The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

The Hesiodic Hecate

George C. W. Warr

The Classical Review / Volume 9 / Issue 08 / November 1895, pp 390 - 393

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00202515, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00202515

How to cite this article:

George C. W. Warr (1895). The Hesiodic Hecate. The Classical Review, 9, pp 390-393
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00202515

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

may be allotted to him in the future, and for a contented spirit as regards what may be denied.' I should therefore keep the MS. οὐ λήψεται and adopt Heinsius' ἀποβαίνειν. Perhaps ἀδιαφορότητα may be concealed under αὐδιότητα, which H. also queries. Though the word is not found elsewhere, yet διαφορότης is not uncommon.

§ 44, p. 857. ἀλλὰ αὐτάρκης μὲν γενόμενος, ἀνενδεής δὲ τῶν ἄλλων, τὸ παντοκρατικὸν δὲ βούλημα ἐγνωκώς καὶ ἔχων ἅμα καὶ εὐχόμενος προσεχῆς τῇ πανσθενεὶ δυνάμει γενόμενος... ἦνται τῷ πνεύματι. Put a colon before ἀλλά, omit the comma after the first γενόμενος and change δέ into τε, insert commas after ἐγνωκώς, εὐχόμενος, γενόμενος. H.

P. 858. Put a full stop, instead of comma, after ἀσκήσει.

Ib. Put a comma after χρωμένην and read ἀξιολόγων for ἀξιολόγως. H.

§ 45. ὁ γοῦν τὰ περὶ θεοῦ διεληφώς πρὸς

αὐτῆς τῆς ἀληθείας χοροῦ μυστικοῦ λόγῳ τῷ προτρέποντι τὸ μέγεθος τῆς ἀρετῆς, αὐτὴν τε καὶ τὰ ἀπ' αὐτῆς, ἐνδεικνύμενος χρήται. The MS. has ἐνδεικνυμένων, for which read ἐνδεικνυμένῳ. [So H.] Put a comma after μυστικοῦ and remove the comma from after the second αὐτῆς to after ἐνδεικνυμένῳ, translating 'He who has received the things concerning God from the mystical chorus of the truth itself makes use of the word of exhortation setting forth the greatness of virtue both in itself and its effects.' [H. governs χοροῦ μυστικοῦ by λόγῳ and suggests προφέροντι for προτρέποντι. προτυποῦντι has occurred to me.]

§ 45, p. 858. πρῶος ἀεὶ...εὐγνώμων, εὐσυνειδητος, αὐστηρὸς οὗτος ἡμῖν κ.τ.λ. Put a colon before αὐστηρός.

J. B. MAYOR.

(To be continued.)

THE HESIODIC HECATE.

THE genealogy of the Titans in the *Theogony* is interrupted by a long eulogy (ll. 411-52) of Hecate, the 'only-begotten' child of Perses and Asterie. The whole exhibits unmistakable signs of something more than ordinary interpolation or recasting. It has too little consistency to merit the title of a 'hymn,' which is sometimes bestowed on it. Indeed, it can only be described as an incoherent medley—'ein Jargon,' as Lehrs calls it (*Aristarchos*, p. 441). E. Gerhard (*Zeitschr. f. d. Alterthumswiss.*, 1852) is led by a minute investigation to the conclusion that two distinct versions of a single hymn have been crudely compressed together. The two pieces, as he restores them, are certainly intelligible and consistent enough. But it is difficult to see the purpose of this strange kind of 'contaminatio,' since the portion peculiar to either of the supposed originals is very small.

The sutures, which Gerhard's theory is designed to account for, are fully manifest. But they admit of a less difficult explanation in every instance. Taking them in order, we have first (413-5) a passage where the 'splendid gifts' of Zeus to Hecate are set forth in somewhat clumsy sentences, which appear to be a mere amplification of the line (427)

καὶ γέρας ἐν γαίῃ τε καὶ οὐρανῷ ἥδὲ θαλάσσῃ.

This line is quite impossible where it stands. But if, instead of rejecting it, we put it here in place of the amplification, it follows easily and serves as a simple definition of the ἀγλαὰ δῶρα in keeping with the subsequent passage. The next trace of the second hand is l. 419, where πολλή τέ οἱ ἔσπετο τιμῇ is followed by

ρεῖα μάλ', ᾧ πρόφρων γε θεὰ ὑποδέξεται εὐχάς.

This has the look of an enlargement with an alteration in the reference of the pronoun. Further evidence of botching is καὶ γάρ (416), which must have changed its place, and still more conclusively ll. 421 f.:

ὅσσοι γὰρ Γαίης τε καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἐξεγένοντο
καὶ τιμὴν ἔλαχον, τούτων ἔχει αἶσαν ἀπάντων.

This must be supposed to mean, 'she (Hecate) has a share *with* all who inherited from Gaea and Uranus'; but the sense, such as it is, is only derived from the juxtaposition. It is clear that the latter clause was transposed from another context. If we remove the intervening patch for the reasons just assigned, we have the words τούτων ἔχει αἶσαν ἀπάντων following πολλή τέ οἱ ἔσπετο τιμῇ with a lacuna, which may be filled by supplying ὅσα τ' ἀπάρχονται or something equivalent, defining the τιμῇ as the goddess' share (αἶσα) of all the ἱερά

καλά. One more passage appears to have undergone a similar process, viz. ll. 450 f. :

θῆκε δέ μιν Κρονίδης κουροτρόφος, οἱ μετ'
ἐκείνην
ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἴδοντο φάος πολυδερκέος Ἡοῦς.

The forced construction of the relative clause and still more the makeshift μετ' ἐκείνην (where, if the sentence had been framed as a whole, we should surely have found μετόπισθε or μετέπειτα) indicate that the first part of the sentence was originally separate, being a simple reference to the function of the goddess as κουροτρόφος. This suspicion is confirmed by the lame addition :

οὕτως ἐξ ἀρχῆς κουροτρόφος· αἶδε τε τιμαί.

The various accretions which have been noticed plainly had for their object to insist on Hecate's title as a primeval or 'Titanic' one. As the passage first stood, her γέρας was the free gift of Zeus, whereas in the inserted lines 421-5 stress is laid on the previous allotment, which Zeus respected. As the latter is the standpoint of the *Theogony*, it may fairly be inferred that the nucleus consists of older material, which was borrowed and adapted by the compiler of the poem. It was perhaps a fragment of a genuine hymn, which may have commenced, as Gerhard suggests, αἰδῶ Ἑκάτην Περσηίδα. The alternative supposition, that the whole of this section as well as what follows is a later excrescence—in other words, that Hecate was nowhere in the original compilation—is unlikely, considering that Coeus, though mentioned first after Oceanus (l. 134), is postponed as though to bring him into this particular connection.

The second portion (429-49), on the other hand, has every appearance of being a later and wholly independent addition. The composition, except on Gerhard's supposition, must be regarded as perfunctory and mechanical to the last degree. Witness the stock phrases twice or thrice repeated : παραγίνεται ('assists,' cf. *Od.* xvii. 173) varied only by a cumbrous μεγάλως (429), ἐσθλή with infinitive of purpose (439, 444, cf. 435), ὃν κ' ἐθέλῃσι (430, 432), ἐθέλουσα θυμῷ (443, 446). The adjective γλαυκή by itself for 'the sea' (440) is a bad imitation of the Homeric ὕγρη; it is altogether distinct from the picturesque Hesiodic conceits, such as φερέοικος for the snail, and ἰδρις for the ant. The digamma is neglected in the name Ἑκάτη (l. 441), whereas it is retained in the former portion (411, 418).

If we detach the compiler's setting as well as the appended piece, the original fragment reads as follows :—

αἰδῶ Ἑκάτην Περσηίδα, τὴν περὶ πάντων
[ἢ δ' ὑποκυσαμένην Ἑκάτην τέκε]
Ζεὺς Κρονίδης τίμησε· πόρεν δέ οἱ ἀγλαὰ δῶρα,
καὶ γέρας ἐν γαίῃ τε καὶ οὐρανῷ ἥδ' ἐθλάσσει.
καὶ γὰρ νῦν ὅτε ποῦ τις ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων
ἔρδων ἱερὰ καλὰ κατὰ νόμον ἱλάσκηται,
κικλήσκει Ἑκάτην· πολλή τέ οἱ ἔσπετο τιμή,
† ὅσσα τ' ἀπάρχονται † τούτων ἔχει αἶσαν ἀπάν-
των.

θῆκε δέ μιν Κρονίδης κουροτρόφος.—

The main features in this description are the affiliation of Hecate to Perses, her potency in three elements (the compiler amplifying the second with ἀστερόεντος ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ, in allusion, perhaps, to Asterie), the statement that she is invoked on the occasion of propitiatory offerings as an assessor and partaker with the gods, and her office of nurturing the young.

In respect to the parentage of Hecate, the procedure in this poem throws some light incidentally on the myths which collected round the name of Perses or Perseus. The compiler himself presents to us in another connection (956 ff.) a Perseis, wife of Helios : their children are Circe and Aeetes, the latter being father of Medea by Eidenia. According to a tradition, which is traceable as far back as the early historian Dionysius of Miletus (*Diod.* iv. 45, schol. *Apoll. Rhod.* iii. 200), a corresponding Perseis, that is, one belonging to the family of the sun-god, bore the name of Hecate ; she differs from the second Hesiodic Perseis only in being the daughter-in-law of Helios, the same names, together with Circe and Medea, reappearing in a somewhat different relationship. Another tradition, which Pausanias (i. 43, 1) mentions as Arcadian, that Iphigeneia was changed into Hecate by the will of Artemis, shows in like manner that the name found its way into the legend in question when the ancient moon-goddess, Iphigeneia, had relinquished her divinity in favour of Artemis. And this, according to Pausanias (*l.c.*), was the application of the name Hecate in the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women. But the compiler separates his Hecate from this family in making out a Titanic parentage for her :—

From a collation of these versions it results that there was (1) a Perseis, related directly with the sun in the Corinthian and Arcadian mythology, (2) a Hecate Perseis, who is detached in this poem but not so in the older tradition. The explanation of this curious bifurcation in the myth seems to be as follows: Perseus or Perseus was the name of a sun-god, who was transformed into a hero when supplanted by the new cult of Helios. Perseis was the corresponding name of the moon regarded as the sun's daughter: Hecate was an epithet of the latter. When the moon was personified, like the sun, by name (Selene), 'Hecate' became the personal designation of a separate deity, who begins to emerge in literature here and in the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter*. The name, interpreted popularly (whether rightly or not) as 'far-darting' (ἐκατηβόλος), helped to perpetuate something of her old lunar associations. The Hesiodic appellation of her mother, Asterie, was manifestly invented with a similar idea. It is quite as transparent as that of the other Titan Astraios, the father of the stars (*Theog.* 382).

It is amply established by literary and archaeological evidence that this lunar goddess owed her real dignity to chthonic attributes. This is clearly perceptible in the Homeric hymn, where she is the attendant of Persephone and has her dwelling in a cave. It is surprising, therefore, that here her γέρας is vaguely apportioned between earth, sky and sea, without any hint of the underworld. Nor is there any trace of her in the primitive superstitions concerning the tomb in the *Works and Days*, 750 ff. Yet her special participation in sacrificial offerings to 'the gods' must, surely, be explained in the sense that offerings were made through her to greater deities, whose servant she was. Are not these the infernal deities to whom she is attached in the Hymn? The *ἱλασμοί*, to which our poet alludes, may well have been rites such as the *περισκυλακισμός*, familiar from notices of her Athenian cult. This was a propitiation of the chthonic moon-goddess consisting in the sacrifice of young dogs. It had its rise, no doubt, in primitive notions: the dog baying the moon may have given the first suggestion. But if we look to the motive of the sacrifice, it was associated with an office of the goddess which is here significantly mentioned, viz. that of *κουροτρόφος*. The dog seems to have represented the children of the house and served, as a victim,

to avert the malign influences in the keeping of the goddess of the cross-ways.

The threefold sphere in itself, as the poet understands it, is perhaps no more than a far-fetched literary interpretation of the triple form, the persistence of which in art is best explained by the position of the goddess at the crossing of the roads and the opportunity which her attitude thus gave for artistic design. That this conception is as old as the Hesiodic poetry may be safely assumed from the archaeological data, which are registered most completely by E. Petersen ('Die dreigestaltige Hekate,' *Archaeol.-Epigr. Mittheilungen aus Oesterreich*, iv. pp. 141-74). It is conclusively proved that a three-headed pillar or herm was the primitive model from which Alcamenes produced his group of three separate figures disposed around a column (Pausan. ii. 30, 2), and that the latter motive was first exchanged for a triple herm with dancing figures (Charites) and finally for a three-bodied Hecate, a partial reversion to the old type. The torch, her constant symbol, which distinguished her from Artemis, is conspicuous in the Homeric hymn; she carries it in the quest of Persephone. In the drinking-vessel, another common symbol, we have a point of connection with the Hesiodic description. For her participation in the sacrifices must include the drink-offering as given through her to the greater deities invoked simultaneously with her. The dog, as Petersen notices, is usually placed beneath the vessel, as though to lap what overflows. His presence as Hecate's companion in the lower world represents the offering as accepted and efficacious. The *ἀπαρχαί*, if we may restore them to the goddess in this passage, will similarly correspond with the fruit which frequently appears in the hand of one or more of the figures.

As for the later portion (429-49), its extraneous origin is evident from its contents as well as on linguistic grounds. According to this poet Hecate gives prosperity (*δῶλος*), she assists the orator in the agora, the warrior in battle, kings in the judgment-seat, athletes in the lists, horsemen (riders), and fishermen on the sea, who pray to her as well as to Poseidon; she gives and takes away spoil, and with Hermes she blesses or blights the cattle. In default of any other explanation, this curiously inflated panegyric has been called 'Orphic.' But this conjecture has not much to stand upon. All we know is that the Orphic poets transferred the name of Hecate to Persephone

and called the latter *Μουννογένεια*. They used 'Hecate' also as a designation of Artemis, but this proves little or nothing, as it was commonly applied to her (e.g. by Aeschylus, *Suppl.* 676) as an epithet. The poet may have picked up the word *μουννογένης* from an Orphic source, but he does not use it in a laudatory sense. His meaning is merely that Hecate got her rights notwithstanding that she was an only child and had no brother to protect her inheritance with his own. Possibly he perverted some mystic hymn in which the underworld, not the sea, was the third sphere of the triune goddess. He seems to have mistaken the participation of Hecate in offerings to other gods for a participation in their functions and to have amplified the triple *γέρας* from that preposterous point of view. The attributes are too miscellaneous to be explained as an approach to Orphic pantheism. In some instances, especially where the associated

deity is named, we may discern a more or less fanciful motive. It is the moon itself which is described as guiding sailors on the sea, helping fishermen, and assisting riders on the road (at night). The title *ἐνοδία*, which was given to Hecate in Aegina, may have arisen from a similar idea, and she may have been concerned with Poseidon in the Aeginetan sea-fishery. The combination of certain gifts, viz. eloquence, success in the games and agricultural prosperity, has a parallel in the case of Hermes. It is known that she received offerings along with that god (as *ἐναγώνιος*) at Methydriion in Arcadia. But such correspondences do not avail to make sense of this part of the eulogy or to lessen the difference in conception between it and the preceding piece. The Hecate of the compiler has much, the Hecate of the interpolator has nothing, in common with her traditional character.

GEORGE C. W. WARR.

Βούλομαι IN HOMER.

IN Buttman's *Lexilogus* an attempt is made to distinguish between the meanings of *βούλομαι* and *ἐθέλω*. We give an abstract of the views there expressed:

1. *ἐθέλω* is of far more frequent occurrence and the most general expression for wishing. It expresses in particular that kind of wish in which there lies a *purpose* or *design*. *βούλομαι* is confined to that kind of willingness or wishing in which the *wish* and the *inclination* towards a thing are either the only thing contained in the expression, or are at least intended to be marked particularly.

2. The active wish, which looks forward to its accomplishment, is in all other cases expressed by *ἐθέλω*, while *βούλομαι* is used in this sense of the *gods* only, for in the case of the gods we particularly observe and mention the inclination which in them connects the wish almost immediately with its accomplishment.

3. From this meaning of inclination, apparent in *βούλομαι*, it is used to indicate that besides the wish there is a preference of one thing to another. *βούλομαι*, but never *ἐθέλω*, stands singly in Homer for 'to prefer.'

4. *ἐθέλω* is sometimes used for *δύναμαι* as at Φ 366, οὐδ' ἐθελε προρέειν, ἀλλ' ἴσχετο.

5. *ἐθέλω* occurs also where *βούλομαι* might have been used; for instance of the

gods, or to express a mere wish, as at H 182, ἐκ δ' ἔθορε κλῆρος κυνέης, ὃν ἄρ' ἤθελον αὐτοί. The examples cited by Buttman are all taken from Homer, with the exception of two in a foot-note. These views are followed in the last edition of Liddell and Scott's *Greek-English Lexicon*.

We shall endeavour to show that the use of *βούλομαι* in Homer, including the forms *βόλομαι* and *προβέβουλα*, is somewhat different from that indicated by Buttman. In the *Iliad* *βούλομαι* is used 19 times. It is used with η 5 times, A 117, Γ 41, A 319, P 331, Ψ 594. In these cases there is plainly a comparison and choice between two things. In one of these passages, A 319, the subject of *βόλεται* is *Ζεύς*, and the object is *δοῦναι κράτος*. In another, P 331, the subject of *βούλεται* is *Ζεύς*, and the object is *νίκην*. Now the same or similar objects occur with *βούλομαι* in 8 other lines, H 21, Θ 204, A 79, M 174, N 347, O 596, Π 121, Ψ 682. In 6 of the above 13 passages the object of *βούλομαι* is *νίκην*. Hence it is fair to assume that in these places also *βούλομαι* expresses preference. The context shows that in every instance a comparison is implied between two things or parties. It is unnecessary to use η in every instance to contrast the two things. In other words, it is unnecessary formally to state the comparison, for it is in the