



THE 21ST EDITION OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
**EUROPEAN INTEGRATION
REALITIES AND PERSPECTIVES**

**Interdisciplinary Dimensions of
Communication Science**

Beyond Myths: Symbolism as a Means of Communication with the Gods

Claudiu-Gilian Chircu¹

Abstract: This paper analyzes the transition of communication systems from prehistoric shamanism to the institutionalized religions of Antiquity, exploring the hypothesis that symbolism functioned as an essential mediation protocol between the human and the spiritual realms (perceived as immaterial). As social and demographic complexity increased, utilitarian shamanism evolved into state religion, while preserving shamanic invocation mechanisms within ecclesiastical rituals. The study examines the use of symbols as a method of communication with entities that, in ancient conception, lacked biological support (body/brain) and therefore could not employ verbal language, relying instead on an archetypal mode of expression comparable to the subconscious processes described in analytical psychology. Evidence of symbolic coding is discussed, including the Sumerian numerical hierarchy (the 12 “magic numbers” as ranks of authority), astrosemiotics (the identification of deities through planetary and orbital configurations), and zoomorphic (snake/bird) and spatial (East/West, North/South) binary dichotomies. Finally, the paper traces the evolution of these sacred symbolic systems into logographic and alphabetic writing, suggesting that the foundations of human communication remain embedded in a symbolic matrix originally associated with interaction with the sacred.

Keywords: symbolic communication; shamanism; ancient semiotics; Sumerian numerology; astrosemiotics

1. Genesis of Religious Institutions – Adapting Communication to Demographic Density

1.1. From Direct Communication to Institutionalized Religion

Religious phenomena, in their institutionalized form, do not represent a spontaneous emergence in human history, but rather the outcome of a long evolutionary process, decisively shaped by demographic and social transformations within human communities. The central argument of this analysis is that the transition from shamanism (as a primordial form of spiritual mediation) to organized religion constituted, in essence, a functional response to increasing social complexity rather than an autonomous doctrinal revelation. Situated at the intersection of the anthropology of religion, the sociology of knowledge, and the history of mentalities, this perspective reinterprets religious origins through the lens of collective management demands in increasingly large populations.

¹ M.A. in Communication Sciences, Editor, Danubius University Press, Danubius International University, Galati, Romania, Address: 3 Galati Blvd., 800654 Galati, Romania, Corresponding author: claudiugilian.chircu@univ-danubius.ro.



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors.
Open access publication under the terms and conditions of the
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial (CC BY NC) license
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

Within small-scale groups, hunter-gatherer tribes rarely exceeding 150 individuals, consistent with the cognitive threshold identified by Robin Dunbar (1992), communication with supernatural forces was perceived as direct, personalized, and instrumental. The shaman, as a privileged mediator between the visible and invisible worlds, fulfilled cumulative roles: healer, meteorological interpreter, astronomical navigator, conflict mediator, and custodian of collective memory. This configuration was well adapted to small communities in which all members knew each other personally and authority was grounded in direct experience and informal consensus.

1.2. The Scalability Crisis of Shamanism and the Emergence of Institutional Religion

The emergence of the first city-states in Mesopotamia (c. 3500–3000 BCE), the Indus Valley (c. 2600 BCE), and Predynastic Egypt required a fundamental restructuring of legitimization systems for authority. Populations of tens of thousands of individuals, stratified economically and socially, could no longer be governed through direct shaman–community relationships.

Émile Durkheim (1912) argued that religion is, above all, a social fact, a collective representation through which society worships itself by projecting its own structures into the sacred realm. This interpretation becomes particularly relevant when analyzing the demographic dynamics of early urban civilizations.

The anthropomorphization of deities can thus be interpreted as a form of communicational scale-up: diffuse, impersonal, and context-dependent spirits characteristic of prehistoric shamanism were systematized, hierarchized, and endowed with recognizable human attributes (jealousy, anger, generosity, justice) in order to facilitate mass cognitive accessibility and normative internalization. Pascal Boyer (2001) demonstrates that “minimally counterintuitive” supernatural agents (entities that subtly violate intuitive expectations about reality) are more easily remembered, transmitted, and ritualized than fully abstract spiritual forms. Anthropomorphic gods thus represent an efficient cognitive solution to the problem of large-scale cultural transmission.

The transformation of the shaman into the priest follows a similar logic. Whereas the shaman derives authority from personal, often transgressive experience (ecstasy, trance, psychoactive induction), the priest derives it from institutional affiliation, doctrinal transmission, and regulated access to ritual. Max Weber (1922) explicitly distinguishes between charismatic authority and rational-legal authority, outlining an evolutionary trajectory that corresponds to the transition from small-scale groups to urban states.

1.3. Persistent Substrates of Prehistoric Shamanism

Religious institutionalization did not eliminate earlier shamanic practices but rather stratified and absorbed them. Traces of these substrates are observable both in civilizations that underwent full urbanization and in societies that preserved tribal or semi-tribal structures over long historical periods.

1.3.1. Shamanism in Indo-European and Mediterranean Traditions

Early Roman traditions and archaic substrata. Early Roman religion, prior to the systematization of the Greco-Roman pantheon, preserved clear elements of shamanic practice. Figures such as the *haruspex* (divination through examination of sacrificed animal entrails) and the *augur* (interpretation of bird flight patterns) reflect a logic of direct reading of the natural world as divine communication, structurally analogous to shamanic practices (Beard, North & Price, 1998). Rituals such as the Lupercalia and cults like that of Bona Dea, from which men were excluded, preserve unmistakable features of pre-urban ritual systems later absorbed into state religion. Early Roman tribal organization (Ramnes, Tities, Luceres) reflects a gentile structure based on kinship and totemic traditions preceding political centralization.

Geto-Dacian tribes and Zalmoxis. The Geto-Dacian spiritual tradition offers a notable case of hybridization between shamanism and institutional religion. Herodotus (n.d., pp. 94–96) describes the ritual of sending a messenger to Zalmoxis by throwing him onto spears, a practice bearing clear traces of ecstatic sacrificial ritual. Mircea Eliade (1972) interprets Zalmoxis as a deified shaman whose periodic withdrawal and return correspond to the classical structure of the shamanic descent into the underworld. Strabo's *ktistai* and *polistai* are similarly interpreted as priest-shamans preserving direct communication with the divine. In Romanian folklore, the figure of the *solomonar* represents a survival of this archaic mediator, associated with meteorological control and initiatory knowledge acquired in liminal spaces.

Vikings and the seiðr complex. Norse culture provides one of the best-documented examples of persistent Indo-European shamanism. The practice of *seiðr*, associated with the goddess Freyja and, according to the *Ynglinga saga*, also with Odin, involved trance states, altered consciousness, and inter-realm travel consistent with Siberian shamanic typologies described by Eliade (1964). The cosmic tree Yggdrasil functions as an Axis Mundi interconnecting three vertical cosmological levels: the divine realm, the human world (Midgard), and the subterranean realm of death and primordial knowledge. The *völva* (Norse seeress) represents a direct functional equivalent of the tribal shaman, holding epistemic authority over war, harvest, and fate. Neil Price (2002) demonstrates that these practices coexisted with institutionalized Norse religion as a distinct yet socially recognized layer.

1.3.2. Shamanism in the Asian Steppe Traditions

Huns and Mongols. The nomadic peoples of the Eurasian steppe constituted, over millennia, a relatively stable cultural environment for the preservation and transmission of shamanic practices in forms that remained structurally conservative. In the case of the Huns, Byzantine and Roman sources refer to religious practitioners (functionally comparable to shamans) who performed divination through scapulimancy (the interpretation of burnt sheep shoulder blades) and other omen-based techniques associated with military decision-making (Maenchen-Helfen, 1973).

The Mongol Empire under Genghis Khan and his successors represents an exceptional case of deliberate coexistence between state-level shamanism and institutional religions incorporated through conquest, including Buddhism, Islam, and Nestorian Christianity. The *böö* (Mongolian shaman) fulfilled multiple roles, including military adviser, ritual mediator, and custodian of relations with Tengri, the “Eternal Sky,” the supreme deity of the Turkic-Mongolic shamanic cosmology (Heissig, 1980). Significantly, *The Secret History of the Mongols* (13th century) presents Genghis Khan as an elected agent of Tengri, indicating that political legitimacy was explicitly articulated through shamanic cosmological frameworks.

Korea, Siberia, and Central Asia. Korea provides one of the most enduring cases of institutionalized shamanism in East Asia. The *mudang* (Korean shaman) continues to perform ritual mediation practices whose continuity can be traced, according to some interpretations, back to the Bronze Age (Kim, 1998). These practices remain integrated into contemporary ritual life, despite successive waves of religious and ideological transformation.

Siberia represents the ethnographic core region of classical shamanism. The very term *shaman* originates from the Tungusic *šaman*, and early systematic studies by Radloff (1884), followed by Shirokogoroff (1935), established the foundations of its academic conceptualization. Siberian traditions thus remain central to comparative models of shamanism in anthropology and the history of religions.

1.3.3. Shamanism in Africa, Oceania, and Latin America

The global distribution of shamanic practices provides strong support for the hypothesis that shamanism constitutes a widespread cognitive and cultural substrate of human religiosity, predating the emergence of formalized religious institutions.

In sub-Saharan Africa, figures such as the Zulu sangoma and Bantu nganga combine therapeutic, divinatory, and ancestral mediation functions within symbolic systems that are structurally comparable to Eliade's typologies of shamanism (Janzen, 1992). These practitioners operate within integrated cosmologies in which illness, misfortune, and social conflict are interpreted as disruptions in relations with ancestral or spiritual forces.

In Oceania, the *tohunga* of Māori tradition and the Hawaiian *kahuna* similarly embody the role of ritual specialists who access privileged knowledge through altered states of consciousness and formalized initiatory techniques (Handy, 1927). Despite regional variation, these roles exhibit a consistent functional structure: mediation between human communities and non-empirical dimensions of reality.

Latin America provides an especially rich field of continuity and syncretism. Amazonian shamanism, including ayahuasca-based ritual systems, has been extensively documented by Reichel-Dolmatoff (1975), highlighting complex cosmologies structured around visionary experience and ecological cognition. In Mesoamerica, *curanderismo* traditions preserve pre-Columbian ritual elements that have been reconfigured through layers of Catholic syncretism, resulting in hybrid systems of spiritual healing and symbolic mediation.

2. The Technology of Ritual – Invocation and the Persistence of Magic in Ecclesiastical Forms

2.1. Hallucinogens as a Shamanic Epistemic Technology

Communication with the ethereal entities of shamanism, later reclassified as gods following the transition to institutionalized religion, represents the primary function of shamanic ritual systems. The use of aromatic smoke in ritual contexts constitutes one of the longest continuously attested protocols of symbolic communication in the archaeological record. In prehistoric shamanism, smoke (often produced by burning plants with psychoactive properties) was understood as a medium thought to open channels of communication with spirits, to purify ritual space, and to serve as a material vector through which intentions could be directed toward the invisible realm. Herodotus (n.d., pp. 73–75) documents the Scythian practice of ritual inhalation of hemp smoke, while recent archaeochemical analyses have identified residues of *Cannabis* and *Peganum harmala* in ritual contexts from the first millennium BCE in the Caucasus region (Russo et al., 2008). Andrew Sherratt (1995) also documents the ritual use of

cannabis in the Eurasian steppe from at least the third millennium BCE, including within proto-Indo-European cultural contexts. Archaeobotanical and chemical studies, such as those by Ruck, Staples & Heinrich (2001), suggest that the sacred Eleusinian beverage *kykeon* may have contained psychoactive alkaloids, implying that chemically mediated shamanic practice penetrated even the most sophisticated mystery systems of Classical Greece. These findings indicate that, for ancient practitioners, the boundary between shamanic revelation and empirical knowledge was fundamentally permeable: chemically induced trance states provided a cognitive framework in which accumulated experiential knowledge could be integrated and transmitted in the narrative form of divine communication.

The transition of this practice into institutionalized religious forms follows a logic of progressive substitution: pharmacologically active substances are replaced by predominantly sensory aromatic agents (Christian incense, Hindu dhūpa, Buddhist censers), while the symbolic protocol remains structurally intact, smoke functioning as a sign of communication with the divine realm. Notably, neurochemical studies have identified anxiolytic compounds in *Boswellia sacra* (Moussaieff et al., 2008), suggesting that this substitution was not pharmacologically neutral.

2.2. Incantation and the Sonic Structure of Invocation

The sonic dimension of ritual represents one of the most direct continuities between shamanic practice and institutional liturgy. Shamanic chanting was not an aesthetic accompaniment but the central operative technology of ritual: through rhythmic and respiratory modulation, it facilitated access to altered states of consciousness necessary for contact with invoked entities (Rouget, 1985). Ethnomusicological research demonstrates that drumming at frequencies of approximately 4-7 Hz produces measurable alterations in EEG activity, correlated with hypnagogic states and increased suggestibility (Neher, 1962).

Repetitive prayer forms, such as the Jesus Prayer in Eastern Orthodox hesychasm, the Catholic rosary, Sufi dhikr, or Hindu japa, constitute direct continuations of shamanic incantation structures, preserving the same mechanism of inducing altered states of consciousness through which communication with invisible entities becomes possible.

2.3. The Persistence of Magic in Ecclesiastical Forms

The historical tension between religion and magic appears, in light of the above arguments, as a dispute over institutional legitimacy rather than a fundamental structural distinction. Keith Thomas (1971) demonstrates that, in medieval popular perception, the boundary between magical and religious practice was highly permeable: the same believer could simultaneously engage in canonical prayer, the use of blessed amulets, and local incantations, perceiving all three as variations of a unified protocol of symbolic invocation. The distinction was administrative (established by ecclesiastical classification systems), not phenomenological.

Exorcism, the consecration of water and oil, the blessing of fields, and the use of relics as healing objects are, structurally, shamanic protocols of symbolic energy manipulation recoded within ecclesiastical doctrinal language. This continuity is not incidental but necessary: institutional religion adopted the symbolic communication technologies of shamanism because they responded to enduring cognitive and social needs, and because they represented pre-existing operational frameworks for interaction with postulated ethereal entities.

2.4. Initiatory Structure

Access to symbolic knowledge, understood as the culturally defined code for communicating with divine entities, was universally restricted and acquired through graded initiation. In classical shamanism, initiation involves a sequence of symbolic death and rebirth through which the candidate gains access to the symbolic register of spirits. This structure is clearly recognizable in the initiation rites of priesthood across multiple traditions: novitiate, ascetic withdrawal, and consecration ceremonies reproduce the logic of shamanic initiation, reinterpreted within the doctrinal frameworks of specific institutional religions (Eliade, 1964; Turner, 1969).

3. Communication with Divinities

3.1. From Shamanic Spirits to the Gods of Institutional Religion

A proper understanding of ancient religious symbolism requires, as an essential starting point, the clarification of a gradual transformation connecting prehistoric shamanism with the earliest organized religions of antiquity. This transformation was not a rupture, but a recodification: the diffuse and impersonal spirits of Paleolithic and Neolithic shamanism became, with the emergence of the first city-states, the anthropomorphic gods of the Mesopotamian, Egyptian, and Indian pantheons. The content of spiritual experience remained structurally consistent; what changed was its public format and institutional infrastructure.

The crucial distinction in this transformation lies in the gap between popular and initiatory theology. For the urban masses, gods were material beings with clearly defined anthropomorphic or zoomorphic forms, inhabiting temples, receiving offerings, and intervening directly in human affairs. This conception was socially functional, providing an accessible narrative framework for legitimizing authority and communal norms. The priesthood, as the direct heir of shamanic knowledge, operated, however, within a fundamentally different theological framework: gods were not material beings, but ethereal entities, functionally equivalent to the spirits of prehistoric shamanism, reconfigured into the doctrinal language of the new religious institution. This distinction between exotericism and esotericism, or between public religion and initiatory doctrine, is explicitly documented in the Greek Orphic tradition, the Eleusinian Mysteries, and the Mesopotamian sapiential literature (Burkert, 1987).

3.2. The Disembodied Entity: The Fundamental Problem of Divine Communication

The recognition, within ancient belief systems, of divinities as ethereal or non-corporeal entities gives rise to a conceptual problem that has important implications for the structure of religious symbolism: such entities are understood as lacking a physical body and, by extension, the biological organs associated with speech and cognition. As a result, communication with them is not conceived as following the verbal protocols of ordinary human interaction. Instead, it is framed as requiring alternative channels or codes of expression considered appropriate to the non-material status attributed to these entities within those belief systems.

The response identified empirically within shamanic traditions, through millennia of ritual practice, and later codified doctrinally by institutional religions, was the symbol. In both shamanic accounts and institutional mystical literature (from Augustine's *Confessions* to Catherine of Siena's *Dialogues*, from Hildegard of Bingen's *Liber Divinorum Operum* to Swedenborg's visions) ethereal entities are described as communicating through images, numbers, astral configurations, animal behavior, dreams,

and visions, rather than articulated speech. The shaman entering trance is described as not receiving a verbal message but rather a symbolic experience that requires interpretation. Similarly, the priest interpreting sacrificial entrails, the augur reading bird flight patterns, or the astrologer decoding planetary configurations are presented as operating according to a shared underlying logic: the divine entity communicates through symbols, and the sacred specialist is the one who possesses the decoding system.

This logic aligns with the Jungian model of communication between the unconscious and consciousness. Jung (1964) argued that the deepest layers of the psyche, inaccessible to direct verbal cognition, express themselves through symbolic imagery, dreams, and intuitions rather than articulated propositions. Jung (1961/1963) describes his own exploration of the unconscious, recorded in the *Liber Novus* (2009), as a sequence of encounters with autonomous figures (Philemon, Salome, Elijah) that communicate through symbolic narratives with a density and coherence surpassing ordinary conscious thought. Although Jung did not interpret these figures as external entities, neither did he reduce them to mere fantasy constructions; they possessed, in his terms, a functional autonomy relative to the conscious ego. Regardless of the ontological interpretation assigned to these phenomena, this functional autonomy explains why, in ritual contexts, both shamans and mystics considered communication with the divine or spiritual realm to be an experience of authentic otherness rather than an internal monologue. The symbol appears as a received message, not a constructed one, thereby acquiring epistemic authority.

The convergence point between mystical experience and depth psychology lies in the shared limitation of the sender: both the ethereal entity and the unconscious psyche are “disembodied agencies.” Lacking a phonatory apparatus, both must rely on a single transmission protocol: symbolic substitution. There is a striking functional similarity between the manner in which spirits are believed to communicate with shamans and the manner in which the unconscious communicates with conscious cognition. In both cases, the sender operates outside the rules of linear logic and verbal syntax. Just as the unconscious cannot deliver a structured list of instructions but instead projects interpretive images or affective states, divine entities in shamanic systems are not described as “speaking” in a verbal sense, but as producing symbolic configurations (astral events, visions, or animal behaviors) requiring interpretation.

This identity of communicative protocol suggests that the human mind possesses a single interface for receiving messages from any agency located beyond the boundaries of conscious cognition. The most coherent and information-dense example of such symbolic communication is the dream. During sleep, conscious cognition is suspended, allowing the unconscious to transmit symbolic messages to awareness—dreams being, by definition, structured in symbolic form. Jung (1933) described dreams as spontaneous products of the unconscious, “a small hidden door in the innermost and most secret depths of the soul, opening onto the cosmic night that was the soul before the emergence of the conscious ego,” where verbal language is replaced by archetypal imagery. Across ancient cultures, numerous myths illustrate divine communication through dreams:

- Mesopotamian tradition: In the inscriptions of the Gudea Cylinders (c. 2120 BCE), dreams transmit architectural instructions for sacred temples, notably the Eninnu temple revealed by the god Ningirsu. In the *Epic of Atrahasis*, the hero receives instructions for constructing the ark through a dream revelation mediated by Enki. In the *Epic of Gilgamesh*, prophetic dreams attributed to Shamash require interpretation by Enkidu.
- Ancient Egypt: The “Dream Stele” of Thutmose IV (c. 1400 BCE) records the appearance of Horemakhet, who legitimizes royal authority through a dream injunction.

- Hindu tradition: In the *Puranas*, King Muchukunda enters a divinely sanctioned eternal sleep, where the dream state functions as a continuous interface with divine essence (Doniger, 1988).
- Greek world: Dream incubation in the sanctuaries of Asclepius illustrates the therapeutic function of dreams, where divine prescriptions for healing are received during ritual sleep (Edelstein, 1945). The myth of Morpheus transmitting news of Ceyx's death to Alcyone exemplifies oneiric communication as informational transfer (Ovid, ca. 8 CE, Book 11).
- Mesoamerican world: In Aztec cosmology, Huitzilopochtli communicates the location of Tenochtitlan's foundation to the high priest Quauhcoatl through a dream vision (Codex Aubin, 16th century).
- Judeo-Christian tradition: Dreams function as divine instruments of warning, legitimization, and revelation, from Joseph's dream in the New Testament (Matthew 1:20) to Jacob's ladder and Solomon's dream in the Old Testament.

Ancient oneiromancy (*oneirocritica*) functioned, within the cultures that practiced it, as a formal system for interpreting dreams, considered a sacred discipline necessary for decoding divine will. This tradition can be described as a protocol for translating symbolic messages believed to be transmitted through the dream-state interface between the ethereal and material domains.

3.3. The Symbol as a Bidirectional Protocol

A direct consequence of this logic, often overlooked in scholarly literature, is the bidirectional nature of symbolic communication in ancient religious practice. If divine entities were believed to communicate with humans through symbols, it was equally reasonable that humans would try to communicate with the divine through the same protocol. The symbol was therefore considered not only a received message but also a transmitted one: a key of access, a signal of identification, and an invocation mechanism.

This explains the pervasive presence of symbolic systems in ancient ritual practices: engraved numbers on votive tablets, specific star patterns on seals, sacrificial animal selection, and altar orientation were not decorative elements but components of a communicative protocol addressed to entities that were believed to be inaccessible through verbal language. Ritual practice thus constituted a bidirectional system of symbolic communication, in which practitioners encoded their intention using the divine system of signs and awaited responses in symbolic form through dreams, omens, visions, or interpreted events. Symbolism, in this framework, is not an aesthetic, metaphorical, or cultural device, as is often suggested in academic interpretations, but was understood as the only viable means of communication between the material and ethereal domains.

4. Ontological Dualism – The Binary Coding of Divine Factions

4.1. Zoomorphic Symbols of Divine Leadership

An effective communication system does not merely transmit content; it calibrates it to the recipient's cognitive and cultural capacity. Ancient religious symbolism demonstrates a remarkable awareness of this principle: the same divinity, or the same divine function, was encoded through different symbolic forms depending on the economic and cultural context of the receiving community. This does not reflect theological inconsistency but rather a deliberate strategy of message adaptation to cultural environments,

corresponding to what contemporary communication theory describes as localization (Nida & Taber, 1969).

The Sun God as Supreme Deity. The solar deity, present in most ancient cultures, encodes the function of supreme ruler within the pantheon. The analogy is structurally transparent: just as the Sun occupies the center of the solar system with planets orbiting around it, the ruling deity occupies the center of the divine hierarchy. This correspondence is particularly evident in Egyptian mythology, where Ra governs the pantheon. Although Egyptologists have proposed various etymologies for this name, its most direct semantic parallel appears in Sumerian, where *ra* also carries the meaning of “ruler,” suggesting that the Egyptians may have designated their supreme deity simply as “the Ruler,” simultaneously integrating solar symbolism (Chircu, 2017).

The Shepherd God. The imagery of the shepherd god or king expresses the same function of leadership, adapted to pastoral societies: just as the shepherd leads the flock, the deity or ruler leads his “flock” of subjects. This is reflected in the Egyptian royal iconography, where pharaohs carried the shepherd’s crook alongside the sceptre as an explicit symbol of governance. Shepherd gods such as Osiris and Andjety in Egypt, Dumuzi in Sumer, and Tammuz in Babylon represent, in the proposed interpretation (Chircu, 2017), different articulations of a single divine archetype: the primordial ruler of the material world, successively adapted to each culture’s symbolic vocabulary.

The Bull God. The bull encodes divine rulership with an additional semantic layer: generative and fertilizing power. The bull-god represents leadership not only as governance but also as creative and reproductive force. El, the supreme deity of the Ugaritic pantheon, was represented as a bull, as was Baal, his successor (Smith, 2001). In Egypt, the Apis bull functioned as a living manifestation of royal divine power, reflecting the structural overlap between sovereignty and creative potency. This association was fully intelligible to cattle-rearing populations, for whom the bull represented the primary source of herd reproduction and, consequently, of communal prosperity.

The Ram God. The ram carries an identical symbolic semantics to the bull, herd leadership and generative principle, but emerges predominantly in ovine-based cultures. It has been proposed (Chircu, 2017) that the differentiation between bull and ram deities arose from cultural localization: in Egypt, a cattle-based society, the supreme deity was a bull; among the Hyksos, primarily sheep herders, the same divine function was encoded through the ram. Thus, identical theological content was transmitted through the most authoritative symbolic form available in the recipient’s local economic system. This hypothesis also accounts for the iconographic tensions documented during the Hyksos period in Egypt, when both symbolic systems coexisted and gradually syncretized (Redford, 1992).

4.2. Binary Opposition as a Universal Principle of Cosmological Organization

The structuring of reality through binary oppositions represents one of the most consistent principles of mythological and religious thought across cultures. Claude Lévi-Strauss (1963) demonstrated that mythological thinking operates fundamentally through oppositional pairs (nature/culture, raw/cooked, sacred/profane) as a cognitive mechanism for organizing experience. What is proposed here (Chircu, 2017) extends this structuralist observation: binary opposition in ancient mythology is not merely a narrative convention but reflects a consistent division of the pantheon into two distinct divine factions organized around mutual conflict as a generative principle.

This dual structure is cross-culturally recognizable: Anunna and Igigi in Sumer, Olympians and Titans in Greece, Æsir and Vanir in Norse mythology, Devas and Asuras in Hindu tradition, angels and demons

in Abrahamic religions, and so forth. In each case, cosmology is organized around a fundamental divine conflict between two structurally opposed groups. The consistency of this pattern suggests, in the proposed interpretation, a shared origin in cultural memory shaped by narrative traditions describing an archaic conflict between celestial and terrestrial divine factions, often structured around motifs of fall or degradation

4.3. Light and Darkness, Sun and Moon

The opposition between light and darkness as moral categories constitutes perhaps the most universal symbolic structure, present from Iranian Zoroastrianism, with its explicit dualism between Ahura Mazda (light) and Ahriman (darkness), to Gnostic systems and Christian theology (Boyce, 1975).

In most cultures, celestial gods were symbolically associated with the sun, while terrestrial deities were symbolically associated with the moon. The case of the Babylonian Marduk illustrates the dynamics of this system: initially regarded as the son of the celestial Enlil and symbolically associated with the Sun, he later came to be identified as the son of Enki, leader of the opposing faction, thereby losing his solar association. Following his adoption during the Babylonian captivity, the Israelites referred to him as Yahweh, a name which, in this interpretation, can be translated as “The One who became the Moon”, a shift in epithet that is understood here as encoding his transfer from one faction to another (Chircu, 2017).

4.4. Right and Left, East and West

The opposition between right and left as a vector of good and evil appears with remarkable consistency across cultures. Etymologically, *sinister* in Latin means “left,” while *dexter* means “right.” While *dexter* evolved toward positive meanings, giving rise to “dexterity” (skill, proficiency), *sinister* underwent a process of semantic degradation due to the association of the left side with unfavorable omens in divinatory rituals. As a result, the word “sinister” has today lost its directional meaning, being used exclusively to describe something gloomy or threatening, thus transforming a simple spatial coordinate into a moral judgment of evil.

In Mesopotamian texts, Enlil (leader of the celestial gods) sits at the right hand of the god An in the Assembly of the Gods, while Enki (leader of the terrestrial deities) is placed at his left. This spatial arrangement encodes hierarchical and moral affiliation in an explicit manner. The same principle appears in Christianity, where Jesus is described as seated at the right hand of the Father, as well as in the iconography of the Last Judgment, where the righteous are placed to the right of the judge and the condemned to the left.

The east/west opposition follows a similar logic: the east, associated with the right and with positive valence, is aligned with the group of celestial deities, while the west (linked to the left and to negative valence) is associated with the group of fallen entities. Egyptian mythology preserves this coding in an explicit form: one of the epithets of Osiris (identified in *The Secrets of the Gods* as the leader of the terrestrial deities) was “First among those of the West,” an epithet also borne by his son, Anubis. When correlated with Sumerian symbolic structures, the three solar aspects in Egypt (Atum at sunrise, Ra at midday, Khepri at sunset) may represent more than three manifestations of a single deity: Ra at midday could correspond to an in a central position, Atum of the sunrise to the god positioned on An’s right, and Khepri of the sunset to the one on his left (Chircu, 2017).

4.5. North and South as Cosmological Vectors

The north/south axis completes the symbolic orientation system. The north, associated with the sky, corresponds to celestial divinities, while the south, associated with the underworld, corresponds to terrestrial or chthonic gods. This cosmological orientation explains the consistent cardinal alignment of ancient temples, where architectural orientation encoded the cosmic affiliation of the cult (Koch-Westenholz, 1995).

The full system of oppositions (sky/earth, light/darkness, sun/moon, right/left, east/west, north/south) forms a coherent symbolic network in which each element is structurally integrated into a unified cosmological framework. In the proposed interpretation, this is not the product of abstract theological speculation, but a structured symbolic communication system designed to encode, transmit, and preserve information about the structure and perceived conflicts of the divine realm, accessible to initiates in its full complexity and to broader audiences in the simplified form of a universal opposition between good and evil.

4.6. Serpent and Bird: The Zoomorphic Expression of Dualism

The most widespread representation of divine dualism is the opposition between bird and serpent. This is not arbitrary but reflects their ecological domains: birds dominate the sky and thus symbolize celestial gods (often represented as falcons or eagles), while serpents, moving along or beneath the ground, symbolize terrestrial and chthonic deities. Thus, through the simple observation of these animals, the affiliation of a given deity with one of the two domains (the upper or the terrestrial) was indicated.

This opposition is dramatized in Egyptian mythology through the conflict between Ra (falcon-headed) and the serpent Apophis, a cosmic struggle reenacted nightly as the sun traverses the underworld (Pinch, 2002). In the Sumerian *Myth of Etana*, the conflict between eagle and serpent encodes a primordial rupture of divine order (Dalley, 1989). The same structure appears in Vedic mythology (Garuda vs. Nāgas) and in Mesoamerican symbolism, where the eagle devouring a serpent becomes a foundational cosmological motif, preserved in the founding myth of Tenochtitlan and still present in the modern Mexican state emblem.

5. Astrosemiotics – Planetary Positioning as a Numerical Identifier

5.1. The Logic of Reverse Counting

In most ancient cultures, deities were equated with celestial bodies, a correspondence extensively documented in Mesopotamian, Egyptian, Greek, and Indian traditions (Rochberg, 2004). For instance, in the *Book of Enoch*, angels are identified with stars, while the fallen ones are described as falling stars. What I propose in *The Secrets of the Gods* (2017) goes beyond this general observation: Mesopotamian peoples counted the planets of the Solar System from the outermost inward toward the Sun, thereby generating a system of planetary numerical identifiers that simultaneously functioned as logotypes of the associated deities. The star with N rays was not a decorative ornament but a precise identifier, equivalent to a heraldic symbol with encoded informational content.

5.2. Ray Stars as Planetary Logotypes

Five-pointed star – Jupiter. Counting from the outermost position, Jupiter is the fifth planet. The five-pointed star represents Enlil of the Sumerians, Zeus of the Greeks, or Jupiter of the Romans, the deity associated with this planet, which also explains its association with the number 5 in certain ritual contexts.

Six-pointed star – Mars. The hexagram, or six-pointed star, identifies the sixth planet, Mars, associated with the Sumerian Martu, later known in Babylon as Marduk. The number 6 thus signifies this deity, a correspondence also visible in Jewish mysticism, where 6 is associated with Yahweh of the Hebrew Bible, reflecting a syncretic legacy from the Babylonian exile period (Scholem, 1974).

Seven-pointed star – Earth. Earth is the seventh planet in the reverse counting system; therefore, the seven-pointed star, and implicitly the number 7, symbolizes the Earth. The Greeks appear to have been aware of this dual positional logic: they referred to Earth as *Ge*, reflecting both its third position from the Sun and its seventh position from the outer boundary of the system (gamma and eta being the third and seventh letters of their alphabet).

Eight-pointed star – Venus. The eighth planet in reverse order, Venus, was represented in Mesopotamian iconography by an eight-pointed star, one of the most recognizable symbols of the goddess Inanna/Ishtar, appearing on numerous cylinder seals and votive tablets (Black & Green, 1992). The number 8 thus encodes the goddess of love across multiple cultures, and the eight-pointed star functions as her planetary logotype.

Nine-pointed star – Mercury. The closest planet to the Sun and the ninth in reverse counting, Mercury, was associated in Mesopotamia with Nabu, son of Marduk and god of writing and wisdom. The number 9 and the nine-pointed star constitute his symbolic identifiers, consistent with his role as divine messenger and scribe, analogous to Hermes/Mercury in the Greco-Roman pantheon.

5.3. Geometrical Symbols of the Heaven–Earth Relationship

Beyond numerical identifiers, ancient traditions used geometry to encode the interface between cosmic levels.

The Cross. In Sumerian cuneiform writing, the sky was represented by a cross, a fact documented in Mesopotamian paleography (Black & Green, 1992). The cross as a symbol of the sky or the sacred appears independently in cultures without direct contact, from Indo-European solar symbolism to the Andean chakana, suggesting that its visual logic (four directions emanating from a center) was universally accessible.

The Circle as Earth. In many ancient cultures, the Earth was represented by a circle, reflecting the perceived horizon, seasonal cycles, and orbital motion, a suitable representation of a spherical planet.

The Cross within the Circle. Attested from Neolithic Europe to pre-Columbian America, this symbol represents the meeting point between heaven and earth, the junction between the ethereal and material planes. In essence, it functioned as a graphic marker of the space where the communication protocol was activated, indicating the precise location of contact between the two regimes of existence. Thus, the circle-inscribed cross was not merely a cosmological representation, but a diagram signaling the availability of a transmission channel between humans and non-corporeal entities.

The Ankh. Although classically interpreted in Egyptology as a symbol of life or eternal life (Wilkinson, 1992), a structural analysis suggests that the ankh (a cross topped with a loop) represents a connection

between heaven (the ethereal plane) and earth (the material plane). In this interpretation, the ankh is not merely an abstract symbol, but the graphic representation of a portal found in various forms across many ancient cultures, the so-called “gate of heaven.” It functions as a marker of transition through which deities were believed to enter the human world, or through which authorized human agents (pharaohs) could access the divine realm. Therefore, the meaning of “eternal life” attributed by scholars does not refer to immortality in a general sense, but to the possibility of living eternally in the world of the gods, the ethereal plane united with the material one through the structure of the ankh.

5.4. A Coherent Semiotic System

What emerges from this analysis is a remarkably coherent semiotic system: the number of rays on a star encodes the orbital position of the associated planet, which in turn encodes the identity of the corresponding deity. A single graphical symbol—the star with N rays—compresses three simultaneous levels of information: astronomical, theological, and numerical. Used on seals, temples, or votive objects, this symbol functioned as an immediately recognizable identifier for those who possessed the code, a visual communication system with a density of information rarely matched in later symbolic traditions, and a level of administrative and semiotic sophistication that Assyriology has only recently begun to acknowledge (Rochberg, 2004).

6. Hierarchical Architecture – Sumerian Numerology as a System for Encoding Divine Rank

6.1. Divine Numbers as an Administrative Protocol

Among all systems of encoding divine authority developed by ancient civilizations, Sumerian numerology occupies a distinct position due to its structural rigor and the internal coherence of the logic it expresses. The numerical system of the Sumerian pantheon exhibits the characteristics of an explicit administrative code: each major deity corresponds to a specific number, each number corresponds to a rank, and the hierarchy of ranks faithfully reflects the structure of power within the pantheon.

In *The Secrets of the Gods* (2017), I propose that these twelve numbers (60, 55, 50, 45, 40, 35, 30, 25, 20, 15, 10, and 5) do not represent arbitrary symbolic attributions, mystical speculations, or “magic numbers,” as some scholars have described them, but rather constitute a coherent system for encoding divine noble rank, a classification protocol of status within the Anunnaki hierarchy, functionally comparable to the registers of noble titles in medieval European chanceries. This interpretation is supported by the internal mathematical coherence of the series and its verifiable correspondence with Mesopotamian mythological texts.

6.2. Binary Differentiation: Masculine and Feminine as an Organizational Axis

A structurally elegant feature of this system is the principle of binary differentiation through which the twelve numbers are distributed between male and female deities. The six “round” numbers, pure multiples of ten (60, 50, 40, 30, 20, 10), are reserved for male deities, while the six numbers ending in 5 (55, 45, 35, 25, 15, 5) are assigned to female deities:

Rank	Male Title	Nr.	Female Title	Nr.
I	Emperor	60	Empress	55
II	King	50	Queen	45
III	Grand Prince	40	Grand Princess	35
IV	Prince	30	Princess	25
V	Duke	20	Duchess	15
VI	Count	10	Countess	5

A single parameter, the termination in 0 or 5, encodes gender information, while the absolute value encodes hierarchical rank. In essence, this is a two-field database compressed into a single number, a remarkably efficient solution for a civilization operating primarily through oral transmission and ritual memory.

This functionality is supported by the observation that divine numbers appear not only in mythological texts but also in Mesopotamian administrative documents (contracts, temple records, royal inscriptions), suggesting a widespread, non-esoteric use of this coding system (Leick, 1991).

6.3. Individual Attributions and Their Internal Logic

6.3.1. An / Anu – Number 60: Supreme Imperiality

An, the supreme deity of the Sumerian pantheon, holds the number 60, the highest value in the series and the base of the Mesopotamian numerical system. His title *lugal kurkurra* (“king of all lands,” plural) distinguishes him explicitly from a simple *lugal* (king of a single domain) and indicates sovereignty over multiple domains simultaneously, corresponding precisely to the rank of emperor in the proposed hierarchy. Notably, the Sumerians constructed their entire sexagesimal system around this number, whose legacy persists today in the 60 minutes of an hour, the 60 seconds of a minute, and the 360 degrees of a circle (Neugebauer, 1957).

6.3.2. Enlil and Marduk – Number 50: The Code of Kingship

Enlil, the executive ruler of Earth, holds the number 50 and the explicit title “King of the Earth” (*lugal kalam-ma*) in Mesopotamian texts, a direct confirmation of the proposed interpretation. The most striking example of the operation of this code, however, is the Babylonian transfer of power: when Marduk replaced Enlil as supreme deity of the pantheon, the transfer of authority was ritualized through the assignment of fifty names to Marduk, recorded in the *Enuma Elish* (Tablet VII). These fifty names do not appear to be a simple accumulation of honorific epithets, but rather the transfer of numerical code 50 (the rank of kingship) from Enlil to Marduk, performed through a ritual procedure in which name multiplication substitutes for the transfer of title. This interpretation is supported by Lambert’s studies (1964) on the performative function of names in Mesopotamian thought: naming was simultaneously a legal and ontological act, not a decorative gesture.

6.3.3. Enki – Number 40: The Grand Prince and Its Traces in Sacred Texts

Enki, god of wisdom and fresh waters, holds the number 40, corresponding to the rank of grand prince. This attribution is reflected in the remarkable recurrence of the number 40 in the sacred texts of traditions deriving from the Mesopotamian cultural matrix, such as the Biblical tradition: the 40 days and nights of the Flood, the 40 years of the Israelites’ wandering in the desert, the 40-year reign periods of kings, Moses’ 40 days on Mount Sinai, and Jesus’ 40 days in the wilderness. These recurrences are not, in the proposed interpretation, coincidences or vague cultural generalizations, but reflections of the specific

importance of Enki (the creator and protector of humanity in Sumerian mythology) in the cultural memory of later traditions influenced by Mesopotamia.

From the perspective of the history of mathematics, number 40 represents two-thirds of 60, a fraction with geometric and astronomical significance, reinforcing the idea that Sumerian numerical attributions were not arbitrary but embedded in a coherent mathematical cosmology (Neugebauer, 1957).

6.3.4. Nanna – Number 30 and Its Astronomical Justification

Nanna, the Moon god, holds the number 30, a choice whose astronomical justification is transparent: the synodic lunar cycle lasts approximately 29.5 days, conventionally rounded to 30. Far from contradicting the hierarchical interpretation, this correspondence supports it: in Mesopotamian thought, astronomy and theology were not separate domains, and the assignment of a number simultaneously relevant astronomically and hierarchically reflects this synthesis. Jacobsen (1976) extensively documents the unity of astronomical phenomena and divine ranking in Sumerian religious thought.

6.3.5. Utu, Inanna, and Hierarchical Mobility

The Sumerian Utu, initially assigned the ducal rank of 20, later becoming Marduk in Babylon, receives through the ceremony of the fifty names the royal code 50, representing a clearly documented upward mobility within the divine hierarchy. Inanna/Ishtar, with the number 15 or the equivalent rank of duchess, functions in mythological texts as a high-level operational authority but remains subordinate to the higher hierarchy, corresponding precisely to ducal status: command authority without sovereign autonomy.

6.4. Divine Numbers as Infrastructure of Ritual Communication

If divine numbers encode administrative ranks within the pantheon, then rituals addressed to specific deities involve a communication protocol calibrated to the hierarchical status of the recipient. Communication with the divine is therefore not homogeneous but stratified, with the numerical code of the invoked deity determining the form, scope, and content of ritual interaction.

This logic is also identifiable in other traditions. In Greco-Egyptian magic (*Papyri Graecae Magicae*), hierarchical invocations of divine entities follow a similar logic of protocol calibration (Betz, 1986). In Vedic Brahmanical tradition, mantras addressed to different deities follow strict prosodic and ritual protocols determined by the deity's rank (Renou, 1955). In both cases, number or numerical epithet functions as a protocol identifier, equivalent to an ancient formal addressing system.

6.5. Persistence of Numerical Codes in Later Traditions

One of the strongest arguments in favor of the proposed interpretation is the documented persistence of Sumerian numerical codes in later religious and cultural traditions. This continuity is not merely historical, but functional, as the numbers define the geometry of pantheons through archetypal patterns. For example:

- 1 represents a single deity, usually the supreme one.
- 2 symbolizes a divine couple, such as divine twins present in many religions.
- 3 signifies a triadic ruling structure (e.g., Vedic triads, Hindu Trimurti, Christian Trinity, Sumerian triad An–Enlil–Enki, Babylonian triad Ea–Marduk–Ishtar).

- 4 symbolizes a divine family consisting of parents and offspring.

This logic of numerically expressed hierarchy presents structural analogies with the Kabbalistic system of the Sefirot (the ten divine emanations), likely mediated through Jewish–Mesopotamian contact during the Babylonian exile (Scholem, 1974). The Pythagorean numerical system may itself be interpreted as a Greek philosophical reworking of these transmitted Eastern traditions (Burkert, 1972). Moreover, the number 60 and its multiples remain active in Greek astronomy through Hipparchus and Ptolemy, ensuring the continuity of the Mesopotamian numerical system in Western scientific tradition up to the present day.

7. Logography and the Alphabet – From Sacred Symbol to Instrument of Secular Communication

7.1. Writing as a Technology of the Sacred

The origins of writing are, across all traditions that preserve memory of its emergence, inextricably linked to the divine. Among the Sumerians, writing was regarded as a gift of the god Enki; in Egypt, hieroglyphs were *medu netjer* (“words of the god”) attributed to Thoth; among the Phoenicians and Hebrews, the alphabet was likewise associated with divine revelation. This cross-cultural convergence is not incidental: the earliest writing systems emerged in temple and ritual contexts, functioning initially as instruments of communication with the divine and as means of preserving sacred knowledge, before evolving into administrative and commercial technologies (Schmandt-Besserat, 1992).

The Greek term *hieroglyphica* (“sacred carving”) explicitly preserves this origin, but the same logic applies to Sumerian cuneiform, whose early signs were pictograms with predominantly ritual significance, as well as to the Proto-Sinaitic script, the earliest known alphabet, whose letters derive from symbols with direct religious semantic load.

7.2. Hieroglyphs and Cuneiform: The Institutionalization of the Sacred Symbol

Egyptian hieroglyphs represent the most elaborate logographic system in which the sacred and communication remain explicitly unified. Each sign functioned simultaneously as image, sound, and concept, a tripartite semiotic density reflecting the Egyptian belief that the name of a thing contained its ontological essence (Wilkinson, 1992). Writing did not merely describe reality; it constituted it: temple and funerary inscriptions were not informational texts but ritual acts with causal efficacy in the divine realm.

Sumerian cuneiform follows a well-documented evolutionary trajectory: from the proto-cuneiform pictograms of Uruk (c. 3400–3000 BCE), mostly symbols of goods and deities, to the abstract signs of classical cuneiform, in which iconic origins are almost entirely lost (Nissen, Damerow & Englund, 1993). This progressive abstraction marks the transition from sacred symbol to administrative tool: as writing became more efficient as a recording technology, it simultaneously lost its iconic transparency and, with it, the visible connection to the sacred that originally structured it.

7.3. The Alphabet: Compression of the Sacred Symbol into Phonetic Sign

The most significant transition in the history of writing, the emergence of the Phoenician consonantal alphabet around the 11th century BCE, derived from Proto-Sinaitic (c. 1850–1550 BCE), represents the moment when the sacred symbol was compressed to the minimal unit of phonetic sign. This compression, of extraordinary technological efficiency, simultaneously entailed a structural secularization: the letter no longer represented a thing, but a sound.

Yet behind each letter of the original Semitic alphabet lay a symbol with full semantic meaning (Diringer, 1948):

- Aleph – ox: power, leadership, primordial divinity. The letter form preserves the ox head with horns, rotated during abstraction.
- Beth – house: domestic space, shelter, temple. The letter reproduces the floor plan of a house.
- Gimel – camel or throwing stick: movement, connection between points.
- Dalet – door: threshold, liminality, access between spaces.
- Mem – water: primordial chaos, creative potential.
- Nun – fish: aquatic life, underworld existence.
- Ayin – eye: vision, knowledge, divine surveillance.

Each of these primordial images belonged to the symbolic-religious vocabulary analyzed in previous chapters. Aleph (ox/bull) was, as shown earlier, the symbol of the leading deity. Beth (house/temple) represented the ritual space of divine communication. Ayin (eye) functioned as one of the key symbols of chthonic or supervising divinities, appearing from the Eye of Ra and the Eye of Horus in Egypt to the Watchers in Hebrew tradition and the divine eye in Christianity or at the top of the Masonic pyramid.

The Phoenician alphabet, later adapted by the Greeks in the 9th century BCE with the addition of vowels and by the Hebrews in its Hebrew form, thus represents a compressed archaeology of sacred symbolism: each letter is a religious symbol disguised as a phonetic sign, a hieroglyph reduced to its sonic skeleton (Cross, 1954).

7.4. The Secularization of Writing and Its Paradox

The fundamental paradox of this evolution lies in the fact that the efficiency of the alphabet as an everyday communication tool gradually obscured its original function as a protocol of contact. Although letters today are used for transactions and profane messages, their structure preserves the “digital imprint” of earlier systems designed for communication with divine entities.

This observation supports the central argument of the article: writing was not invented as a simple method of data storage, but as an interface technology. The sacred symbol did not disappear with secularization; rather, it was compressed and stratified into the morphology of the alphabet. Each letter thus remains a code unit within a complex signaling system originally designed to ensure precision and stability in communication between the human plane and the entities believed to govern the order of the world.

8. Conclusions: The Symbol as a Bridge between Dimensions

The analytical trajectory followed in this article has been guided by a single overarching thesis: that ancient symbolism should not be understood as aesthetic ornament or as an expression of presumed pre-scientific naivety, but rather as a coherent communication system with internal logic, transmissible structure, and long-term social functionality. The reconstruction of this system, from its emergence in the shamanic practices of small-scale societies, through its religious institutionalization, and up to its final compression into the alphabetic letter, reveals a remarkable continuity of underlying communicative intent, beyond the diversity of cultural forms it has taken.

In ancient societies, communication with invisible entities (spirits, deities, cosmic forces) was conceived as fundamentally non-verbal. The divine entity, regardless of its ontological status, was not regarded as an agent of articulated language, but rather as an instance that conveyed information through indirect channels. Within this framework, the symbol (whether number, zoomorphic figure, astral configuration, ritual gesture, or spatial orientation) functioned as a protocol mediating between incommensurable ontological domains, condensing into a perceptible form information believed to be impossible to transmit through ordinary discursive language. The Sumerian numerical system encoded divine rank into stable identifiers; star symbols with N rays functioned as astro-theological markers of deities; zoomorphic symbols translated cosmological functions into the vocabulary of local pastoral economies; and oppositions such as bird versus serpent organized cosmological affiliation into immediately recognizable visual schemes. In all these cases, the symbol was not a decorative substitute for meaning, but the very infrastructure of sacred communication.

From the perspective of communication theory, the essential feature of these systems is not their mythological complexity, but their informational density: each symbol operated simultaneously across multiple semantic levels (cosmological, hierarchical, moral, ritual), accessible in differentiated ways depending on the initiate's level of knowledge. The same sign conveyed a unified image to the uninitiated, while encoding additional layers of meaning for the initiated. In modern terms, this constitutes a multi-layered communication system with graded access, an architecture of information security applied to the sacred domain, employed across many millennia.

The impact of this “language of symbols” on human cognition and later social structures is difficult to overstate. The Sumerian sexagesimal system, directly derived from numerical codification of divine rank, still structures the measurement of time and angles today. Alphabetic letters in Western writing systems preserve within their morphology religious symbols over three millennia old. Liturgical gestures in contemporary religious practices reproduce recoded shamanic invocation protocols transmitted through at least a hundred generations. The fundamental moral oppositions of Western thought (good/evil, light/darkness, right/left) are direct inheritances of the ontological dualism of the Mesopotamian pantheon, transmitted through the theological frameworks of the Abrahamic traditions.

This analysis does not seek to adjudicate the ontological reality of the entities with which ancient peoples believed they were communicating through these symbolic systems. That question lies, by its very nature, beyond the methodological scope of historical and anthropological inquiry. What can reasonably be affirmed is that the symbolic system through which this communication was mediated was real, coherent, and structurally influential: it shaped social organization, structured knowledge, legitimized authority, and provided existential meaning for entire communities over timescales far exceeding those of any modern institution. In this demonstrable effectiveness lies, regardless of ultimate interpretation, the enduring significance of the symbolic project of antiquity as an attempt to construct a communicative bridge between human societies and the divine realm.

References

- Beard, M., North, J., & Price, S. (1998). *Religions of Rome* (Vol. I). Cambridge University Press.
- Betz, H. D. (Ed.). (1986). *The Greek magical papyri in translation, including the Demotic spells*. University of Chicago Press.
- Black, J., & Green, A. (1992). *Gods, demons and symbols of ancient Mesopotamia: An illustrated dictionary*. British Museum Press.
- Boyce, M. (1975). *A history of Zoroastrianism* (Vol. I). Brillant.
- Boyer, P. (2001). *Religion explained: The evolutionary origins of religious thought*. Basic Books.
- Burkert, W. (1972). *Lore and science in ancient Pythagoreanism* (E. L. Minar, Jr., Trans.). Harvard University Press.
- Burkert, W. (1979). *Structure and history in Greek mythology and ritual*. University of California Press.
- Burkert, W. (1987). *Ancient mystery cults*. Harvard University Press.
- Chircu, C.-G. (2017). *Secretele zeilor* [The Secrets of the Gods].
- Cross, F. M. (1954). The evolution of the Proto-Canaanite alphabet. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, 134, 15–24.
- Dalley, S. (Trans.). (1989). *Myths from Mesopotamia: Creation, the flood, Gilgamesh, and others*. Oxford University Press.
- Diringer, D. (1948). *The alphabet: A key to the history of mankind*. Hutchinson.
- Dunbar, R. I. M. (1992). Neocortex size as a constraint on group size in primates. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 22(6), 469–493.
- Durkheim, E. (1912). *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life: The Totemic System in Australia*. Felix Alcan.
- Eliade, M. (1958). *Patterns in comparative religion* (R. Sheed, Trans.). Sheed and Ward.
- Eliade, M. (1964). *Shamanism: Archaic techniques of ecstasy* (W. R. Trask, Trans.). Princeton University Press.
- Eliade, M. (1972). *Zalmoxis, the vanishing god: Comparative studies in the religions and folklore of Dacia and Eastern Europe* (W. R. Trask, Trans.). University of Chicago Press.
- Frazer, J. G. (1922). *The golden bough: A study in magic and religion* (Abridged ed.). Macmillan.
- Goody, J. (1986). *The logic of writing and the organization of society*. Cambridge University Press.
- Grof, S. (1988). *The adventure of self-discovery: Dimensions of consciousness and new perspectives in psychotherapy and inner exploration*. State University of New York Press.
- Handy, E. S. C. (1927). *Polynesian religion*. Bernice P. Bishop Museum.
- Heissig, W. (1980). *The religions of Mongolia* (G. Samuel, Trans.). University of California Press.
- Herodotus (1998). *The histories* (R. Waterfield, Trans.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published ca. 430 BCE).
- Jacobsen, T. (1976). *The treasures of darkness: A history of Mesopotamian religion*. Yale University Press.
- Janzen, J. M. (1992). *Ngoma: Discourses of healing in central and southern Africa*. University of California Press.
- Jung, C. G. (1963). *Memories, dreams, reflections* (A. Jaffé, Ed.; R. Winston & C. Winston, Trans.). Pantheon Books.
- Jung, C. G. (1964). *Man and his symbols*. Doubleday.
- Jung, C. G. (1968). *The archetypes and the collective unconscious* (R. F. C. Hull, Trans.; 2nd ed., Collected Works, Vol. 9, Part 1). Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C. G. (2009). *The red book: Liber novus*. W. W. Norton & Co.
- Kalweit, H. (1988). *Dreamtime and inner space: The world of the shaman* (W. Wünsche, Trans.). Shambhala.
- Kieckhefer, R. (1990). *Magic in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kim, T. (1998). *Korean shamanism — Muism*. Jimoondang.
- Koch-Westenholz, U. (1995). *Mesopotamian divination*. Museum Tusculanum Press.

- Lambert, W. G. (1964). *Babylonian wisdom literature*. Clarendon Press.
- Leick, G. (1991). *A dictionary of ancient Near Eastern mythology*. Routledge.
- Levi-Strauss, C. (1963). *Structural anthropology* (C. Jacobson and B. G. Schoepf, Trans.). Basic Books.
- Lewis-Williams, D. (2002). *The mind in the cave: Consciousness and the origins of art*. Thames and Hudson.
- Maenchen-Helfen, O. J. (1973). *The world of the Huns: Studies in their history and culture* (M. Knight, Ed.). University of California Press.
- Merkur, D. (1985). *Becoming half hidden: Shamanism and initiation among the Inuit*. Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Moussaieff, A., Rimmerman, N., Bregman, T., Straiker, A., Felder, C. C., Shoham, S., Kashman, Y., Huang, S. M., Kim, H. I., Vogel, Z., Kunos, G., Bhatt, D. L., Mackie, K., Walker, J. M., & Mechoulam, R. (2008). Incense acetate, an incense component, elicits psychoactivity by activating TRPV3 channels in the brain. *The FASEB Journal*, 22(8), 3024–3034.
- Neher, A. (1962). A physiological explanation of unusual behavior in ceremonies involving drums. *Human Biology*, 34(2), 151–160.
- Neugebauer, O. (1957). *The exact sciences in antiquity* (2nd ed.). Brown University Press.
- Nicholson, H. B. (1971). Religion in pre-Hispanic central Mexico. In R. Wauchope and G. F. Ekholm (Eds.), *Handbook of Middle American Indians* (Vol. 10, pp. 395–446). University of Texas Press.
- Nida, E. A., & Taber, C. R. (1969). *The theory and practice of translation*. Brillant.
- Nissen, H. J., Damerow, P., & Englund, R. K. (1993). *Archaic bookkeeping: Early writing and techniques of economic administration in the ancient Near East* (P. Larsen, Trans.). University of Chicago Press.
- Ovid. (2004). *Metamorphoses* (D. Raeburn, Trans.). Penguin Books. (Original work published ca. 8 CE).
- Pinch, G. (2002). *Egyptian mythology: A guide to the gods, goddesses, and traditions of ancient Egypt*. Oxford University Press.
- Price, N. S. (2002). *The Viking way: Religion and war in late Iron Age Scandinavia*. Uppsala University.
- Redford, D. B. (1992). *Egypt, Canaan, and Israel in ancient times*. Princeton University Press.
- Reichel-Dolmatoff, G. (1975). *The shaman and the jaguar: A study of narcotic drugs among the Indians of Colombia*. Temple: University Press.
- Renou, L. (1955). *Vedic and Paninean Studies* (Vol. I). E. de Boccard.
- Rochberg, F. (2004). *The heavenly writing: Divination, horoscopy, and astronomy in Mesopotamian culture*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rouget, G. (1985). *Music and trance: A theory of the relations between music and possession* (B. Biebuyck, Trans.). University of Chicago Press.
- Ruck, C. A. P., Staples, B. D., & Heinrich, C. (2001). *The apples of Apollo: Pagan and Christian mysteries of the Eucharist*. Carolina Academic Press.
- Russo, E. B., Jiang, H.-E., Li, X., Sutton, A., Carboni, A., del Bianco, F., Mandolino, G., Potter, D. J., Shi, Y.-X., Zhao, L., Liu, S.-X., Yu, Y.-F., Luo, Y.-F., Han, G.-B., Snyder, J. A., Stevens, J. F., Whiting, P. K., Montali, E., Russo, J., ... Li, C.-S. (2008). Phytochemical and genetic analyses of ancient cannabis from Central Asia. *Journal of Experimental Botany*, 59(15), 4171–4182.
- Schmandt-Besserat, D. (1992). *Before writing: Vol. 1. From counting to cuneiform*. University of Texas Press.
- Scholem, G. (1974). *Kabbalah*. Keter Publishing.
- Sherratt, A. (1995). Alcohol and its alternatives: Symbol and substance in pre-industrial cultures. In J. Goodman, P. E. Lovejoy, and A. Sherratt (Eds.), *Consuming habits: Drugs in history and anthropology* (pp. 11–46). Routledge.
- Shirokogoroff, S. M. (1935). *Psychomental complex of the Tungus*. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.
- Smith, M. S. (2001). *The origins of Biblical monotheism: Israel's polytheistic background and the Ugaritic texts*. Oxford University Press.

Thomas, K. (1971). *Religion and the decline of magic: Studies in popular beliefs in sixteenth and seventeenth century England*. Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Turner, V. (1969). *The ritual process: Structure and anti-structure*. Aldine.

Wasson, R. G. (1968). *Soma: Divine mushroom of immortality*. Harcourt, Brace & World.

Weber, M. (1922). *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft: Grundriss der verstehenden Soziologie* [Economy and Society: Outline of Interpretive Sociology]. Mohr.

Wilkinson, R. H. (1992). *Reading Egyptian art: A hieroglyphic guide to ancient Egyptian painting and sculpture*. Thames and Hudson.