Quiritesque* (later only: *Quirilium*). Juxtaposed both with the Senate as inferior and with the Quirites as superior, the *Populus Romanus* undoubtedly referred initially to the *pubes romana*, that is, the vigorous, combative part of the nation (we know that *publicus*, the adjective of *populus*, had to be reworked on the root of *pubes*); like Mars between Jupiter and Quirinus, the "people" thus appear to be framed, at equal distance, by the "Fathers" and already by a kind of "plebs".

Secondly, the etymology, combined with what we have just learned, sheds light on the usual formula of propitiation that Livy uses twice in this first book, which he wants to make a kind of museum of national antiquities: when *the interrex* convenes the assembly of *the Quirites* for the election of Romulus' successor (I, 17), he says to them: *Quod bonum fauslum felixque sit, quirites, regem create, ita patribus visum est...;* when King Tullus, after the betrayal of Mettus Fuffetius, announces that he is going to transplant the Albans to Rome (I, 28), his first words are: *Quod bonum faustum felixque sit*

populo romano ac mihi vobisque, Albani... The terms of this triad are remarkable when one considers their most ancient meanings.

The last, *felix*, is formed from the root *fê-*, that of *fecundus* and *femina* (Indo-European **dhê-*, Greek θῆλυς, "female", Armenian *di-el*, "to suckle", etc.), which has the most direct connection with the fertility of women and animals and, by extension, plants and soil; this is, moreover, the literal meaning of *felix* in Latin (*arbor felix*, "fruit-bearing tree", *felix Campania*, etc.).

The second, *fauslum*, is formed from *favor* (or from a lost neuter **faves-*) like *honestus* from *honor, augustus* from *augur, onestus* from *onus*, etc. (Wolfflin, *Arch. f. latein. Lexicogr.*, XIII, 1906, p. 24). The root is that of the verb *favere*, 'to help', whose uses, from the earliest texts, are very extensive and oriented towards all kinds of help. But a mythical feature clarifies the primitive form *of auxilium* to which *fauslum* must refer. The stories about the childhood of Romulus and Remus are unquestionably and strongly centred on Mars: Mars is the father of the twins; abandoned, they are fed by the she-wolf, *and hoc animal in tutela esse Martis*[55]; around them flies the woodpecker, *picus*, bird of Mars; finally, a shepherd arrives who, faced with these clear wonders, understands that they are of divine race, takes them to his wife and raises them. Now this shepherd, associated with the animals of Mars in the protection of the sons of Mars, is called *Faustulus* or *Faustus*: he is therefore burdened with a presumption of "martiality" and, at the same time, his name, which refers to the form of help that the adjective *faustus* properly signifies[56] .

As for the first term, *bonum*, it is the most purely religious of the three. While *bonus* and *bene* also very early on came to denote all sorts of different nuances of 'good', the meaning

is defined by expressions such as *Bona Dea, Bonus Cerus* (applied to Janus), *bona verba*, 'words of good omen', etc. Etymologically, the word, whose ancient form is *duenos*, seems to be related [to57] to a Vedic root *du-*, specialised in liturgical uses, that of the verb *duvasyati*, 'he honours with gifts', from *duvasyu*, 'he who honours, offers', from the old neuter *duvas*, 'offering, homage' (and the no less old feminine *dû*, 'gift', if it were assured). *Bonus* is therefore a specifically religious word, and the fact that its superlative *optimus* is reserved as a cultic epithet for Jupiter — as *Dag-da*, literally "Bonus deus", is the name of the Druid god of the Irish — sufficiently indicates its level of sacredness. It is remarkable, moreover, that *bonus* is the only one of the three terms to have subsequently taken on moral values: *felix* evolved into "happy", *faustus* into

"opportune" or "favourable", and *bonus* into "good, virtuous, just, charitable".

Thus, this triple formula, undoubtedly archaic, implicitly refers, in the normal order, to Jupiter, Mars and Quirinus. Precious confirmation is provided by the following fact: Plautus[58] and Cicero[59] extend the formula with a fourth term: *ut nobis hæc habitatio bona fausta felix fortuna-taque eveniat*, says Plautus; *majores nostri*, says Cicero, *omnibus rebus agendis*

"quod bonum faustum felix fortunalumque esset" præfabantur. And *fortunatum* does indeed appear in other variants that are more or less dislocated, shortened or lengthened, dating from a time when the old values were no longer felt. However, Livy, having an *interrex* speak at the beginning of Roman history, then having the third king speak, was careful not to introduce *fortunatum* into this formula, which he attributes to them with obvious intention and antiquarian care. Why? Because *fortunatum* is the "special word"

special word" of the goddess *Fortuna*, whose cult, according to a firm tradition, was only established by Servius, the penultimate of the seven kings. The historian sensed the connection between the adjective and the goddess and avoided anachronism. It is therefore legitimate to look for in the three primitive terms what is so clear in the term adventice: an orientation towards a particular nuance of divine blessing, of the mode of action sought; *bonum, faustum, felix* are also likely to be oriented, and they can only be so in the directions that have just been defined. In the form of abstract adjectives, this propitiatory formula, which according to Cicero the ancient Romans placed before all their actions, is equivalent to the statement of the gods of the triad that Decius places at the beginning of his declaration of *devotio* and the fetial at the beginning of his *tes-tatio injuriae*[60].

1. *Myths and Gods of the Germans, an essay in comparative interpretation*, 1939.

2. Sing. *öss*, plur. *æsir*, derived from **ansu-*.

3. German *Ans-* in proper names, Anglo-Saxon *ôs*.

4. Sing. *vanr*, plur. *vanir*.

5. See Erik Brate, *Vanerna, en mytologisk undersökning*, Stockholm, 1914; *Myths and Gods of the Germanic Peoples*, chap. IX.

6. *History of the Ynglingar*, 4.

7. *Altgermanische Religionsgeschichte*, II, Berlin-Leipzig, 1937, pp. 277 ff.

8. Pp. 43 ff.

9. See above, p. 144.

10. *Op. cit.*, p. 71.

11. Horace, *Epodes*, 17, 28: *sabella carmina*, etc.

12. S. v. *Sabini: a cultura deorum dicti, id est* ἀπὸ τοῦ σέϐεσθαι.

13. See above, p. 148.

14. We can see that F. Rühl (*Rheinisches Museum*, LIV, 1899, pp. 316 ff.) is undoubtedly wrong to seek the "original" of the Sabine women's peacemaking intervention in a detail of the Amazons' war (mediation by the Amazon abducted by Theseus) mentioned in a single word, "according to the historian Clidemus", by Plutarch alone in his *Life of Theseus* (ch. 27). It is always dangerous to dissociate the whole, to extract from a coherent narrative one of the features that best illustrates this coherence, in order to explain it in isolation as a chance "borrowing" from some foreign tradition. In this particular case, moreover, the most classical philology

should have been enough to deter the author: assuming that the analogy were substantial (which it is not), it is the reverse borrowing that would be probable, since the feature in question is linked to the war of the Amazons only in Plutarch's *Life of Theseus*, which he rightly compares to that of Romulus.

15. See K. Meyer in Nutt, *Voyage of Bran*, II, pp. 160 ff.

16. § 150, in *Ir. Text*, III, 1897, 354: "He was a beautiful god among the peasants; the Tuatha Dê Danann worshipped him, for he was to them a god of (the?) earth because of the extent of his power, *bâ dîa talmhan dôibh ê ar mhêt a chumachta*"; the words "god of (the?) earth" are unclear; and in any case, this text, like all the others, emphasises the god's power, obviously magical, *cumacht*.

17. *The Gallic War*, VI, 17.

18. Fraser, *The First Battle of Moytura, Eriu*, VIII, 1916, p. 16.

19. *The Second Battle of Mag Tured*, text and English translation by Wh. Stokes in *Rev. Celt.*, XII, 1891, pp. 52 ff.; 306 ff.; French translation in d'Arbois de Jubainville, *L'épopée celtique en Irlande*, 1892, pp. 393 ff., and in Dottin, *L'épopée celtique*, 1926, pp. 37 ff.; cf. *Mitra-Varuna*, pp. 107 ff., pages which the present commentary seeks to improve upon.

20. §§ 149-161.

21. V. *Mitra-Varuna*, pp. 124 ff.

22. Pp. 127 ff.

23. 1930, I, p. 127; cf. *Legends about the Narts*, 1930, pp. 23 and 143–145.

24. See above, p. 163.

25. J. Muir, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1866, pp. 11 ff., and *Original Sanskrit Texts*, I², 1868, pp. 470 ff.; Ch. Renel, *The Evolution of a Myth, Açvins and Dioscuri*, 1896, pp. 184 ff. 197 ff.

26. *Asmâbhir nindilâv etau, bhavelam somapau katham? devair na sammitâv etau...*

27. *Mahâbhârata*, XIII, 157, 17 ff.; cf. III, 124, 12, etc.

28. See above, p. 61.

29. Cf. *Myths and Gods of the Germans*, p. 110.

30. See J. de Vries, *Altgermanische Religionsgeschichte*, II, 1917, pp. 135, 181 et ff.; 271, 406.

31. See *Mitra-Varuna*, chapters III and IV.

32. Plutarch, *Romulus*, 16.

33. Plutarch, *Parallel Lives of Lycurgus and Numa*, 2; *Mitra-Varuna*, p. 31.

34. pp. 145 ff.

35. Varro, *De ling. lat.*, V, 74.

36. Plutarch, *Numa*, 16; cf. *Roman Questions*, 15.

37. Plutarch, *Romulus*, 23; cf. Livy, I, 14, etc.

38. See above, p. 172.

39. See above, p. 179.

40. Pp. 84 ff.

41. *Placentque novum pia turba Quirinum: Fastes*, II, 507.

42. Ἐγὼ δ᾽ ὑμῖν εὐμενὴς ἔσομαι δαίμων Κυρῖνος. *Romulus*, 28.

43. See above, p. 145.

44. Pp. 127 ff.

45. Servius, *Comm. to the Aeneid*, VI, 859.

46. *Catapatha Brâhmana*, I, 9, 3, 8-11; etc.

47. See above, p. 88.

48. *De ling. lat.*, V, 165.

49. *Augustus*, 22.

50. *Odes*, IV, 15, 9.

51. When Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, I, 9, 16, interprets the compound name *Janus Quirinus* — in a completely different context, incidentally — *as quasi bellorum potentem, ab* hasta *quam Sabini* curim *vocant*, he simply misinterprets Quirinus in the same way that most Romans did, as expressed in the Greek translation Ἐνυάλιος, 'warlike': see above, p. 186.

52. *Quod pondere numero mensura constat...; quarum rerum litium causarum...; censuit consensit conscivit...; ut ego sciam sentiam intelligam...; precor venerorque veniamque a vobis peto.*

53. See above, pp. 48 and 58.

54. See above, p. 115.

55. Servius, *Comm. to the Aeneid*, 1, 273.

56. Let us not forget, in another legendary use of functional division, that Lucumo and his Luceres are defined by the "help" given to Romulus against Tatius: *venisse auxilio*, says Varro, *from ling. lat.*, V, 46; ἐπικουρίαν ἱκανὴν ἄγων says Dionysius of Halicarnassus, II, 37.

57. Ernout-Meillet, *Dict. étymol.*, s. v.

58. *Trinummus*, 123.

59. *De divinalione*, 1, 45.

60. See above, pp. 75 and 98.

CHAPTER VI

The sons of Numa.

I. Disruption of Roman traditions.

The concordant meanings of the Jupiter-Mars-Quirinus triad, the triple *flamonium*, the three Romulean tribes and the related Sabine legend leave no doubt that, in the most ancient religion and even in the most ancient organisation of Rome, functional tripartition played a major role. But this conclusion should not obscure an equally certain fact: the Romans of the historical period had only a very fragmentary memory of this ancient system. Separately, we find clearly affirmed features as significant as the "agrarian" character of the Sabines and the cults founded by Tatius, or the opposition of Mars as *bellator* and Quirinus as *tranquillus*, but Elegy IV, 1 by Propertius is the only text in which a complete interpretation of the tribes as groups of specialists is still visible, and it is not even certain that, when he copied an old text on *the ordo sacerdotum*, Festus was aware of the true values that justified this order. It was Romulus who founded the three tribes and Numa who created the three flamines, without any historian noting the profound identity of this political mechanism and religious hierarchy, without any text linking them, although Romulus's relationship with the Ramnes on the one hand, with Jupiter on the other, as well as Tatius's relationship with the Tities on the one hand and with Quirinus on the other, are unanimously recognised. And it is a question of knowing to what extent Augustus, by exploiting the ancient meaning of Quirinus, by appropriating the tradition of the closures of the temple of Janus, or by reviving the *flamonium*, was aware of

the whole of which he was using pieces. This disarticulation of traditions relating to functional classes is undoubtedly the consequence of a policy whose tenacity has been demonstrated by Mr Piganiol: an early and continuous effort, already in the Etruscan period and then in the time of the decemvirs, reorganised Roman society according to entirely different principles and, in order to make it forget its origins, broke up and crumbled everything that had been its framework.

We now propose to show that Roman legend has preserved other *membra disjecta* of this whole, even more completely dissociated from the principle which alone can interpret it.

<div align="center">

*

*   *

</div>

II. *Classes and brothers in India and Iran.*

India offers various explanations for the origin of castes.

A widespread tradition has it that they arose, among many other products susceptible to similar hierarchical labelling, from members of Purusha ('the Male') or Brahman, who were sacrificed at the beginning of time. There are reasons to believe that this representation of the initial, cosmic and creative sacrifice, a mythical projection of human sacrifices of which traces remain in Vedic literature, is not recent, although the first mention of it is only found in the[tenth]book of the Rig Veda. It may even be partly Indo-European, since Iran and Scandinavia have similar cosmogonic accounts, but where social classes or functions are not involved.

Another explanation, much less widespread in India, but which bears witness to its antiquity in certain proper names and corresponds to the explanation that the various

Iranian peoples usually give of their classes, consists in having them either "instituted" by a king of ancient times (the act of institution often being expressed by the word *pra-vrtti*, which in certain philosophical systems also means "emanation") or "begotten" singularly by the sons of a king. Almost all Indian accounts of this kind place the founding king or ancestor in the lunar dynasty, among the first descendants of Purûravas, in places and under names that vary elsewhere. The castes established or begotten are sometimes four (including çûdra), sometimes three (the three arya castes), and more rarely two (the first two castes, the noble castes, *ubhe vîrye*). When they are created, there are generally as many brother-ancestor- s as there are castes, but it also happens, through an inexplicable awkwardness, that the expected number of brothers are indeed named, but only one is declared the ancestor of all castes. Finally, some accounts do not claim to explain the origin of all Brahmins, all Kshatriyas, etc., but simply of this or that family of each, whose precise names are given: these are local legends, linked to a particular dynasty and kingdom.

Iran presents the same type of explanation in very diverse forms. Mr. Benveniste and ourselves have given our reasons for believing that one of the oldest and undoubtedly most popular variants established or created social classes through the "first king" Yima: there are traces of this in *the Avesta*, and in the Muslim era, it was this version that prevailed. But Zoroastrian orthodoxy did not fail to honour the prophet for such an important initiative; it was therefore Zoroaster who instituted the classes, most often through his sons: *Isat-Vastra* was "chief priest",

Urvâtat-nara was "farmer" and presided over the underground enclosure of Yama; finally*, Hvare-cithra* was "warrior" and commanded the crusade of the holy king Peshô-tanû. M. A. Christensen noted other variants, more or less complete, and undoubtedly originating in a particular province of Iran: for example, it is to Hôshang, another "first king" already known from *the Avesta*, and to his brother, the gentleman farmer Vêgherd, that the Muslim Al Bîrûnî, drawing on Pahlavi traditions, links the foundation of the three social classes and the corresponding festivals (the "Mazdean priests" appear here only transformed, secularised into "scribes" as in several other texts of the same period); it is remarkable

— if we consider the reflections in the previous chapter — that Vêgherd founded only the agricultural class, while Hôshang, the king, founded both the royal power and the state of the scribes: thus, once again, a divide is established between the third class and the united pair of the first two; The good understanding between Hôshang and Vêgherd was proverbial[1]. Finally, if Mr Christensen[2] and ourselves[3] are correct, the Scythian legend reported by Herodotus, IV, 5-7, also recounts the establishment, by the three sons of Targitaos, of social classes related to objects that fell from the sky, symbols of the activities of these classes.

<p style="text-align:center">*
*   *</p>

III. *The sons of Numa.*

No *people* claim Romulus as their ancestor; none of his descendants, if he had any, were kings: this founder is not an ancestor. On the contrary, the second founder of Rome, Numa, is linked by a tradition preserved by Plutarch to four *gentes* through his sons and to the beginning of a dynasty through his daughter, since her son would be a second successor, Ancus

Marcius. These contrasting behaviours of the first two kings express, among many other things, the two antithetical conceptions of sovereignty that they embody[4]. On the other hand, this abundant offspring, with which only the second king of Rome was blessed, is surely an ancient and important feature of the legend, for in another Latin city, Aricia, the counterpart of Numa the lawgiver and friend of Egeria, that is to say, the "dictator Manius Egerius, is known only through the proverb that affirms the profusion of his descendants[5] .

Now Numa is the teacher or organiser of *the* triple *flamonium*, that is to say, the religious and, if one dares to use this word in Rome, philosophical aspect of the functional tripartition of society; and it was he who established the rituals dedicated to the triad of Jupiter, Mars and Quirinus: the ritual of the Salii, the ritual of the Fetials and the ritual of Fides. It is therefore natural to wonder whether the tradition of the four *gentes* descended from his four sons, also dissociated from the whole, does not extend the Indo-European tradition that the Indo-Iranians present in its pure form on the "begetting" of functional classes by several brothers, sons of a "first king".

Plutarch says that chroniclers disagree about the children and marriages of the second founder of Rome. Some do not believe that he remarried after the death of his first wife, Tatia, or that he had any children other than a daughter, Pompilia. Others attribute four sons to him, Pompo, Pinus, Calpus, and Mamercus, each of whom became the ancestor of a *gens*: the Pomponii descended from Pompo, the Pinarii from Pinus, the Calpurnii from Calpus, and the Mamerci from Mamercus; and this common origin earned them the nickname *Reges*,
"kings". A third group of historians declares that these

genealogies are false, invented to flatter the *gentes* they name, adding that Pompilia was not born to Tatia, but to a second wife, Lucretia, whom Numa married after he had already become king. On one point, all agree: that Pompilia married Marcius and was the mother of Ancus Marcius, the fourth king of Rome[6].

These contradictions are not surprising, as Numa was not a historical figure, but rather a "centre of explanations": it is understandable that those who wanted to emphasise his austerity, loyalty and *gravitas* would have wanted to make him a one-woman man, married to Tatia, whose very name expressed her partial analogy with Tatius[7] ; his type of *pater familias* involving descendants and dynasty as opposed to the "Luperque" type of Romulus, it is also understandable that another king of Rome must have been his grandson, which, given the names of the kings in Roman legend, could only have been through his daughter. Finally, as the third group of authors, whose opinion is reported by Plutarch, suggests, it is conceivable that historical *gentes* may have wrongfully claimed this commendable origin, and that honest critics or rival *gentes* may have opposed these claims. There is nothing strange about the principles of these various traditions. But the one that associates the four *gentes* must be looked at more closely.

As has been noted, it contradicts a certain fact: although the Marcia *gens*, which claimed descent from King Ancus Marcius, did indeed use the surname *Rex*, this surname was not borne by any member of the four *gentes* supposedly descended from Pompo, Pinus, Calpus and Mamercus. Moreover, there is no point in exploiting this anomaly, which is undoubtedly an easily explainable error on Plutarch's part: he will have

attributed to the descendants of Numa's sons the nickname proper to the descendants of his daughter.

One detail, as we have also noted, can be dated, and it is late: it was in the last century of the Republic that a Calpurnius, whom we know well, claimed to be descended, along with his plebeian *gens*, from the ancestor Numa, and placed his effigy on his medals. But does the audacity of this plebeian prove that the entire tradition is recent?

<div align="center">*
*   *</div>

IV. *Pomponii, Pinarii, Mamerci, Calpurnii.*

Throughout Roman history, the *Pomponii* offer nothing remarkable: very few well-known magistrates, a few poets, a good number of scholars, geographers, jurists and grammarians, and finally Cicero's friend T. Pomponius Atticus, are not enough to put this family in the spotlight. But we can immediately see why, with its eponym Pompo, it could not fail to appear here: it retains approximately the same gentile name as Numa, Numa being a Pompilius, son of the Sabine Pompilius [Pompo8], and the names Pompo, Pomponii, and Pompilius deriving by regular processes from the same name Pompus, which is not attested elsewhere. Thus, the first of the four boxes in the system was rightfully confiscated for the benefit of the Roman *gentes* which, onomastically, appeared to be the most direct heir to the old king.

The *Pinarii*, along with the Potitii, are one of only two families in Rome that can be described as sacerdotal. They are specialised in the strictest sense of the term: after two mentions under the Tarquins (including a vestal Pinaria) and three mentions in the Consular Fasti in the 5th century, the Pinarii

are now known only collectively, as the ministers of the cult of Ara Maxima, until the extinction of their race, *donec Pinarium genus fuit*[9]. It matters little here under what conditions they were attached to this cult of Ara [Maxima10]. And if it is true that these priests did not even exist as a family, if they did not form an authentic *gens*, if they were properly only ministers called "pinarii" subordinate to the officiant called

"potitius" as Mr J. Carcopino has suggested with impressive arguments[11] , it is even more significant to find, occupying one of the four categories of the system, a fictitious *gens*, a college of priests dressed as *a gens*.

The *Mamerci* and their eponym Mamercus take us to a completely different province of Roman life. First of all, Mamercus is obviously inseparable from Mamers, and whatever the phonetic order of the trio of Italic names for Mars (*Mars, Mavors, Mamers*), it is certain that Mamers is Mars[12] . The Mamerci of history do not belie this bellicose eponym.

The Mamercus, descendants of a son of Numa, are referred to differently by Plutarch in another chapter[13], and by Festus: they are the Aemilii. And indeed, a large group of members of the Aemilia *gens* from the fifth and fourth centuries, i.e. from the epic age, bear the nickname *Mamercus* or *Mamercinus* (a nickname which, uniquely, also appears as a first name, attested only in the same *gens*). Apart from this surname-first name, apart from their descent from Mamercus son of Numa, a tradition reported in particular by Plutarch[14] testifies to the Aemilii's insistence on inserting themselves into the most glorious prehistory through a "martial" angle: it was an Aemilia, daughter

of Aeneas and Lavinia, who, through the works of Mars, gave birth to Romulus.

What is certain is that from the beginning and throughout the Republic, the Aemilii were one of the most glorious and powerful *gentes* in Rome[15], one of those prestigious *gentes* who, siding with the people, felt capable of leading the opposition to the Senate; their greatness lasted until the reign of the Julian emperors, with whom they showed solidarity (Emilius is said to have been a brother of Julius, son of Ascanius, son of Aeneas). Consulships, dictatorships, victories, and real or legendary triumphs accumulated from generation to generation under this name[16]. This is particularly true of the Aemilii Mamerci of the fifth and fourth centuries: L. Aemilius Mamercus was consul in 481, 478 and 473; victor over the Veii, it was only due to the animosity of the Senate that he did not celebrate his triumph. Ti. Aemilius Mamercus, consul in 470 and 467, is the archetype of the great patrician demagogue fighting against the patriciate. A Mamercus Aemilius, son of Mamercus, *vir summae dignitatis, vir potestati* [par17], was a military tribune with consular power in 438, then dictator three times (the last probably being only an epic variant of one of the first), in 438, 437 and 426; he was twice honoured with a triumph, after crushing the Fidenates and the Veientes; and it was in "his" war that A. Cornelius Cossus, tribune of the soldiers, won from Lars Tolumnius of Veies the second opime spoils, those that would be consecrated to the warrior god of the triad, Mars. L. Aemilius Mamercinus, as popular and anti-senatorial as his ancestors, was, in the middle of the fifth century, once *magister equitum*, three times consul, twice dictator, once *interrex;* during his last consulate, upon the announcement of a Gallic invasion, he is said to have raised a totalitarian army, granting no exemptions, incorporating even the crowd of

artisans and labourers unfit for war; with the Gauls keeping quiet, he is said to have subjugated the unfaithful city of Privernum with this army in a campaign that was famous in epic poetry, since Titus Livius knows two variants of the epilogue and "history" itself has split it in two[18]. The character of the Aemilii in general and the Mamerci in particular is therefore not in doubt: they are a good example of patrician *people*, charged with command and honours, turbulent, ambitious, epic.

The *Calpurnii* transport us to a new setting: of the four *gentes* linked to Numa by his sons, this one alone is plebeian. The Calpurnii are upstarts, and late upstarts at that: it is only at the end of the Republic, in the branch of the Pisons, that they gain importance, and it is then that the filiation attested to by both Plutarch and Horace is invented[19]. Initially proud of their origins (one is cited who, having become praetor, did not remove the iron ring of his order), they soon, as was natural, made common cause with the aristocracy and defended the Republic against Caesar and Octavian; but then, just as naturally, they were among the easiest to rally: Calpurnius, who had supported the party of Caesar's murderers, agreed in 23 to be Augustus' colleague as *suffect consul*. In short, origin, conduct, spirit, everything here is plebeian.

In summary, the four sons of Numa gave rise to four families: 1) a *gens* that was not specialised but retained the gentile name of the old king; 2) three specialised *gentes*: the fictitious or real *gens* that was most clearly priestly; one of the oldest and most illustrious patrician *gentes,* which also bore the name of Mars in its special praenomen and in one of its usual cognomina; and finally a typical plebeian *gens*, which grew late. There is no need to

emphasise how much this picture parallels, on another level, the system which lists after the *rex* the *flamen dialis, the high priest* par excellence, then the *flamen* of the god of *the milites* and that of the god of *the quirites*. One can certainly assume that this composition is a matter of chance. But then, what difficulties!

It is easy to accept that the Roman *gentes* must have competed eagerly for the distinction of seniority that came with being linked to Numa; and that the outcome of these competitions must have varied over the centuries, depending on the rising or falling fortunes of this or that *gens*, for the Calpurnii, at the end of the Republic, provide us with proof that it was not difficult to gain entry. But it is precisely strange that such a desirable lineage should contain only four branches. It is no less strange that such a limited number of places should be occupied, except for that of the Mamercii, by *gentes* of little or no importance: if the Pomponii were able to gain and maintain their place through a kind of onomastic privilege that ensured the plausibility of the whole, what can be said of the Pinarii, an extinct family, who have so little lustre and vitality that one can plausibly doubt their existence as *a gens*? And how were the Calpurnii, plebeians and last-minute candidates, able to settle alongside the very noble Aemilii, when so many patrician *gentes* could have joined the ranks? In short, what principle limits the number of elected members to four? What principle protects the memory or fiction of the Pinarii while allowing the intrusion of the Calpurnii? What principle keeps the other great patrician families away from a group that includes the Aemilii?

Everything is understandable, without the slightest reservation, if an ancient tradition attached to Numa by his four sons, in addition to a

royal descent, three families and three only, corresponding to the three primitive social classes, priests, warriors, and "commoners": a tradition very similar to that which we have seen attached, in Iran and India, to various fabulous kings or legislators. The framework was limited and could not expand without destroying itself. Whatever the ambition of *the* patrician *families* emulating the Aemilii, they could only enter it in the precise place of the Aemilii, by eliminating them, which seems to have been impossible since they remained in full force from the beginning of Roman history until the end of the first century AD. On the contrary, however tenuous and uncertain their existence may have been, the Pinarii priests were irreplaceable. Finally, the Calpurnii occupied a place that was in any case reserved for plebeians; if they had to eliminate predecessors or competitors, it could only have been other plebeian families; and their usurpation would have offended the *gens* Aemilia all the less because, on the contrary, in order for its own claim to be plausible, it needed to surround itself with *sacerdotes* and *quirites*. If the genealogical free-for-all of the Romans was contained by this traditional framework, which was both strict and oriented, the picture recorded by Plutarch is natural: the vagaries of history contributed to filling it in only by conforming to the legend from century to century. We can see how important it is, when faced with traditions of this kind, not to dissociate the elements and not to believe that everything has been explained once the main details have been accounted for in isolation. The harmony of the whole still remains to be explained, and it is there, in general, that the most genuine and fruitful difficulties lie in wait.

*

*   *

*V. Social functions and brothers
among the Germanic and Celtic
peoples*.

Mr Christensen[20] seems to have had the idea that some of the legends, so common among Indo-Europeans, in which an ancestral king is succeeded by his two, three or four sons who are the founders of "races", could be "social legends", i.e. legends related not to the geographical distribution of peoples, but to a classification of social functions or classes, or at least combining the two values.

This idea is probably true of the Celts and the Germanic peoples, but the argument cannot be taken to its logical conclusion: in each of the legends we have in mind, one of the three brothers remains less well defined than the others, or even undefined. Moreover, these legends are known only through allusions or summary and incomplete accounts. We cite them only to show the difficulty of the research on the domains ancient "Nordic" domains which, unlike the Scythians, did not have the good fortune to attract the interest of Herodotus.

According to ancient poems, Tacitus[21] says that Mannus, son of Tuisto, son of Earth, himself had three sons who became the eponyms of the three parts of the Germanic peoples: the *Ingaevones*, "those closest to the ocean"; the *Herminones*, who are "medii"; and the *Istaevones* (or *Istraeones?*), who include all the others. Whatever one may think of this geographical distribution, it is likely that it is accompanied by a functional classification: M. Jan de Vries has shown[22] that two of the names of the eponyms suggested by the names of the descendants, **Inguwaz* and **Ermenaz*, coincide with the second name of the Scandinavian Freyr (*Yngvi*) and

with one of Odhinn's nicknames (*Jörmunr*), i.e. they designate two of the members of the functional triad of Upsal, the Almighty Magician and the Fertiliser; the last name, whose form is uncertain (* *Istuwaz?* * *Istraz?*), is less straightforward to interpret and there is as yet no way of proving that it corresponds to Thôrr.

, the Celtic , , who think if readily by three, Mr Vendryes recently compiled, under the title *L'unité en trois personnes chez les Celtes*[23], a large number of triple or grouped characters, divine or human, whose composition formula is variable and which do not all call for the same explanation. Among these triads, which are not simply intensive triples but true classificatory trinities, two groups of three brothers can perhaps be interpreted by the division of social "functions".

When the last conquerors arrived in Ireland, the island was, as we have seen, in the hands of the Tuatha Dê Danann; they then had three brothers as kings, sons of Cearmad Milbheol and grandsons of the druid god Dagda, who took turns on the throne, with the transfer of power taking place on "the Mound of Kings[(24)] ", but who are also seen deliberating together and, unfortunately for them, killing the leader of the new arrivals[25] . These three associated kings, each of whom has a personification of Ireland as his wife, are called: *Eathur* son of the Hazel Tree (*mac Cuill*), *Teathur* son of the Plough (*mac Ceacht*), *Ceathur* son of the Sun (*mac Grêine*); these remarkable expressions do not, of course, attribute "fathers" to these characters who, being brothers, have only one, Cearmad; they indicate the object of worship (G. Keating) or predilection of each, and at the same time reveal his essence: the Sun and the Plough immediately characterise two of them, one as

celestial and luminous, the other as agrarian (cf. "*Dium*" and *Quirinus* at either end of the Roman triad); unfortunately, the hazel tree [0] [26] is charged with so much meaning and has so many "valences" (magic, power, etc.) that it poorly characterises the one who is said to be its "son"; nevertheless, as one would expect if the classification is functional, it may refer to the warrior, because the hazel wand (*crom chuill*) plays an important role in the initiation trials of the Fiana, the companions of the hero Finn, whose shield, incidentally, is made of hazel wood[27].

The second group is that of the three *Fothad*, three twin grandsons of a king of the island of Brittany, whose three names, ending in *-dia*, qualify them as "gods". They are men, however, and do not reign, but they seem to be distinguished according to the three functions that interest us here. Furthermore, their story associates this functional division with a curious division of moments in time according to degrees of brightness (nightfall, midnight, morning), which brings to mind — in a different order — the three *gunas* (daylight, twilight, darkness) that Indian thought very early on drew a parallel with the caste system[28].

Here is what the treatise "La Convenance des Noms" teaches about them, unfortunately not without verbiage[29]: "They were called 'The One God', 'The Strong God', 'The Beautiful God' (*Oendia, Trêndia, Caendia*) ; le premier était dit aussi
" l'Homme des Richesses " (*int-Airgthech*, de *airget* "silver"[30]), the second "the Man of the War Chariots" (*in Cairpthech*) and the third, *Fothad Canainne* (meaning?); their mother gave birth to them all at once: *Oendia* at nightfall, and his name was given to him because, thanks to his good fortune, he had no king (above him?); *Trêndia* at

midnight, and his name was given to him because of the strength of luck with the gods at that moment (*sic*); *Caendia* in the morning, and his name was given to him because of the charm and beauty of the red light (?) of the morning... Fothad *Cainidae* (a more intelligible variant of *Canainne*) means that the gods (*dée*) were beautiful (*cain*) when he was born; *Fothad Airglhech* "F. of Riches" was so called because wealth was most dear to him, hence his champion's bracelet and his two rings and his gold necklace and his dog and his horse; *Fothad Cairpthech* "F. of War Chariots" was so named because horses and chariots were the share he gave (to his sons?), and he was also *Fothad Dolus* "F. of Darkness" because he travelled in the dark nights.

The comments on the first series of names (*Oendia*, etc.) are obviously, as is often the case in this short treatise, the work of an exegete who no longer knows the true justifications and who speaks for the sake of speaking; the explanations of Airgthech and Cairpthech add nothing to the actual meanings of these names, but at least these are clear. It emerges from the text as a whole that the first of the three twins, born in the evening, is defined by his riches and his taste for riches; that the second, born at midnight, a lover of dark nights, is a "strong" man defined by his taste for horses and chariots[31]; and that the third, born in the morning, is defined only by his beauty, which appears "dialic", linked to the radiance of the day in opposition to the darkness that immediately preceded it. This is perhaps the last and confused remnant of Druidic reflections on the essence of social functions, their origin and their relationship with other classifications of entities (divisions of the day, physical qualities)[32].

1. A. Christensen, *The First Man and the First King in the Legendary History of the Iranians*, I, 1918, pp. 143 ff.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 137.

3. See above, p. 152.

4. *Mitra-Varuna*, p. 31.

5. Festus-Paulus, s. v. *Manius: ...a quo multi et clari viri orti sunt et per multos annos fuerunt, unde proverbium: "multi Manii Ariciae";* cf. *Mitra-Varuna*, pp. 61 ff.

6. *Numa*, 21.

7. See above, p. 178.

8. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, II, 58.

9. Titus Livius, I, 7.

10. See the seminal work by Jean Bayet, *Les Origines de l'Hercule Romain, Bibl. des Ecoles françaises de Rome et d'Athènes*, vol. 132, 1926, pp. 268 ff., 318 ff.

11. *Journal des Savants*, 1928, pp. 212 ff.; reprinted in *Aspects mystiques de la Rome païenne*, 1941, pp. 197 ff.

12. Festus, s. v.: *Mamercus praenomen oscum est ab eo, quod hi Martem Mamerlem appellant.*

13. *Numa*, 8.

14. *Romulus*, 2.

15. Plutarch, *Paul-Emile*, 2, etc.

16. See the entries by Krebs and various contributors on the 180 known Aemilii in *the Encyclopaedia* Pauly-Wissowa, I, 1894, col. 542-593: the Mamerci are listed under numbers 93-101.

17. Titus Livius, IV, 16 and 17.

18. Titus Livius, VIII, I and 20.

19. *Epistle to the Pisones*, 292.

20. *Trebrödre og Tobrödre-Stammsagn, Danske Studier*, 1916, pp. 45 ff.

21. *Germanie*, 2.

22. *Altgermanische Religionsgeschichte*, I, 1935, pp. 212-216.

23. *Proceedings of the Académie des* Inscriptions et Belles-Arts, 1935, pp. 324 ff.

24. *Ros na Rîg: Rev. Celt.*, XI, 1923, p. 406.

25. D'Arbois de Jubainville, *Le cycle mythologique irlandais*, 1884, pp. 234 ff.; A. B. Cook, *The European Sky-God* in *Folk Lore*, XVII, 1906, p. 165, based on G. Keating's *History* of *Ireland*.

26. Whose name is the same in Rome, *corulus*, among the Germans, German *Hasel*, and among the Irish, *coll: *kosolo-*.

27. Standish O'Grady, *Silva Gadelica*, 1892, I, p. 92; II, p. 100; cf. A. B. Cook, *loc. cit.*

28. See above, p. 64.

29. *Coir Anmann*, § 220, in Stokes, *Irische Texte*, III, 2, 1897, pp. 376 ff.

30. Stokes translates this as "herdsman", no doubt thinking of the noun *airge* "sheepfold, flock", but a little further on he renders it correctly as "The Moneyed",
"the one who has money".

31. See, in Germania, the warrior types described by Tacitus, the *feralis exercitus* of *the Harii*, who are not only the strongest men but who choose the darkest nights for their attacks: *Germania*, 43; see *Myths and Gods of the Germans*, p. 80.

32. Let us add, to exhaust what we know about these characters but not to shed light on them, that, according to a quatrain published and translated by Stokes (*op. cit.*, p. 421), "F. of the War Chariots" died at the hands of "F. of Riches", and that another quatrain published and translated by Standish O'Grady (*Silva Gadelica*, 1892, II, pp. 483 and 531), alludes to a misadventure unknown elsewhere: "F. of Riches" is said to have fallen asleep for nine months at the voice of the hen of Bairche (?).

CHAPTER VII

The talismans of the king's house.

I. The talismans of the Scythians and Iranians.

The Scythian legend of the sons of Targitaos centres on an important theme: that of burning gold objects falling from the sky, which are both, analytically, symbols of the three juxtaposed social functions and, synthetically, the talisman of unitary kingship. The plough with the yoke, the axe and the cup do not fall in a scattered order, but together. Nor can they be separated during the successive attempts made by the three brothers to seize them, even though these three brothers and their descendants undoubtedly also represent the various social classes: it is to the last that all the symbols, from the most noble to the most humble, surrender, and this sign is clear enough for his brothers to abandon τὴν βασιληίην πᾶσαν, total kingship, to him.

The mechanism is fully described if we take into account the chapter of Herodotus that follows the account of the legend of acquisition (IV, 7): the four objects are not purely mythical; the kings of the Scythians keep them after an interval that they themselves estimate at ten centuries; and they circulate them each year from kingdom to kingdom, trying to win their favour with great sacrifices; if the one who has the sacred gold falls asleep in the open air during the festival, the Scythians believe that he will die within the year and, as compensation, they give him all the land he can ride around on horseback in a day.

The last sentence is unclear, as Herodotus's phrase does not specify who "the one who has the sacred gold" is; he

It seems, based on the preceding words, that it is the local king with whom the gold stops during its circular journey; but it is difficult to understand why this king would need to receive, as compensation for his impending death, a territory which, although extensive for a private individual, would not significantly increase the royal domain. It is possible that Herodotus is reporting here, without fully understanding it, a substitution ritual: there are many examples, in the ancient world and among so-called primitive peoples, of designated victims who, for a year, are given a royal lifestyle by the king or society, and who are sacrificed at the end of that period, in the capacity of king, to deliver society or the true king from the defilements of the year. But whatever the meaning of this detail, Herodotus' account at least leaves no doubt about the annual journey of the talismans throughout the Scythian world, the honours bestowed upon them, and consequently the permanent service they provided.

Throughout the Indo-Iranian domain, there is no equivalent as clear and distinct as these talismanic symbols, which are embedded in both myth and ritual, in prehistory and in current usage. However, there are traces of them in both India and Iran proper. It suffices to cite here the case where the mechanism is the least incomplete.

[1]recalls that Hôshang, one of the "first kings" of Iran, is said to have distinguished, together with his brother Vêgherd, the three functions of social life, which Al-Bîrûnî names sometimes in Arabic and sometimes in Iranian: Hôshang established two functions, Royal Power and the Secretariat (*ad-dahûfadhiyya* and *al-kitâba*), while Vêgherd established Agriculture (*ad-dahqana*); two annual festivals commemorate the good understanding between the two brothers and their harmonious institutions; in one of these festivals, the king

leaves his throne, mingles with the peasants, and everyone can speak to him freely[2].

However, another tradition preserved in the Pahlavi book *Zâd-Sparam*, XI, 10, also places the division of society into three estates—ecclesiastical, warrior, and rural—during the reign of Hôshang, but this division is achieved through a completely different process. During the reign of Hôshang, men travelled continuously between these fabulous provinces of the world, which the holy books of Mazdeism call the Kêshvar, and their vehicle was a no less fabulous ox; it carried on three places on its back a wonderful fire which, one night, fell into the sea; the men gathered up the substance, divided it into three parts and established it in three hearths "which became by themselves three Glories, whose dwellings were in the fire *Farnbâgh*, in the fire Gushnasp and in the Bûrzin Mihr". These three fires are well known and played a talismanic role in the Sassanid Empire: the first, the fire of the ecclesiastical state, was kept in Kariyân, in Persia proper; the second, the fire of the warriors, in Gandjâk, in Azerbaijan; the third, the fire of the farmers, on Mount Rêvand, in Khorassan[3]. Another Pahlavi book, the *Bunda-hishn*, XVII, 4-9, which tells much the same story but places the fall of the fire during the reign of another king, Takhmôruw (whom Mazdean literature links to Hôshang in varying but always very close genealogical and dynastic relationships: son, successor, grandson), describes well the service that these three fires subsequently rendered when Takhmôruw's successor collected them and established them in sanctuaries: "...And during the reign of Yim, all things were accomplished more perfectly with the help of these three fires": the first saved the Glory of Yim threatened by the demonic Dahâk; the second, installed on the mane of a

horse, helped destroy the temples of the non-Mazdagians; the third protected the country, though it is not specified how. Finally, in the time of Zoroaster, according to the *Bundahishn*, the holy king Vishtasp, converted to the true religion, placed all three in their final seats.

Thus, the cycle of Hôshang presents, dissociated in variants that our limited information does not allow us to connect, the same two themes which, when combined, constitute the story of the sons of Targitaos: the establishment of social states (Scythians and Iranians: three) by a group of brothers (Scythians: three; Iranians: two); symbolic representation of these three social classes by four burning objects (Scythians) or by three fires (Iranians) that fell from the sky, were collected on earth and preserved, and used by successive kings as talismans. The main difference lies in the form of the talismans: the Scythian legend describes them as various instruments, of a specific shape, which are also burning; the Iranian legend simply describes three fires. It is not possible to determine whether one of the two conceptions is more archaic than the other; it seems that *the Avesta* preserves traces of a legend in which Ahura-Mazdâh himself gave Yima (the *Yim* pehlevi) two golden instruments symbolising social activities, but unfortunately obscure4. On the other hand, the three Iranian fires are reminiscent of the three Indian sacrificial fires, also created from the single supernatural fire that King Purûravas brought to earth from the "world of the Gandharvas": a frequently repeated tradition has it that these three fires, which are also said ad nauseam to represent all parts of the universe, were formed at the same time as the three Vedas were born from a single Veda, and also the three Aryan castes from a single caste, these simultaneous tripartitions defining one of the changes of Ages in the world. It would be

be beyond the scope of this work to search in India for traces of objects comparable to those in Scythian legend: there are plausible examples, both in ritual and in legend, but this would require reflections that are not relevant here. It suffices to note that, whether they are various objects or simply multiple fires, talismans from another world guarantee the prosperity of the king and the people in Iran and Scythia according to the social tripartite division.

<center>*

*   *</center>

II. *The treasures of the Tuatha Dê Danann.*

Irish practice retained until Christian times, under the *rî*, the tripartite division of society into the priestly class, the military nobility, and the farming people[5]; legends seem to associate this functional division with groups of three brothers, sometimes kings, who were not founders but representatives[(6)] ; finally, the three functions are both represented and performed by typical figures in the society of the former gods, the Tuatha Dê Danann[7] .

The analogy between the Iranian and especially Scythian accounts guarantees the antiquity of a fascinating episode linked to the history of the Tuatha Dê Danann.

When they set out to conquer Ireland, they brought with them four "treasures" which, it was said, had been given to them in four distant cities by four magicians. Several epic tales mention or describe these four "treasures", and M. V. Hull, who has studied them carefully, has shown through purely philological arguments that their collection is older than the texts through which we know them[8]. No doubt it is even older than he thinks. Here is the beginning of a fragment from *the Book of Lecan* and

the *Book of Ballymote*: "There were four cities in which the Tuatha Dê Danann learned science and magic, for science and magic and sorcery were at their service. The names of these cities are Failias and Findias, Goirias and Murias; from Failias came the Stone of Fâl, which is in Tara (capital of the High King of Ireland) and which cries out under every king who takes sovereignty over Ireland; from Gorias came the sword that belonged to Nuada; from Findias came the spear of Lug; from Murias came the cauldron of Dagda. There were four sorcerers in these cities: Fessus in Failias, Esrus in Gorias, Ascias in Findias, and Semias in Murias. It was from them that the Tuatha Dê Danann learned science and knowledge. No battle ver prevailed against the spear of Lug or against the one who held it. No one escaped the sword of Nuada after being wounded by it, and when it was drawn from its warrior's sheath, no one could resist the one who held it. As for the cauldron of Dagda, no gathering of guests ever left it unsatisfied. As for the Stone of Fâl, which is in Tara, it did not speak except under a king of Ireland. Other texts, such as the first paragraphs of the *Second Battle of Mag-Tured*[9], agree in their commentary, which is sometimes richer, as we shall see, for the Stone of Fál. The interpretation of these magical "treasures" is immediate.

Two of them, Lug's spear and Nuada's sword, without any need to seek nuances between their definitions, are weapons of war, which unfailingly ensure victory.

The cauldron of the god Dagda is one of a long line of cauldrons in Irish and Welsh mythology, many of which, like this one, are either inexhaustible or provide wonderful food, while others have varying properties (cauldrons of hierarchy, serving each

their rightful share; resurrection cauldrons, bringing back to life those who are immersed in them; cauldrons of knowledge and magic, etc.), of which the famous silver vase found in the Danish bogs of Gundestrup is a good ritual counterpart, and of which the Holy Grail is only the latest but not, beneath its Christian guise, the least faithful to its most distant origins. Like the cup of Scythian legend, this cauldron belonging to Dagda, the god who embodies Druidism itself, must represent the sacred object par excellence: perhaps in the Druidic liturgies that we do not know, the cauldron had specific roles; but in addition, among the Celts as well as among the Scythians and the Germanic peoples, the most solemn and widely religious acts of society are the seasonal assemblies where individuals, grouped hierarchically, find union, strength and prestige in communal drinking, listen to the praise and mockery of poets, speak of justice and exercise their minds. Like those that take place among the Nartes Alägatä[10], these drinking parties full of magic and law, these collective and value-creating excitements, ensure the maximum fulfilment of the primary social function.

The Stone of Fâl, whose name is obscure, has had a more mobile destiny, but essentially symbolises the very soil of Ireland, which is often called, among other circumlocutions, "the Plain of Fâl", *Mag Fhâl;* which is why it only makes its miraculous voice heard when it feels itself being trodden on by the one who is or will be its rightful master, by the king and no one else; one text even specifies the varying degrees of loudness of the rumblings it emits depending on whether it has a supreme king or the king of one of *the coided*, one of the particular kingdoms[11]. J. Loth strongly emphasised both the
"telluric" and "royal" value of the Stone, which is also that

as is most often claimed by old Irish people, and he recalled the examples of "navel of the earth", *omphaloi*, which are known in the Celtic world[12]. Secondarily, perhaps, it is described as a "stone phallus", *Fâl Ferb Cluiche*, which led J. Baudis to see it essentially, albeit exaggerating somewhat, as a fertility stone[13]. By extension, it is also seen to be used for other ordeals than the designation of the king: an accused person who climbs on it turns completely white if he is innocent, says the late *Acallam na Senôrach*, and if not, a black spot forms on him; if the woman who steps on it is irremediably barren, the stone oozes blood; if the woman is destined for motherhood, milk[14]. All these developments are easily explained and do not obscure the starting point: the voice of the Stone of Fâl, with or without the harmonic of fertility, is the voice of the earth discerning its king.

Thus, the four treasures of the Tuatha Dê Danann are: the Spear and the Sword, weapons of war; the Cauldron, a magical utensil; and finally the Stone, through which the soil of the kingdom expresses itself. Like the four objects that fell from the sky under the sons of Targitaos, they symbolise the three social classes. The two main differences are as follows.

Firstly, the function of fertility, under Magic and under Warrior Force, remains in the shadows here, whereas the Plough and the Yoke manifest it redundantly among the Scythians; if the earth is present through the Stone of Fâl, it is not as a giver of fruit but as a maker of kings; this anomaly can no doubt be explained by the remark made in a previous chapter[15], that the Tuatha Dê Danann directly patronise, along with the Royalty, only Magic and Warrior Force, and that they ensure Fertility indirectly, through an arbitrary order, through the service imposed on a defeated Fomôre: it

is therefore natural that the last of the treasures of the Tuatha Dê Danann should retain only the noble functions of the rural class and of the land itself, considered as the foundation and support of royal power rather than as producers.

The second difference is sufficiently justified by the difference in location and, no doubt, customs: the Scythian legend closely groups the four objects together, somewhat neglecting the individual value of each once it has been presented, to collectively make them *the* talisman that reveals the legitimate king. In contrast, Irish tradition attributes only warrior virtues to the Spear and the Sword, and only magical virtues to the Cauldron, without reference to royalty; only the Stone of Fâl plays the role of revealing the king, since anyone who climbs on it and fails to make it speak cannot be elevated to the throne by election.

At the same time, only one of the four treasures, the Stone of Fâl, has retained its value over the centuries: it continued to fulfil its purpose until Cûchulainn cut it with a sword, or until "its heart leapt out of it from Tara to Tailtiu in Ulster", or until the birth of Christ broke the power of idols[16]. On the contrary, the cauldron of Dagda, the spear of Lug and the sword of Nuada do not seem to have survived the mythical hegemony of the Tuatha Dê Danann; yet when we refer to the definition of these three wonders, at least that of the two weapons[17], it seems that they were not constitutionally linked to their first owners. Perhaps there was a time when the King of Ireland not only ascended the Stone of Fâl or a stone of similar significance, but also took possession of the other divine treasures.

The above considerations are addressed to Grail historians: as early as 1888, A. Nutt had linked the treasures of the

Tuatha Dê Danann with the talismans that appear in the procession of the Holy Grail, notably in Chrestien de Troyes and his followers: a broken sword, a bloody spear, a vase; with regard to the Stone of Fâl, he recalled that, in Wolfram von Eschenbach, the Grail is not a vase but a stone. More recently, M. C. L. Brown has taken up this comparison with a wealth of argumentation[18]; finally, although they do not agree with M. Brown on all points, Roger Sherman Loomis and Jean Stirling Lindsay, who have done so much to make the Celtic origin of the Grail legends more than probable, retain the essentials[19]. Now that, beyond the treasures of the Tuatha Dê Danann, the marvellous objects of the "King of the Grail", the associated vase and weapons join the talismans of the ancient Scythians and, like them, are linked to Indo-European magic and symbolism of royalty, social hierarchy and prosperity, we can better understand the long resonance of these motifs until well into the Middle Ages. It will be necessary to revisit this fascinating question in its own right.

Finally, we must ask ourselves whether these prehistoric traditions did not, on a completely different level of literature, contribute to the formation of a well-known type of tale, that of the "Magic Gifts". After conducting as comprehensive a study as possible, one of the masters of the new folklore school, Anti Aarne, concluded that this tale originated in Europe and then spread to parts of Asia[20]; Kaarle Krohn, leaning towards the opposite hypothesis, admits an Indian origin[21] ; what is certain is that the area of distribution of the tale extends little beyond the domain covered by Indo-European languages: it is therefore there, in some particular society, that it was formed. However, in the form that seems to have given

given rise to the others, and which presents a succession of three "magical gifts" given to the hero by a supernatural character, two of the three objects are consistently the same in both Europe and Asia: 1) an object that magically provides food (a vase, cauldron or pot in Asia, a tablecloth or similar object in Europe); 2) either a stick that beats or an axe or sword that kills thieves and enemies. The third object is more variable: it is often (mainly in Europe) an animal that produces gold in the form of dung, but there is also a bowl that provides gold at will, a box that fills with precious clothes, or a melon that contains jewellery. An inexhaustible vase, an invincible weapon, a talisman (especially an animal) that brings wealth: these are three good examples of the three "social functions" or at least their principles, and no doubt these old categories, which already framed the thinking of the Indo-Europeans, presided over the formation of the tale, wherever it took place.

The story shows the hero successively dispossessed by a thief of the nourishing talisman and the talisman of wealth, but then regaining them thanks to the striking object: could there not be, beneath this scenario, a heretical theory, a popular conception of the hierarchy of values, placing fighting strength in its historically accurate place, above both boastful wealth and naturally naive faith, above gold, which satisfies but invites envy, and the sacred, which gives life but is defenceless?

<div align="center">

*

*   *

</div>

III. Ancilia and Salii.

Rome also has its talismans. The main one, *the ancile*, fell from the sky under Numa, the founding king who organised the triple *flamonium* and who, through his sons, gave rise to *gentes* that reflected the prehistoric social tripartition. on the other hand, the Salian priests who, twice a year, carry through the city, along with the spears of Mars, *the ancile*, or rather the *ancilia*, since in practice there are twelve of them (one real and eleven fake to reduce the chances of theft, according to tradition), are *in tutela Jovis Martis* [Quirini22] , under the protection of the old triad. It is therefore likely that, in part, we are gathering here another of *the membra disjecta* of the mythical-ritual ensemble that the Scythians have preserved with the utmost consistency.

Only partly, because both the indented shape of the *ancilia* shields and the dancing nature of the Salians have long steered research in another direction: towards the Asian sea, towards the Aegeans, towards Crete, where the bilobed shield haunted engravers as much as the double axe, where the dance of the armed Curetes rocked the first dreams of a Zeus who was hardly Indo-European. It is nevertheless possible that, through a syncretism whose historical process escapes us but which is quite natural, the 'Nordic' builders of Rome, while adopting with   the corresponding priesthood   of the   talismans "Mediterranean" talismans, they inserted them into their tripartite representation of social life, substituting them for those symbolic talismans whose faithful image has been shown to us by Ireland and Scythia.

The formula *in tutela Jovis Martis Quirini* applied to the Salians would suffice to prove this syncretism. But Mr Geiger[23]has disputed its importance: this critic believes that Jupiter must have been pushed under Servius' stylus by his kinship with the warrior gods Mars and Quirinus, by the "warrior conception

of the god of the sky". This explanation is in itself improbable: the formula *Jupiter, Mars, Quirinus* is archaic, it exists outside this particular case; it would therefore be strange if it had been recomposed here by chance, without regard to its other uses, under the influence of a circumstantial analogy felt between Jupiter and Mars. Now that we know that, everywhere else, this formula associates three elements that are not analogous but heterogeneous and complementary in a larger unity, we are inclined to think that, once again, Jupiter, and also Quirinus, are fundamentally different from Mars and that their union in a triad, once again, signifies the joint interest that the three functional classes of society once took in the ritual. But it is easy to verify directly that Jupiter, Mars and Quirinus are not brought together here by Servius' whim.

Let us first consider the gods who own the talismans. Mars and Quirinus openly share this privilege: in the speech full of antiquities with which Camillus implores the Romans, after the passage of the Gauls, to rebuild the city on its original site, he calls upon the gods of the national talismans as witnesses: "What shall I say of your *ancilia*, Mars Gradivus, and you, Quirinus Pater[24]?" All that can be conceded to the contrary opinion is that Quirinus' role is secondary and that, in everyday language, the *ancilia* are more commonly attributed to Mars; nevertheless, legally speaking, they are the common property of the second and third gods of the triad. As for Jupiter, he is here more than just a co-owner, he is a donor. The original legend does not mention Mars or Quirinus; it is Jupiter who promises Numa to give him "a sure pledge of empire", *imperii pignora certa dabo*[25] ; and it is he, in fact, who, the next day at

, after a triple clap of thunder in a clear sky, causes the miraculous shield to fall before the king and the assembled people. The triad is complete: through a distribution of roles in accordance with the hierarchy of the gods, Mars, assisted by Quirinus, administers Jupiter's initial blessing throughout history.

Let us now consider the places where talismans are normally kept. The sovereign presence of the first god is clearly apparent. Although belonging to Mars and Quirinus, the *ancilia* and *hastae Marlis* are kept not in one of the great temples of Mars or Quirinus, nor in the *curiae* of the Saliens of Mars or Quirinus on the Palatine or Quirinal hills, but *in regia*, in a chapel of Mars incorporated into the 'king's house', that is, in the home of the Roman who, along with the *flamen dialis*, is most involved in the cosmic and social "zone" of Jupiter and generally of the sovereign gods. Twice a year, the Saliens come to take the precious deposit and carry it solemnly through their *mansiones*, but then they return it to its conservatory. (The usual location of *the ancilia* in the *regia* also proves that, originally, like the golden objects of Scythian legend, they were of primary interest to the monarchy. And the existence of the chapel of Mars in the *regia* perhaps testifies to a particular affinity between the first two gods of the triad.)

Finally, let us consider the gods that Rome mobilises when the talismans of the *regia, ancilia* and *hastae Marlis*, move on their own and make noise. This is the omen of a serious event, a sign that the pontiffs and collectors are sure to note and that Julius Caesar, host of the *regia* in his capacity as high pontiff, was wrong to neglect on the night before the Ides of March. So the Romans initiate a sacred procedure that we know from an old senatus

consultum that Aulus Gellius copied because of a detail of vocabulary (IV, 6): the high priest informs the Senate, which instructs one of the consuls 1° to sacrifice to Jupiter and Mars with major victims, *hosliis majoribus;* 2° for the other gods, to appease those he deems should be appeased; 3) if additional victims, *hostiæ succidaneæ*, are necessary, to add Robigus to the list of gods. Thus, the only three gods named, those who, like an advance guard and a rearguard, frame the whole operation, are Jupiter and Mars on the one hand, and Robigus on the other: we have seen [above26] what Robigus is, the god of wheat rust, an agrarian god, whose cult is one of the services of the flamen of Quirinus. So this is still the great triad, with an insignificant variation, and this time with the archaic caesura that separated the third function from the first two, which were closely associated[27] .

It is in light of these connections that the expression *in tutela Jovis Marlis Quirini* should be understood: it is justified. Admittedly, there are only two colleges of Salians, the *Palatini* belonging to Mars and the *Collini* belonging to Quirinus (the latter, judging by the legends of their institution, being inferior – "posterior", says "history" – to the former); admittedly, there are no Salians belonging to Jupiter; but this does not invalidate Servius's trinitarian formula, the triple and complete guardianship that covers the Salians: here we simply find, with regard to the priests, the situation that has just been analysed with regard to the weapons themselves (belonging to Mars and Quirinus, they were given by Jupiter) and with regard to their place of storage (carried on feast days in the *mansiones* of the Saliens of Mars and Quirinus, they are kept in ordinary times *in the regia*). Jupiter's guardianship, which is general, continuous and profound, is different from the more

conspicuous but distributive guardianship of the other two gods; yet it is real and necessary.

Thus, the main talismans of Rome are well designed and used in relation to the tripartite division of society: a vestige of the Indo-European mechanism that has just been studied. But, as we said at the outset, the type of priesthood and even more so the nature and form of *the ancile* are Mediterranean and not Indo-European. Among the Scythians and the Celts, the multiple talismans are at the same time transparent symbols of the three functions. In Rome, while *the ancile* and the *haste Martis* can, at a pinch, be seen as symbolising the warrior function, the other two functions remain without figures. Has it always been this way? Perhaps not: Romulus' *lituus*, the sacred staff of the king-augur, was preserved, not in the *regia* with the shield and spears, but with the priests who used these weapons, in the *curia* of the Salii Palatini. This connection between *the ancile*
"pignora imperii" and the *lituus,* which promises Rome "eternal life[28] " is no coincidence, for Virgil, imagining this *regia* avant la lettre that is the temple of Picus in Laurente[29], places an *ancile* in the left hand of the statue of the god and the "Romulean *lituus*" (*quirinalis*, here, means nothing else) in the other. We thus glimpse a tradition in which, as twin talismans, the *lituus* and *the ancile*, a typical sacred instrument and an archaic weapon, symbols of the first two functions, at least coexisted.

Nevertheless, viewed from a distance, the talismans of the *regia*, the Salians, and their cult are above all associated with Mars. This was certainly the opinion of the Romans of the great century. The old triad is present, but the predominant element, in fact if not in law, is the second of the three gods. Moreover, here as in almost all

its uses, in a reversal fraught with consequences, Quirinus, god of the Salii, is perceived only as a double of Mars, no less warlike than the original. The particular evolution of Roman life, the military form it took on early on and always retained, dictated this balance.

<center>*</center>
<center>*   *</center>

IV. *The fable of Attus Navius.*

Rome may have retained a more literal memory of the three symbolic objects. We recall that, according to a tradition in which the most blatant falsification is mixed with probable history, Tarquinius Priscus is said to have attempted, without success, to 'change' the three Romulean tribes, whose functional value we now know[30]. In fact, he must have succeeded, since, in history, the three tribes bear Etruscan names that can only date from that period, and since they lost their original meaning and were reduced to topographical divisions. But Roman honour was interested in Tarquin's failure. And this failure was explained by a kind of fable that was glorious for Rome and more directly appropriate to its office than has been thought until now. With minor variations, the story goes as follows.

King Tarquin, wanting to 'change' the system of the three tribes, Attus Navius, who was then the most famous of the Roman augurs, asserted that nothing could be undertaken in this matter without securing the consent of the birds (according to others, when consulted by the king, he declared that the birds were unfavourable to the project). Irritated, and to mock such an unfortunate art, Tarquin said to him: "Well, soothsayer, make your observations (*inaugura*) and tell me if the thing I

am thinking of at this moment is possible!" Taking in his hand the *lituus* that had earned him his prestigious reputation through previous wonders and which is, after that of Romulus, the second famous *lituus* in ^Roman^ mythology[31], Navius questioned the heavens; *augurio acto*, he answered in the affirmative. The king bursts out laughing and, pulling a razor and a whetstone from under his cloak, says: "I was thinking of asking you to cut this stone with this razor!" Without losing his composure, Navius takes both items and, miraculously, the razor cuts the stone. Respectful of this sign from the gods, Tarquinius renounced his plan, allowed the tribes to remain, and gave Navius trust and honours. The razor and the stone were carefully buried *in comitio* and a *puteal* was installed above them, as on a place struck by ^lightning32^.

This story is undoubtedly more than amusing. In the minds of Cicero and Livy, it simply shows the Etruscan king being defeated by the Latin augur. Originally, its very plot was intended *to* figuratively *demonstrate* the excellence of the social organisation which, in the prologue, is threatened and which, in the conclusion, is saved. We must therefore pay attention to *the lituus* that the augur constitutionally possesses, and to the razor and stone, *novacula* and *cos* (two old Indo-European words) that the king gives him: these three objects are in fact the main actors in the comedy; two of them will be religiously buried by the Romans as relics, if not talismans, and Cicero will extol the ever-youthful power of the third[33]. The order in which the objects are used is no less interesting than their nature: the augural staff acts first, announcing and commanding the miracle; then the sharp tool acts, performing the miracle; finally, the stone, obediently undergoing the miracle, allows itself to be cut by the object whose ordinary function

is to sharpen. If the sacred instrument, the cutting tool and the stone tool symbolise the priest, the warrior and the working people, the meaning is clear: the miracle of Navius first establishes the primacy of the "priestly function"; it then establishes that, under the cover and guarantee of this once recognised primacy, the warrior in turn has all rights over the third estate, which is moreover destined to serve him. It is understandable that Tarquinius
— according to the Romans — renounced altering such a well-established and advantageous mechanism, and that, contenting himself with strengthening the "warrior function", he multiplied not the number of tribes but that of centuries of horsemen: the apologue demonstrated its point as directly and pertinently as the later one about the Members and the Stomach, with which Menenius Agrippa put an end to the sulking of the plebs.

It is therefore likely that the three objects in the anecdote of Navius and Tarquin are symbolically related to the three social functions. That the cutting instrument is a razor and not a sword as in Ireland; that the stone is cut in two by this razor (royal, in fact) and not, like the noble slab of Fâl, by a hero's sword, is a consequence of the transformation into "farce" that the Quirites subjected most of their myths to, and to which even the serious Numa himself had to lend himself, bargaining with Jupiter and "tricking" his partner, replacing a man's head with an onion head in sacrifices. The substitution of the razor and its whetstone for more elevated and appropriate symbols was all the easier because the meaning of the scene could only be obliterated once the tribes had lost all functional value.

If this interpretation is correct, Navius' anecdote can be defined as a folk tale that never came to fruition. Less fortunate

than the prehistoric tale, undoubtedly Indian, which gave rise to the tale of the three "Magical Gifts"[34] , it remained attached to Tarquinius, Navius, the augur, and was unable to convey to the world a lesson that Rome itself had long since ceased to understand.

The most interesting aspect for our study is that this anecdote seems to preserve the memory of the collection of functional talismans that Rome a had to keep of its prehistory
"Nordic", and who, dispossessed in rituals and myths by the double-lobed shield of the eastern islands, took refuge in folklore.

1. See above, p. 202.

2. *Chronology* of Al-Bîrûnt, trans. Sachau, 1879, pp. 206 and 411; A. Christensen, *Le premier homme...*, I, 1918, pp. 143-144.

3. A. Christensen, *Le premier homme…,* I, p. 146; *L'empire des Sassanides*, pp. 65 ff.

4. *Vidêvdat*, II, 7 and 18; cf. Vsëvolod Miller, *Oselinskije Etjudy*, III, 1887, p. 127.

5. *Drûi, flaith, bô aire:* see above, p. 111.

6. See above, pp. 216 ff.

7. See above, pp. 167 ff.

8. *The four jewels of the Tuatha Dê Danann, Z. f. cell. Phitol.*, XVIII, 1930, pp. 73 ff.

9. *Rev. Celt.*, XII, 1891, pp. 52 ff.

10. See above, p. 56.

11. *Acallam na Senôrach*, end: *Silva Gadelica*, 1892, I, p. 233; II, p. 264.

12. *Lia Fâil, stone of enthronement or trial of the kings of Ireland at Tara, omphalos or phallus?, Rev. des Et. Anc.*, XIX, 1917; pp. 33; cf. *ibid*., XVII, 1915,
pp. 193 ff., *L'omphalos, chez les Celtes;* and W. Deonna's note on a Savoyard omphalos, *ibid*., XXVIII, 1926, p. 181, with an extensive bibliography; cf. Vendryes, *Rev. cell*., XLIV, 1927, p. 257, and XLVII, 1930, pp. 206 ff.

13. *On the antiquity of the kingship of Tara, Eriu*, VIII, 1916, pp. 101 ff.

14. *Silva Gadelica, loc. cit.*

15. See above, pp. 167 ff.

16. According to the *Book of Conquests*, see J. Loth, *Rev. des Et. Anc*., XIX, 1917, p. 33.

17. See above, p. 227.

18. *The Grail and the English "Sir Perceval"*, 1925, reprint of six articles published between 1919 and 1924.

19. From the first: *Celtic Myth and Arthurian Romance*, New York, 1927, pp. 237 ff.; from both in collaboration: *The Magic Horn and Cup in Celtic and Grail Tradition*, in *Romanische Forschungen*, XLV, 1931, pp. 66 ff.

20. *Die Zaubergaben, eine vergleichende Märchenuntersuchung, Journal of the Finno-Ugric Society*, XXVII, *Helsinki*, 1911.

21. *Folklore Fellows Communications*, XXXIV, 96, 1931, pp. 48 ff.

22. Servius, *Comment, in the Aeneid*, VIII, 663.

23. Pauly-Wissowa, s. v. *Salii*, 1914.

24. Titus Livius, V, 52.

25. Ovid, *Fasti*, III, 346.

26. Pp. 92 ff.

27. See above, p. 163.

28. Λίδιον… τὴν σωτηρίαν, Plutarch, *Camille*, 32.

29. *Aeneid*, VII, 170 ff.

30. See above, pp. 130 ff.

31. Cicero, *De divinatione*, I, 17.

32. A heavily damaged text by Festus adds a fig tree, *ficus Navia,* to these relics.

33. *What? This lituus of yours, which is clearly a sign of good fortune, where did you get it?..., loc. cit.*

34. See above, pp. 232 ff.

Conclusions and questions.

Our study leads to several conclusions.

The Indo-Europeans viewed the world and society as consisting of three hierarchical bodies performing three functions: magical and legal administration, military force, and fertility. In practice, under the king, society appears to have been divided according to this model into three hierarchical classes, although it is impossible to say how strictly the system was enforced. Historically, legends derived this tripartite division from a king, either a founder or an ancestor, and in the latter case, it was his three sons who had created the three classes; other legends, at least in the West, told how the harmonious balance of social functions had been established after a period of chaos and war, either through the free agreement and fusion of several "good" divine or human races, or through the enslavement of a "bad" race to the "good" race, the good or one of the good races having assumed the first two functions, the bad race or the other good race having assumed the third. Symbolically, the classes and functions were each represented by one or more magical objects, which had once come from another world and were preserved and used as guarantors of the proper functioning not only of the classes considered in isolation, but also of their harmonious whole, the state, the kingdom. Religiously, the first class by definition performed most of the rituals, but the other classes may have had their own designated priests and, in any case, their own particular rituals. Mythologically, specialised gods presided over the three cosmic and social compartments and were grouped like them into triads in solidarity. Philosophically, these

cosmic, social and divine classifications led to others, with many conceptual provinces being susceptible to tripartition.

The Romans of historical times were so far removed from such representations that they had an imperfect understanding of even the most certain traces of them. But the fossilised hierarchy of the three major flamines, the still reconstructible definition of the three primitive tribes, the legend of the Sabine War and the fusion of the peoples of Romulus, Lucumo and Tatius, the tradition about the sons of Numa and the specialised *gentes* descended from them, the oldest talismans of Rome, and finally the archaic triad of Jupiter, Mars, Quirinus and all that is associated with them in terms of mythology and ritual, allow us to affirm that, on Roman soil, these antiquities initially functioned to the full. The intermediate periods between the Indo-European community and Roman history, particularly the pile-dwelling phase of the future Romans' lives, must have initiated a change, but it was only during the Etruscan period, then in the time of the decemvirs and under the effective principate of the pontiffs, that the system was overturned, Rome then took on such an original form that chroniclers were mistaken in attributing it to its beginnings. This explains why, for Cicero or Ovid, the connection between several of these vestiges was so tenuous and broken between most of them, and why, in any case, the sense of the system's scope was lost.

Some other parts of the Indo-European domain, India, Iran, Scythia, Scandinavia, Ireland, have been used only to provide elements of comparison and demonstration. They will, of course, have to be examined for themselves, or rather, the set of comparative data will have to be successively oriented so as to shine on each of them the same beam of light that has

been concentrated here on Latin facts. Instructive differences will emerge, as well as constants, a kind of "rut" in evolution.

We now know enough to define a few frequent processes which, without ever making the triad unrecognisable, add important extensions to it at the beginning or end: it often opens with the mention of the "king function"; or, which amounts to the same thing, the first function has two representatives, one for the legal administration of the world and the other for its magical administration; it is also often complemented, at the bottom, by a "craftsman" element; finally, the heterogeneous situation created by the Celts in Production (see above, p. 173) sometimes leads, among them, to the eclipse of its representative, or its orientation towards the medical function. This explains tetrads and pentads such as: Mitra, Varuna, Indra, the Nâsatyâ (Pre-Indians of Mitanni); Brahmin, Kshatriya, Vaishya, carpenter (India: *Baudhâyana dharmaçâstra*, I, 3, 9); priests, warriors, herders, artisans (Mazdean Iran); Zeus-Oromazdes, Apollo-Mithra, Heracles-Artagnès, "my homeland Commagene that nourishes all" (inscriptions of Antiochus of Commagene); Janus, Jupiter, Mars, Quirinus (preamble to the Roman *devotio*, Titus Livius, VII, 9); *rex, flamen dialis, fl. marlialis, fl. quirinalis, pontifex maximus* (Roman *ordo sacerdotum*); Mercury, sovereign magician; Jupiter, king of the gods; Mars, warrior; Apollo, healer; Minerva, worker (the five great Gallic gods of Caesar, *Gallic Wars*, VI, 17); etc.

Before concluding this investigation, let us raise three questions, probably interrelated, which we will leave to historians of Greece and the Near East.

<p style="text-align:center">*</p>
<p style="text-align:center">*   *</p>

Among the Indo-European societies that we have neglected, it is unlikely that either the Slavs or the Balts will ever provide any significant material. On the contrary, we regret the lack of information available on the Thracians and their relatives, the Phrygians, whose religious life was intense and original, for what we do know seems to imply a tripartite conception of society and the world.

Herodotus, V, 7, says that the Thracians as a whole recognise only three gods, Ares, Dionysus and Artemis; but that in addition, the kings have a special cult, that of Hermes, from whom they claim to be descended[1]. This framework, this triad expanded into a tetrad by the king, is reminiscent of the systems we have just studied. Ares obviously refers to the god of war, which, according to Herodotus, was the most noble occupation in the eyes of the Thracians. Dionysus, worshipped "on the highest mountain[2] " and the inspiration for orgiastic cults, is apparently the god of the sacred administration of the world, the representative of those barbarian priesthoods that made such a great impression on the Mediterranean peoples; finally, Artemis, or Bendis, as she is known locally, may not be the patron goddess of agriculture, for which the Thracians have nothing but contempt[3] , although Thracian women never fail to offer her wheat straw[4] ; in any case, she must be interested in other provinces of abundance and fertility, for she is said to be a huntress, both 'Uranian' and 'Chthonic', and identical to the moon[5] .

On the island of Samothrace, whose mysteries instructed the Greeks before inspiring Servius with learned nonsense, we know at least that sacred science classified the deities as follows: θεοὺς μεγάλους, θεοὺς δυνατούς, θεοὺς χρηστούς,

great gods, powerful gods, beneficent gods: brief but accurate labels for the three functions.

While we can say nothing about Heracles, Hermes and Apollo Σπηλαῖται who, according to Pausanias, X, 32, 1, saved the Phrygians of Themisyon during the Galatian invasion, and while we do not know how to interpret the Phrygian tomb[6] where a triple Hecate appears surmounted by a crescent between the god Mên and another naked god armed with a double axe, on the other hand, the lost children of Phrygia, the Armenians, seem to have retained the functional triad, at least by rejuvenating one name.

The historian Moses of Khoren, I, 31, attributes three sons to the legendary king Tigranes: *Bab, Tiran* and *Vahagn*. Vahagn, also known from other texts, is none other than the Iranian god of victory, *Vrthragna*, borrowed in his Parthian form, worshipped as the "giver of valour" and assimilated to Heracles by the pagan Armenians. Moses says nothing about Bab and Tiran, but their proximity to Vahagn places them in the mythical world, and we are not entirely without means of interpretation. The name Bab, isolated in Armenia, is that of the Phrygian Βάβυς, brother of the Silenus or Satyr Marsyas, like him a flute player, who with him challenged the citharist Apollo, but whom Apollo pardoned, considering that he had played badly: thus Babys, and Bab consequently, must be the mythical representative of ancient priestly brotherhoods, sacred musicians, perhaps the ancestors of these corps of *gêl-kʻ*, properly "scholars" and therefore "incanters" (root

*weid-), by which the Armenian translator of the Bible, in the 5th century, rendered the Greek ἐπαοιδοί. As for Tiran, the third element of the triad, he must undoubtedly be confused with the other Tiran, scarcely less fabulous, brother of the other Tiran, brother of the other Tiran, brother of the other Tiran, brother of the other Tiran, brother of

century, rendered the Greek ἐπαοιδοί. As for Tiran, the third element of the triad, he must undoubtedly be confused with the other Tiran, hardly less fabulous, brother of the high priest Majan and the savage Artavazd; Moses, who made two

characters from one, characterises his "Tiran II" in these terms (II, 62): "No great deeds are told of him; he obeyed the Romans faithfully; he remained at peace, it is said, devoting himself to hunting and pleasures. " Thus the triad Bab, Vahagn, Tiran (Moses puts Vahagn in last place only because he wants to attach a relative clause to his name) seems to contain a kind of mythical musician, then the genius of military victory, then a vassal king, devoted to peace, hunting and pleasure: good counterparts to Dionysus, Ares and the "queen" Artemis of the Thracians, — to Jupiter, Mars and the *tranquillus* Quirinus of the Romans.

<div align="center">*
*   *</div>

As for the Greeks, leaving aside their mythology, we will simply note that the ancients themselves interpreted the division into four tribes that characterised Ionian societies in hierarchical and functional terms, but which, according to Emil Szanto, was actually Attic in origin[7] . These tribes, the Geleontes (or Teleontes?), the Hoplites, the Ergades and the Egicores, whether or not they descended from the four sons of Ion[8], so obviously call for an explanation of this kind that Plato, Plutarch, and Strabo record it, not to mention the authors who copied them. According to *Timaeus*[9], the earliest Athenians first distinguished the class of priests, τὸ τῶν ἱερέων γένος; then, on the same level, the group of artisans and that of shepherds, hunters and labourers; and finally, quite apart, that of warriors, τὸ μάχιμον γένος. More precisely, Plutarch[10] echoes historians who explained the very names of the primitive tribes by the way of life of the first inhabitants of Attica: the Hoplites are said to have led the warrior life (τὸ μάχιμον), the Ergades that of artisans (τὸ ἐργατικόν); the

Geleontes were farmers and the Egicores were shepherds. Strabo[11] similarly interprets, without citing names, the Hoplites as φύλακες, the Ergades as δημιουργοί and the Geleontes as γεωργοί, but for him the Egicores are not shepherds but religious magistrates, ἱεροποιοί, and Euripides seems to suggest the same equivalence since he paradoxically links them[12] not to goats (αἴξ) but to the "aegis" of Athena. We can see that these interpretations are more or less in agreement, and everything that has been said in this book confirms the sentiment and undoubtedly the memory of the ancients.

From then on, one is tempted to understand the tribes of the last arrivals among the Greeks, the Dorians, in functional terms as well. Almost everywhere they are found, the Dorians are divided into three tribes whose names do not vary: Ὑλλεῖς, Δυμᾶνες, Πάμφυλοι. Already in *the Iliad*, the ships of the Dorians of Rhodes, for example, are grouped in threes, διὰ τρίχα, while those of the other contingents are grouped in fours[13]. The adjective τριχαί-Ϝικες used to refer to them *in the Odyssey*[14] contains the Indo-European word *weik-*,
*woik-, *wik-*, which is found intact in the Sanskrit *viç* 'clan' and in the Avestan *vîs* 'group of families', from which the Greek Ϝοῖκος 'house', the Latin *vicus* 'village, neighbourhood', Gothic *weihs* and Old Slavic *vĭsĭ* 'village', are derivatives and which, in Sanskrit, also provided the name of the Arya of the third class, the *vaiçya*. It therefore seems that the Dorian division is essentially topographical, and this is indeed how the legend explains it, through "distributions of land" (τρισσὰν γαῖαν... ἐδάσαντο, says a fragment from Hesiod). But we have seen on several occasions, particularly with regard to the Roman tribes, that this type of division was consistent, however contradictory it may have been

, with a functional definition. Perhaps this was also the case among the Dorians.

Diodorus, IV, 37, recounts that, overwhelmed by the Lapiths while they were staying in Thessaly, the Dorians called on Heracles, the father of Hyllus, to come to their aid, promising him a third of their territory and sovereignty over all their people. According to Ephorus (fragment 10), Argimios, king of the Dorians when they lived at the foot of Mount Oeta, had two sons, Dymas and Pamphylos; but he adopted Hyllos out of gratitude to Heracles, who had restored him to the throne: from these three young men came the three tribes.

Whatever the etymology of the name[15], this legend directly links the tribe of the Ὑλλεῖς to Heracles, as opposed to the other two, and to Heracles as a hero, warrior, helper, bringer of victory and king: this probably provides the definition of the Ὑλλεῖς, the leading tribe, the warrior tribe.

The name Πάμφυλοι, with its first element παν- "All" seems to refer to people who are less "distinguished", both more numerous and easier to conceive of collectively than members of other tribes. In this regard, it should be remembered that the Sanskrit equivalent of the Greek πᾶς is viçva "all, whole", i.e. at least an indirect derivative of the word viç "clan", from which is also derived the name of the lowest of the Aryan classes, the herders-farmers, the vaiçya; that the Latin totus "whole, all" seems to be related in the same way to an old Italo-Celtic and Germanic name for the topographical tribe or people, *teutâ-16; that, finally, the most likely etymology of the Latin names for the god and men of the lowest class, Quirinus and quirites, brings them closer to Curia and explains them as *co-vîrio-, collective

formed on *vir* "man" as Πάμφυλοι is on φυλή
"group of families".

From our functional perspective, with warriors and the third
estate being identified, Δυμᾶνες can only be interpreted as
referring, in one way or another, to sacred men. This is indeed what
their very name suggests, which can be analysed almost as the
equivalent of the Sanskrit *brah-man-*, with a complex but similar
ending (-μᾶν- from -μαον-) and substitution of the root *barh-*
(Indo-European *bhelgh-) indicating religious operations, with the
root *du-*, also specialised in religious value, as seen [above17] the
Vedic derivatives, and which undoubtedly explains the Latin
duenos, bonus in relation to the first social function[18] .

Unfortunately, these reflections on legends (Ὑλλεῖς) and names
(Δυμᾶνες, Πάμφυλοι) cannot be based on the social practices of
the Dorian classes, about which we know almost nothing.
However, it should be noted that they agree with the only
somewhat precise information we have: in an inscription from
Halasarna, on the island of Kos[(19)] , the Dymanes and the Hylleis
are defined as "those (of the three tribes) who participate in the
cults of Apollo and Heracles", αἷς μέτεστι τῶν ἱερῶν Ἀπόλλωνος
καὶ Ἡρακλεῦς ; this expression proves that each tribe had its own
patron god; that the first two, at least in Cos, claimed Apollo and
Heracles as their patrons; and finally, that a kind of intimacy
brought these first two tribes together: all of this is consistent with
what we would expect if these "tribes", like the Roman tribes, were
derived from Indo-European classes.

<p style="text-align:center">*
*   *</p>

If the oldest traditions of the Dorians and Ionians thus preserved
the memory of a functional division of the

society, tripartite (priests, warriors, third estate) or quadripartite (priests, warriors, farmers, artisans), would Plato's ideal city not be, in the strictest sense, an Indo-European reminiscence? It is constituted by the harmonious arrangement of three functions, three states, τὸ φυλακικόν or βουλευτικόν, τὸ ἐπικουρικόν, τὸ χρηματιστικόν, *custodum genus, auxiliarii, quaestuarii*, as translated by Marsile Fi-cin, i.e. philosophers who govern, warriors who fight, and the third estate, farmers and artisans combined, who create wealth. the solidarity of the first two groups above the third is strongly marked, but above all the originality of each: that each estate acts in accordance with its definition, οἰκειοπραγία, that it avoids confusion, πολυπραγμοσύνη, and Justice, the ultimate goal of political life, is thereby assured; Finally, each estate corresponds to a particular "formula of virtue": the third estate need only be temperate, σώφρων; warriors must combine temperance with courage, ἀνδρεία; the "guardians" will also be wise, σοφοί. All this is the stuff of dreams, for those who have studied India's political-religious treatises: the same definition of the three social classes; the same solidarity between the first two, *ubhe vîrye;* the same anathema against "confusion", varnânâm *samkaram*; the same exhortation to adhere to the mode of action of the estate to which one belongs, svadharmah; the same distribution of duties and virtues among the estates... Indian legalists and the *Republic* echo each other: is it not because they are singing the same ancestral song? Our entire study has shown that, varying in richness depending on the canton, a vast group of representations has been linked since ancient times to the social tripartite division. Consider all the ways in which this "Indo-European philosophy" has been passed down , and even Plato : non only traditions

Greek traditions on the origins of the Ionians and Dorians, but also the increased contact with that repository of doctrines, both Aryan and non-Aryan, that was the Achaemenid Empire; but also Orphism, where fragments of the knowledge of the Thracian and Phrygian priests were deposited and where triads are not lacking; but Pythagoreanism, whose "Hyperborean" components Henri Hubert urged us not to neglect twenty years ago; but folklore, finally, for it seems that, just like the corresponding Indian myth, the myth of the Races in Hesiod associates with each of the Ages, or rather the three "pairs of Ages" through which humanity renews itself only to degenerate, a "functional" conception — religion, war, labour — of the varieties of the species.

Even the most beautiful passage from the fourth book of The *Republic* must be mentioned here. After discovering the tripartite formula of society, Plato turns his attention to the individual, to the 'human One', and in this microcosm finds the same elements in the same hierarchy, the same conditions of harmony commanding the same virtues.

"The just man, from the point of view of justice, differs in nothing from the just state"; he has within him the equivalent of the wise, the warriors, the men of money: these are the principles of knowledge, passion, appetite, τὸ λογιστικόν, τὸ θυμοειδές, τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν; he subordinates them so that the second only helps the first, and so that the first two together dominate the formidable third, "which is in every man the most considerable part of the soul and which is by nature insatiable for wealth "; that it opens up the "spiritual areas" that suit them to wisdom, courage and temperance: it will be what it should be.

Similarly, India, with its characteristic instability of representation and formulation, composes the soul, or at least the envelope of the soul, of the same three *gunas* as society and the universe: these "qualities" that were first light, twilight and darkness, *saltva, rajas* and *tamas*, either through their isolated presences or through their combinations, constitute individuals as well as states: sometimes the sense of moral law, passion, interest, *dharma, kâma, artha*, unite in a triad equivalent to that of *the gunas*, and their praiseworthy or blameworthy balances define the types of men; sometimes, following a very Indian pattern, it is serene knowledge, restless activity, ignorance as a source of error, which contend for our ephemeral edifice, and this simple enumeration outlines a therapy. Other arrangements also appear, but it can be said that a good part of Indian morality only makes sense because human nature has been analysed into three functions that must be coordinated, or into three tendencies, only one of which must remain, or into three appearances, the equal vanity of which the wise man recognises. And the point of convergence of these systems is the triad of *the gunas*.

But Plato, while he clearly elucidated the homology of the soul and society, probably did not invent it. And if he found it in some of his predecessors, Pythagoreans or others, had they not received the secret from further afield? In short, had not the oldest Indo-European thinkers, who had drawn parallels between the triple order of *the world* and that of *society*, completed this vast analogical science by discovering the triple order of *the individual?* An unanswerable question, of course. In any case, the Indians and Greeks were not the only ones to take the logic of the system to its conclusion: when we read that, according to the requirement of the mythical Queen Medb[20] , every candidate for the supreme kingship of Ireland had to be a

man *cen êt, cen omun, cen nêoit*, "without jealousy, without fear, without avarice" — magnanimous in his power, brave in battle, generous with his wealth — we have proof that the Druids, too, recognised the same architecture in souls as in kingdoms.

1. This is undoubtedly Zalmoxis, as Strabo, VII, 3, 4 ff., also states that only the king has access to the sanctuary of Zalmoxis.

2. Herodotus, VII, 111.

3. *Id*., V, 6.

4. *Id*., IV, 33.

5. Hesychius, s. v. δίλογχον.

6. *Bull. Corr. Hell*., XX, p. 64, pl. XVI.

7. *Die griechischen Phylen*, in *Sizb. d. Akad. d. Wiss., ph.-hist. Klasse*, CXLIV, Vienna, 1902, pp. 71 ff.

8. Euripides, *Ion*, 1575 ff.

9. 24 A.

10. *Solon*, 23.

11. VIII, 7, I.

12. *Ion*, 1580-81.

13. II, 653 ff.

14. XIX, 177.

15. See Otto Lagercrantz, *Die drei dorischen Phylennamen, Streitberg-Festgabe*, Leipzig, 1924, pp. 218 ff.

16. Ernout-Meillet, *Etymological Dictionary of Latin, s. v.;* cf. Vendryes, *Proceedings of the Académie des* Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, 1939, p. 476.

17. See above, p. 196.

18. It should be noted in passing that the Latin *sag-men*, which refers to the bouquet of sacred grass that the *fetialis* priest holds in his hand throughout his mission, and which is therefore in diplomatic matters what *the* Avestan *bars-man-* is in religious matters, a bouquet of sacred foliage held by the officiant throughout the sacrifice, is also formed like *bars-man-*, i.e. like the Sanskrit *brah-man-:* the purely religious root of *sacer* is simply substituted for the root **bhelgh-*, which has been retained in the name of the priest *fla-men.*

19. Paton Hicks 367; cf. Szanto, *art. cit*., p. 23.

20. See above, p. 115.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

Le Festin d'Immortalité (The Feast of Immortality), a study of comparative Indo-European mythology, Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibl. d'Études, vol. XXXIV, Geuthner, 1924.

Le Problème des Centaures (The Problem of the Centaurs), a study of comparative Indo-European mythology, Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibl. d'Études, vol. XLI, Geuthner, 1929.

Legends of the Narts, followed by five mythological notes, Champion, 1930.

The Language of the Ubykhs, Coll. de la Société de Linguistique de Paris, vol. XXXV, Champion, 1931.

Comparative Studies on the North-Western Caucasian Languages, Abkhaz, Ubykh, Circassian, A. Maisonneuve, 1932.

Ouranos - Varuna, study of comparative of of Indo-European mythology,
A. Maisonneuve, 1934.

Flamen-Brahman, Ann. du Musée Guimet, Bibl. de Vulgarisation, vol. LI, Geuthner, 1935.

Popular Ingush texts, with interlinear translation, commentary and grammatical introduction, A. Maisonneuve, 1935.

Laze tales, with interlinear translation, Works and Memoirs of the Institute of Ethnology, vol. XXVII, 1937.

Fables of Tsey Ibrahim (Western Circassian), translated literally with a grammatical introduction and an index of verb forms (in collaboration with A. Namitok), Ann. du Musée Guimet, Bibl. d'Ét., vol. L, Geuthner, 1938.

Myths and Gods of the Germanic Peoples, an essay on comparative interpretation, Leroux, 1939.

Mitra-Varuna, essay on two Indo-European representations of sovereignty, Bibl. de l'École des Hautes Études, Section des Sciences Religieuses, vol. LVI, Leroux, 1940.