

1955

3-10-1983

Myth, Saga, Legend and Necessity.

485

A Preface to Liturgy.

For thousands of years, the students of antiquity had to read of the wicked Tarquinius Superbus who was driven out of Rome. Also they all had to hear the fable of Menenius Agrippa which he told on the stomach and the other members of the human body when he tried to persuade the Plebejans to return to Rome. This is called saga or legend and now is dismissed as not trustworthy for the use in history books. And as Latin disappears from our schools, the two stories about the Republic and the Plebejans on the Aventine are no longer public property.

But the schoolchildren of today again are told of some untrustworthy traditions. This time it is not called saga or legend, but the term myth is applied to the Easter grave in Jerusalem. And a fierce debate rages on the myth of Christianity or in Christianity.

I find these debates so long fruitless as long as nobody seems to know what a saga, a legend, a myth really is, and why they exist and what their righteous place in the life of a society is.

To my own surprise, I found fifty years after leaving my old school that Tarquinius Superbus and Menenius Agrippa may still be of some use for the purpose of enlightening us on myth, saga, legend.

Some patient is needed before the reader will see the connection in the following two articles with our own problems of myth. But I feel able to promise the patient reader that we at least will emerge at the end out of the fog in which the word 'myth' now is bandied around without any certainty about the central question: Why myth? and what produces myth with perpetual necessity? And why and when may we boast of living without myth or mythology, in the clarified realm of reason and miraculous freedom? We may anticipate one answer because this answer will not help anybody who is too lazy to read on: Myth remains indispensable for those who are too lazy to participate in the miracle of freedom themselves; Mr. Bultmann's discussion of myth is a frightful indictment of the laziness of those whom he presupposes to make up the Christian Church.

Juppiter and Vediovis

~~The Religion of Rome~~

The Naming of the Gods.

Around 500, most probably since 509 when the temple on the Capitoline Hill for Juppiter Optimus Maximus, for Juno, and for Minerva was built, and, until, in 494, the Aediles of the plebs were put in charge of the Aedes Sacrae for Ceres, Liber, and Libera, on the Aventine Hill, the religious order of the Romans underwent a radical transformation.

Names tell us this story. Therefore, a Latin Grammar also is a key even the only explanation of the history of Roman Religion. Hence, as we may look into this story without any personal bias, we here receive from grammar an object lesson in the way history works. And it certainly does not proceed in the manner in which the Enlightenment of the last two hundred years assumed history to operate.

The Revolution of 500 B. C. in Rome meant that the Rex, Priest, Commander, and Judge at one time in one person, lost his role as Commander-in-Chief to a new patrician, a kind of military Major-domo, called the Praetor Maximus, the 'Biggest Leader'. This Praetor was the forerunner of the later Consuls. But the Greeks, through all antiquity, translated the Latin word Consul by the title HYPATOS, the BIGGEST. This would be inexplicable unless they simply continued the Latin usage of Maximus, for the new office. And the Maximus of course was one only, the Praetor maximus. At this time, then, also The Pontifex Maximus, the Custos Maximus, and the Vestalis Virgo Maxima, received their titles. The Patricians of Rome under the leadership of the two new Maximi, Praetor and Pontifex, stripped the King of his role in battle. He became a rex sacrorum at home only, inside the walls of Rome, 'intra pomerium'.

The God whom he embodied was Dies, the King of Heaven, "Rex". The Dies, however, who was worshipped on the Capitoline Hill, was not invoked as "Rex". This was not easily accomplished. And we find in this necessity of dropping the byword 'Rex' from the Divine liturgy, the explanation of the explanation. Dies or Diovis became, instead of Dies Rex, Juppiter Optimus Maximus. The three changes together would propitiate the God. He remained the FATHER, he was called the highest and the richest as well. The three changes were ingeniously coupled by the invocation Juppiter. This vocative form bore no semblance any more to Diovis Rex. And thus, as Juppiter prevailed exclusively now, the forbidden combination of Diovis Rex was made linguistically inaccessible. The Taboo of language which we here meet is a mighty weapon in the change of religion. As the change in the command of the army of men was the issue, Juno Regina did not lose her title 'regina'. But she never had accompanied her husband-brother into the field. Minerva now, the motherless daughter of Juppiter Maximus, squeezed Juno out as the single companion. Minerva, the mastermind in the assembly of men, had to be accepted by jealous Juno

Jupiter and Vediovis II

Jupiter and Vediovis II

Around 500, the King of Rome lost his position of the commander-in-chief of the army. A Hypates ~~the Religion of Numa~~, a Praetor Maximus took his place. When the Rex deum hominumque Iovis, Diovis was to be the Maximus, in line with the praetor maximus, the Curio maximus, the Vestalis virgo maxima, and the pontifex maximus, the old title of Diovis, this name 'Rex' ceased to be appropriate. 'Juno regina' did not seem offensive as this was a military revolution, a change in the command of the army. Juno Regina, was an invocation left intact. But Iovis, maximus / optimus, instead of 'Rex' could best be introduced by only ~~max~~ speaking of him now in the vocative form of Jupiter. The predilection for 'Jupiter' instead of ~~Diovis~~, came about, when it was important to avoid the temptation of calling Diovis Rex, the form of the Nominativ Diespiter disappeared now. We only read now of Jupiter. This made any revival of a Diovis Rex impossible, unfeasible. However, the new invocation of Jupiter Maximus Optimus left on the Capitol, had further consequences of great liturgical impact. Juno Regina, worshipped in the ~~grove~~ with Diovis, was not taken up to the Capitoline Hill. Minerva, the sovereign Mind of Jupiter himself, took Juno's place, once more stressing the assembly of men, the army, as inspired by the God ~~was given a place on the Capitol~~. And Juno had to offer for his marriage, daughter of ~~some husband~~. The brother of youthful Juno, the Diovis of the ancient Brother-Sister marriage, became, in precise contrast to the new Optimus Maximus, the 'Vediovis', the little, small, low, weak Diovis who kept his cult at the foot of the Palatine Hill. He also remained everywhere over Latium. As Jupiter Anxur, of old, or as 'Vediovis' where the Roman reform struck, he remained. And as the Julii ~~maxim~~ served him as his priests down to the days of Caesar in their Latin town. ~~Thurians~~ But what a name is Vediovis. ~~Vesivius means his name, comes of a sick heart. Vediovis is the~~ Goveist ~~and~~ the Reformers did not rest their case by the dialectics of Jupiter Maximus and Vediovis. They were the new officers corps, a corps which replaced the king as commander-in-chief by a praetor maximus; but it is sometimes forgotten that they of course, from the very first day, had to provide for the spiritual welfare of the common man, the plebs, as well. The religious reorganisation of the plebs and of the patricians ran parallel. The class wars often too simply are made into a barren sequence of kingship, aristocracy, democracy, as though at any one time, only one of these institutions had to be cared for. This is not so. The complexity of history consists, as all medieval or modern history proves again, in doing justice to the permanent groups although in varying degree or preponderance. Royalty has its democratic and aristocratic orders, and the patricians of Rome cared very much for the plebs from the very first. Our tradition states this very clearly by giving the plebs the Aedes Cereris, Liberi and Liberæ, on the Aventine already in the year 494.

Now, in this temple, the plebs received their Magna Charta within the military revolution of the praetor Maximus and his pontifex Maximus. The very names of the privileges bestowed on the plebs, do reflect the share which for the plebeians was the most substantial and the most valuable result of the change.

We are told that the Plebs had tribuni plebis now, and, for the temple of Ceres, Liber, and Libera, they had aediles plebis, priests of the Aedes Sacrae on the Aventine Hill.

Both, the names of the deities worshipped in the temple, and the fact that the priests of the plebs were given their name from the new buildings, is equally eloquent.

For, Liber, (the Greek "Dionysos",) and Libera, replaced Vediovis, the young appearance of ~~Juppiter Rex, Jovis Rex~~ Jovis Rex, in the same manner as Juppiter Optimus Maximus, on the Capitol Hill, replaced the Diovis Rex of the Lucus and the Juno Lucina, at the foot of the Hills. The parallel is astonishing exact.

His, the name of 500 was involved. was
Diovis Rex, the celestial parallel to the King on earth, ~~was~~ split up into the senior and the junior half of its own character, so to speak.

Diovis Rex, Juno Regina
worshipped in Luce, in the Grove, all over Latium
and in Rome, too
split into

The Deities on the Capitoline Hill

The Triad

Juppiter Optimus Maximus

Minerva his motherless daughter

Juno

The Deities on the Aventine

The Triad

Ceres = Demeter

Liber = Dionysos

Libera = Kore

This paralleled the army's marching order. Here, the patricians formed the Seniores, and the name senate, only reflects this senioratus of the landed gentry who served in the cavalry, the celeres, under the Tribuni Celerum. Accordingly, the highest aristocratic colonel, was called Magister Celerum, Commander of the Horse, a very close reference to the term "Maximus" in Praetor Maximus. Magis and Maximus, in Magister and Praetor Maximus (whom the Greeks translated by the term HYPATOS, the Highest) and the patres, the patricians served under the Commander of the Horse, under Tribuni Celerum. The Junior Part of Rome, the foot soldier, were the Plebs and they served under Tribuni Plebis. Plebs and Patres, then, corresponded to senatus and Juventus, to senior and junior partners in the army. In English, gentry and yeomanry would be the exact equivalents.

The core of the division of patres and plebs, then, was in the army.

~~Senatus~~ Yeomanry was the JUNIOR Partner, without the Horse, the cavalry. When the cavalry wrested the leadership of the army from the King, the compensation which the junior part could receive, was not to be found in the army itself. It was found in the domestic order, in a victory over the king's supremacy in religious matters. For, within the precinct, within the walls, (pomerium it is called in Latin, which means most muros, inside the walls,) the Rex was in charge of all the sacred actions. He was, and remained, the Rex sacrobum. Hence, the privilege of the Junior Partner of the Army could neither be found in the fighting order of the army outside the walls, nor in the peaceful order of the priest-king inside the walls. Where and how then was it found? The plebs - in opposition to the landed gentry, the landowners of Rome - now for the first time in history were given sacred land, aedes,

Juppiter and Vediovis IIII

aedes sacrae^{*)} ; it is true, the new sacred ground and buildings had to be found outside the district of the King's priestly jurisdiction, on the Aventine Hill. Hence the precious ring of the names Aedes Sacrae and Aediles Plebis, in the ears of the yeomanry. Not the Tribuni Plebis were the revolutionary gain of the Plebs. For, the Tribuni Plebis simply paralleled the Tribuni Celerum, of the landed gentry. But the Aediles Plebis and their Aedes Sacrae, were revolutionary indeed. They emancipated the yeomanry from the king's priestly prerogative in Peace, in the same measure, as the Praetor Maximus with his Pontifex Maximus, emancipated the landed gentry from the same king's military prerogative.

This then is the reform counselled by the Delphian oracle about 500. The life of the Romans with their Gods ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ was regulated from then on in the army by the pontifices of the commander-in-chief, in the Plebs outside the pomerium on the Aventine in the old city by the Rex sacrorum, the remainder of the regimen of old, and the flamines of Diovis, Juppiter, Mars, Quirinus.

The Gods of the Army were Minerva, Juppiter Optimus Maximus, Hunc
The Gods of ancient royal Rome Diovis, Juno, Mavors, Mars, Quirinus.
The Gods of the yeomanry, the Plebs, Liber, Libera.

For the senior partner, then, two adult deities and one Daughter Goddess, Minerva, were chosen. For the junior partner, one adult Mother Goddess, and two young ones, Liber and Libera. (in Greek Dionysos and Kore) were selected. In this preponderance of the two ~~senior~~ adult forms of ~~the~~ Divinity, on the Capitoline Hill, and of the two junior forms of the Deity, on the Aventine, the relation between senior and junior partner, between Senatus populusque Romanus, has been carefully expressed. *The two Triads explain each other; they were established under Greek influence.*

The choice of the names Minerva, in the patrician Triad, of Ceres, in the Plebeian, and the conservative preservation of Juno Regina, is an object lesson in conservative reform. It is a hedging and an encroachment on Juno from two sides, much more than any insult of the Goddess, in a direct attack. Religion ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ probably to the amazement of the Hegelians and the Marxians, was not reformed dialectically as secular life can be reformed. It was changed by the method of bypassing and of leaving behind. Vediovis is the result of this method of bypassing the king's cult of the heavenly King, *and in looking upon a King's* Also the names Liber and Libera- although this will be violently denied- must have been chosen as the singular of LIBERTI, =children, and, in this case, again, the positive ring of the Son, the Liber, against the name Vediovis, Small Zeus, was not accidental, but carefully planned.

The reformers, as we hear in the sources, were advised by Delphi. Hence, even the place of worship of the royal family in the sky, the Luci at the foot of the Hills, were now to receive a Delphian hero, Lycoreus, Lucoris, as the protector of a Greek asylum. In

*) Compare, Mario Sabbatucci, L' Edilita Romana, Magistratura e Sacerdotio. Roma, 1954 (Memorie della Accademia dei Lincei)

Juppiter and Vediovia
Poplifugia and Regifugium

V

other words, not only did the new architecture of the temples on the Capitol and on the Capitol supersede the worship in the open groves, these older temenoi without "aedes", - we hear of Vulca, the artist from Etruscan Veji as adorning the new buildings- but some influence from Delphi did even try to transform the old place of worship, into a hero's ~~asylum~~ asylum. Hence, the royal priesthood lost its power even in its traditional place. For ~~the~~ the Latin tradition and the Sabinian as well, had felt that the sacred grove mirrored the sky, and the great privilege of the "Spectio", of asking from the sky 'world above for orientation below, this system of harmonizing heaven and earth by which the king reconciled his ancestor God in the sky and his people on earth, seems to have been lost at this time, too, to the new magistrates.

When we recognize the term Aedilis for its suggestive power: that in the aedilis, the military group of infantry men were given a vested interest in the good earth and in the property of a sacred building, for the first time, side by side with the proprietors of the land, then we suddenly become aware of the appropriateness of the term "pontifex" for the priesthood which at this time arose and encroached on the rex sacrorum.

For if we put the rex in the center,
as rex sacrorum

~~the~~ we now see him flanked ~~by~~ in the ~~field~~ field
on the Aventine by the in the luci in the valley by the two Maximi
aedilis aedis sacrae the Delphian hero Lycæus Praetor and pontifex.

This means that aedilis and pontifex are corresponding terms. For the one newly coined term stressed the sacred structure of peace time use, of the agrarian rites. The Aedilis guaranteed this to the plebs, the youth, at home. The other stressed the skills of camp making. The excavations of the terramare settlements have shown how closely the Roman Castra were modelled after the meat and bridges plan of these masterpieces of safety in central Italy. The bridge across the Tiber the pons publicus, has been held responsible for the name and the profession of the "bridgebuilders", the pontifices. But once built, this bridge and its repairs scarcely could monopolize the activities of the pontifices as a group. Furthermore, the very fact that "Maximus" was not, and at one stroke, the title by which 'Rex' was replaced on heaven and on earth, for Juppiter as well as for the imperator, the praetor, proves that the parallel of praetor and pontifex was uppermost in the mind of the actors of the day.

And the praetor was the military leader outside the city. It therefore seems reasonable to look for his name and function in the campaigns of the army. It had to be a name ~~max~~ by which neither the cavalry, the Celeres, nor the yeomanry, the plebs, were singled out, or preferred. The religious men of the army, the Chaplans, had to ~~be named with a name which~~ be named with a name which stressed the unity of the army corps, not its branches. The term pontifex, by concentrating on the camp, instead of the battlefield, fulfilled this requirements of ~~pointing to the chaplans as serving the~~ pointing to the chaplans as serving the common cause of both forces. The building of camps, then, was the skill of the pontiff; the owning of a sacred building in peace time, was the new right of the aedilis. Both received their names from the same reform because the

Juppiter and Vediovis

reformers wanted to ~~break~~ break up the union of cult, military leadership, and domestic administration as vested in the King. Whenever, in the course of any political order- be it in England's glorious Revolution, or in ~~Kleisthian~~ Solon's Reform in Athens, such a division of powers occurs, the issue lies between the organisation belli domique, war and peace. Secularisation- and the fight against ~~the~~ the divine right of kings is secularisation- never is a monistic, single tendency. The Commons of England needed a sword on the Continent of Europe. The Dutch prince William III had to be made King, to the great distaste of the British lawyers, and later the Dukes of Marlborough and the Duke of Wellington had to protect the aristocratic government at home in the British Isles. And this has been the deepest organisational problem or constitutional riddle of British politics, to combine equality at home and proconsular powers abroad.

Therefore, we must not wonder that when in 500, Greek influence prevailed in Rome and did away with the Indoeuropean divine rights of kings, to a certain extent, the division of war and peace, of army and civilian constitution created a profound dilemma.

Pontifex and aedilis, Pontifices and aediles, are twins, ~~at least~~ at least in their new roles; for, it is no reason to believe that the name pontifex was a new name. But it is every reason to think that PONTIFEX MAXIMUS indeed was a new parallel to Juppiter Maximus.

These Roman names tell their own story eloquently enough and Mommsen already saw the implications of the change from Juppiter Rex to Juppiter Maximus with his usual sagacity. However, although not as an argument, it seems advisable to put before the reader at this point a historical parallel so that the separation of peace and war, of army and civilian order, may be more fully weighed. Since Rousseau and Montesquieu, this central task of the political order has been strangely obscured. All lawyers, for instance, during the last 200 years, have tried to legislate on the peace time army and to treat the war time army as nothing but the mobilized peace time army. They all behaved like my colonel who in 1915 told us that it was high time for us to go home and have a decent army again.

The constitution of states, however, is written in war. and the peace time army always is the shadow, the skeleton, the phantom of the real thing. The very fact that pontifices were named from the real situation of the campaigning army of the Romans, goes to show that the ancients did not think via Montesquieu or Rousseau, but via blood, sweat, and tears. And it seems to me that all the fantastic modern explanations of the title pontifex ~~should~~ should be evaluated in the light of this modern fallacy. For instance, pontifex, was derived from the paths in heaven, and Marquardt and quite a number of living authors, are inclined to believe that the rational term pontifex is a popular etymology of a sacred Indoeuropean word for path. However, the rex of Rome was the priest of the sky. The pontifex was built up against this pathfinder. Of the limitation of the name 'pontifex' for the technician who built or repaired the bridge across the Tiber, we already had to speak. It would be quite inexplicable whence such group could ever have pushed the majesty of royalty into the background and ever could have occupied the Regia, the residence of the Rex sacrorum, as ~~the~~ the pontifex Maximus was allowed to do.

*) See on this my academic address "Kriegsheer und Rechtsgemeinschaft" Breslau 1932.

VII

Juppiter and Vediovis

Our parallel may prove the reality of the dilemma and the power of the constitution of the army in war.

The Merovingian kings inherited the Roman bishoprics in Gaulle, and the divine right of their own pagan descent from Wodan. ~~They were~~. They fell under the rule of Majordomi, of Commanders-in-Chief of the army, and these Generalissimos had no foothold in the domestic administration of the Church of Christ nor in the polytheistic traditions of the Franks. Karl Martell and Pippin conquered, but the religious sanction rested on the royal blood of the Merovingian family. What happened. The more the Carolingian daily achievements in war, and the Merovingian heritage drove apart, the more did it become apparent that the Carolingians needed a religious sanction. They could find this only in the clergy with whom they associated during the actual campaigns of the army. This clergy were the priests who accompanied the relic of the patron saint of the army, the cap of St Martin of Tours, into battle. The group of priests on whom this task devolved, at first cannot have had a high rank. They were called the capella, and its individual members received the title capellanus.

Now, these capellani moved up in rank together with their commanders-in-chief, just as Niemöller and Gollwitzer moved up in Dahlem when Hindenburg went to their Church. The same chaplains whose names were unknown when Karl Martell defeated the Arabs, were the center of the Frankish Administration by 800. Even the archbishops coveted the rank of archchaplain in addition to their rank as primates of Gaulle or Germany. For the chapel was the king's church and all the bishops and abbots were educated, trained and selected within the chapel.

When we read that on February First, in Rome, the pontifex had to ask the King and the flamines, the old priesthood, to give him the sacred wool for the rites of "Februation", we are very close to the relation of archchaplain and archbishop, in Carolingian days. An older Canon Law and a new, clashed and had to be reconciled by subtle fictions.

The crowning feature of the reform of 500 was the reform of the calendar. The ten month calendar of 360 plus 5, at this time, was replaced by an adaptation of the Greek year and its attempt to ~~unify~~ harmonize mooncycles and solar cycle, and to forget the Sordit yearaltogether.

We already have realized in our first part that the five tremendous days of February 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, could not be forgotten. To this day, The 24th of February is the Day of the intercalated Apostle Matthias and in him, the old privilege of the Five Days is transparent. What is officially now the end of February, still shows that it once has been the opening of the next year. However, we now are in a better position to understand the calendar makers of 500. For, Rex and Pontifex Maximus and aediles now have become understandable. We may expect that the central institution of royalty, his leading the year, may have undergone a change, too.

And this, indeed did happen. The pontifices added two months to the calendar, January and February. They tried to have the Five tremendous Days, the "epagomenai", absorbed inside February, and they, instead, developed the new festival of the Saturnalia, at the end of December. Nobody has doubted that the mosk - king of the Saturnalia, and the regifugium

in some unfathomable manner,

of February 24 are "doubles". But the important thing is to see the difference between an old sacred ritual which is superseded like the ~~interregifugium~~, and the Saturnalia which is a gay celebration instead of a sinister and ominous one.

~~That~~ At the Regifugium, the king had to run for his life, into the bush around the grove so that the branches would conceal him. The "bush", the jungle, had to swallow him. And in the interval, not a mock king, but an interrex took over. To the end of the Roman republic, the interrex of Rome acted for five days. The five days of his office demonstrate his origin in the New Year interval. Later on, one interrex, as a ~~public~~ ~~magistrate~~ magistrate, was allowed to appoint ~~interrex~~ a next interrex, but the true character of his office, even then, showed in the fact that the ~~interrex~~ first interrex, the real substitute during the regifugium, did not have the right of the "spectie", of orientating the earth according to the sky. The regifugium, - and this is reflected in the loss of the spectie by the interrex - ended the order on earth as derived from the sky during one round of 260 days. And in our first article, we had recognized that the Sopdit Year was the re-spect, and the circumspect skill to follow the lieutenants of Sopdit-Sirius, the decans, in their "relief" from duty, in the sky. The interrex, then, was without this circumspection, this insight into the harmony of heaven and earth, on which the sacred order of the territory depended.

~~Maxing~~ While the interrex of the Five Days preceding March First kept a most important political place in the new republican order, the King of the Saturnalia, never reached any stature outside the revelry of the winter solstice. This is an illustration of their very different origin in time.

The further consequence of this "double" of mock king in December, but interrex as a useful permanent magistrate gratefully preserved from the regifugium in February, is that we now are enabled to understand one other Roman festival. The day of the publifugia has always been paralleled with the regifugium. Little, however, is known about it, and the date of its insertion into the Calendar has never been seriously investigated. It in any case was a holiday of the populus, the people. They left the city in some great hurry, and they had to call each other, during this "flight", by their first names, without their family names. Also, the regifugia came on a queer date. For, ~~XXXX~~ it was the canon law of Rome that no feast day should come between any First of the Month and any Nonae. The only holiday which breaks this rule is the Regifugia. It falls on July fifth, or Quinctilis Fifth, two days before the Nones of that month.

Why, then, this strange and rather second rate holiday? When we consider the new order of the pontifices, the aim of the day is not hidden. It comes six months after the Saturnalia, the newly instituted competitor of the Regifugia. This points to the fact that the name Regifugia was to be rivalled by publifugia, just as much as the mock king rivalled with the interrex. The break of the calendaric rule that no holiday should come between calendae and Nonae, is rational enough when we consider that the regifugium was of the same irregular and illogical date for the new calendar of twelve or thirteen moons with

X

Juppiter and Vediovis

of either 354 or 378 days.
 within one solar year. What was permissible for the King, had to be permissible for the army, too, and thus, the ~~Regifugia~~ Populus Romanus received from the hand of its wartime chaplains, the pontifices, this privilege. That it was reasoned out, as a dialectical attack on the weight of the regifugia, shows in the otherwise strange idea to place it five days after the first of the month, instead of five days before. But this is typical of studied opposition. An old taboo was to be broken, a royal privilege was to be rivalled. There was no other way to express the purpose of the publifugia except to let it break some otherwise respected rule.

Finally, as to the content of the festival. Here, also, meager as our data are, enough is known to see the parallel and the difference of the two days when the king flees into the bush, and the populus flees the city. The one name reads regifugium, the other poplifugia. Can we find any possible cause for this distinction? Devoto has tried to show that "Fugium" is of very old origin, and as we have accepted from him, meant the disappearance of the king behind the branches of the trees surrounding the "Hain", the grove, or lucus. The poplifugia did not demand the same thing from the people. First of all, they did not leave the ~~city~~ but they left the walls of Rome.
 grove

Second, they could not possibly disappear. They very much remained in sight. Hence, regifugia is the older term. Poplifugia is young. It is a name of a countermovement against regifugia, and it is not simultaneous with regifugium.

But why regifugium, and poplifugia? One is a singular, the other a plural. I am not sure that we can know with certainty the cause; however, one possible reason may be adduced. The king lost his titulus, his name, rank, his sacred address for five days. He was made into a nobody by the regifugium. This aspect of the ancient ritual is not appreciated among us. The trembling caused by the loss of one's name had been thoroughly forgotten by Humanism. Today the concentration camps have resulted from this lightheartedness of the governing classes about the name. In the concentration camps, the inmates lose their identity. In a state prison, the man is condemned by name, for a definite crime. In the Camps, nothing is said to them, they are nameless and their fate or function has no name. The ignominious loss of one's name is complete only when both, name as well as function or position in society, both are lost. In fact, the essence of the names of antiquity was that it was not separated into proper name of address and name of office, of degree and title. The five names of Pharaoh of Egypt united to bestow on him Title, rank, degree, function and name. The name of King was title and name in one. The extinction of one's name, the erasure of the nomen, was done to the Cesars like Domitianus, by the Senate in 96. And the Book of Revelation when it gives the figure of 666 to Nero or Domitianus intends to make it unspeakable. By an interesting investigation of Professor Marcus, it has been brought out very recently that the Ruler of Egypt - and later on, in his succession every man at his funeral - had to wait for the great acclamation. "The formula rank - He is rightly acclaimed" *).

*) R. Marcus, Journal of Near Eastern Studies XII, 1954, 21ff.

It is not superfluous to bring in this feature as the NOMEN Romanum of the city of Rome, received its own name from the intervening Rex.

X

Juppiter and Vediovis
Poplifugia and Regifugium

The Pharaoh of Egypt and all other heavenly rulers of any pagan establishment did not carry their Title or name for themselves only. It seems to be hard to understand for modern men that the names formed one stream of influence from the heavens to the ruler and through him to every one ruled by him. This was the Divine Right of Kings that without him, no body could carry the name of the kingdom. The franchise of the citizenry emanated through the king because he alone mediated between heaven and earth. This is no farfetched mysticism. It is most rational. The earth as we have mentioned in our first essay on 360+5, divides us. The settlement of any land for good is based on a division of professions, of scribes and peasants, craftsmen and warriors. In sharp contrast to the happy warriors of the nomadic order, the land demands specialisation, for, at least a priestly class must be supported to devote itself to the observation of the sky. The throne of any king, his ~~solium~~ solium, meant just this one fact that under him, people would have to do different things. The diversity was made possible by the divine influence the king on his throne. For he thereby re-united those whom space and profession separated. The heaven made for unity, the earth for the division of labor. The king kept the respiratory process between the two directions of dispersal and reunion alive. No wonder, then, that as in Shakespeare it is said by Ulysses in his great speech on order, the order comes down from heaven and bestows via the Royal title by which the king rightly is acclaimed as the Son of Heaven, the correct names on all the inhabitants of this heaven-mirroring land.

The loss of the king's name, therefore was the chaos. But as the liturgy required the ostensible reinvestment of the Ruler, the regifugia did take this risk, once a year.

I have tried to explain why all the order passed through the title of the king. Nobody could hold title to land or to any honor in the land except by emanation; the king's name ennobled all the other names. And nobody could have a name outside the magic circle of the royal title.

If we apply this principle to the regifugia and poplifugia, the gain is considerable. We know of two facts: 1. on the regifugium, the Kingship ceased for five days. The "Interrex" is proof of this. The royal nomen lost its celestial power. The bearer was a man without a name.

2. Now, the poplifugia contained the parallel fact: the populares, peaving the city in a throng, had to abandon their claim to their titles. For the Family names were as we have seen name and title and professional function all wrapped in one. Hence, it is clear that they undertook to imitate the King. But as with the regifugium it is with the poplifugia. The cause of the regifugium was not the calamity of the chaos, the cause of the regifugium was simply that his New Installation on New Year's Day, had to be prepared. On March First, the King of Rome was Mars Triumphant. Glad in purple, smeared with Red, he was the Bull, the Taurus, the Royal Steer. The regifugium prepared his re-establishment in full glory. Applying this to the poplifugia, we have to see the emancipation of Republican or better of pontifical Rome in the fact that the citizens could return from the poplifugia and don their names again, in their own right, without the king's intervention. The names given up on the poplifugia, returned to them the next day. This indeed was the triumph over royalty: for it made a citizen's name and title and profession independent from the royal name.

Juppiter and Vediovis

XI

In this process, the political problem of the last millennium before Christ consisted everywhere. We have difficulties in understanding that the basileus, the rex, the kōnig, made the citizenship available; before the word Civis, polites, Buerger, covered any one individual, the king had to be installed through whom this heavenly manna of correct and truthful names received its sanction.

The Res Publica of 500 in Rome became a civitas without the namegiving rex. And the great change is embodied in the fact that with the opening of the new temple of Juppiter Optimus Maximus in 509, the name of the year was represented by a new namegiver, the praetor Maximus. The eponym office of the Praetor Maximus which the consuls inherited, was the emancipation of the inhabitants of Rome from the namegiving monopoly of royalty. The Res Publica every year recorded another name for this purpose so that all the populus might hold their names from the New Year's Magistratus, instead from the annually re-instituted Sacred King. This, then, is the religious meaning of the Republic. But if Res Publica was the discovery of citizenship without royal sponsorship, the name of poplifugia is most intimately connected with the upsurge of the new theme of a Res Publica outside the Divine Right of Kings.

And what then could have been more imperative than to institute a festival of the Res Publica, the ~~Poplifugia~~ Poplifugia? During the Fugia, the populus lost its RES, its status as named and entitled citizen of the Republic. At their return, they were recovered by their property, their goods, and Chattels, in the name of the res publica as represented by pontiff and aediles. Again, we can see how carefully the name of aedes sacrae of Ceres, Liber and Libera were chosen, for the surety and assurance of the plebs. Sacrae, Sacred is the namegiving power. A sacrament is tantamount to this power of bestowing the right names on peoples, land, things. The Son and Daughter, the boy and girl of Rome, in their sacred Temples on the Aventine, now had the source and origin of their own property, goods, and chattel, their family status guaranteed. The one word "Sacred" expressed this new equality with the old order.

We do not know whither the fleeing people without their names fled on the poplifugia. I don't think that we shall ever know. But I deem it not impossible that they did leave for the Aventine. Liturgy, in later rational times always is re-read as history. The Regifugium later was read as the flight of the last Etruscan King from Rome. This goes right through all later interpretations of liturgy. The alleged secession of the plebs to the Aventine probably is no exception of this rule. In 494, the poplifugia were instituted, as a solemn recess to the new centre, the Aedes Sacrae of Ceres, Liber, and Libera on the Aventine. And out of this, the annalists composed their stories of Menenius Agrippa etc. etc. The irony of this "imitation by contrast" of the regifugium may have been that the king lost his name by fleeing from the grove, but that the populus recovered it by marching upon the Aventine. Of this, we do not know enough. However, the strange equilibrium of

March First
Regifugium five days March 1.
earlier

July First ~~XXXXXX~~ ~~XXXXXX~~ ~~XXXXXX~~
~~XXXXXX~~ ~~XXXXXX~~ ~~XXXXXX~~
Poplifugium
five days
later

may suggest - that, indeed, the poplifugia did not have to be acted "in contrarium" by a happy return into the City. The God Mars did find his representative on March First in the sacred King again. The Popli-

Juppiter and Vediovis

XII

fugia would have been left dangling in the air unless the reinthronisation so to speak, the re-naming of the Res publica was enacted on some place outside the city which they had left in such ceremonious haste.

The newest treatment of the poplifugia by Walter Kraus isolates the festival from ~~the~~ the annual cycle. We already have pointed out the striking features of its being one half year removed from the Saturnalia, and its breaking the tabbo of the calendar by coming five days after the Kalendae. We now like to add that poplifugia do require some re-institution. The regifugium is repaired on New Years Day. The loss of name by the populus, also would have to be repaired. But our calendar is silent about any such action. Yet, the Romans were very strict in their ritual of "in contrarium agere", or meeting any act by its opposite act. As the Poplifugia are left without such a restitution, the restitution may have been a part of the day itself. That which they lost inside the pomerium, they were given back on the Aventine. In this way, the new fountainhead of their law, was powerfully established, and the S. red Aedes on the Aventine showed their power to create names. In Latin *creare* means to name and to nominate. It is always said and printed that the ancients did not know of the creation out of nothing. Nothing is more arbitrary than this statement. The creation out of chaos, out of nothing, is the whole content of the New Year ceremonies. The Creation of a new heaven and a new earth was the content of the whole ritual from China to Mexico. The very word CREARE meant exactly what the Bible means when she has God create heaven and earth by the word of his mouth. And ~~the~~ since *sacrare*, sacramentum, *sacra* are the acts of creating new order out of nothing, the Temple on the Aventine must have been the center of some enactment of political significance.

As to the distinction of the singular regifugium and the plural poplifugia, it can hardly be justified when or as long as we compare the two formative words *regi* and *popli*. *populus* and *reg* both grammatically are singulars. As soon, however, as we concentrate on the meaning of the two events, the plural becomes indispensable. the one royal nomen and the innumerable nomina of the people, are to suffer a parallel temporary eclipse. Hence the singular of poplifugium would be most inept. I cannot say that actually the two forms, *nomen* and *nomina*, actually were heard or made themselves felt, when poplifugia was coined; but the term poplifugium would have been incongruous, because the *populus* was not made to leave Rome as one united body but as a dissociated mob. The forming of the Res Publica out of a mob of nameless people, made nameless for the occasion, is the content of the festival of which we only know by its beginning, the collapse of the named order, in the form of the ~~poplifugia~~ poplifugia.

Since this collapse proudly superseded the collapse of the royal influence upon all other names of the nomen Romanum, in the old days, we cannot be surprised to see the name Vediovis supersede the venerable name of Diovis. In the last years, the excavations of Rome have recovered the temple of Vediovis as built in much later days, and in it Vediovis is shown as a beautiful Apollon. This shows that no sinister features were given to this Diovis when his royal majesty ~~had~~ had to be lowered in favor of the maximus Juppiter. By considering the form of "ve-purato" in the sense of "no fire, without fire (pyr)", we may perhaps see the vicinity of the various new names given in the first days of the annual namegiving "archon Eponymes" of Rome, the Maximus Praetor. Neither the wicked Deus, nor the little, nor the mad God, seem to me possible explanations of the name vediovis. From our study of the creation of names out of nothing, and of their temporal disappearance through the exigencies of the liturgy, I am inclined to look in the direction of namedness for the understanding of the "name". or antiname, Vediovis. He seems to me to form the ~~max~~ direct contrast to the formula for the

1) Pauly = Wissowa, Artikel Poplifugia

XIII

as mentioned before

The Dies whc

Horus of Egypt. "his formula, ~~ran~~: "He is rightly acclaimed". Vediovis/is not rightly acclaimed. He is without acclamation. The process of invoking the Gods is a most delicate part of old Roman ritual. The Gods of enemy cities, for instance, were formally evoked. Hence, a number of verbs ~~acclamare~~, ~~fari~~, ~~invocare~~, ~~creari~~, might be supplied to fill the name of Vediovis with its correct meaning. But an omission of invocation seems to me probably involved although I am unable to define its precise character. That element however, of the Divinity, which is repudiated by the syllable "Ve", should be sought in the direction of the voice, human or divine voice, by which the Gods and men enter into communication. Whether it was the Plebs who were told, Invoke Liber and Libera, instead of young Diovis, Diovis as the adolescent and the brother of Euno, Dies Anxur, or whether the dismissal from the duty to acclaim was stated for the ~~populus~~ Romanus so that after 509, the cult ceased to be enacted by the whole congregation and was restricted to the Flamen Dialis, we do not know. There never seems to have been a priest of Vediovis, by name. Hence, the Flamen Dialis must have served in his temple. And this is the reason why I do not think that he ever was invoked as Vediovis, but that he simply was not invoked by the larger group which had done so before, and which now transferred their allegiance to the Aventine. The ~~populus~~ never was the king's ~~populus~~; in the regifugium, the old royal army was represented by the Salii, the sword-dancing priests. The excavated temple of Vediovis is situated between Arx and the Temple of Jupiter Maximus, at the place of the ~~asylum~~ of Romulus or Lycoris. If his festivals became the task of the flamen alone, it could be compared to those christian festivals which cease to be celebrated in foro and are kept on as festivals ~~on~~ chore. An example of this is ~~Gandamas~~, which the Pope has made into a holiday in chore.

Juno, Diana,

The Latin names of Diovis Rex, Jupiter, ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Diovis Anxur, Vediovis *) ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~, Rex, flamen, regifugium

*) There never was a Jupiter Anxur. for the term Anxur marked out that heavenly God who was invoked as not yet the Father; and when Virgil spoke of Jupiter Anxur, with one p, by the way, he had to do so because the old religion had become ununderstandable.

In 509 were restricted by the Roman names of Jupiter Optimus Maximus Minerva, Ceres, Liber and Libera, Pontifices ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ and Pontifex Maximus, as well as by the Aediles Aedis Sacrae.

Senior and Junior Partner of this new ~~res~~ Publica pushed the old order of the year and of the divine services into the background. The new order distinguished patricians and plebs, as senior and junior partner of the Senatus Populusque Romanus. And old and young coincided more or less with named and unnamed, with nobility and the multitude. The commonwealth of youth is its abundance, its plethora. And Plebs means this plethos, this inexhaustible supply. The wealth of namedness is the essence of the nobility. It is important that plebs in 509 did not have the ring of our word plebeian at all. Of the young as well as of the old, that quality was underscored, which was most excellent and enjoyable in them. Plebs had no degrading meaning; it praised the abundance, just as the nobility praised the namedness. These are both advantages.

XN

Juppiter and Vediovis

other words, the new architecture of the temples on the Capitol and the Aventine, superseded the worship in the open groves, the temples without aedes, which were cut out by the specter of the sky and the orientation on a sacred plain below on earth. And the honor of the grove, ~~now~~ now was to be shared by a hero of the grove.

Vediovis and Lycoreus and Juno Lucina, as the strange Triad of the lucinae are the distorted ~~old~~ deities under the pressure from Juppiter Optimus Maximus, Juno Regina, Minerva on the one side, from the Pontifex Maximus on the Capitoline Hill and from Ceres, Liber and Libera, on the other side, from the Aventine and its unheard off Aedes Sacrae, its stone temples owned by the Junior Partner, the Plebs.

ancient

The Romans, and any commonwealth distinguished the ~~old~~ and the new, the old and the young, also by the contrasts of named and unnamed. Nobility is the named part of the commonwealth, and the plebs is the unnamed multitude, the ~~wealth~~ wealth of folks which replenishes by its youthful abundance the channels of ~~repute, of nobility.~~

No wonder, then, when we find in the history of the names as given here, a reflection of this distinction. Liber and Libera, Koros and Kore in Greek, Boy and Girl, as we might though defectively interpret their names, are deliberately nameless. The Young have not yet a name of the full authority of the mature and adult. In the City of Rome, the members of the senate, every one of them has made a name. The plebs is the weakness of unnamed manhood. In a precise parallel, a member of the House of Lords in England must be called by his own name. For this is the meaning of the ~~word LORD~~ that you have your own name. But the very opposite is true of

word LORD: the Commons. In the House of Commons you are out of order when the Speaker calls you by your name. It is the severest form of censure when this happens. Winston Churchill is the honorable Member for Woodford as long as he behaves well. To be named by one's own name, in the house of Commons, makes one ignominious, ignoble, of ill repute. This is true in our own days; it goes to show how eternal the orders of society really are. For, the junior partner has his honor in being recognized as a member of the Body Politic, of the Commonwealth. It is the senior partner only, who may add a name of his own, to his membership within, and so to speak on to of this membership. Lordship is conditioned on membership first. Nobody can be an aristocrat unless he ~~undoubtedly~~ undoubtedly shares the rights of the Commons, first. This may warn the modern analytical mind against oversimplification in the history of Religion, of the Church, and of the State as well. The human classes and orders never are mutually exclusive. The whole logical scheme of history is untenable, as we all co-represent our own opposites, too. Young become old, Folks become rich, new men become senators. Any dialectics of young and old, senators and new people, are relative and subjugated to their essential polarity and unity.

Liber,

The Latin names of Diovis, Juppiter, Vediovis allow us to learn an object lesson in the true unfolding of historical life among men.

When Julius Caesar became emperor of Rome, one of his claims was still that his ancestors had been the priests of Vediovis, the Latin Jovis Anxur, through the ages. In a deeper sense, then, Virgil rightly became the poet of the Caesars by singing of the Latin Kings who were "Dispatres among men."

Juppiter and Vediovis

embodied Mars and Diespiter among men.

Only, the old Latin, religion as all ancient religions, were not ubiquitous on this earth. As we now approach the end of our journey, we may recall that the Gentiles before Christ had to be satisfied to have the ubiquitous divinities in the sky above the many wrinkles of the earth. On earth, any hill, mountain, obstacle, separated the gods of one piece of the globe from the gods of another piece of the globe. The Gods in the sky alone seemed to overcome this curse of separation. And for this merit of their ubiquitousness—the Book of Genesis calls such a God who is everywhere, Shaddaj—the constant rise and setting of moon, stars and sun, were discounted. Men of antiquity put up with the problems of the rotation of the firmament and the revolutions of the zodiac, the planets, etc., in order to benefit from the stars ubiquitousness. Royalty had to implement this celestial advantage by being able to be present in one place all the time.

Hence, the rex sacrobum had to occupy the city's pomerium incessantly. He could not ride ~~anxur~~ on a horse or any horsedrawn carriages. He could not go to battle. But he was the heavenly bull on this sacred earth which his word had consecrated. And as long as there was to be a Rome, the member of the family in the sky who alone was omnipresent 24 hours a day, had to be kept on. The leadership of the army, the presiding in court, the provision of the fruits, all this could be given to other magistrates, from Maximus and Magister to minors. But the full majesty nominis Romani depended on the spot where heaven and earth were married in holy marriage and for this reason, Diovis Anxur had to remain through his embodiment on earth.

For it seems not too bold to say that Anxur has to do with the gloss "anxare", to proclaim, and that it was the Aius, the Speaker-King and the Speaker God who created the order between heaven and earth, in any place of Latium. What had been achieved for the whole gigantic area of Egypt once, over one thousand miles, by the progress of Horus, was now repeated in every one peculiar and particular sacred grove wherever a permanent settlement was invoked and installed by having a godman sit down on a solium, a throne and consecrate the soil in the image of the sky.

The earth, by the end of antiquity, had been consecrated in most of its parts. What now was needed was the reunion of all these many separate matrimonies of heaven and earth, the reunion of all the many godspeakers and Diovis Anxurs, in one Name on earth as it is in heaven. The Roman way at this point becomes clear as a sensible causeway into Christianity.

The religion of the Latin Kings already had been a good deal of the true religion for it had reconciled heaven and earth, and God's will in heaven had been done on earth, too. One of the obstacles to our understanding this essential unity of all religions, prechristian and Christian, is a last misnomer of the last centuries with regard to Vediovis or Diovis Anxur. While we have seen that Anxur is the Speaker God, and Vediovis perhaps the God without the people's acclaim in Choro, it has been the fashion of many decades to bestow liberally on those deities of which we know too much the term "chthonian", and to pretend that they represent something sinister in the Netherworld. Now, Vediovis-Apollo was not sinister, not silent like Hades. He spoke as Anxur and he was beautiful like Apollo.

Oscar Goldberg already in 1938 showed that the alleged chthonian Gods of Greece were in fact simply the Gods of this territory, the epichor-
rian Gods within the limits of constellation, orientation, and auspici-
on.

The fashion of the term chthonian is a mere fashion. When we dis-
miss it, we recognize the real process before the coming of Christ.
The division of the earth made many mediators necessary whose names came
between the sky and the people on earth. The omnipresence of the
ruler on earth and the ubiquitousness of the stars over the whole of the
earth, together expressed mankind's religion because men wished to do
God's will then as much- or as little- as we today.

Christ is the Rex Sacrorum from every city on the globe rolled in
to one. His death and his resurrection corresponds to the regifugium
and the New Year. And the interlude of the patricians and the democra-
cies of the last five hundred years before his coming, were the time of
preparation which was needed to uproot the rex sacrorum, the divine
kingship of every myth-crowned place on the globe. For, the myth is the
price of the local limitations of the divinity. If the God speaks
in Rome to the Romans only, a myth is indispensable to distinguish the
God of Rome from the God in Tuscolum or in Alba Longa. Myth- so much
debated today and totally misunderstood, is the price of the local
boundaries of the divine. That which is restricted in time or place in
religion, has a myth by which its singularity and particularity may be
justified, whereas Christianity is antimythical and historical because
its God is not hidden in the sacred grove between the two peaks of the
Capitoline Hill. It is well known although never mentioned by the
Bultmann's that Golgatha and the grave in Jerusalem were left empty
lest Christ be a myth and missed out on his universal mission to re-
place any one local rex sacrificulus, basileus, divine king or
local pharao anywhere all over the globe.

When the Romans dismissed critically the Rex Rex in the sky and
Rex in the Regia of their town, the coming of Christ came nearer one
whole step. And the exaltation of Juppiter into the Biggest and the
Highest could not conceal the weakening of the sacred marriage between
heaven and earth.

Let us once more stress the fact that Juppiter Maximus and Vediovis
have been simultaneous creations. The old Diovis had insured a harmony
of heaven and earth. This now was pushed into the background, for the
sake of the marching legions of the populus Romanus. The orbis terrarum
was conquered by the Juppiter Maximus and his Pontifex Maximus where
the Latin Kings had been satisfied with keeping the seed and harvest
time. Alexander the Great resulted from the democratic reforms in Greece
and Julius Cesar resulted from the republican revolution of the Romans.

But to this day, the task of reconciling the unity of all men
in one heavenly will, and of diversifying the professions by each one
man's earthly will, reminds us of the pre-democratic and pre-republican
religions.

One will has to prevail in heaven and on earth.

Juppiter and

Vediovis

XVI

We were God's incarnations among men. ~~We may ask ourselves now, at the end of this story, how the invocation of Vediovis was handled. Did people pray to Vediovis under this name?~~

In the Latin cities, ~~this was not done. He was the companion of~~ Anxur (or Axur) ~~of the XXXIX Volturna, the companion of Feronia, of~~ the Goddess of fruitfulness, as her Adonis, her Thammuz. And in the Eneid (VII, 799) Virgil gives him his sacred grove ~~as a companion of Feronia.~~ Quibus Jupiter Anxurus arvis praesidet et viridi gaudens Feronia lucco. It has been the habit to call Vediovis a chthonian God, and the use of this term "Chthonian" is one of the pet habits of the last decades.

Anything of which we know too little, is called chthonian.

Goldberg already has shown in 1938, that the Gods called chthonian, simply were the gods of the good earth, of the country, the chora, in Greek. They lived within the termini of the NOMEN Romanum, and they reconciled this piece of land to the heavens. The abuse of the word chthonian, in our case, would make Vediovis into Pluto, the God of the Netherworld. Of this, there is no hint in our traditions.

The fact is that Juppiter Maximus and Vediovis were cocreations. And the sacred grove, the lucus, of Vediovis, certainly as little as in Dodona or among the Volsci, suggested the underworld. He did insure the people of the harmony between the skyworld above and the fields below. This was his central significance, for as to this day in the Pater Noster, One will has to prevail in heaven and on earth.

And although the enlightenment does take this harmony for granted, it is the most difficult achievement of every day life. Any division of labor on earth produces vested interests. And vested interests are antagonistic. It always takes a higher will, a divine will to reunite those whom their daily work specializes. The heaven stands for unity, the earth, for diversity, or division of labor. And it is not any luxury to believe in Vediovis or in Juppiter or in Ceres. We who believe in One God, Creator of Heaven and Earth, should cease to forget, that our division of labor and our classes, sexes, and ages, do threaten us with rifts, anarchy, and decadence, unless we have one Name above all these dividing names by which we can explain ourselves to each other as being truly One.

Vediovis when re-instated as the God of the Julii, in Cesar's days, this youthful edition of the Father of Gods and Men, was unable to convince the Romans or the Roman provinces, for that matter, of the essential unity of the God Cesar and the subject races, of the Roman and the NonRoman humanity, of slave and free. God had to become slave before the exauctorisation of Vediovis in 500 was compensated for. Christ is that Son of God, the inconspicuous one, the Vediovis, but this time not as the invocation of a spirit, but as the incarnation of this spirit among us. The true story of the Capitoline hill in Rome, of the Aventine Hill outside Rome, of the open world of the Roman pontiffs and commanders in Chief, ended in the Son of the Father. We again divide the invocation into two, young and old, senior and junior, Father and Son. And we know that they are two in one Spirit, and that there is One Spirit out of the Two. The curse of the Cross, of the vanquished, of Vediovis, is lifted by the Bearer of the Cross and of the Curse of the Cross.

'Vepurato', ~~extinguish~~ the fire, was an old Italic formula, and it shows that the syllable ve- intended abolition, deprecation, extinction. He who accepts the scandal of the syllable "VE", the negation of glory, can see in the process of the names of Roman worship, a very simple and unifying history of the One Religion for which all the nations have always been heading. The "many" religions are just not there. All men of good will always have tried to worship the Father, the Son, the Spirit.

it.

Maximus

thanks to

The word 'maximus'; ~~xx~~/Hanells brilliant reconstruction of the parallel between Jupiter Maximus against Juppiter ~~Max~~ before, the praetor maximus who impressed the Greek world so that HYPyatos remained the term for the later consul, the pontifex maximus as the companion of this new officer, opens the way to a further understanding of the two other maximi in Rome, the Vestalis maxima, and the Curio Maximus. The Vestalis Maxima replaced the Queen. She took over the service inside the home of the city from the wife of the king, the regina. And the Curio Maximus replaced the King at the religious ceremonies of the Curiae, in the comitiae of these pedigreed families. The reform is so comprehensive and so logical that we everywhere see one principle: royalty was replaced by sovereignty, and the systematic thoroughness makes every one of the five Maximi on earth the rational instruments of the one reform on earth which on the Capitoline Hill exalted Jupiter Optumus Maxumus.