HECATE: A TRANSFUNCTIONAL
GODDESS IN THE *THEOGONY*?

DEBORAH BOEDEKER

College of the Holy Cross

Halfway through the *Theogony*, just before the birth of Zeus is de-scribed, comes the enigmatic "Hymn to Hecate" (411–52), a remarkable and much contested passage which provides our earliest testimony for the goddess.[1] In contrast to the usual picture of a sinister, chthonic Hecate associated with the dead, the moon, crossroads, torches, dog sacrifices,[2] the Hesiodic figure can be called "a healthy, independent and open-minded goddess" with "universal" powers.[3]

---

[1] Papers dealing with aspects of the material in this article were delivered at the University of Chicago on October 12, 1982, the annual meeting of the American Philological Association in Philadelphia on December 30, 1982, and at Wheaton College on May 6, 1983. I would like to thank my colleagues at those places for their suggestions—not that they necessarily agreed with my conclusions—especially Professors J. Clay, A. Momigliano, C. P. Segal, E. Stehle, and D. Wender. I am especially grateful to G. Nagy, who commented on an earlier version of this paper, and to the anonymous referees for *TAPA*, who provided several useful suggestions. Finally, I want to thank the College of the Holy Cross for a Batchelor (Ford) research fellowship in the summer of 1982, which enabled me to work on this material.

On the use of the term "hymn" see P. Walcot, "Hesiod's Hymns to the Muses, Aphrodite, Styx and Hecate," *SO* 34 (1958) 5–14, at p. 13. M. L. West, *Hesiod Theogony* (Oxford 1966) 276, considers the passage "not so much a hymn as a gospel." For the *Theogony* passage as our earliest attestation of Hecate, see T. Kraus, *Hekate* (Heidelberg 1960) 58. I shall refer to these and the following works with the author's name only: M. B. Arthur, "Cultural Strategies in Hesiod's *Theogony*: Law, Family, Society," *Arethusa* 15 (1982) 63–82; G. Dumézil, *Mythe et Épopée* 1 (Paris 1968) [= Dumézil 1968]; G. Dumézil, *Archaic Roman Religion*, translated by P. Krapp (Chicago 1970) [= Dumézil 1970]; E. B. Lyle, "Dumézil's Three Functions and Indo-European Cosmic Structure," *History of Religions* 22 (1982) 25–44; P. Marquardt, "A Portrait of Hecate," *AJP* 102 (1981) 243–60; B. Sergent, "Les Trois Fonctions des Indo-Européens dans la Grèce ancienne: bilan critique," *Annales E. S. C.* (no vol.) 1979, 1155–86 [= Sergent 1979]; B. Sergent, "L'Utilisation de la trifonctionnalité d'origine indo-européenne chez les auteurs grecs classiques," *Arethusa* 13 (1980), 233–78 [= Sergent 1980]; F. Solmsen, *Hesiod and Aeschylus* (Ithaca 1949).

[2] See E. Rohde, *Psyche*, translated from the eighth edition by W. B. Hillis (London 1925) 297–98 and 590–95, with copious notes. For an illustration of Hecate eating the dead, see E. D. T. Vermeule, *Aspects of Death in Early Greek Art and Poetry* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1979) 109.

[3] West 277.

The honors attributed to Hecate here are unique when compared to other descriptions of the goddess, unique also in the *Theogony* itself, where no other god enjoys such a broad range of benevolent influence. Indeed, the extraordinary tone of the Hecate passage has led to widely divergent interpretations of its role in the *Theogony*. Many commentators, including Wilamowitz, Jacoby, and Kirk, have bracketed the description of Hecate on rather tenuous philological or theological grounds.[4] Others, however, use the passage as a basis for theories about the composition of the entire poem. Mazon, for example, without citing any evidence apart from the passage itself, declares that Hecate must have been the chief goddess of Hesiod's village of Ascra, and that the *Theogony* must have been composed for a festival there.[5] Van Groningen reaches a similar conclusion, and welcomes the poet's personal devotion to this goddess as a balance for his otherwise detached theological tone.[6] Wade-Gery, on the other hand, believes that the *Theogony* is the poem with which Hesiod won a prize at the funeral games of Amphidamas on Euboea, an event mentioned in *Works and Days* 654–59.[7] West accepts this theory and supports it by referring to the classes of people helped by Hecate (*Theogony* 430–42): these are, he suggests, the very men who would have been present at the games.[8] Moreover, West agrees with the common opinion that Hecate came to Greece from Asia Minor (Caria), as argued at length by Kraus.[9] Since the poet of *Works and Days* claims that his father emigrated from Asia Minor (Aeolian Kymē) to Boeotia, West believes that Hesiod's own family may have introduced the worship of the Asiatic Hecate into Boeotia.[10] In *Theogony* 411–52, West concludes, the poet is commending to his audience his own favorite goddess.

[4] F. Jacoby, *Hesiodi Theogonia* (Berlin 1930) 162–63; U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Der Glaube der Hellenen* (Berlin 1931) vol. 1, 172; G. S. Kirk, "The Structure and Aim of the *Theogony*," *Hésiode et son influence*, Entretiens Hardt sur l'antiquité classique 7 (Geneva 1962) 61–95, at p. 80. West, 277–80, discusses and convincingly refutes the arguments against authenticity on philological and religious grounds.

[5] P. Mazon, *Hésiode* (Paris 1928) 21–24.

[6] B. A. van Groningen, *La Composition littéraire archaïque grecque* (Amsterdam 1958) 269–70.

[7] H. T. Wade-Gery, "Hesiod," *Phoenix* 3 (1949) 81–93, at pp. 85–87. (This assumption pertains to the whole *Theogony*, not just the Hecate passage as stated by Marquardt 253, note 14.) P. Walcot, "Allusion in Hesiod," *REG* 73 (1960) 36–39, differs with Wade-Gery and suggests that the *hymnos* mentioned in *WD* 654–59 was Hesiod's version of the story of Helen and the beginning of the Trojan War.

[8] West 45. But see below, pp. 82–83, for discussion of an inappropriate conclusion about the Hecate passage which West develops from this theory.

[9] Kraus, esp. 26–54.

[10] West 277–78, following F. Schwenn, *Die Theogonie des Hesiodos* (Heidelberg 1934) 100 (not cited by West). Solmsen, 51–52, note 169, is duly skeptical: "Whether it is correct to infer that Hesiod's family had a special attachment to Hecate . . . is more than I can say. . . ."

Arguments explaining Hecate's special status in the poem in terms of Hesiod's beliefs or family history should be advanced with great caution. Even the theory that Hecate originated in Asia has been seriously questioned.[11] In any case, as Solmsen realizes, we can know little about the personal religious beliefs of a traditional poet.[12] We should be equally cautious in interpreting passages in the *Theogony* with "autobiographical" references in the *Works and Days*. Rather than explain the Hecate passage with *ad hoc* or *ad hominem* arguments, I find it more productive to study it as part of the poem as a whole.[13] Hence in this paper I will discuss some of the patterns which underlie the "Hymn to Hecate," and from those patterns suggest the role of the passage in the *Theogony*.

What especially characterizes Hecate here is her broad range of *timai*—honors, powers, spheres of influence. First, she has a share of *timê* on earth, sea, and sky (412–14 and 426–28), the three realms of the universe visible to mortals (in contrast to Olympus and Tartarus, cf. 680–85, 839–43). Hecate's share in all these realms contrasts with the Homeric pattern whereby different parts of the universe are apportioned to different gods: Zeus gets the sky as his share of *timê*, Poseidon the sea, Hades the darkness, while earth and Olympus are shared among them (*Il.* 15.187–93). Despite the similarity of language, e.g., ἕκαστος δ' ἔμμορε τιμῆς (*Il.* 15.189) and ἡ δὲ . . . ἔμμορε τιμῆς (*Theog.* 414), these two passages present very different conceptions of *timê* in the universe. In the *Iliad* three brother gods divide their inheritance. Their *timai* are "powers" to be used actively in each sphere, and the general context implies a "zero-sum" concept of *timê*, leading to competition and resentment—here, to Poseidon's fearful resentment of Zeus' attempt to restrain him, since he is after all *homotimos* with his brother god (*Il.* 15.186). In the *Theogony* there is no such three-way division of powers: Zeus comes to dominate every sphere. Hecate, however, is freely awarded *timê* in three parts of the cosmos, first by the Titans in the old order, then by Zeus in the new. Her *timê* implies "honor" more than "power" and does not threaten or decrease the honor of the gods who have granted it to her; rather the contrary.[14] In turn, Hecate bestows

[11] W. Berg, "Hecate: Greek or 'Anatolian'?" *Numen* 21 (1974) 128–40. Berg argues that the evidence for Hecate in Caria is generally much later than that on the Greek mainland, and that Hecate's prominence in Roman times in the Carian town of Lagina, where she was worshipped as *Soteira Megiste Epiphanestate*, comes from her assimilation there to Roma herself. Berg's own suggestion that Hecate may be equated with the *Ipemedeja* attested on a Linear B tablet from Pylos (Tn 316), however, seems equally tenuous.

[12] See note 10 above.

[13] I am here in substantial agreement with the principles stated by Arthur 80, note 8: ". . . the focus of the following analysis of the poem is predicated upon a view which regards the text as a self-referential system, a structure of ideas and of narrative progressions which, as it evolves, generates the context for meaning."

[14] P. Philippson, "Genealogie als mythische Form," *SO Fasc. Supplet.* 7 (Oslo 1936) 22: "An der Grösse und Machtfülle der also Belehnten erweist sich die Grösse und Machtfülle des

timê and *olbos* on those she favors among "men on earth" (416–20). With
her beneficent and pervasive *timê*, Hecate unites the spatial divisions of
the universe, and also links the mortal and immortal races.

In addition to receiving honor throughout space, Hecate also unites
past and present time with her influence. "From the beginning" (*ex archês*)
she got *timê* from the Titans (421–26); "from the beginning" is she *kouro-
trophos* (452). And now, not only does Zeus allow her *timai* to continue
undiminished in his regime, but he even increases them (423–28). As is
well known, in the *Theogony* Aphrodite also gets a share of *timê* "from the
beginning" (203–4), i.e., from her birth, before the reign of Zeus. Aphro-
dite's *timai* implicitly continue into the present, but unlike Hecate she is
not honored or acknowledged by Zeus. Styx, on the other hand, is singled
out for unique *timê* by Zeus (399–401); her special honors do not begin
"from the beginning" before his regime (395). Only Hecate in the *Theog-
ony* has *timê* both "from the beginning" (from the Titans) and from Zeus.
In other ways too her *timai* are less restricted than the important but lim-
ited spheres of Aphrodite and Styx.

Nowhere is the breadth of Hecate's honor more apparent or more
unique than in the range of mortals whom she is able to help. The
choice of occupations in this category has never been fully explained by
commentators. According to West, Hecate helps five classes in particular:
kings (434, 430), men at war (431–33), cavalrymen (439), athletes (435–
38), sea-fishermen (440–42).[15] West's conviction that Hesiod composed
the *Theogony* for the funeral games of Amphidamas, and that the poet
is here "evangelizing" his favorite goddess to those present at the games,
leads him to overlook Hecate's relationship to other kinds of people who
are mentioned as well.[16]

In a recent article Patricia Marquardt proposes a longer and more
accurate list of those helped by Hecate: princes, politicians, warriors, ath-
letes, horsemen, fishermen, herdsmen, *kouroi*.[17] It will be noted that Mar-
quardt divides West's "kings" into two categores, "princes" (presumably
the "honored kings *en dikêi*," 434) and "politicians" (those "conspicuous *en
agorêi*," 430). Like most recent editors, West places line 434 before line 430

Belehnenden. . . ." See also Solmsen 51–52, and von Groningen (above, note 6) 268: "Les
dieux n'abandonnent rien; ils partagent. Hécate non plus abandonne rien; elle partage."
15 West 45.
16 West's theory about the first performance of the *Theogony* leads him to make a par-
ticularly misleading statement about the Hecate passage: "[Hesiod] adds that she increases
flocks and herds, and nurtures κοῦροι, if she chooses to, but he does not say, 'she is a good
goddess for herdsmen,' as for the other five classes of men" (West 45). Actually the poet
says that Hecate is "good" (ἐσθλή) three times in the passage: for athletes (435), for horse-
men (439), and "for increasing the herds in the stables, together with Hermes" (444).
17 Marquardt 247.

in his text (a reading which Marquardt does not dispute),[18] thereby juxta-
posing the "princes" and "politicians," who are in the *Theogony* at least
better taken as one category than two. This is clear from a celebrated pas-
sage earlier in the poem, where kings (βασιλῆες, 88) perform their works
in the agora (ἀγορῆφι, 89, cf. ἀγορεύων, 86) by giving straight judgments
(δίκῃσιν, 86); for this a king is held in reverence (αἰδοῖ, 92, cf. βασιλεῦσι
παρ᾽ αἰδοίοισι, 434) and is conspicuous (μετὰ δὲ πρέπει, 92, cf. μεταπρέπει,
430) among the assembled people.

  Both Marquardt and West omit from their lists one of Hecate's most
impressive functions, the one first mentioned of all her many dealings with
mortals: her universal role in sacrifice (416–20). Although this role is
indeed separated from the others by some eight lines, it is closely con-
nected with them in sense and in diction. The goddess willingly (πρόφρων,
419, cf. προφρονέως, 433, as well as ἐθέλῃσιν, 430, and ἐθέλουσα, 443)
grants a favor (ὄλβον ὀπάζει, 420, cf. νίκην . . . ὀπάσαι, 433, and
ἄγρην . . . ὤπασε, 442) in response to prayer (εὐχάς, 419, cf. εὔχονται,
441).

  We can now list all the kinds of people helped by Hecate, in the
order in which they are presented:[19]

> (a) participants in correct sacrifice (416–20)
> (b) kings "in *dikê*" and "in the agora" (434, 430)
> (c) warriors in battle (431–33)
> (d) athletes in competition (435–38)
> (e) horsemen (439)
> (f) sea-fishermen, who pray to Hecate and Poseidon (440–43)
> (g) herdsmen, helped by Hecate and Hermes (444–47)
> (h) *kouroi* (450–52)

Hecate's sphere of influence is very broad, but it does not include all occu-
pations mentioned in the Hesiodic poems, e.g., farmers, bards, merchants,
craftsmen.[20] Further, as Marquardt notes, the roles suggested here, with
the exception of *kourotrophos*, which has analogues in Hecate's ritual[21]

---

[18] West here follows Schoemann, Rzach, and Jacoby, among others. *Pace* F. Pfister, "Die
Hekate-Episode in Hesiods Theogonie," *Philologus* 84 (1928) 1–9, at p. 2, it is clear that
line 434 is out of place in the manuscripts. West 285 plausibly argues that its misplace-
ment was due to the homoearchon ἐν τε . . . /ἐν τ᾽.

[19] I follow West's text for the position of line 434. West also places line 439 (horsemen)
between 433 (warriors) and 435 (athletes); this change from the manuscripts does not
seem necessary to me, but in any case it is immaterial to my argument about the order of
classes helped by Hecate.

[20] For Hesiodic references to farmers, see *Works and Days*, *passim*; bards, *Theogony* 95,
Works and Days 26; merchants, *Works and Days* 646; craftsmen, *Works and Days* 25.

[21] Marquardt 244, note 2, quotes the scholiast on Aristophanes, *Wasps* 804, to the effect
that in Athens Hecate was commonly regarded as *kourotrophos*. See also Rohde, *op. cit.*

and iconography,[22] are not known to be associated with the goddess in other sources; conversely, her usual chthonic characteristics are conspicuously absent. What has motivated Hecate's range of influence in the *Theogony*?

Remarkably, these eight categories are presented in what might be called canonical Indo-European order, according to the tripartite system of "functions" proposed by Georges Dumézil. This scheme, by now familiar if controversial, is a system of stratification that Dumézil applies to human and divine spheres, consisting of a hierarchical order of social roles. According to Dumézil, tripartition is primarily an ideology rather than a description of actual social structures, a "means of analyzing, of interpreting the forces which ensure the course of the world and the lives of men."[23]

The first and most important function is sovereignty, which may be divided into two parts: magical-religious and legal-contractual authority as reflected for example by the Vedic gods Varuṇa and Mitra respectively. Correspondingly, the first human groups associated with Hecate in the *Theogony* passage are (a) sacrificers and (b) kings–judges.[24]

The second function in the tripartite scheme is physical force, especially the work of the warrior. In the Hecate passage, this aspect of society is reflected in (c) warriors, (d) athletes, and (e) horsemen, all of whom would be part of the warrior class in archaic Greek society. The Funeral

---

(above, note 2) 322, note 91, quoting an inscription from Larisa where a dedication is made to Hecate ὑπὲρ παιδός (*Ath. Mitt.* 11.450).

[22] Hecate is apparently represented as a *kourotrophos* of Zeus on the east frieze of her late Hellenistic temple at Lagina, where she is shown giving Cronus the stone in place of the infant Zeus—the role played by Gaia in *Theogony* 485–86. See Kraus 46.

[23] Dumézil 1968, 15. For an introduction to Dumézil's work, with bibliography and analysis of his theories, see C. S. Littleton, *The New Comparative Mythology* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 1973²), esp. 7–15. The tripartite system does seem to be reflected in an attested social structure in the case of the three Aryan castes in Indic society: Brahmans (priests), Kṣatriyas (warriors), and Vaiçyas (food-producers). Usually, however, tripartism is found in more abstract form, such as in canonical groups of gods who embody each of the three functions: Mitra-Varuṇa, Indara, the Nasatyas in a fourteenth-century Hittite-Hurrian oath at Boghazkoy; the pre-Capitoline triad Jupiter, Mars, Quirinus at Rome; the Scandinavian triad Odhinn, Thor, Freyr worshipped together at Uppsala. Cf. Sergent 1979, 1155–56. In addition to such groups of gods, tripartite ideology is often attested in myths or mythologized history. In Greek myths, where this pattern is relatively infrequent, the most salient example must be the Judgment of Paris, where Hera offers royal sovereignty, Athena military victory, and Aphrodite marriage to the beautiful Helen. Cf. Dumézil 1968, 580–86.

[24] The Varuṇa-Mitra or religious-judicial division of the first function which I discern here gains further support from a study of *Theogony* 77–103 by C. P. Roth, "The Kings and the Muses in Hesiod's *Theogony*," *TAPA* 106 (1976) 331–38, esp. 333, where the author proposes that *basilêes* in the *Theogony* may be "more judicial than royal" in the manner of early Indo-European judges. See also J. Duban, "Poets and Kings in the *Theogony* Invocation," *QUCC* 33 (1980) 7–21, esp. 13–18, for the role of kings as judges in this passage.

Games of Patroklos in *Iliad* 23, for example, show warriors competing as athletes. From the perspective of epic, as well as in his own experience, the poet would find the same social group using force in both battles and contests.

The third function in the Indo-European world-view, according to Dumézil, pertains to fertility, the production of food, and physical well-being. This function is represented by Hecate's involvement in (f) fishing,[25] (g) animal husbandry, and (h) nurturing the young. The omission of agriculture presents a serious problem, since farming was evidently an important means of food production in Hesiodic society, and is well attested in Greek epic as well. I can only speculate on the reasons why Hecate is not here connected with cultivators of the soil. Several hypotheses present themselves: possibly agriculture was precluded from the "Hymn to Hecate" because other figures (e.g. Demeter) were so prominently connected with this activity that Hecate's special relationship with farmers would have been conspicuously anomalous to Hesiod and his audience. Again, perhaps the well-known similarities between Hecate and Artemis in later sources reflect earlier cults in which Hecate was a kind of *potnia therôn*, connected with animal life but not with cultivated crops: this role has been suggested for Hecate most recently by Marquardt, who reviews the iconographic evidence for such a goddess (not necessarily to be identified with Hecate, however) in archaic Boeotia.[26] Whatever has motivated the absence of agriculture, Hecate's involvement with "third-function" activities is sufficiently secured by her powers over fishing, animal husbandry, and human offspring.

Thus it appears that all Hecate's dealings with mortals fall into the trifunctional Indo-European pattern of sovereignty, force, and productivity. It is unusual to find an Indo-European scheme in Greek epic, yet I believe that the structure can be proposed here with some confidence. First, the "tripartite" elements are not excerpted selectively: they account for all Hecate's roles with regard to human concerns. Moreover, these roles are even listed in "canonical" order (although the order of the three functions is by no means regular in all the contexts where Dumézil and his colleagues have identified tripartite structures). Finally, previous attempts to explain Hecate's functions have been incomplete, inaccurate, or inconclusive.

---

[25] W. Burkert, *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 1979) 96, recalls the importance of fishing as food-gathering, as attested in Greek religion and iconography. Elsewhere in Greek literature, e.g. Plato, *Laws* 823E, fishing (together with snaring land animals) is an ambivalent activity, not to be recommended because of its deviousness; cf. M. Detienne and J.-P. Vernant, *Les Ruses de l'intelligence: la métis des Grecs* (Paris 1974), esp. 32–39, for an analysis of this point of view. In the Hecate passage, however, fishing appears to imply only food-gathering, without the connotations of trickery: cf. esp. 442: ῥηιδίως ἄγρην κυδρὴ θεὸς ὤπασε πολλήν.
[26] Marquardt 253–59.

But why would this ideology prevail here in the *Theogony*? To some extent, it can be argued that Hesiodic poetry, more than Homeric, for example, preserves the archaic Indo-European world-view as a means of schematizing human society. Thus when the poet wants to say that Hecate can help all classes of people, the three functions provide (however unconsciously to the poet) a pattern for saying so. Tripartite structures have been discerned in a number of other Hesiodic passages. The best known example is an ingenious and controversial analysis of the myth of the Five Races in *Works and Days* 109–201, first suggested but later rescinded by Dumézil himself, then brilliantly developed by J.-P. Vernant. According to this synchronic interpretation of the myth, the Gold and Silver Races reflect positive and negative aspects of the first function; the Bronze and Heroic Races, negative and positive aspects of the second; the "mixed" Iron Race reflects the third function.[27] In addition, F. Vian finds reflections of the three functions in Hesiod, fr. 141 MW (the three sons of Zeus and Europa),[28] and A. Yoshida proposes a similar interpretation of fr. 203 MW, where Zeus gives *nous* to the Amythaontidae, *alkê* to the Aeacidae, and *ploutos* to the Atreidae.[29] These and other examples of tripartism in Hesiodic poetry are summarized and critically discussed by B. Sergent in a useful article;[30] Sergent concludes elsewhere that Hesiod is "one of the masters of tripartite thought in Greece."[31]

Not only Hesiodic poetry but other aspects of culture as well testify to an undercurrent of tripartism in Boeotia. Several passages in Pindar seem to reflect the same Indo-European scheme.[32] The foundation legends of both Orchomenos and Thebes follow a pattern in which representatives first of sovereignty (at Thebes, Cadmus and Harmonia), then of force (the Spartoi), and finally of fertility and physical well-being (Zethus and Amphion), combine to form the complete city, which only then receives its walls and its name.[33] At Thebes too Aphrodite was worshiped in three

[27] G. Dumézil, *Jupiter Mars Quirinus* 1 (Paris 1941) 259. J.-P. Vernant, "Le Mythe hésiodique des races, essai d'analyse structurale,"· *Rev. Hist. Rel.* 157 (1960) 21–54, now in *Mythe et pensée chez les Grecs* 1 (Paris 1969²) 19–47. Among the many other interpretations of this Hesiodic passage, I would single out especially that of P. Smith, "History and the Individual in Hesiod's Myth of the Five Races," *CW* 74 (1980) 145–63.

[28] F. Vian, *Les Origines de Thèbes. Cadmus et les Spartes* (Paris 1963) 241–42.

[29] A. Yoshida, "Survivances de la tripartition fonctionnelle en Grèce," *Rev. Hist. Rel.* 166 (1964) 21–38, at p. 38.

[30] Sergent 1979, 1161–62.

[31] Sergent 1980, 246.

[32] E.g. *Pythian* 3.44–55, the three types of remedies practiced by Asclepius: incantations, surgery, herbs. For bibliography, summary, and criticism see Sergent 1979, 1162–63, and Sergent 1980, 247–51.

[33] Vian (above, note 28) 243, and Vian, "La Triade des rois d'Orchomène: Etéoclès, Phlégyas, Minyas," *Hommages à Georges Dumézil* (Bruxelles 1960) 215–60, at pp. 215–24. See also Sergent 1979, 1167.

forms, according to Pausanias 9.16.3–4, with the names Ourania, Pan-
demos, and Apostrophia. Not only does the "Dumézilian" Vian interpret
the epithets as reflecting first, third, and second functions respectively,[34]
but even A. Schachter, in a recent survey of Boeotian cults which seems
quite innocent of Dumézilian bias, concludes that the titles refer to "reli-
gious sanction," "the common good," and "the defence of the state."[35]

Goddesses or other female figures reflecting the three Indo-European
functions are not uncommon elsewhere in Greek cult. A similar triple
Aphrodite is attested at Megalopolis in Arcadia (Pausanias 8.32.3), and at
Sparta Hera was worshipped as Argeia (a goddess of the Acropolis),
Hypercheiria (a protective goddess), and Aphrodite (connected with sex-
uality). In Athens, according to a fifth-century inscription, at the lesser
Panathenaia sacrifices were made to Athena Polias (of the Acropolis:
political sovereignty), Nike (victory in war), and Hygieia (physical well-
being).[36] Sergent cites these and more examples of transfunctional Greek
goddesses, together with new iconographic evidence which suggests that
the pattern goes back to Mycenaean times.[37]

Dumézil himself long ago recognized a "transfunctional" or "triva-
lent" goddess in the Indo-Iranian tradition, and similar figures have since
been identified in a number of other Indo-European cultures.[38] The
Iranian goddess *Aredvī Sūrā Anāhitā* "Moist Strong Immaculate," for
example, is invoked in *Yašt* 5 by priests (asking for holiness and wis-
dom), by warriors (asking for fast horses and glory), and by women (ask-
ing for heroic husbands or safety in childbirth).[39] Similar to Anāhitā is
the Vedic *Sarasvati*, who is primarily a river goddess connected with
fertility, but who also destroys enemies and directs pious thoughts and
sacrifices. Indeed in *Rig Veda* 10.125 (= *Atharva Veda* 4.30) Sarasvati,
or rather her counterpart *Vāc* "word," supports the "canonical" Indic
gods of the three functions: Mitra and Varuṇa, Indra-Agni, and the
Aśvin twins (= the Nasātyas).[40] Other trifunctional females have been
identified in other cultures: Juno Seispes (= Sospites) Mater Regina at

[34] Vian, *La Guerre des Géants* (Paris 1952) 143–47, and Sergent 1979, 1164.

[35] A. Schachter, *Cults of Boiotia* 1 (London 1981) 40.

[36] Vian (above, note 33) 251, 257–58, citing *IG* II/III² 334. See also Dumézil 1968, 123
and Sergent 1979, 1164.

[37] Sergent 1979, 1157 describes a fresco from a sanctuary at Mycenae, which is divided
into three panels, each depicting a female figure. The central figure is flanked by two
smaller figures facing her; the one on the right holds what appears to be a lance; the one
on the left, accompanied by an animal (a calf?), apparently holds some kind of grain.
Sergent interprets the fresco as a sovereign goddess in the center, accompanied by god-
desses of warfare and agriculture.

[38] For a resumé of the research on trivalent females, see Dumézil 1968, 103–24 and
550–63.

[39] Ibid. 104–5.

[40] Ibid. 106–7.

Lanuvium;[41] three heroines of Ulster all named Macha—one was mar-
ried to a priest, another was a warrior queen, the third was the fertile
wife of a wealthy farmer;[42] Draupadī, who is in the *Mahābhārata* the
wife of all five sons of Pāṇḍu, who themselves represent the three
functions;[43] a Nart heroine named Satana, who appropriates the virtues
of each function in turn as she seeks to become her own brother's wife.[44]

  Thus it appears that in Indo-European religion there was a tendency
(Dumézil's term "theologem"[45] suggests a single pattern too rigid to
accommodate the great variety of trivalent female figures) for a single
female to incorporate aspects of all three functions, and sometimes to
relate to separate male embodiments of each function. A recent study by
Emily Lyle suggests a more flexible reformulation of Dumézil's tripartite
scheme, according to which a transfunctional goddess would play an
even more integral role in Indo-European (or perhaps even broader)
ideology.[46] Citing a variety of Indic, Roman, Greek, Iranian, and Irish
traditions (including rituals, iconography, philosophy, and myths) which,
she believes, reflect Indo-European cosmology, Lyle suggests that in
addition to the three-part division of human society (for Dumézil, the
basis of Indo-European ideology) there exists also a four-part division of
the cosmos. A transfunctional goddess could synthesize or be interfused
with each of the three male parts, as Dumézil discovered, but from
another point of view she could be seen as "one member of a tetrad . . .
[with] a separate station of her own"; her own quarter would itself repre-
sent the "whole" or the "homeplace."[47] Lyle's hypotheses are speculative,
of course, but her suggestion that the Indo-European world-view was
more flexible than a rigid tripartite scheme is well worth further exami-
nation. I shall return to some of her points when I discuss the role of
Hecate vis-à-vis Zeus in the *Theogony*.

  By analyzing the Hesiodic Hecate in terms of Indo-European trans-
functional females, I do not mean to suggest that the Greek goddess is a
reflex of a specific "original" Indo-European figure. As far as I can tell,

---

[41] See "Juno S. M. R.," *Eranos* 52 (1954) 109–19, now summarized in Dumézil 1970,
297–303.
[42] See J. Puhvel, "Aspects of Equine Functionality," *Myth and Law among the Indo-
Europeans* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 1970) 159–72, at pp. 165–66.
[43] Dumézil 1968, 103–4 and 107–22, citing the seminal article of S. Wikander,
"Pāṇḍava-sagan och Mahābhāratas mystika förutsättningar," *Religion och Bibel* 6 (1947)
27–39. As Dumézil theorizes (1968, 103–4), the polyandry of Draupadī with the noble
sons of Pāṇḍu is likely to be neither a retelling of history nor a free invention, but the
transposition into human terms of a rich and meaningful theological complex: the rela-
tionship between a transfunctional goddess and gods of the three functions.
[44] Dumézil 1968, 550–63.
[45] Ibid. 104.
[46] Lyle (above, note 1).
[47] Ibid. 30–31.

apart from the *Theogony*, neither her cult, nor her scant myths, nor even her iconography (despite the common "three-formed" Hekataia)[48] suggests Indo-European ideology. My concern is not with the religious history of Hecate but with her description in the *Theogony*, which has long been recognized as an anomalous view of the goddess. If we find that Hecate here is trivalent, we must ask why: what role does a trans-functional goddess play in the pattern of the poem?

The *Theogony* is a poem of the many and the one. It records the births of myriad gods who populate the universe, and describes the primacy of the one "father of gods and men" who rules them all. How does the *Theogony* reconcile the diversity of the divine world with its unity and stability? The paradox is resolved in part by the process of *dasmos*, distri-bution or apportioning of powers, announced in the prologue (71–74, 112) as one of the major themes of the *Theogony*.[49] This process is best illus-trated when Zeus distributes *timai* to all his allies, who have just urged him to become their king (881–85).

Marylin Arthur has recently suggested in a fascinating article how Hecate may fit into the theme of Zeus' power and primacy. She discerns in the poem a pattern whereby the power of females is systematically contracted and displaced (from Gaia to Aphrodite to Styx to Hecate to Pandora), so as to become less threatening and more amenable to the patriarchal ideology that culminates when Zeus gives birth to Athena. Along this continuum, Hecate plays the role of a benign, asexual "daugh-ter figure." According to Arthur, just as Styx gives Zeus her children in return for *timê* from him, so Hecate exchanges "the heritage of the Titans" (i.e., her share in all the *timai* of the earlier generation of gods) for the *timai* which Zeus bestows on her.[50]

Arthur is surely correct in inferring that in the *Theogony* Hecate's *aisa* or *moira* represents (by metonymy) the legacy of the Titans, and that her role is defined in terms of her relationship to Zeus. To be sure, Solmsen long ago argued that Zeus integrates into his regime some gods and (especially) goddesses of the old order, such as Hecate, to effect "a reconciliation between the old and the new."[51] Arthur modifies this view by showing that when females are brought into Zeus' patriarchal system

---

[48] On these triple-bodied images of Hecate, see Kraus 102–18 with illustrations.

[49] The issue of *dasmos* is an important one in the *Theogony*, recurring in several pas-sages that deal with gods and men, or men alone, as well as in contexts where divine *timai* are apportioned. Thus at Mecone, men and gods were making a decision (ἐκρίνοντο, 535) when Prometheus unfairly apportioned the ox (δασσάμενος, 537 and διεδάσσαο μοίρας, 544). In the Pandora passage, the "misogynist's dilemma" is framed in terms of apportionment: if a man does not marry and produce heirs, his kinsmen (χηρωσταί) will divide (δατέονται) his possessions (606–7).

[50] Arthur 68–73.

[51] Solmsen 72–75.

their powers are reduced—as with Gaia, who finally becomes a partisan
of Zeus (882–85), or displaced—as with Pandora whose deceptive ap-
pearance harms men rather than gods (570, 589–93). Further, Hecate
may even be considered a positive counterpart to Pandora, for her
benevolent power (δύναμις, 420), broad as it is, is directed exclusively
toward men.[52] With her *timai* restricted to the human realm, Hecate
poses no threat to Zeus' regime, yet she is the one god who most resem-
bles him in the range of her powers.

Hecate's relationship to Zeus in the *Theogony* then is not so filial as
Arthur suggests. Obviously Hecate is not overtly descended from Zeus,
for this would obviate her role as representative of the old Titan order;
nor does she come to resemble him, as Athena does (896). Moreover, she
does not even serve Zeus' interests, like Styx (397–98) or Gaia (883–85).
All Hecate does is accept the *timai* Zeus adds to her original lot, without
losing any of her earlier honors (421–28). We might conclude that some-
how Zeus needs her more than she needs him, although undoubtedly his
own power and prestige are increased when he bestows *timê* on another
god.[53] In other traditions, as Arthur notes,[54] Hecate is called a daughter
of Zeus, yet in the *Theogony* she is not his daughter, but rather a small-
scale reflection or, more accurately, a paradigm for him; and this may be
the reason he honors her so greatly yet without fear.[55]

Hecate, as befits a descendant of Gaia, Ouranos, and Pontos, is
honored in earth (γαῖα), sky (οὐρανός) and sea (θάλασσα). In the spatial
extent of her passively accepted *timai*, she foreshadows Zeus' own active
acquisition of power in the *Theogony*. Although nowhere in the poem is
Zeus said to rule over the different divisions of the cosmos, nevertheless
his influence over them can be clearly inferred from passages where his
struggles to gain or maintain authority reverberate in various regions. In
the Titanomachy, sea (πόντος, 678), earth, and sky (γῆ and οὐρανός,
679) quake in the tumult; this battle also disturbs other regions of the
universe, less familiar to mortals, and not associated with Hecate in the
Theogony: Olympus (680), Tartarus (682), Oceanus (695), Aether (697),
even Chaos (700). Similarly, earth (γαῖα, 839; χθών, 847), sky (οὐρανός,
840 and 847) and sea (πόντος, 841; θάλασσα, 847), as well as Tartarus
(841, cf. 850–51) and Olympus (842) resound and seethe during the
struggle between Zeus and Typhoeus (839–52).

---

[52] Arthur 70.

[53] See above, note 14.

[54] Arthur 69, note 14. See also L. R. Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States* (Oxford 1896–
1909, repr. Chicago 1971), 2, 502, for the parentage of Hecate, a highly variable element
in her tradition.

[55] A fascinating collocation of Zeus and Hecate appears in a double throne cut out of
rock on Chalcis, which is dedicated to Zeus and Hecate (*IG* XII 1.958). Cf. Kraus 28 and
Marquardt 252, note 11.

Like Hecate too, Zeus dispenses *timê* to others. She gives honor and wealth (*timê* and *olbos*) to mortal men who sacrifice properly, calling upon her (416–20); Zeus distributes *timai*, as we have seen, to the gods who have just persuaded him to be their king (883–85). Hecate provides a model showing that the *timê* which a god receives is not unconnected to his generosity and reciprocity.

Hecate, who with her *timê* incorporates and unifies so many aspects of the cosmos (especially the human world), provides yet another model or foreshadowing of Zeus' acquisition of power. The categories of people she helps, which appear to reflect Indo-European tripartite social struc-ture, are in turn reflected by the course of events through which Zeus gains his primacy. Lyle recalls Dumézil's observation that in Indo-European ideology the king must possess the virtues of each function: royal authority and the knowledge to practice ritual properly for the first function, physical courage for the second, abundance and generosity for the third.[56] This tripartite pattern, more schematically seen in the trans-functional Hecate, informs in a general way also the process whereby Zeus stabilizes the multifarious universe with his kingship. I would sug-gest that, as well as establishing priority of the new generation over the old, gods over mortals, and males over females, Zeus' primacy also in-volves his mastery of all three "functions."

Cronus, we are told, is conquered by the "crafts and strength" (τέχνῃσι βίηφί τε, 496) of his son. A close look at Zeus' rise to power, however, suggests that these two modes of action are used in sequence more than simultaneously, with "first-function" intelligence preceding "second-function" force. First, through Gaia's tricks Zeus escapes the plans of infant-devouring Cronus (474–91) and survives. He is a direct threat to his father's sovereignty (βασιληίδα τιμήν, 462), for Cronus is destined to be overcome by Zeus' plans (βουλάς, 465). Next Cronus is tricked by Gaia (494) into vomiting up the children he swallowed, along with the stone that replaced Zeus (495–97). Zeus places the stone in Pytho as a sign and wonder (500)—clearly a token of his primacy. Zeus' next action is to release his father's brothers from their bonds and to receive from them the thunder and lightning with which he rules (ἀνάσσει, 506) mortals and immortals (501–6). He is taking on the attri-butes of sovereignty, thus far with no overt use of force.

Then the sons of Iapetus are described, and Zeus' reactions to their pride. He strikes Menoetius with a thunderbolt (514–16) and assigns (ἐδάσσατο, 520) to Atlas the task of holding up the sky (517–20), but of all the Iapetids it is Prometheus who challenges Zeus most of all, and his story which Hesiod elaborates. Through his reactions to Prometheus Zeus establishes sacrificial ritual (556–57) and other restrictions on mortals

[56] Lyle 35.

(most notably the economic burdens implied by the creation of the first
woman, especially 590–93); these results are accomplished by a battle of
wits with Prometheus (535–616, cf. especially the "mental" vocabulary in
537, 540, 545–47, 550–51, 555, 559–61, 565, 572, 613, 616). Even the
chaining of Prometheus is not described as an act of violence, but only
stated impersonally as a *fait accompli* attributed to Zeus' anger (χόλον,
615), in the expanded version of the story (614–16, cf. the more active
and forceful account given briefly in 521–23, along with Zeus' punish-
ments of Menoetius and Atlas). All these events in Zeus' rise to power so
far emphasize "first-function" intelligence and authority—not purely, to
be sure, but nevertheless with surprisingly little recourse to physical
force.

     Next, however, Zeus appropriates the attributes of the second func-
tion in two tumultuous, violently earth-shaking battles, first against the
Titans (especially 687–712), then against Typhoeus (especially 839–58).
These battles show Zeus as a great warrior, virtually the embodiment of
violence and force. With his success in warfare he is recommended by
Gaia and accepted by the other gods as their king; immediately he dis-
tributes *timai* among the gods (883–85). This generous action is followed
by Zeus' entry into "third-function" activities through his marriages, by
which he produces numerous children, including daughters such as the
Horae and the Charites (901–3, 907–11), whose spheres of influence
include peace, tranquillity, and physical well-being.

     In reviewing evidence drawn from Indic and Irish myths as well as
Greek philosophy, Lyle recalls a pattern discerned by Dumézil in which
the ideal king incorporates the virtues of all three functions, namely wis-
dom (especially relating to sacrifice), courage, and generosity. She sug-
gests that the king's tripartite virtues may acquire a new dimension,
"justice" or "cosmic truth," through his relationship with a (transfunc-
tional) goddess.[57] Aspects of this pattern, I would suggest, are reflected in
the *Theogony*, with Zeus as tripartite ruler and Hecate as transfunctional
goddess. As Arthur clearly shows, however, in terms of the sexual pat-
terns in the Hesiodic poem it would be too dangerous for Zeus to make
such a powerful goddess his consort. Instead, he merely confirms her
kindly, generous, mortal-directed *timai*, a sharing of honors which
implicitly suggests Zeus' justice.

     I would argue then that the trifunctional model informs aspects of
Zeus in the *Theogony*, as it does aspects of Hecate, and that the two are
closely connected. Hecate may be described as providing a model for
Zeus' synthesis of powers. Yet her passive acceptance of the *timai* ac-
corded her by other gods presents an antithesis to Zeus' active pursuit
and use of power. Hecate is never directly "subsumed" or "consumed,"

---

[57] Ibid. 35–42.

to use Arthur's terminology, into the regime of Zeus, as is the sexually active and more threatening Metis (886–91).[58] Instead, she remains outside the struggle for power, a parallel or paradigm foreshadowing Zeus' acquisition of even broader *timai* in the *Theogony*.

[58] See Arthur 69, where this pattern is applied directly to Metis and by extension to Hecate.