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This is a study aimed at reconsidering the origins, in the broadest sense of the word, of the ancient goddess Hekate. To the best of our knowledge, what is the geographical provenance of Hekate? What does the evidence for the goddess up to the end of the fifth century B.C. tell us about the development of her character in the Greek religious world? Why did Hekate acquire such frightening and evil connections to the supernatural and black magic by this point? Although several theories have been proposed about the origin of Hekate, a Karian provenance remains the most likely, notwithstanding the Hellenistic date of the evidence that is normally cited. Tenuous links and methodological flaws characterise the theories that she was Mycenaean or Mesopotamian, while the Thracian theory rests on a fallacious assumption that Hekate evolved from the Thracian Bendis. The Karian theory is propped up by a variety of data that allows us to draw back incrementally the date to which Hekate’s worship in the region may be assigned. Evidence until the end of the fifth century is chronologically dichotomous: the earliest evidence, Hesiod’s *Theogony*, depicts a great, benevolent goddess, while evidence from the second half of the fifth century characterizes Hekate as a malevolent deity connected to ghosts, witchcraft, and sorcery who could and would occasion grievous harm to people, especially parturient women or newborns. This aspect of Hekate’s divinity in relation to women’s transitions and the failure thereof seems to have become particularly pronounced following her introduction to the Panhellenic pantheon and her mythic subordination to Artemis. But did the goddess ever bear inherent connections to the dead, despite Hesiod’s glowing Hymn to her? Milesian archaeological evidence suggests she might have. However, it was the acquisition of magical properties that ultimately extinguished much of Hekate’s benevolence. It seems most likely that the Thessalian reputation for black magic, which was a direct result of medism in 485 and 480 B.C., was causative of this, given Hekate’s close association with the Thessalian Enodia.
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INTRODUCTION

And Asteria conceived and bore Hecate whom, above all,
Zeus the son of Cronos honored. He gave her splendid gifts,
To have a share of the earth and the unfruitful sea.
She received honour also in starry heaven,
And is honoured exceedingly by the deathless gods.
For to this day, whenever any one of men on earth
Offers rich sacrifices and prays for favour according to custom,
He calls upon Hecate. Great honour comes to him
Full easily, he whose prayers the goddess receives favourably,
And she bestows wealth upon him; for the power surely is with her.

Hes. Theog. 411-420, c. late eighth century B.C.¹

Medea: By the mistress whom I worship
          Most of all, my chosen helper,
          Hecate, who dwells in the inner chamber of my house,
          None of them shall pain my heart and smile at it!
          Bitter will I make their marriage,
          Bitter Creon's marriage-alliance, and bitter my banishment from
          the land!

Eur. Med. 395-400, 431 B.C.²

Chorus: Daughter of Demeter, goddess of the cross-ways, you who
          Rule over assaults by night
          And day, guide
          This cup full of death

¹ Translation based on that of Evelyn-White (2002).
² Translation based on that of Kovačs (1994).
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Against the one to whom my queen sends it—from
The drops of the earth-born Gorgon, her throat cut,
To the one who is grasping at the house of Erechtheus.

Eur. Ion 1048-1057, c. 414 – 412 B.C. 3

The passages I have cited throw into sharp relief a dramatic distinction between the characterization of the ancient goddess Hekate in Hesiod’s Theogony and her portrayal by the tragedian Euripides in the second half of the fifth century, for which Sophocles had paved the way in a fragment of the no-longer-extant Rhizotomoi. 4 Indeed, so struck by this contrast was Kraus that he asserted, in his 1960 monograph on Hekate, that ‘one could be tempted to speak of two goddesses.’ 5 There are, admittedly, questions that affect our acceptance of so great a distance between the ‘two Hekates’ having existed. 6 Was the character of Hesiodic Hekate distorted by both the thematic requirements of the Theogony and Hesiod’s personal views? Might such personal views have distorted by suppressing elements of the goddess that would inhibit the growth of her popularity throughout Greece? Furthermore, in the case of the Euripidean portrayal, tragedy, of course, presents worst-case scenarios, and so if we are expecting a negative portrayal of a deity, we should expect the most severely negative one possible. And yet even if thematic requirements, personal views, and literary genre are considered, the fact remains that, by the end of the fifth century, associations with highly macabre sorcery 7 and the vengeful, restless dead were an entrenched aspect of Hekate’s character; if they had existed earlier, would we not expect at least some allusion to them,

---

3 Translation based on that of Potter (1938).
5 Kraus (1960) 64.
7 Gordon (1987) 62-63 discusses the ‘usual anthropological distinction between witchcraft and sorcery’. Witchcraft is ‘used to mean harm done to another unconsciously, by virtue of a natural baleful force’, while sorcery means ‘harm done knowingly by whatever means’. The evil eye is a good example of witchcraft, while the three ‘most important’ examples of sorcery are ‘drugs (pharmaka), incantation (epōdē) and binding by means of a curse (katadēsis).’
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notwithstanding the rather exiguous state of pre-mid fifth century B.C. evidence? Hekate certainly was a goddess of ‘great diversity’ throughout antiquity, as is to be expected: at the beginning of Chapter Three, I quote Sourvinou-Inwood, who states that we must not proceed from the ‘assumption that the divine personality of a deity was substantially the same throughout the Greek world’, nor should we ‘conflated evidence from different parts of the Greek world.’ This introduces a geographical aspect: of the numerous theories surrounding Hekate’s provenance, which is the most plausible? Might the Theogony present an Anatolian perspective, and the Euripidean extracts a paradigm that gradually developed following a foreigner’s incorporation into the Greek pantheon? While in and of itself a discrete and interesting field of inquiry, the question of geographical origins also constitutes an important stepping stone towards reconciling these disparate characterizations.

This, then, is essentially a thesis about origins, in the broadest sense of the word. Despite a considerable amount of scholarly attention having been focussed on the goddess Hekate, which is surprising given her status as a minor goddess,

---

8 Johnston (1990) 1-2.
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uncertainty persists in the two areas of inquiry with which I am broadly concerned: the question of Hekate’s geographical origins; and the question of the circumstances in which Hekate was originally connected with a ‘stream of anxious and gloomy superstitiousness that spread through the whole of later antiquity and even reached through the Middle Ages to our own day’,¹² most conspicuously transmitting Hekate to modern audiences in her Shakespearean manifestation.¹³ It is within this aforementioned uncertainty that the value of my study is located, for I hope to offer some new perspectives. My study differs markedly from some of the most recent ones published. Zografou’s 2010 study represents an important contribution to the area of Hekate scholarship. The final product of a decade-long commitment, the text both updates this field of research and forms a starting point for future studies on the goddess.¹⁴ Zografou’s work does, however, dedicate only a small footnote to the subject of Hekate’s provenance, and she ‘abandon[s] the idea of a systematic comparison with the [Thessalian] goddess … Enodia’, a subject which ultimately forms the basis of the thesis advanced in my third chapter.¹⁵ Zografou does go into detail in relation to Hesiod’s Theogony and the Homeric Hymn to Demeter, and discusses pieces of evidence dated to the sixth and fifth centuries B.C. from various locales that directly concern Hekate—these matters are also addressed in this thesis. In general, however, Zografou’s book is concerned with illuminating many features of Hekate through a systematic analysis of her association with intermediary spaces. Fauth’s idiosyncratic 2006 study is all but unrelated to this thesis, as his specific focus is the Hekate of late antiquity. He, too, surveys evidence pertaining to the Hekate of the Archaic and Classical periods, but it is a brief survey, and one that Zografou describes as ‘assez elliptique et imprégné

¹¹ Perhaps the best basis for a classification of a deity as minor is twofold: a scarcity of large sanctuaries and very few mythical developments concerning the figure. See Zografou (2010) 13.

¹² Rohde (1925) 298.

¹³ Macbeth 3.5

¹⁴ Serafini (2012) 228.
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des couleurs sombres des époques postérieures.’ Another book published in 2006 by a German scholar, Nina Werth, is dedicated solely to a study of Hekate’s polymorphism in representations, something that is not of general concern in this work. The temporal framework of von Rudloff’s 1999 book, which grew out of his master’s thesis, is more in alignment with part of my study, as he explicitly aims to examine how Hekate appeared in the Archaic and early Classical periods. It is frustrating, then, that the author frequently cites much later evidence without systematically providing reasons for doing so. This tends to call into question the scholarly value of his contribution, a point that has been emphasised by other scholars. He does, however, pose some insightful questions.

Chapter One of this thesis aims to revisit and reconsider the aforementioned geographical provenance of Hekate. It deals first with the theories proposed by Berg and West, who claim, respectively, that Hekate was of Mycenaean origin or an ‘evolute of Mesopotamian Lamashu.’ Methodological issues underpin the inability of West’s thesis to hold water. Berg’s article accurately sets out problems involved with accepting the (commonly-proposed) Karian origin of Hekate, but his positive argument in favour of a Mycenaean origin—although more plausible than

16 Zografou (2010) 15. Cf. Serafini (2012) 228, who states that Fauth’s attempt ‘to follow the development of this divine figure in literary sources’ is ‘cursory’ and dedicates ‘little attention to the archaic and classical eras, which would have deserved more space.’

17 See, in particular, Johnston (2000). While the author’s intelligent questioning and healthy scepticism have been praised (Johnston (2000); Zografou (2010) 15), the way von Rudloff slots the documentation of his evidence into different locations of worship for the goddess or what he calls Hekate’s five major functions has been described as ‘rather condensed’ by Zografou (2010) 15. She also criticizes the ‘very schematic and sometimes even arbitrary way in which [von Rudloff] separates or associates the various roles of the goddess’, citing his separation of Enodia and Trioditis from the role of the goddess of transitions, as well as irrelevant subjects in his chapter entitled ‘Hekate Chthonia: Dread Goddess of the Underworld’. Herring (2011) 140, discussing his categorization of Hekate as ‘simply one aspect of Artemis’, states that she ‘disagre[e]s strongly with von Rudloff and do[es] not believe he presents an accurate image of Hekate in the Greco-Roman world.’ It seems, then, that a flawed methodology prevents von Rudloff’s study from being as successful a contribution as it might have been. See also Serafini (2012) 227.

INTRODUCTION

West’s proposal—is not ultimately convincing. From here, the chapter sets out to test Farnell’s Thracian thesis, which is essentially predicated on a purported similarity between Hekate and the Thracian Bendis. An attempt at a systematic comparison of the two goddesses follows, but the fact that almost all of the evidence (epigraphic, literary, and sculptural) pertaining to Bendis is Greek, rather than Thracian (numismatic and archaeological) is detrimental to our ascertainment of the goddess’ Thracian character, and therefore to any conclusive decision about the relationship (if any) between Bendis and Hekate. This section of the chapter aims to shed as much light as possible, given the limitations, on the subject and provide at least a probable conclusion before shifting to a reconsideration of the Karian thesis.

First, the two core components of this thesis are laid out—the presence of a large sanctuary and many theophoric names that seem to bear the name of the goddess—before the major points of Kraus in support of the cult at Lagina representing a revival of a much more ancient Anatolian cult are recapitulated and reassessed. The chapter then turns to Herring’s very recent proposal that Laginetan Hekate was a Hellenistic creation. Herring’s thesis is in aid of addressing the apparent dearth of evidence pertaining to Hekate in this region prior to the second century B.C.—a concern first expressed by Berg in his aforementioned article—but the most she ventures to say about the origins of the goddess is that she was an incarnation of an Anatolian goddess. From this point, I advance a theory related to the curious epithet φοινικόπεζα, used of Hekate (and Demeter) by Pindar. I then critically assess archaeological finds from the temenos of Laginetan Hekate’s temple, which are dated to the fourth and late third/early second centuries B.C. The earlier evidence concerns the (establishment of the) cult of a δαίμων, while the later finds are clothing-related, and can therefore be connected to childbirth. If these later finds can be connected to Hekate—and there is a reasonable argument that they can—it would seem unlikely that Hekate’s childbirth functions can be reasonably divorced from her Hesiodic function as kourotrophos, given that she is

---

19 Farnell (1896) 2.507-510.
20 Herring (2011).
arguably depicted in a derivative of that Hesiodic function on the temple constructed on the very same site as these finds. Moreover, the epigraphically-attested cult of a δαίμων probably speaks to Hesiodic influence, as well. Taken together with the allusions to the *Theogony* on the Laginetan temple’s friezes as well as the seemingly Hesiodic divine partnership of Hekate and Zeus in relation to Stratonikeia, a trend of Hesiodic influence on religious activity and expression seems to emerge. After I account for this trend, I turn to a reassessment of Johnston’s ideas about the origins of Artemis Ephesia.

The second chapter in this study has a firm chronological framework. Given that Hekate’s macabre associations with sorcery and ghosts are first described by Euripides, it makes no sense to go beyond the end of the fifth century B.C. in order to track the development, or perhaps rather the degeneration of her character. Accordingly, evidence that is thoroughly discussed in either of the other two chapters and predates the end of the fifth century B.C., including Pindar’s second *Paean*, Milesian archaeological evidence, a thorough examination of the goddess Enodia, and the Berlin terracotta, will be alluded to where appropriate, in order to allow for as expansive a methodological approach to the study of Hekate’s character in this timeframe as possible. Where later evidence is included, it is used to elucidate, if at all possible, opaque earlier sources, but the extent of its role in analysis is allowed no further scope. This is the reason that Hekate’s cult on Samothrace, for example, is missing from this chapter: if there were cultic inscriptions from this island that fitted within our temporal framework, it would make sense to analyse them with regard to the later literary sources. We can be reasonably certain that a cult to Hekate existed on this island from at least the Archaic period onwards. However, as it stands, the late date of the evidence means that to include it would be to go well beyond the chronological framework and provide a distorted account of the development of Hekate’s character, given that,

[21 It is, however, debatable that Euripides established these associations; it is more likely that he reflects a recent development in her local cult or conveys an association common outside of Attica.

[22 The earliest source is fourth century B.C.]
from the Hellenistic period onwards in particular, the goddess’ morose traits became so dominant. A broad range of evidence is canvassed in this chapter: poetic, hymnic, sculptural, artistic, epigraphic, and dramatic. Of these sources, the greatest problem facing scholars remains her highly anomalous depiction in the *Theogony*; the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, too, has provided its fair share of scholarly issues, mainly due to its ‘seeming intrusiveness’. Accordingly, as much weight as is reasonably allowed by the constraints of this study has been accorded to the analysis of both pieces of literature.

Chapter Three is perhaps the most ambitious part of this thesis: it aims to revisit the highly controversial question of why, by the end of the fifth century, an association with ghosts and sorcery had become an entrenched aspect of Hekate’s persona. The two fundamental ideas around which this chapter essentially pivots are those proposed by Nilsson and Kraus. The former argues that, in Karia, Hekate would have had close, but not exclusive connections to ‘Spuk und Zauber’, ‘otherwise there would be no explanation for the Greek Hekate.’ Although the earliest evidence for Hekate in Miletos is scrappy, it is nonetheless important to probe as far as possible in order to ascertain whether Hekate’s associations with the macabre had their latent beginnings in the Near East. Milesian Hekate apparently possessed a civic aspect: she was closely associated with the Molpoi, who in turn were concerned with laws, treaties, and decrees. Through an analysis of Hekate’s civic role in the *Theogony* and the arguments of Kolb and Kenzler, who connect civic Hekate with her chthonic associations, this part of the chapter aims to establish a framework within which future study pertaining to Milesian Hekate could potentially be focussed. Could Hekate’s location at the gates of Miletos, as mentioned in a mid fifth century inscription in the Delphinion, represent instead a *relocation* as a result of a trend towards extramural burial, given her inherent chthonic associations? At this point, some discussion of Milesian burial practices is necessary. While the nature of this entire discussion is patently conjectural, it is

---

23 Johnston (1999) 23. Johnston argues that ‘Hekate’s role in the extant Homeric hymn seems to be a confused reflection of an earlier version or versions.’
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important to reconsider Hekate’s civic role at Miletos, and the *Theogony* may go some way towards shedding light on the situation. Ultimately, however, we are at the mercy of exiguous evidence. Furthermore, even if associations with the dead in herd, we have yet to demonstrate that the goddess originally had links to haunting apparitions and magic, although a chthonic basis would certainly have made the transition smoother.

The second half of this chapter is a reconsideration of the connection between Hekate and Thessalian Enodia. Kraus originally stated that ‘Enodia möchten wir nun als die Gestalt ansprechen, die für die düstere, die Nachtsite Hekates gleichsam als Komponente am ehesten in Frage kommt’ and that ‘Thessaliens [war] geradezu das klassische land der Zauberinnen, und ist Hekate nicht die Herrin des Zaubers geworden?’ 25 The character of Enodia is known especially through Thessalian archaeological discoveries. Although the evidence is insufficient to proceed with absolute certainty, it gives us a fair idea of the sort of goddess Enodia was, and the ways in which an association and eventual identification with Hekate would have made sense. However, are we justified in saying that Enodia was so connected to witchcraft and sorcery that Hekate would easily acquire these traits from her? If not, the other way to test the hypothesis that the close connection to Enodia caused Hekate to transform into a goddess of witchcraft is by reference to the idea of a Thessalian reputation for magic. However, in what chronological boundaries are we working? It is at this point that the study proposes a new historical framework in which to approach the question of Enodia’s influence on Hekate. The inseparability of the *polis* from religion meant that, in the Greek world, political divides would, by necessity, cause religious divides. As a consequence, magic was given a theoretical Persian origin, so it could be represented as foreign and illicit.26 The Thessalian medism of 480 B.C. arguably provides us with the cause of a decline in the (principally) Athenian perception of Thessalian religion which would, in turn, inevitably affect any deity closely connected to another deity of Thessalian origin.

25 Kraus (1960) 83.
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A few extra notes about the scope of this study. A systematic comparison with Kybele will not be the aim of this study, although the goddess does appear at numerous points through the study. In his chapters on ‘[d]ie kleinasiatische Hekate’ and ‘Hesiod — Thrakien — Enodia’ Kraus dedicates much of his discussion to the ‘sphere of Anatolian mother goddesses’, in which Kybele has an obvious place.\textsuperscript{27} Thasos and Aegina have been mentioned where relevant, but are not thoroughly discussed within the thesis. Instead, a short discussion of Hekate’s Aeginetan presence is appended.\textsuperscript{28} Hekate and trimorphism has not been the subject of any especial consideration in this thesis, as it is a phenomenon for which almost all the evidence dates later than the fifth century, apart from the fifth century skyphos mentioned in Chapter Two.\textsuperscript{29}

\textsuperscript{27} Kraus (1960). For more on Kybele, see Munn (2006); Borgeaud (2004); Vassileva (2001); Roller (1999); Lane (1996); Gasparro (1985); Naumann (1983).

\textsuperscript{28} Thasos is addressed at Kraus (1960) 69-73.

\textsuperscript{29} And discussed by Simon (1985). The Alkamenes statue, the first trimorphic statue of Hekate, is no longer extant. It is discussed in Chapter Two.
CHAPTER ONE
RECONSIDERING THE GEOGRAPHICAL ORIGINS OF HEKATE

INTRODUCTION

A determinative statement of Hekate’s point of geographical origin remains elusive, notwithstanding the considerable attention the subject has been afforded. This is because, generally speaking, there is insufficient evidence to remove any doubt. The aim of this chapter is to reconsider various theories that have been published since the nineteenth century. First, two more recent proposals will be scrutinised. In 1974, William Berg proposed that Hekate was a Mycenaean goddess.¹ Some 21 years later, David West submitted that the best approach to the subject was to conceive of Hekate as an evolute of the Mesopotamian Lamashtu.² However, even in an area of research that, by necessity, attracts widespread speculation, these theories are simply too tenuous, and never manage to get off the ground. Most of the focus in this chapter is split between the Thracian and Karian theories. Lewis Farnell and Theodor Kraus were, respectively, the first to provide a detailed case for each theory.³ Examining the accuracy of the Thracian claim involves a thorough comparison of Hekate with the Thracian Bendis, given that a supposed likeness between the two leads Farnell to the conclusion that Hekate most likely originated from that northern region. There are methodological difficulties involved in a systematic comparison of the two, given the non-Thracian lens through which most of the evidence for Bendis depicts the goddess. There is arguably enough evidence, however, to give us a firm indication of whether the hypothesis that Hekate evolved from Bendis is accurate or not. If any likeness falls flat, so does the theory that Hekate is Thracian. The focus then shifts to a reconsideration of the Karian theory.

¹ Berg (1974).
² West (1995).
³ Farnell (1896); Kraus (1960).
The data varies greatly in form: epigraphic, archaeological, onomastic, sculptural, literary, and mythological sources are all drawn upon. Is Amanda Herring correct that Hekate’s major Hellenistic cult in Lagina was a distinctively new form of worship that did not represent the revival of a much more ancient Karian one? 

Could the cult have been both distinguishable from previous worship and yet still represent some sort of revival? These questions and more are considered in the final portion of this chapter.

THE MYCENAEN AND MESOPOTAMIAN THEORIES

Berg proposes that Hekate ‘must’ have been a Greek, specifically Mycenaean goddess. His argument begins with the assertion that ‘almost all’ the archaeological and literary evidence for Hekate’s cult, from ‘earliest times down to the second century B.C.’ is of mainland Greek, particularly Attic, provenance. To prop up his Mycenaean thesis, Berg relies on a Linear B tablet (Tn 316) that mentions a dedication to a trio of goddesses at Pylos. The three deities mentioned are Preswa, I-pe-me-de-ja, and Diuja, with whom he equates Persephone, Hekate (through Iphimede), and Demeter, respectively. Berg’s argument is essentially pinned on the presumption that these identifications are correct, and he cites the association of the three goddesses in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter, on vases, and on a metope. Each identification, however, is extremely tenuous. While there is arguably evidence for a link between Iphimede and Hekate in the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women, the reading of Iphimede (or Iphimedeia) in the tablet is inconclusive. If the reading is indeed correct, it does not necessarily follow that this connection to, or, rather, form of Hekate, dated back to Mycenaean times. Finally, even if Berg’s identification of the trio were sound, the antiquity of the evidence would not necessarily lead us to the conclusion that Hekate was undeniably of Greek origin. Scholars have

---

4 Herring (2011).
5 Berg (1974).
6 See Chapter Two, n. 141.
justifiably cast Berg’s proposal aside.⁷

West, on the other hand, advances a conclusion that is ‘essentially the same’ as D. W. Myhrman, stating that it is ‘virtually certain that the Greek Hekate is an evolute of Mesopotamian Lamashu’ and was consequently incorporated into the Greek pantheon by the Mycenaeans.⁸ This argument is similar in kind to one proposed earlier by Burkert, and later followed by West, who suggests that Lamia and Gello are derivatives of Near Eastern demons such as Lamashu and Gallû.⁹ With reference to Smith, Johnston’s article ‘Defining the Dreadful’ addresses the methodological problems in the ‘scholarly quest for the ‘roots’ of Greek demonology among other cultures.’¹⁰ There is a difference in that Hekate was a goddess, rather than a demon, and would therefore not be depicted to quite the same ‘physically repulsive or grossly deformed’ extent as, for example, aōrai,¹¹ until very late times.¹² However, the motifs that West cites in support of Hekate’s derivation from Lamashu (some of which are rather tenuous) generally constitute traits that are best interpreted with reference to the Greeks rather than Near Eastern peoples. That is because, as Johnston asserts, ‘most of the traits have been shown to accord well with the premise that a society marginalizes that which is undesirable’ by associating it with frightening or anomalous traits, such as giant size,¹³ canine sacrifice,¹⁴ serpents and snaked-headed men,¹⁵ witches,¹⁶ and so forth. It is true that

---

¹¹This term is used frequently throughout this study, and is explained in full by Johnston (1999). The most succinct and accurate way to define aōrai is as untimely dead women, such as ‘childless mothers’ and ‘blighted virgins’. (Terms borrowed from Johnston (1999) Ch. Five).
¹⁴Ibid, 283-284.
¹⁵Ibid, 284.
¹⁶Ibid, 286.
1: RECONSIDERING THE GEOGRAPHICAL ORIGINS OF HEKATE

‘ritual techniques’ could be exchanged between cultures, but that is a different concept to the traits on which West so heavily relies.\(^{17}\) With the application of this model, West’s theory breaks down. It also explains West’s lack of archaeological and literary evidence for a connection between Hekate and Lamashtu, as well as his failure to substantiate transmission of the latter’s worship to Greece.\(^{18}\)

**THE THRACIAN THEORY: INTRODUCTORY REMARKS**

The first advocate of a Thracian origin for Hekate was Voss, in the third instalment of his *Mythologische Briefe*.\(^{19}\) He claims that ancient Pelasgian tribes in the northern area known as Thrace worshipped a beneficent deity, known as Hekate or the male Hekatos. Nearly a century later, Farnell expanded upon this theory, and became its main proponent.\(^{20}\) Initially, he cites the varied accounts of Hekate’s genealogy,\(^{21}\) as well as her associations with superstition and magic as justifications for looking beyond the Greek border. He then refines this proposal by suggesting Hekate’s origin may best be explained as coming from beyond the northern border, and refers in particular to her worship in Thessaly (notwithstanding the lack of evidence in that region), the islands of the Thracian Sea, and Aegina, the yearly

---

\(^{17}\) Johnston (1995) 381 and *passim*.

\(^{18}\) Cf. Herda (2009) 98 n. 406, who seems to accept West’s argument, but has reservations about his proposals regarding the etymology of Hekate’s name.

\(^{19}\) Voss (1827-34) 3.190-191.

\(^{20}\) Farnell (1896) 2.504-510.

\(^{21}\) Namely, the following claims: of Hesiod ‘and others’ (*Theog.* 409-411) that she was the daughter of Perses and Asterie, of Musaeus (Schol. Ap. Rhod. 3.467) that her parents were Asterie and Zeus, of Bacchylides (fr. 1B = Ap. Rhod. 3.467: see Campbell (1992) 4.253-254) that she was the daughter of Night, of Euripides (*Ion* 1048) as the child of Leto, and of Thessalian legend as having the parentage of Admetus and a Pherai woman. It was also believed that she was closely related to Aëttes and Circe of Cholcis. Hesiod mentions (*Theog.* 448) that she is an only child, something that is also discussed in Chapter Two. See Farnell (1896) 2.502. Other accounts of Hekate’s genealogy are given by Pherecydes (daughter of Aristaeus), Sophron (Sophr. *ap. Schol. Theocr.* *Id.* 2.12: daughter of Zeus and Hera), Callimachus (fr. 466: same as Euripides), and Orphic authors (*Orph Fr.* 41: same as Euripides). For full references, see Johnston (1999) 246 n.131.
τελεταί on which island were apparently founded by the Thracian Orpheus.\textsuperscript{22} Honing in on the prospect of a Thracian origin, Farnell cites a passage of Strabo,\textsuperscript{23} and claims that he believed Hekate belonged to a Phrygian-Thracian cultic sphere, defined primarily by orgiastic worship of an earthly Mother-Goddess. Bendis, a Thracian deity, belonged within this sphere.\textsuperscript{24} Farnell uses the supposed likeness between Bendis and Hekate to bolster his claim of the latter’s Thracian origin. Finally, he refers to the metamorphosed, canine Hekabe who apparently joined Hekate’s throng of hounds roaming the Thracian forests.\textsuperscript{25} Since the proposals of Voss and Farnell, support for a Thracian origin for Hekate has been slight. Hanell argues that both Artemis and Hekate are derived from Thracian Bendis.\textsuperscript{26} Bell gives Hekate a Thracian origin in his 1991 study, presumably because his description of Bendis says the Thracian goddess was ‘identified … with Hecate’.\textsuperscript{27} Three years later, while discussing Hekate in relation to her Byzantine cult, Limberis stated that Hekate, ‘like Byzas’, was originally from Thrace.\textsuperscript{28} She does not elaborate beyond this, but evidently relies on Farnell for the assertion.\textsuperscript{29}

\textsuperscript{22} Paus. 2.30.2. See also Farnell (1896) 505; Marquardt (1981), 251 n. 8. For Orpheus’ connection to Thrace, see Graf and Johnston (2007) 167. For more on Aegina, see the Appendix.

\textsuperscript{23} Strab. 10.3.18

\textsuperscript{24} Cf. Auffarth (2013): ‘Comedy … (in 430 Cratinus, Thracian Women fr. 85; Aristoph. fr. 384) tended to caricature her cult as orgiastic’. See text for references.

\textsuperscript{25} Farnell (1896) 2.508. On the possibility of Hekabe as Thracian, see West (1995) 224-228. This genealogy seems to stem from Euripides’ Hekabe. She is, however, also represented as Phrygian. See Gregory (1995) for a discussion of Euripides’ ‘genealogical innovation’ vis-à-vis his fabrication of a new paternity (and therefore country of origin) for Hekabe for the purposes of the narrative.

\textsuperscript{26} Hanell (1934) 185-7.

\textsuperscript{27} Bell (1991) 94, 219.

\textsuperscript{28} Limberis (1994) 126.

\textsuperscript{29} Dölger (1922-1943) 2.418 asserts that the ‘Graeco-Ionian’ appellation ‘Hekate’ and the Thracian ‘Bendis’ are simply two alternative names for the same figure, but stops short of asserting where this particular deity originated.
THE ‘PURE’ BENDIS

Farnell’s identification of Hekate with Thracian Bendis is the central pillar in his theory of Hekate’s origin. In order to evaluate this claim, it is necessary to examine the character of Bendis separately. This, however, proves to be no easy task, given the meagre evidence for what Abrahamsen has termed the ‘pure’, Thracian Bendis.\footnote{Abrahamsen (1995) 49.} The Thasian colonies of Neapolis and Oesyme, located between the Strymon and Nestos rivers, were home to at least two sanctuaries where worship of a goddess known as Parthenos was performed. Scholars generally believe this deity to be Bendis.\footnote{Larson (2007) 176. For more on Bendis as Parthenos (and vice versa), see Isaac (1986) 69, 107-108, 289.} Coins struck by the Teian colony of Abdera in the late fifth century depict a goddess accompanied by a doe.\footnote{Kraus (1960) 74.} In her right hand she bears a branch, a particularly Thracian depiction, and one that Abrahmasen interprets as a symbol of immortality.\footnote{Abrahmasen (1995) 50. Fol and Marazov (1977) 24 assert that the twig granted free passage to Hades, while Simon (1985) 274 n. 22 states that branches were also used for purificatory purposes: ‘Mit Zweigen besprengte man sich aus Perirranteria beim Eintritt ins Heiligtum.’ Purification is a function intimately associated with Hekate. See, for example, Johnston (1991).} She holds a bow in her left hand. This is the earliest Thracian representation of Bendis,\footnote{According to Kraus (1960) 74, upholding the interpretation of Picard.} and its numismatic form suggests an esteemed position for the deity in this part of Thrace. \textit{Prima facie}, however, it does not strike a resemblance to the varied iconographic representations of Hekate.

The presence of Hekate at Abdera is quite possibly evidenced by the use of personal names on coins struck by the colony.\footnote{Isaac (1986) 107 also mentions the fourth century historian Hekataios; von Rudloff (1999) 47 states that ‘two noteworthy old theophoric names – Hekatonymos and Hekataios – are recorded at the city from the fifth and fourth centuries.’ See also Radt (1958) 73: ‘Auf einen Hekatekult in Abdera deuten auch die aus Abdera bekannten Namen Ἑξατάτοιος ... vgl. auch Ἑξατ ... und Ἑξατόνυμος’. See below for the reliability of theophoric names as evidence of Hekate’s cult.} Given its colonial status, some
1: RECONSIDERING THE GEOGRAPHICAL ORIGINS OF HEKATE

scholars have justifiably assumed that Hekate’s cult was brought from Teos, particularly because Ionian evidence of her worship is of greater antiquity.36 Pindar’s second paean includes a fragmentary hymn for the city that states that an oracle of victory was given by Hekate on the day of the new moon.37 Pindar describes Hekate as φοινικόπεζα παρθένος εὐμενής Ἑκάτα, ‘red-footed maiden, kindly Hekate.’ Along with Pindar’s depiction, the lack of a good reason for the adjective εὐμενής to be interpreted as euphemistic and the fact that a theophoric name is unlikely to derive from a sinister goddess provide support for Kraus’ conclusion that the Abderan manifestation of Hekate seems to have lacked the sinister characteristics commonly associated with Hekate’s later manifestations.38 It seems clear, then, that both Bendis and Hekate were worshipped at Abdera; at this stage, nothing further can be safely stated about their relationship, and the possibility of Hekate being a reflex of the Thracian deity. Given the paucity of evidence for Bendis in Thrace in general, it is necessary to look elsewhere for clues about her character.

NON-THRACIAN EVIDENCE FOR BENDIS

Bendis, who would have become known to the Greeks during their colonization of the Northern Aegean during the Archaic period, was the subject of an unprecedented cultic installation at Athens. Most of the information about her

37 Pind., Pa. 2.77. Wilamowitz (1966) 251 suggests that the Abderites quoted an oracle to the poet that gave their ancestors strength on the particular day (of the new moon), before going on to secure military victory. This would make Hekate more of an intermediary messenger, rather than a giver of the oracle itself. Radt (1958) 73 states that ‘[m]öglicherweise wurde Hekate in Abdera als Botin der Götter verehrt – nach Sophron (fr. 7 Kaibel) hiess sie ja ursprünglich Ἀγγεῖλος’. See West (1995) 199-200 for elaboration on Hekate as messenger. Zografou (2010) also discusses Ἀγγεῖλος at 183-90.
38 Kraus (1960) 65: ‘Das Adjektiv εὐμενής in diesem Zusammenhang als euphemetisch anzusehen, liegt kein Grund vor. Die Göttin ist hier wirklich die Gnädige, die der Stadt Geneigte, so wie sie später noch wirklich εὕρικοος ist.’
presence and worship in Attica is derived from inscriptions that are dated from c. 429 to the second century B.C. 39 She arrived with her cultic companion Deloptes, 40 who has been identified as a Thracian Asklepios. 41 Opinions vary as to the date of Bendis’ entry, but it seems to have been at some point in 429 B.C. 42 The first two letters of her name appear in the accounts of the treasurers of the Other Gods of this year. 43 Since no other divine name beginning with these two letters was available, the reference is surely to Bendis. 44 Foreign gods were generally inclined to court suspicion among the nationalistic Athenians, and yet the state festival for Bendis, the Bendideia, was still being celebrated annually and extravagantly at the Peiraeus in the 330s. 45 The cult was so well received that earlier versions of the festival proceeded from the prytaneum, the political and judicial core of the city. 46 Beyond 200 B.C., there is no evidence of the continuation of the cult. 47 This most curious of festivals in honour of a Thracian deity has long aroused the interest of historians.

40 IG II² 1256 (see below, n. 74), 1324.

43 IG I² 310, line 208.
44 Nilsson (1942) 45.
45 IG II² 1496, which tells us that in 334/33 the state received 457 drachmas from the sale of the hides of animals that were sacrificed at the festival. In terms of extravagance, only the city Dionysia and the Olympia were superior: see Simms (1988) 61. See also Parker (1996) 173 and Larson (2007) 177.
46 IG II² 1283 (see below, n. 80), which can possibly be dated to 261/260 B.C. For more on centrifugal processions, see Graf (1996) 60-61.
47 See Nilsson (1951) 48 for theories as to why the festival did not continue.
who debate the motives behind its introduction. For present purposes, the Greek literary, epigraphic and artistic evidence of Bendis following her Attic introduction is significant. It provides information about the Greek perception of Bendis, which in turn allows the relationship (if any) between Bendis and Hekate to be scrutinised, and whether the latter evolved from the former. It is, however, important to remember that the Greek perception does not necessarily tell us that one evolved from the other. It is more likely to speak of a syncretism. As Hoddinott states, ‘Thracian religion is … confused by the Greek viewpoint through which it was first and is still most commonly studied’.

Through the narrative of Sokrates, Plato’s Republic documents the inaugural Bendideia at the Peiraeus on 19/20th Thargelion, 429 B.C. Evidently a torch race on horseback (the latter being a very Thracian touch) took place in the evening, followed by an all-night celebration. From this account, the equine, torch, and nocturnal aspects of this festival allow for a very general association with Hekate. There is evidence that Hekate may have been connected with the horse.

---

48 Foucart (1903) 84 holds that Bendis’ worship was brought to the Peiraeus by Thracian merchants; Ferguson (1949) 157ff. hypothesized it was for healing purposes due to its introduction at the time of the great plague (but this presupposes Bendis was a healing goddess, whereas she was probably not); Larson (2007) 177 articulates nicely the now well-accepted view that Bendis was introduced to ‘cement existing diplomatic, military, and trade relations with the Odrysian Thracians at a time when a major war with the Peloponnesians was imminent’; Thuc. 2.29.4 (see Garland (1992) 112) informs us that at the time of the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War Athens attached considerable importance to the formation of an alliance with the Odrysian Thracians.


50 Pl. Resp. 1.327a-328a.


52 In support of his statement (at 223) that Hekate is connected with horses (and therefore comparable to Bendis’s festival), West (1995) 209, 212-213 cites Arg. Orph. 977-99; Porph. Abstr. 4.16.53f.; PGM IV.2302 (Betz (1986) 79); PGM IV.2548ff. (Betz (1986) 84-85); PGM IV.2610ff. (Betz (1986) 86); and PGM IV.2755ff. (Betz (1986) 90). All of this evidence, however, is later (indeed, much later in the case of Orphic Argonautica and Porphyry) than three late Classical reliefs, which West fails to mention. The reliefs, which are discussed in more detail in Appendix n. 8, all depict a goddess bearing torches in the company of a horse. We cannot be sure that Hekate is the
association with the torch is a long-standing one: the first mention of her in relation to a torch is in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, which was most likely written before the mid sixth century B.C.\(^{53}\) The nocturnal association is something that develops during the classical period. Proclus, a fifth century A.D. scholiast on *Republic*, mentions Bendis in relation to ‘the many names of the Moon’. He uses the name Βενδίς ... κραταιά, ‘mighty Bendis’.\(^{54}\) The grammarian Hesychius of Alexandria, also from the fifth century A.D., states that Bendis and Artemis are named Σελήνη.\(^{55}\) On the rock reliefs of Roman-era Philippi, dated to the late second and early third centuries A.D.,\(^{56}\) crescent symbols appear in connection with a syncretised representation of Diana and Bendis, but these are not much use. Arguably, the meagre and late references to Bendis’ lunar nature preclude any firm establishment of her as a moon goddess. This does not seem to have prevented wide scholarly acceptance of Bendis’ supposed lunar role, and consequently her connection to Hekate on these grounds. It is not contentious that Hekate was associated with the Moon, although the question of whether this attribute was original or not tends to provoke varied responses.\(^{57}\) But other Greek goddesses also carried this association, to lesser or greater degrees, and so even if Bendis had closely mirrored Hekate’s late lunar role, it would be artificial to rely on the similarity between these two goddesses to the exclusion of all others in order to derive one from the other. Of especial significance for present purposes is the fact that all torch-bearing goddesses can be securely identified as Hekate. Nevertheless, a real possibility exists. Given the closer temporal proximity of these reliefs to the introduction of Bendis and her festival, as well as the fact that they make a direct connection between a torch-bearing goddess and horses (instead of the vaguer epithets and associations of the evidence cited by West), they are a more suitable basis from which to argue for a connection between Hekate and Bendis in relation to the Bendideia.

\(^{53}\) *Hom. Hymn Dem.*, 52. For a discussion of the date of the *Homeric Hymn*, see Chapter Two.

\(^{54}\) For the comments of Proclus, see Kern (1972) 223, no. 200 (*In R. 1.18.12*). I have taken these two translations from West (1995) 222.

\(^{55}\) Hsch. s.v. διλογχος: Latte (1953) 1.459.


\(^{57}\) See, for example, Farnell (1896) 2.511; West (1995) 203; Johnston (1990) 30-31.
that Artemis was closely associated with the Moon, a connection that arguably began at least 200 years before the first irrefutable evidence for Hekate as lunar, which is from the first century AD.\textsuperscript{58}

Hesychius provides other pieces of information about Bendis in his lexicon. In his treatment of the possibility of a Thracian origin for Hekate with regard to Bendis, West cites Hesychius frequently.\textsuperscript{59} Hesychius is indeed a helpful ancient source, but the lateness of his work is an important factor in the evaluation of its validity. Hesychius includes a reference to Bendis as ἳ Ἀρτέμις, Θρακιστί,\textsuperscript{60} an idea also expressed by Palaephatus, who says the Thracians use the name Bendis for Artemis.\textsuperscript{61} Hesychius provides a comparatively full account of (his perception of) the character of Bendis. He states that the word διλόγχον (‘two-lots’)\textsuperscript{62} was the name used by Cratinus for Bendis.\textsuperscript{63} Elaborating, Hesychius writes that Bendis was given this name either because she had to discharge duties towards the two honours allotted to her, heaven and earth, or because she was armed with two spears (because she was a κυνηγετική, ‘divine huntress’)\textsuperscript{64} or bearing two lights. Of the two lights, one was her own, while the other was or was derived from the sun. As stated above, Hesychius concludes the entry by stating that Bendis and Artemis are named Σελήνη, entrenching the aforementioned lunar aspects of both.\textsuperscript{65} West relies on this conclusion to Hesychius’ entry to assert that the two lights carried by Bendis are the moon and the sun.\textsuperscript{66} In the Aristophanic comedy ‘The Lemnian Women’,

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{58} See Johnston (1990) 31, nn, 7-8; Sen. Med. 790; Plut. De def. or. 416 c-f and Plut. De fac. 944 c ff.
\item \textsuperscript{59} West (1995) 221-224.
\item \textsuperscript{60} Hsch. s.v. Βενδίς: Latte (1953) 1.323.
\item \textsuperscript{61} Brunner (1663) 47 (Greek) and 48 (Latin), for Chap. 32, lines 10-12.
\item \textsuperscript{62} West (1995) 222.
\item \textsuperscript{63} Hsch. s.v. διλόγχον: Latte (1953) 1.459.
\item \textsuperscript{64} West (1995) 222.
\item \textsuperscript{65} Although, as per the discussion above, his perception of Bendis as a lunar goddess seems to be relatively unfounded.
\item \textsuperscript{66} West (1995) 222.
\end{itemize}
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Bendis is called the μεγάλη θεός, according to both Heyschius and Photius.⁶⁷ Her mention in this comedy could indeed suggest that she was worshipped in Lemnos. Arguably the most significant statement from Hesychius is found under the entry Ἀδμήτου κόρη, where, through the words Ἐκατη τινὲς δὲ τὴν Βενδίν, he states that the two names were interchangeable and connects Hekate to Thessaly through the paternity of Admetos.⁶⁸

The other pieces of Greek literary evidence for the character of Bendis include another entry from Hesychius under βούσβατον (‘cow-pasturing’),⁶⁹ where he again mentions Thracian Artemis,⁷⁰ and a statement from Herodotus that Thracian and Paeonian women burned straw in their sacrifice to Ἀρτέμιδι τῇ βασιλείᾳ in what is most likely a reference to Thracian Bendis.⁷¹ On Attic representations, Bendis bears a striking sartorial resemblance to Artemis.⁷² In a votive relief from the British Museum, which is dated from c. 400 to 350 B.C., a representation of Bendis appears to the right and in front of two older, bearded, and garbed men. The foremost of these men carries a torch. They lead eight young, naked men, who are grouped in couples. The first in line carries an object; it may be a torch handle. This is likely a representation of the victors from the torch race without their horses, led by their trainers and sponsors.⁷³ Bendis appears on a much larger scale. She wears a sleeved, shortened tunic. Over this, an animal hide is worn over her left shoulder and girt round the waist; the tail of the beast hangs down the middle. Over both shoulders she wears a large cloak. It is fastened around her neck by a circular brooch and hangs down her back. She wears knee-length hunting boots and a Phrygian cap. In her right hand, she grasps a phiale, either to pour out blessings or to accept a sacrifice. Her left hand rests on a spear. A later votive relief

---

⁶⁷ Hsch. s.v. μεγάλη θεός (Latte (1953) 2.635); Naber (1864) 1.410 (Photius).
⁶⁸ Latte (1953) 1.43. See Rohde (1925) 322 n. 90.
⁶⁹ West (1995) 221.
⁷⁰ Latte (1953) 1.340.
⁷¹ Hdt. 4.33.5.
⁷² Hartwig (1897) 7; Simms (1988) 66.
from the Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek in Copenhagen was part of a stele from the Piraeus, and bore an inscription which is dated to 329/8 B.C.\textsuperscript{74} It depicts Bendis with her aforementioned consort Deloptes, who rests on a staff. There are inconsequential amendments to her earlier depiction: the cloak is draped over one shoulder and the Phrygian cap sits further back on the head, exposing some of her hair. The two deities look down at two bearded, draped worshippers. Bendis once again holds the phiale, indicating that the human figures will be honoured for their successful execution of the goddess’ festival,\textsuperscript{75} or that Bendis is receiving a sacrifice. The spear appears in her left hand. Meanwhile, a small scene in low relief appears above the heads of the human figures. Hermes, carrying a cornucopia, leads three nymphs, while Pan looks on holding his flute.\textsuperscript{76}

Reminiscent of this small scene is the upper register of a quarry relief from Paros, with whom Athens was allied. The relief, in an unfortunate state of disrepair, is dedicated to the nymphs by Adamas of the Odrysians. The lettering of the inscription allows for a date at some point in the second half of the fourth century B.C.\textsuperscript{77} Due to the weathered state of the relief, we are at the mercy of travellers from the eighteenth century who sketched renderings. The relief has drawn as many fanciful interpretations as it has reasonable ones. Larson’s fairly recent interpretation identifies several of the figures on the upper of the two registers as the mask of the personified Acheloös, a seated Pan, Ge, and a Silenus-like figure. The more controversial aspects of her reading include an identification of Hermes and two nymphs and, based on the similarity of this scene to others, a group that may represent the Korybantes. On the lower and main register are four large figures, one of whom is generally recognized as Bendis (whose iconography is the same as on the votive reliefs, including the spear and phiale) accompanied by three

\textsuperscript{74} IG II\textsuperscript{2} 1256.

\textsuperscript{75} Larson (2001) 135.

\textsuperscript{76} Ibid. Larson asserts that there is a close connection between Bendis and nymphs in Thracian cult; more on this soon. For images of these two votive reliefs see Garland (1992) 25-26, Larson (2007) pl. 13.2.

\textsuperscript{77} IG XII 5.245. See also Bodnar (1973) 270; Muthmann (1975) 122-123, pl. 18; Berranger (1983); Edwards (1985) no. 89.
nymphs. To the left are several smaller figures whom Larson identifies as Demeter, Persephone, and Hekate, who appears as a torch-bearing girl. The other disembodied heads could represent any of a number of deities, possibly Zeus, Hera and Poseidon.

The aforementioned connection between Bendis and nymphs is important, particularly in relation to the goddess Parthenos. An inscription from the third century tells us that a nymphaion was situated near Bendis’ sanctuary at the Piraeus, the Bendideion. Isaac says that Bendis was ‘Hellenized as Parthenos or Artemis’, Larson holds that Parthenos was ‘an epithet of Bendis’, while Wilamowitz connects Hekate, Bendis and Parthenos of Neapolis, citing Pindar’s phrase φοινικόπεζα παρθένος ἑυμενής Ἑκάτη. The common denominator is a close association or identification of Bendis and Parthenos, and a relationship to nymphs. Larson holds that the word νύμφη is paradoxical in meaning, referring to either a pre-nuptial, virginal girl over whom Artemis has dominion, or a highly-sexualised fertility deity who is intimately associated with verdancy, such as springs and forests. She holds

---

78 Larson’s identification of the two figures as Demeter and Persephone is in line with Bodnar (1973) 276, who states that the two seated figures are so closely fused that they not only share the same throne, but almost the same lower body. This challenges any interpretation of the figures as singular and therefore Kybele/Meter, an argument put forward by Roller as recently as 1999. See Larson (2001) 180; Bodnar (1973); Roller (1999) 227. See Roller in particular for further bibliographical suggestions. Vermaseren (1977) 80 also discusses the relief, although many of his identifications have since been challenged.

79 Bodnar (1973) 276; Larson (2001) 180 says they are possibly Zeus Kynthios, Herakles and Apollo. Another relief that requires a passing mention is one from Chalkis, although it most likely does not depict Bendis. Kraus discusses it succinctly, stating that Bendis is reminiscent of both Artemis and Dionysos. Indeed, the Thracian goddess was mistakenly identified on the Chalkian relief, whereas the more plausible interpretation is the gender-transcendent Dionysos. See Kraus (1960) 75. The interpretation is supported by the likely identification of his companion as Hades (rather than Deloptes), because he holds a cornucopia, the traditional attribute of Hades. Hades is closely associated with Dionysos. For a detailed treatment of the confusion surrounding this relief, see Daux (1964). The confusion persists, as Larson’s very recent interpretation of the pair as Bendis and Deloptes demonstrates: Larson (2007) 176, fig. 13.2.

80 IG II2 1283, II. 17-20.

that Artemis is an ‘über-nymph’, but stresses that these two ideas of the nymph should not remain taxonomically separate.\(^8^2\) The first part of Larson’s assertion about the paradoxical nature of the word νύμφη is importantly related to the concept of a young woman. If Parthenos is indeed an epithet of Bendis, this would suggest that she is a young, virginal and nubile woman. The sculptural representations we have discussed envisage a young woman, specifically an athletic huntress wearing very similar garb to that of Artemis.\(^8^3\) Bendis’ connection with nymphs also indicates a fertility function, and serves to entrench her association with Artemis. The mention in Herodotus of Thracian women burning straw indicates a connection with agricultural fecundity, which may have been the reason for Bendis’ title of μεγάλη θεός in Aristophanes’ comedy.\(^8^4\) In terms of Hekate, Pindar’s epithet φοινικόπεζα, used in conjunction with παρθένος, is possibly related to the colour of ripe, red corn and, significantly, is used by Pindar at only one other point: as an epithet for Demeter, who quite clearly presided over agricultural fertility.\(^8^5\) Further, it is clear from the scholiast to Plato’s Republic that the Athenian Bendideia was a springtime festival (it was held in Thargelion), a fact that strengthens the fertility (and particularly agricultural) associations.\(^8^6\) If we operate under the assumption that Parthenos is Bendis, and take the liberty of using representations of Parthenos to develop the character of Bendis, yet more interesting evidence manifests itself. On the reverse of Neapolitan coins, Parthenos is depicted wearing a polos and holding a flower, possibly a poppy head, in one

---

\(^{8^2}\) Larson (2001) 109-110. Simms (1988) 68 states more or less the same point in relation to Bendis, saying that she may have originally been nothing more than a wood and mountain nymph. She cites Nilsson (1964) 112.

\(^{8^3}\) Although her hunting attributes and Artemis-style clothing are a Hellenization and therefore less significant when speaking of spheres outside hunting, as Simms (1988) does at 68.

\(^{8^4}\) Simms (1988) 68.

\(^{8^5}\) Pind. Ol. 6.94. For the translation of φοινικόπεζα, see Liddell, Scott and Jones (1940), s.v. φοινικόπεζα.

\(^{8^6}\) Schol. Pl. Resp. 327a. See Simms (1988) 61 n. 18, who cites two modern sources in support of this date for the Bendideia.
hand and a phiale—an attribute we have seen in relation to Bendis—in the other. On another relief, Parthenos is again wearing a polos. The polos, a traditionally Near Eastern and Anatolian headdress, was, among others, often associated with Hekate, Artemis and Kybele. The bright scarlet colour of the poppy flower, if indeed that is what Parthenos carries, has been interpreted by Graves as a symbol of rebirth after death. The same scholar asserts that the poppy was associated with Demeter. At the very least, it is a product of agricultural fertility, although it is important not to distort the evidence in unreasonable ways.

BENDIS AND ARTEMIS – BUT WHAT ABOUT HEKATE?

With this variety of evidence in mind, it seems that Bendis was a goddess whom the Greeks perceived very similarly to Artemis. It is clear, however, that the two deities remained distinct, regardless of how similar they were in representations. Xenophon’s account of a battle between the Thirty Tyrants and the forces of Thrasybulos at the Peiraeus in 404/3 B.C. describes the temples of Artemis Mounychia and Bendis (the Bendideion) as lying in close proximity to one another. As Garland asserts, Artemis had a ‘natural affinity’ and was ‘conveniently … identified’ with Bendis, a link which was strengthened by the

87 See Isaac (1986) 68, who provides further references.
88 Isaac (1986) 69.
89 Morris (2001) 139 states that the polos ‘expresses in visible form the protection a deity (often a goddess) affords her city.’
90 Graves (1955) 96, 24.15. He also discusses the poppy-heads found in a Cretan goddess’ headdress found at Gazi, a mould found at Palaiokastro which depicts a goddess bearing poppies, and the signet-ring recovered from the Acropolis Treasure at Mycenae. Graves’ identification of the goddess on this ring who holds three poppy-heads as Demeter is probably a stretch; the most we can reasonably say is that a Minoan fertility or plant goddess of the late Bronze Age is depicted.
91 A perception evidently adopted by the Romans: ‘Artemis-Bendis was later to become prominent in Philippi as well’: see Isaac (1986) 69.
92 Xen. Hell. 2.4.10-11.
close proximity of the two temples. Likewise, the fact that there was a temple for each goddess demonstrates that they were nonetheless distinct. Artemis, however, is not Hekate. Despite the ‘natural affinity’ between Artemis and Bendis, a nuanced approach (rather than a complete dismissal) is also called for in relation to the nexus between Bendis and Hekate. Artemis is reminiscent of Hekate in those characteristics where she is comparable to Bendis. Accordingly, we can quite naturally draw on the affinity between Artemis and Bendis to inform the Hekate-Bendis relationship, taking care, of course, not to conflate Hekate and Artemis. One of the apparent golden threads between all three is the iconographic concept of the torch-bearing maiden. Hekate is frequently depicted bearing a torch in both hands. Likewise, Artemis often appears with one or two torches. As per Hesychius, the epithet δύλογχον may indicate that Bendis bore two lights, although more reliable evidence can be sourced from Plato’s description of the Bendideia at the Piraeus and its torch race. If we take this thread and combine it with Parisinou’s statement that ‘in the case of … unmarried girls, the torch symbolizes their attachment to the realm of Artemis, the virgin goddess who is frequently represented with a torch in hand’, several other corroborative links appear. Hekate is variously attested, in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* and particularly in early Classical representations, as a

---


95 For depictions of Artemis with two torches, see Graf (1992) 228: Artemis Soteira in Megara and Delus; Artemis Phosphoros in Byzantium, Odessus (and the Roman manifestation of Diana Lucifera) in Philippi. A nuptial procession to the thalamos depicted by the Copenhagen Painter in 470 B.C. shows Artemis holding two burning torches, see Parisinou (2000) 33. At 228-233 Graf (1992) discusses Artemis Soteira/Phosphoros and Hekate, a well-known instance of conflation of the two goddesses. Such conflation is most likely attributable to the Greek colonisation of Ephesus, at which site Hekate was quite possibly the indigenous goddess of whom Pausanias speaks (Paus. 7.2.6). For a detailed discussion of this, see below. For more on Hekate Phosphoros, see Graf (1985) 229 n. 97, who lists literary and epigraphic evidence; Isaac (1986) 235; Herring (2011) 76; Berg (1974) 137 n. 41; Herda (2006) 282-283.; Herda (2011) 67 n. 57; Zeleny (1999) 68 (cf. Kraus (1960) 66ff.); Kraus (1960) 11, 22.

pre-nuptial, virginal maiden.\footnote{97} Now, if we recall that Bendis at Neapolis\footnote{98} was known as Parthenos or Maiden, was intimately associated with nymphs, and identified with Hekate by Wilamowitz, we have an interesting resemblance between the two, particularly in relation to the torch.\footnote{99} However, the lack of extant iconography depicting Bendis with a torch or torches is troubling, although not necessarily fatal within the purview of other evidence.

Both Hekate and Bendis came to use the epithet Enodia, although it was more frequently attached to the former.\footnote{100} Enodia was a Thessalian goddess, and her name seems to mean ‘In-the-Road’, suggesting a guardian-like status on the road into a city and in front of houses.\footnote{101} This sits well with Hekate’s vigilant and liminal qualities. However, other than poorly corroborated claims of Bendis as a lunar goddess,\footnote{102} there is not much to suggest she was a liminal figure. Enodia was connected with children.\footnote{103} Hekate brought with her into Greece a similar concern with birth and the welfare of the young in her capacity as a kourotrophos. Again, however, other than the maidenly, nymph-like status of Bendis, who could be described as on the cusp of marriage and birth, there is a lack of evidence.\footnote{104} There

\footnote{97}{See Chapter Two.}
\footnote{98}{Wiesner (1963) 109 mentions a much later sanctuary of Bendis near Nicopolis ad Istrum where, he argues, two reliefs represent Hekate ‘in einem Heiligtum südwestlich von Nicopolis ad Istrum geben von 37 Reliefs allein 35 das Motive der Hirschreiterin wieder, während die beiden anderen die der Artemis nahestehende Göttin Hekate darstellen’.
\footnote{99}{Recall also Wilamowitz’s statement about Pindar calling Hekate παρθένος.
\footnote{100}{Johnston (1990) 24 n. 10.
\footnote{101}{Johnston (1999) 208.
\footnote{102}{It may strike the reader as unusual that I so readily associate a lunar function with liminality. Middle-Platonic philosophy popularized the view that the Moon was an intermediary figure between gods and mortals, which caused the eventual association of Hekate with the Moon. See Johnston (1990) 29-38.
\footnote{103}{See Chapter Three for detailed discussion of Thessalian evidence for the character of Enodia.
\footnote{104}{In terms of health and welfare, Bendis has been described as an averter of illness. The proponents of this theory argue that she was introduced to Attic Greece at the time of the Athenian plague in 430 B.C. See, for example, Ferguson (1949) 157-162, who was the first to associate
are strong grounds for stating that Bendis was a huntress: from her late fifth century numismatic depiction from Abdera, where she is accompanied by a deer and holds a bow, through her Greek representations in hunting garb. Moreover, her close association with nymphs could suggest an association with fertility, something that would be supported by the (admittedly few) references to a possible agricultural side. Larson holds that a nubile, fertile young girl was perceived as a ‘wild creature who needed to be socialized and reconciled to the culturally approved restrictions on female behaviour’, which ties in with the idea of Bendis as a virginal girl connected with the wilderness. If she did indeed represent the cusp of womanhood, we can plausibly reassert the connection to Hekate. But such a link does not, of itself, suggest that Hekate was a reflex. Rather, it speaks of a universal social concern with the stages of a woman’s life in relation to her reproductive capacity. What is more, Hekate arguably represents the transition from one stage to the next—the centre, rather than either extreme—while Bendis may have simply exemplified eroticized, virginal potential. In any case, Kraus’ statement is arguably the most accurate: the shared characteristic of both is their chthonic nature. Recalling, once again, Bendis’ numismatic representation from Abdera, it is evident that she was holding a branch, a symbol that seems to have been associated with fertility and the afterlife. Chthonic associations are also suggested by Bendis’ introduction with the great plague of Athens, without explicitly stating that she was a healing deity. Naturally, though, his theory can only be borne out by proof that she possessed some kind of healing or disease-averting characteristic that would give her plague-related introduction in Athens some meaning. There is no firm evidence to support this theory, and so any comment remains speculative. See Simms (1988) 68.

105 Places associated with nymphs include: springs (microhabitat); mountains (macrohabitat); caves, which were likely to contain springs whether large or small; places characterized by abundant water, shade, and vegetation, often semicultivated vegetation. Fertile, moist parts of the landscape were associated with female anatomy. See Larson (2001) 8-10.


108 Kraus (1960) 75-76.
I: RECONSIDERING THE GEOGRAPHICAL ORIGINS OF HEKATE

by Parthenos’ polos on coins from Neapolis (occasionally a key to the identification of Hekate), as well as the possibility of the flower she holds being a poppy. As we have seen, the torch seems to have been intimately associated with Bendis by the Athenians, itself a chthonic symbol.\textsuperscript{109}

THE THRACIAN THEORY: CONCLUDING REMARKS

There does, then, seem to be several valid grounds for an association between Hekate and Bendis. Unfortunately, the suggestions I have provided about the character of Bendis cannot be rigorously proven, due to a lack of evidence. Moreover, the establishment of her Thracian character is precluded by the Greek origin of most of the evidence surveyed. Accordingly, to establish Hekate as a derivative of Bendis would be to go dangerously beyond the scope of the sources, and would go against the clues that any extant evidence provides on the link, if any, between these goddesses, particularly in light of the role of Artemis. Was it the case that Hekate was brought to Abdera from its mother city Teos, as Radt has assumed,\textsuperscript{110} and matched to Bendis upon her arrival, as Wilamowitz holds?\textsuperscript{111} Any statement is conjectural. Furthermore, as Kraus remarks, Teos yields no evidence of Hekate worship. He suggests, instead, that its position not far from the northern border of Karia meant Hekate’s worship would have eventually organically grown, or been introduced to the Teians.\textsuperscript{112} This redirects our attention to the most commonly accepted theory of Hekate’s origin: that she was a native of Anatolian Karia.

\textsuperscript{109} Farnell (1896) 2.509; Nilsson (1957) 396-397 n. 4; Richardson (1974) 156; West (1995) 198; Herring (2011) 150.

\textsuperscript{110} See above.

\textsuperscript{111} Wilamowitz (1966) 251.

\textsuperscript{112} Kraus (1960) 66.
RECONSIDERING THE KARIAN THEORY: INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

As mentioned above, the Karian theory of Hekate’s origins draws widespread scholarly agreement. The arguments of Kraus are still the most detailed account of this theory.\textsuperscript{113} It is frequently cited in treatises that do not deal extensively with the origins of the goddess. In asserting this theory, scholars rely on two main pieces of evidence to argue that Laginetan Hekate was the revival of an ancient cult: the large sanctuary of Hekate at Lagina and the presence of many Karian, theophoric names carrying the \textit{hekat}- root during the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.\textsuperscript{114} Stemming from these observations is the use of sycophantic titles for Hekate at Lagina such as \textit{σώτειρα}, \textit{ἐπιφανεστάτη θεά}, and \textit{μεγίστη},\textsuperscript{115} and the fact that the city of Idrias, which may have been the site on which Stratonikeia was founded by the Macedonians, was known as Hekatesia.\textsuperscript{116} The fact that no other sanctuary of this size was dedicated to Hekate is tantalizing evidence, and yet the complex was probably not constructed until the late second century B.C.,\textsuperscript{117} four centuries after the earliest-known pieces of archaeological evidence for worship of Hekate.\textsuperscript{118}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{113} Kraus (1960) 24-56. Cf. Laumonier (1958).
\item \textsuperscript{114} For example: Johnston (1999) 205; Sittig (1981) 60-67; Laumonier (1958) 422; Zgusta (1964) 159; Berg (1974) 128; Kraus (1960) 24-56. Sittig is the primary source for these theophoric names; of the 267 he lists, 57 are from Karia.
\item \textsuperscript{115} Kraus (1960) 43-44. Kraus calls the latter two ‘typical’ for this period, and states that they were also used for other deities, \textit{μέγας} and \textit{μέγιστος}, he argues, were appellations used predominantly for deities whose origins and characters were non-Greek. Cf. Zeleny (1999) 11. The epithet \textit{σώτειρα} has also been attested in Apamia, Akmonia, Kotiaeion, Delos, Lartos, Kos, and Thera. See Kraus (1960) 44 nn. 207-208. Commenting on all three epithets, Kraus (1960) 45 states that they are in keeping with the character of the original, Asia Minorian Hekate.
\item \textsuperscript{116} Zografou (2010) 93 n. 1; von Rudloff (1999) 52; Johnston (1999) 205, citing Steph. Byz. \textit{s.v. Ἐξατηρία}. It is important to be wary, however, of the very late date (early sixth century A.D.) of Stephanus Byzantius. Cf. Bean (1971) 89.
\item \textsuperscript{117} See below for more detailed discussion of the date of the temple.
\item \textsuperscript{118} Late sixth century B.C., from Anatolia (Miletos) and mainland Greece (Athens). See Herring (2011) 74-75. West (1966) 278 says the Milesian piece is the older of the two and that the altar may date to the seventh century.
\end{itemize}
Compounding this problem is the fact that the aforementioned *hekat*- root has not been demonstrably proved as an exclusive derivative of the goddess’ name. These theophoric names—for example, Hekatomonos, Hekataios, Hekaton, Hekatodoros, Hekatonymos—are of particular importance because they are older than the sanctuary, dating to the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. Indeed, the name Hekatos, which we saw at the beginning of this chapter, is used in relation to, or in replacement of Apollo – Homer, Alcman and Simonides provide examples of its use in isolation.\textsuperscript{119} Furthermore, Strabo believes that the islands known as the Hekatonnesoi were derived from Apollo’s aforementioned epithet.\textsuperscript{120} While Karia is arguably not the home of Apollo,\textsuperscript{121} it seems that his worship was nonetheless widely practised in Karia in the Archaic and Classical ages.\textsuperscript{122} He was not, however, the partner of Hekate in Karia; this was Zeus.\textsuperscript{123} It is noteworthy that Laumonier holds that the theophoric name Hekatomnos does not fit the Greek language, but is specifically Karian in formation, while the name Hekatos seems to have been applied to Apollo by the Greeks only—at least in the case of the three aforementioned poets.\textsuperscript{124} However, any firm statement seems to be precluded by the

\textsuperscript{119} For example: Hom. *Il.* 1.385; 7.83; Alcm. (Davies (1991) 46); Simon. (Davies (1991) 573). However, note the important comment of Kraus that ‘nur der Name der Hekate, seit Hesiod in die Literatur eingegangen, hat sich im Kult gehalten, während Hekatos schließlich „nur aus der Lektüre‘ noch bekannt war.’ See Kraus (1960) 13-14. Contrast this to the comments of Herda (2006) 288; (2008) 31, who states that Hekatos was used for Apollo, oracle god of Didyma.

\textsuperscript{120} Strab. 13.2.5.

\textsuperscript{121} Kraus (1960) 20.

\textsuperscript{122} Herring (2011) 73.

\textsuperscript{123} Before the existence of a temple at Lagina, the most important deity in the region was Zeus Chrysaoreus. Prior to this deity, Zeus Labraundos was worshipped, while a sanctuary to Zeus Panamaros existed during Hekate’s pre-eminence. For the temple of Zeus Chrysaoreus, see Şahin 1976; Cohen (1995) 268-273 and Strab. 14.2.25.

\textsuperscript{124} Laumonier (1958) 422: ‘Mais ce qui est beaucoup plus probant et qui atteste même de façon indubitable l'origine carienne d'Hékate c'est le nom d'Hékatomnôs dont la terminaison ne laisse aucun doute sur le caractère indigène du mot tout entier. Tous les essais d'étymologie hellénique et les rapprochement avec les épithètes apolliniennes ἐκτοτός, ἐκατήβολος.’ This argument is upheld by Burkert (1985) 171. Hekatomnos was ‘dynast’ of Karia and a Persian satrap.
supposed lack of evidence for Karian Hekate prior to the second century. Indeed, no numismatic representations of Hekate are produced by Stratonikeia—the urban centre located ten kilometres from Lagina—until the second century.\footnote{Herring (2011) 117 claims that coins depicting Hekate did not appear until the end of the second century or even later. Williamson (2012) 120 n. 28, however, argues that the earliest coins were issued after Rome declared Karia free from Rhodian possession in 167 B.C. Citing Meadows (2002), she states that these early coins can be dated between 160 and 130 B.C.}

In any case, it is important to recall the appearance of the *hekat-* root in Abdera (Hekataios and Hekatonymos), mentioned above. These names appeared in Abdera during the fifth and fourth centuries, that is, at the same time that the *hekat-* root is attested in Karia. While the derivation of these names is also uncertain, the argument for a link to Hekate can be advanced by the fact that Pindar’s second

---

in the first quarter of the fourth century B.C. (c. 390-377). Little else is known about him. As von Rudloff (1999) 51 states, ‘[t]he prominence of someone who had a [name derived from the *hekat-* root] could be a coincidence, or it might suggest that Hekate was already quite important at the time.’ If the latter is correct, the goddess’ presence and cult must have been so firmly established and revered that the use of a theophoric name by the region’s ruler was suitable. Rutherford (2006) 140 states that ‘Hecate’ looks like a Greek name, and it was also the form used by the Karians themselves, since the theonym Hekatomnos seems to be written h-q-t-m-n-o-s in Karian. And in view of that, there is a possibility that Hecate is a Greek or Ahhiyawan goddess who was introduced into Karia rather than vice versa.’ Debord (2009) 256, on the other hand, argues that ‘Il pourrait donc être tentant de considérer qu’Hécate s’est implantée en Carie à partir de la Grèce. Nous pensons que c’est l’inverse qui s’est produit : le nom porté par le fondateur de la dynastie satrapale du IV\textsuperscript{e} s. est la transcription en grec de *χτάμνος*, il se rencontre en lycien sous la forme *ekatamla* (=*Εκατόμνος*). Dans les textes connus aucun théonyme grec n’a été transcrit en carien, *gt* est donc bien le nom originel de la déesse. Cette affirmation est encore renforcée par l'existence de plusieurs noms théophores bâtis à partir de *Akta* (Aktaussollos, Aktauassis, Aktademos).’ Debord is emphasizing a point made by Adiego (1994). Adiego, in his important 2007 monograph on the Karian language, holds that ‘it is possible that the Greek form has undergone the analogical influence of the goddess’ name Hekate, so that the a vowel would be absent in the original Carian name’ (Adiego (2007) 243). Adiego’s most important argument is that ‘the existence in Carian of a noun *mno-* ‘son’ means that we can analyse the name as a Carian compound *kt+mno*’ (378), a point shared by Schürr (2010). See also Schürr (1992); Neumann (1994).
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*Paean* was written at some point in the fifth century B.C., and it is a contemporaneous reflection of a citizenry’s praise of Hekate on account of her role in the defeat of Thrace. Thereafter, theophoric names may have been used by people as an expression of gratitude. While Apollo Derenus was also an integral thread in the civic fabric of Abdera, it seems that the name Hekatos was restricted to literature. The comments of Apollonios Rhodios do not necessarily prove the cultic use of the epithet in Didyma. Let us proceed on the basis that the theophoric names in both Karia and Abdera are derived from Hekate. Under this assumption, there is a problem with corroborating Hekate’s Karian origin with theophoric names: if such names appear during the same time frame (fifth and fourth centuries) in both places, why place particular emphasis on the Karian ones? Because her worship would have been brought to Abdera from Teos, which in turn would have been infiltrated by Karian religion? The Hekate sanctuary cannot be used to prioritize the Karian names, since it did not exist until the late second century. What is more, both areas yield evidence that is later than the aforementioned sixth century evidence. Is the case for a Karian origin, despite its widespread acceptance, built on tenuous grounds?

First, it will help to discuss briefly the points Kraus makes both to support his thesis that Hekate’s Laginetan cult was a revival and to account for the apparent evidential vacuum prior to the second century. The earliest unequivocal evidence for Hekate’s cult in the region is an inscription that mentions Menophilos Leontas, a

---

126See Radt (1958) 17-19 for a discussion of the date, which may more feasibly be located in the first half of the fifth century.

127Dougherty (1994) 210 n. 26 states that there were close connections between Abdera and Teos in Pindar’s time. As we have seen, Teos was located near the northern border of Karia. Proceeding on the speculative basis of numerous scholars (Radt (1958) 73; Wilamowitz (1966) 251; Graham (1992) 67; von Rudloff (1999) 47), namely that Hekate was brought to Abdera from Karia-neighbouring Teos


130But recall the fact that ‘by the fifth century … she was being worshipped in Aehina, in Selinus and by many people in Athens.’ See West (1966) 277.
priest of Hekate who was charged with the priesthood of Helios and Rhodes.\textsuperscript{131} Several things can be said about this epigraph. First, the fact that such a priesthood existed in Laginetan territory means the inscription must be dated to the thirty-year period of Rhodian dominion over Stratonikeia: 197-167 B.C. Second, given that Laguna was incorporated into Rhodian territory around 189/188 B.C., a similar, or slightly later date can be attached to the introduction of the Rhodian cult, and, by extension, the inscription. Finally, given that Menophilos was already a priest of Hekate, the cult was clearly older than the inscription itself.\textsuperscript{132} This could potentially take us back to the turn of the third and the second centuries, and therefore nearly a century prior to the construction of the temple. Moreover, Kraus states that it is possible to distance numerous ‘original’, Asia Minorian cultic aspects from the ‘Hellenistic superimposition’ of Greek religious conventions.\textsuperscript{133} Only in Laguna did eunuch priests of Hekate appear, to whom the epithet σεμνώτατοι was attached, an indication of their rank.\textsuperscript{134} Although it seems likely that the importance of the eunuchs’ role had receded in importance,\textsuperscript{135} they were nonetheless charged with directing the δημόσιοι in the upkeep of the sacred grove and supervising the children’s choir that sang hymns to Hekate.\textsuperscript{136} The inscriptions are late (third century A.D.), but cannot attest to a cultic element that was introduced from Greece in the Hellenistic period,\textsuperscript{137} given the utter contempt with which Greek culture perceived such voluntary castration.\textsuperscript{138} Indeed, the entire

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{132} All three of these points are borrowed from Kraus (1960) 42.
\item \textsuperscript{133} Kraus (1960) 51.
\item \textsuperscript{134} Kraus (1960) 47; Laumonier (1958) 370; Hatzfeld (1920) 78-81, no. 11d; 84, no. 16.
\item \textsuperscript{135} Kraus (1960) 47; Laumonier (1958) 370.
\item \textsuperscript{136} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{137} When the new Macedonian settlement of Stratonikeia, to which the sanctuary of Laguna belonged, was founded.
\item \textsuperscript{138} Kraus (1960) 48. See Roller (1997) 542, who states that their ‘asexual condition caused them to be viewed with disgust and loathing … In some cases the eunuch priest was described as a
\end{itemize}

35
‘institution of sacred eunuchism was connected with great goddesses whose origins lay in the ancient Near East’. Such deities include Kybele and Artemis Ephesia. While Herring argues for an importation of this cultic aspect from Kybele, a case can be made in relation to Artemis Ephesia. Bremmer concludes that, in this locale, worship of Artemis had ‘incorporated a pre-existing Anatolian goddess with her eunuch priest’. Later in this chapter, we will come across Johnston’s theory that this pre-existing Anatolian goddess was likely Hekate herself, which can be reconciled with ancient authors’ accounts that Ephesos was founded on a pre-existing Karian settlement, whose inhabitants had already constructed a sanctuary in their goddess’ honour. If this argument is indeed valid, then it would seem likely that the Laginetan cult incorporated and revived an aspect of Hekate’s cult of great antiquity from their Karian forebears.

A less understood component of the Laginetan cult is the office of the κλειδοφόρος, the central figure in the annual κλειδὸς πομπή or κλειδὸς ἀγωγή, a centripetal procession. The inscriptions that mention this office and procession range from first century B.C to third century A.D. in date. They inform us that a young girl, frequently the daughter of the priest of Hekate, invariably held the

---

139 Roller (1997) 543. For references to other works on eunuch priests, see Roller (1997) 555 n. 2.
140 Herring (2011) 123.
142 On the significance of the centripetal procession for the symbolic unification of the region, see Williamson (2012); Herring (2011) 125-126; Laumonier (1958) 398 n. 7. On such processions more generally, see Graf (1996) 57-59.
143 See Hatzfeld (1920) numbers 2, 6, 9, 15, 17, 18, 53, 56; Diehls and Cousin (1887) numbers 6, 7, 14, 37, 41, 45.
office and that it was a position of great esteem.\textsuperscript{144} It is also clear that the title of κλειδοφόρος was unique to Lagina.\textsuperscript{145} Unfortunately, however, the inscriptions do not tell us how old the procession was or what it was expected to accomplish. Accordingly, it is difficult to discern the ideas and influences behind the custom, which in turn poses difficulties for the question of its provenance. The problem is compounded by the fact that no other numismatic, epigraphic or archaeological\textsuperscript{146} evidence from Lagina connects Hekate to the key, while using Hellenistic and Imperial Greek and Roman evidence to bolster any theory does not necessarily lead us in the right direction\textsuperscript{147} – beliefs are fluid between locales. As a result, many scholars have made conjectural attempts to fill the gaps. Hatzfeld proposed that the key was carried in order to unlock the gates of Hekate’s sanctuary, but most scholars have subsequently argued that greater significance ought to be attached to its carriage.\textsuperscript{148} Laumonier, for example, proposes that the key was used to lock and unlock Hades.\textsuperscript{149} In her 1999 monograph, Johnston submits that, based on the erection of a new statue of Hekate when new gates were built behind Lagina, the key was used to lock and unlock, actually or symbolically, the city gates that were under liminal Hekate’s tutelage.\textsuperscript{150} Drawing comparisons with Shamash, Resheph, and Ishtar, Kraus suggests that the key may have been used to unlock celestial gates.\textsuperscript{151} Following this question, Kraus queries whether the ‘Vorstellungen, die sich

\textsuperscript{144} Laumonier (1958) 369 stresses that the κλειδοφόρος was never male. The significance of the position is demonstrated by epigraphic mention of statues and inscriptions dedicated to the young girls who held the office.

\textsuperscript{145} For Hekate Κλειδούχος, see Johnston (1999) 39-48.

\textsuperscript{146} That is, the temple friezes.

\textsuperscript{147} Kraus (1960) 49.

\textsuperscript{148} Hatzfeld (1920) 83.

\textsuperscript{149} Laumonier (1958) 398, 412, 416-417. His theory is supported by Berg (1974) 137 and Johnston (1990) 42, who subsequently changed her stance.

\textsuperscript{150} Johnston (1999) 206.

\textsuperscript{151} Kraus (1960) 50. For more discussion of the procession of the key, see von Rudloff (1999) 52; Nilsson (1957) 400-401, who states that, although the festival gives no information about the true nature of the goddess, she was undoubtedly a Karian like Zeus Panamaros and his consort;
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mit der Schlüsselprozession in Lagina verbanden, einheimisch und auf irgendeine Weise mit Altorientalischem verknüpft sein? However, as Kraus acknowledges, there is also the possibility that this was a cultic element imported from Greece as part of the cultural exchange so typical of the Hellenistic period. Or was it, rather, that a new cultic instrument was grafted onto a formerly ancient rite? Much uncertainty surrounds the procession of the key; strong arguments exist for both its importation from Greece and the possibility that it was linked with a native, ancient, and non-Greek custom.

Kraus also cites the monthly feasts in honour of the goddess, which Laumonier originally described as an indigenous tradition. The case for the revival of Laginetan Hekate as an ancient moon goddess, on the other hand, seems to be built on fairly tenuous grounds. In conclusion, Kraus states that the Laginetan cult must have represented the revival of a much more ancient cult. He then applies this idea to the concentration of evidence for Hekate’s worship in southwest Asia Minor (viz. Karia and Phrygia), the vast majority of which belongs to the Hellenistic or Imperial periods. This application allows him to deduce that the problematically late date of the data simply represents a trend, beginning in the Hellenistic period, of breathing new life into ancient beliefs.

Herring presents an interesting account of Hekate’s presence in Karia, and attempts to address the awkward evidential vacuum in relation to the goddess prior to...
to the second century. Her thesis is that Laginetan Hekate was a Hellenistic creation who served the interests of a population undergoing sweeping cultural and political transitions. Herring asserts that the character of this goddess differed fundamentally from earlier and later manifestations, relating this difference to the circumstances and needs of the Chrysaoric League, the ‘Karian koinon par excellence in the post-Hekatomnid period’. The earliest evidence for this league comes from an inscription in Labraunda, dated to 267 B.C. (when the League was under Ptolemaic control), but our knowledge of its inception is murky. It was a typically Karian federation of villages, known as koina; it did not include all Karians. They existed for political and religious purposes and are essentially comparable to federal states; they created ethnic identity and federal citizenship. The name of this particular league seems to have been derived from Chrysaoris, the original name of the relevant region. Intrinsic parts of these koina were the Hiera Kome, or sacred villages. Laguna epitomizes such a sacred village in that it was used purely for religious, and not residential purposes. Accordingly, Laguna fell under the civic dominion of Stratonikeia, to which a ten-kilometre Sacred Way connected it. Despite not being a Karian town (indeed it was a Macedonian settlement, founded at some point after the early 260s B.C.), Stratonikeia, the capital of the league, was a member by virtue of the native demoi in its territory, according to
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157 See Herring (2011), particularly Chapter Two passim.
160 Although we do not know how many poleis were part of the League. At this stage we aware of seven. See Herring (2011) 34; Gabrielsen (2000) 158-159.
162 The only residents were the temple staff and their families. See Herring (2011) 119.
163 The other main sanctuary within its territory was that of Zeus at Panamara. See van Bremen (2000) 390-391.
164 van Bremen (2000) 389; Webb (1996) 108 writes that it was founded on an older Karian village by Antiochis I, who named it after his wife.
Strabo.¹⁶⁵ The \textit{Hiera Kome} represented the centre of religious life for the federation. Accordingly, the deity worshipped at these sanctuaries represented the federation as a whole.

Before Hekate’s sanctuary was constructed by the Chrysaoric League, it is apparent that other sanctuaries existed. For example, inscriptions from the early third century indicate that Zeus Labraundos was worshipped at Labraunda, the original \textit{Hiera Kome} of the league.¹⁶⁶ By the end of the third century, it seems that Zeus Chrysaoreus became the principal deity of the league. According to Strabo, the temple of Zeus Chrysaoreus was also within Stratonikeian territory,¹⁶⁷ although its precise location has not been pinpointed. The sanctuary of Hekate was constructed at some point in the late second or early first century,¹⁶⁸ and represented a more significant shift in religious focus than before. Applying post-colonial theory, Herring argues that during the second century the Chrysaoric League was a hybrid of Karian, Greek and Roman elements: there were Greek colonists, native Karians and Anatolian gods with Greek names.¹⁶⁹ The League was declared free and independent by the Romans in 167 B.C.,¹⁷⁰ heralding a shift in social and political organisation. It was at this stage that Stratonikeia began to mint its own coins. According to Herring, Hekate’s nature as a liminal goddess spoke to a population

¹⁶⁵ Strab. 14.2.25.

¹⁶⁶ Although see Şahin (1976) 8-9, 8 n. 31, who discusses the likelihood of the League having met at Labraunda on the basis that a Chrysaoric inscription appears there. See Herring (2011) 38-39, 40 n. 33; Webb (1996) 112, who states that the ‘\textit{Federation of Zeus was based in Mylasa, and its major sanctuary was at Labraunda}. Mylasa was a strong ally of Stratonikeia, and Labraunda is the only Karian site that can be identified with Amazons. The worship of Zeus Labraundos developed into a very important national cult under the Hekatomnids, Mylasa having been the capital of Karia until Mausolus designated Halikarnassos as capital’. Webb relies on Strabo for the underlined sentence above (Strab. 14.2.23).


¹⁶⁸ See below for van Bremen’s date.

¹⁶⁹ Herring (2011), in particular Chapter One.

¹⁷⁰ After being a Rhodian possession at least in the period 197-167 B.C.: Livy 33.18.22 and Polyb. 30.31.6.
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grappling with change and uncertainty.\(^{171}\) Citing the monomorphic representation of Hekate at Lagina, Herring argues that her trimorphic form was deliberately cast aside by the Chrysaoric League so as to distance her sinister associations with the undead. This was because the trimorphic statues known as *hekataia* were erected in front of houses partly to drive away such malevolence.\(^{172}\) The sum of these hybrid, constituent parts was a goddess who addressed the particular circumstances of a community. Hekate’s cult was not, according to Herring, the revival of a much more ancient one.

A KARIAN PRESENCE IN MILETOS

While Herring’s argument is a thoughtful and detailed one, she does not really offer an argument about the precise origins of Hekate; the most she says is that Hekate was an incarnation of an Anatolian goddess,\(^{173}\) and therefore does not follow the suit of any arguments in favour of a Greek (specifically Mycenaean), Thracian or Mesopotamian origin. Before we can go forward with her theory of a Hellenistic creation for Laginetan Hekate, we need to go back. The earliest known archaeological evidence of Hekate worship comes from Miletos, on the Karian coast. This evidence is an altar found in the sanctuary of Apollo Delphinios. A boustrophedon-style inscription dedicates the altar to Hekate by two prytaneis, Euthras and Leodamas.\(^{174}\) The fact that this dedication was made by two civic officials in front of the prytaneum allows for the firm conclusion that Hekate was integrated into official religion. We can also suggest, albeit with less certainty, that her relationship to the prytaneum, and its own status as a symbol of communal integrity and strength, indicates a protective role, or at the very least a beneficent,

\(^{171}\) Herring (2011) 16, 69.


\(^{173}\) Herring (2011) 151.

\(^{174}\) Kawerau and Rehm (1914) 153, #41 (Kawerau); ibid., 275, n. 129m #71. See also Wilamowitz (1959) 1.169; Nilsson (1955) 1.722; Johnston (1999) 204; West (1966) 278 who says that the altar may be as old as seventh century; Kraus (1960) 11-13.

41
well-intentioned one. Herda goes slightly further to assert that she is a ‘protectress of the political and judicial assemblies as well as of the competitions’, something I address in Chapter Three of this study.\textsuperscript{175} The fact that a shrine in her honour appears by at least the fifth century at the Milesian gates certainly demonstrates protective characteristics, or, as Herda puts it, her role as ‘protective goddess of the outside’.\textsuperscript{176} It was at these gates that the Milesian New Year procession stopped for the first time in order to venerate the goddess.\textsuperscript{177} Miletos is significant because of this early evidence and its location. Herring imposes too simplified a history on Miletos when she states that ‘it was firmly established as a Greek city from the beginnings of its history’.\textsuperscript{178} Though usually considered Ionian, we cannot ignore the remarks of Homer and Herodotus who state, respectively, that Miletos is held by Karians and that it is in Karia, with the same dialect as Myus and Priene.\textsuperscript{179} Herda states that, in ‘Iron Age, ‘Ionian’ Miletos VIII (from c. mid eleventh century BCE on), … a Karian presence can at least be identified through onomastics, Karian cults, Karian female costumes and in rare cases also by the use of the Karian script.’\textsuperscript{180} Drawing a slightly more affirmative conclusion than Greaves, Herda concludes that ‘we have to suppose a surprisingly high degree of cultural interaction between Karians and Ionian Greeks from the Late Bronze Age on, until the cultural

---

\textsuperscript{175} Herda (2011) 68-69.

\textsuperscript{176} Herda (2011) 69 n. 70. Cf. the term ‘Göttin des Draußen’: Wilamowitz (1959).

\textsuperscript{177} Herda (2011) 69 n. 70. See also Nilsson (1955-61) 1272.2, who describes the regulation of the Molpoi which required them to erect a γυλλός (block of stone, see Liddell, Scott and Jones (1940) s.v. γυλλός) near Hekate’s shrine in front of the city gates, to decorate the γυλλός and sprinkle it with undiluted wine, and to intone the first paean at this location. The second γυλλός was to be erected in front of the gates of Didyma, which bore a similar relationship to Miletus as Lagina did to Stratonikeia. See also Johnston (1999) 206.

\textsuperscript{178} Herring (2011) 75.

\textsuperscript{179} Hom. II. 2.868; Hdt. 1.142.3. Cf. Kraus (1960) 51-54, who locates Miletos on the coastal outskirts of the area of land in southwest Asia Minor which he describes as having the greatest concentration of (numismatic, archaeological, epigraphic and literary) evidence, most of which belongs to the Hellenistic and Imperial periods.

\textsuperscript{180} Herda (2013) 434-441; Herda and Sauter (2009).
diversification finally disappeared in the Hellenistic or the Roman period.\footnote{Herda (2013) 440. Greaves (2002) 77 states that it is ‘highly likely’ that a mixture of Greeks and Karians occupied the site from the ‘very earliest times’. Berg (1974) 134, who ardently protests Hekate’s origin as Karian, does not hesitate to label Miletos as certainly Karian.}

**PINDAR AND THE UNUSUAL EPITHET ΦΟΙΝΙΚΟΠΕΖΑ**

From this point, we return to the north, specifically to Abdera. Recall the second *Paean*, in which Pindar paints a benevolent picture of a goddess who announces to the Abderites that they will be victorious. Dated to between 476 and 465 B.C., it is one of the earliest literary mentions of Hekate, the *Theogony* and Homeric *Hymn to Demeter* aside.\footnote{For the date, see Kraus (1960) 65 n. 312.} Within Pindar’s description of Hekate we come across the unusual epithet ΦΟΙΝΙΚΟΠΕΖΑ. One of the most striking things about Pindar’s use of this word in relation to Hekate is that he only ever uses it elsewhere as an epithet for Demeter.\footnote{Pind. *Ol.* 6.94.} It is reasonable to suggest that Pindar is deliberately making a connection between the two, perhaps in relation to the colour of ripe corn, and therefore agricultural fecundity. It is a sure thing that the ancients, particularly poets, took great pleasure in being playful with their words. If we dig a little further then, does this word yield any other clues from Pindar as to the nature of Hekate? As far as modern commentary goes, Wunderlich sees the reference to the colour red as easily understood. He states that Hekate has ouranic, as well as chthonic properties, and in performance of the former she would appear at, or immediately after sunrise bearing torches.\footnote{Wunderlich (1925) 94.} Wunderlich cites Virgil (*Aen.* 6.257) and holds that Pindar is referring to her Hesiodic association with dawn (as kourotrophos) and accordingly with the colour red. He also references the word ροδοδαίκτυλος used in relation to Eos. Finally, Wunderlich suggests that the word may refer to a hem,
rather than feet, something which is upheld by Stulz.\textsuperscript{185} There does, however, seem to be an interesting case for an alternative interpretation. The word Φοινίξη was regularly used by the Greeks to denote the home of the people they knew as Φοίνικες. The origin of this word, however, is an unsettled field of inquiry.\textsuperscript{186} As Edwards states, the theory that the word Φοῖνιξ carries the sense or concept of ‘purchasers of red dye’ has commanded the most widespread support amongst its myriad interpretations.\textsuperscript{187} There seems to be consensus on the φοίνιξ- root of φοινικόπεζα referring to a colour approaching both purple and red. Could it be possible that Pindar is going beyond an association between Hekate and agricultural ripeness, and linking her to dye of a similar colour, thereby referencing her origin? Without developement, the idea seems tenuous. Interestingly, however, Miletos seems to have been particularly renowned for its purple dye that it extracted from shells. Aristotle states that the Karian shores had an abundance of purple murex shells.\textsuperscript{188} These shells secreted a substance, the colour of which became more intensely purple when exposed to sunlight, rather than fading. Athenaeus also speaks of small purple shells found on the Karian coast.\textsuperscript{189} What is more, Chahin, a modern scholar, directs our attention to an inferior substitute for the dye which could be sourced from madder, a plant which was found in inland parts of Karia.\textsuperscript{190} Homer makes an elegant comparison between the bloodied body of the wounded Menelaos and the ivory that Karian women soak in purple dye.\textsuperscript{191} It seems, then, that Karia, in particular coastal regions, was rather often associated with the production of purple dye; this idea is commonly accepted in modern literature.\textsuperscript{192}

\textsuperscript{185} Stulz (1990) 140ff. Preller (1854) 1.475 also advanced this interpretation in the 19th century (when discussing Pindar’s use of the epithet for Demeter), suggesting that ‘die rötliche Pracht des Kornfeldes den Saum zu ihrem Gewande bildete’ \textsuperscript{185}

\textsuperscript{186} Edwards (1979) 112.

\textsuperscript{187} Edwards (1979) 95-96.

\textsuperscript{188} Arist. Hist. an. 5.15.3.

\textsuperscript{189} Ath. Deipn. 3. 88F.

\textsuperscript{190} Chahin (1987) 126.

\textsuperscript{191} Hom. Il. 4.141.

\textsuperscript{192} Emlyn-Jones (1980) 18; Stevenson (1824) 204.
Supporting the notion of Pindar making such a reference is Pausanias’ statement that the majority of inhabitants in Boeotia, Pindar’s home, were engaged in murex-fishing.\footnote{193 Paus. 10.37.3. See also Edwards (1979) 135.} Coming from a place with a heavy commercial emphasis on murex-fishing and purple dye would surely have rendered a Boeotian even warier of other Mediterranean hotspots for such an industry—that is, beyond the knowledge of someone less familiar with purple dye.

At this stage, I am wholly aware of the fact that Miletos was only one of many coastal regions in the ancient world engaged in the production of purple dye. If this is indeed the reference being made by Pindar, is there any way we can strengthen the argument for a Milesian, and more generally a Karian allusion by the poet? Interestingly, several scholars support the idea that Φοινίκη originally referred to Karia. This idea has been advocated as recently as 2003 by Beekes.\footnote{194 Beekes (2003) 15. Cf. Herda (2013) 466 n. 235.} It is discussed in detail by Edwards and in passing by Margalith.\footnote{195 Edwards (1979) 92-93, n. 84; Margalith (1994) 156-157, n. 38.} Although he acknowledges the ‘cumulative force’ of the evidence, Edwards concludes by rejecting the attribution of Φοινίκη to Karia. He does admit, however, that although nothing indicates the name Φοινίκη was \textit{commonly} used to refer to Karia, it ‘may have been occasionally applied by poets’. Which poets? A passage in Athenaios suggests that Φοινίκη was applied to Karia by Corinna and Bacchylides.\footnote{196 Ath. \textit{Deipn.} 4. 174 F. Edwards (1979) 93 says that this application may simply be ‘a poetic extension of the name from the mountain Phoinix [in Karia] to the hinterland’—in any case, this is still Karia. Herda (2013) 466 n. 235 states that ‘the settlement \textit{Phoinix} on the Karian Chersonese probably did not get its name from Phoinix the Phoenician, or from \textit{phoinix} for ‘palm tree’, but from the local production of purple dye.’} There is no mention of Pindar. If we dig a little further, however, more possibilities surface. Indeed, Corinna may have been Pindar’s mentor.\footnote{197 This detail is taken from an anonymous \textit{Vita metrica} (9f.) of the poet. See also Allen and Frel (1972) 26. But cf. the comments of Campbell (1992) 1-3, who emphatically states that ‘Corinna’s dates are disputed’ and that her extant works actually belong to the third century B.C., rendering it impossible that she was a contemporary of Pindar.}
gave him advice on the use of myth, which angered him, and was victorious over him in a competition once, according to Pausanias, or up to five times. It is apparent that Bacchylides was a contemporary of Pindar, and that the two were great rivals. Both were lyric poets and authors of epinician hymns, and competed for the patronage of Hieron of Syracuse. Scholiasts on Pindar state that in pursuit of this patronage the two poets directed disparaging, envious remarks at one another. Of course, it is one thing to say that a rivalry existed, and quite another to suggest that this rivalry would account for similarities in vocabulary. It is striking, however, that the poets attributed with the use of Φοινίκη in relation to Karia should be so closely associated with Pindar. Moreover, Athenaeus’ comment need not restrict such a usage to Bacchylides and Corinna.

EPIGRAPHIC EVIDENCE: THE DAIMON OF LEROS AND THE KORANZA INSCRIPTION

However, the possibility of a Pindaric reference to Karia must be reviewed in light of the other evidence suggesting (the revival of an ancient cult of) Karian provenance. One of Herring’s most pivotal ideas is that Hekate was a creation of the Hellenistic period. This is to say, of course, that she was fundamentally new and had not existed in that particular form before. In support of this statement, Herring cites the lack of ‘evidence of the worship of Hekate at Lagina before the second
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198 Plut. De glor. Ath. 4.347.
199 Paus. 9.22.3
200 Ael. VH 13.25; Suda s. v. Κόριννα.
201 Wind (1971) 9.
202 Schol. Pind. Ol. 2.86ff; Schol. Pind. Pyth. 2; Schol. Pind. Nem. 3.82. See Cambell (1992) 105-109, who mentions the possibility that the scholiasts may not be correct.
203 Indeed, Faraguna (1995) 56 hints at Thuc. 1.8, where both the Karians and the Phoenicians cited by Thucydides in relation to their control of the Aegean. While this is rather more tenuous, there is the possibility that Thucydides was aware of the genre of victory odes and borrowed a Pindaric equation of Φοινίκη and Karia. See Hornblower (2004) passim but esp. 52-58.
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century BC’. This is because the sanctuary at Lagina is so often cited in support of a Karian origin. There is, however, evidence of religious activity in the Laginetan temenos before the Hellenistic period. A fragmentary, honorary decree, dated to the second half of the fourth century B.C., was excavated from the temple cella between 1998 and 2001. It describes the introduction of the cult of the ‘daimon of Leros’, and details the procedure of the annual sacrifice as well as the entitlements of the priest Leon and his descendants. Is Hekate’s cult inferred, instead of that of Apollo and Artemis, which was situated further to the north? Let us consider this, keeping in mind the difficulty in defining δαίμων. First, the φαντάσματα that she is described as controlling in earlier texts did not become known as δαίμονες until Plutarch. Second, specific mention of her dominion over creatures identified as δαίμονες is not evidenced until Porphyry, hundreds of years later than the date to which this inscription is ascribed. Before we write off any association, however, it will help to take heed of some of Burkert’s statements. He asserts that

204 Herring (2011) 73.
205 I.Stratonikeia 1417. See Şahin (2002); Williamson (2012) 116, n. 10. See also Ateşlier (2011) 283, who states that ‘new excavations show that the temenos wall of the temple dates back to the fourth century BC’, although he does not provide a citation for this comment.
206 That is, could the cult of a daimon have been established within a temenos dedicated to Hekate? It is clear that Hekate could not be the daimon being introduced, given the non-feminine (τοῦ) used. Moreover, I am aware of no instance in which Hekate herself is labelled a daimon, although a god being called as such is not without precedent (see Liddell, Scott and Jones (1940) s.v. δαίμων; Burkert (1985) 180).
207 See Burkert (1985) 179-181 for a helpful summary of the difficulties.
208 φαντάσματα: Hippoc. Morb. sacr. 6.362; Eur. Ion 1049; Trag. Adesp. 375: ἀλλ’ εἰ ἄν ψυχόν φάντασμα φοβεῖ χθονίας 0’ Ἐκάτης κόμον ἐδέξιω (where the chorus asks a disturbed person for the cause of their affliction); Plut. Dio 2.
209 See Johnston (1990) 34 n. 12 for the references to Eusebius, who quotes Porphyry, as well as to Porphyry himself, who describes Sarapis as the ruler of particularly evil daimones. Johnston also cites Augustine to bolster the view that, despite Eusebius’ description of Hekate’s control of evil daimones, it is more likely that Porphyry perceived such creatures as capable of benevolence and malevolence and that their essential characteristic was their ability to mediate between gods and men.
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‘[o]n the basis of Hesiod’s myth, … what did gain currency was for great and powerful figures to be honoured after death as a *daimon*, and goes on to cite the death of Darius, Alcestis, and Rhesos.\(^\text{210}\) Moreover, ‘in Hellenistic grave inscriptions’, Burkert holds, ‘it became almost a matter of course to describe the dead person as a *daimon*.\(^\text{211}\) Burkert cites Plato, whose approval of the Hesiodic idea of posthumously venerating those who are ‘more than human’ or who have been ‘adjudged exceptionally good in the ordinary course of life’ probably applies to the circumstances described by this inscription.\(^\text{212}\) It is most likely, then, that someone of great esteem had passed, and that worship on a par with that of a divinity was established and regularized. Moreover, it seems plausible that such a cult had its basis in Hesiodic literature. We are, however, left with the question of


\(^{211}\) Ibid.

\(^{212}\) It will be helpful to set out the words of Plato in full: *Pl. Resp.* 468e-469b: And shall we not believe Hesiod who tells us that when anyone of this race dies, so it is that they become hallowed spirits dwelling on earth, averters of evil, guardians watchful and good of articulate-speaking mortals? We certainly shall believe him. We will inquire of Apollo, then, how and with what distinction we are to bury men of more than human, of divine, qualities, and deal with them according to his response. How can we do otherwise? And ever after we will bestow on their graves the tendance and worship paid to spirits divine. And we will practice the same observance when any who have been adjudged exceptionally good in the ordinary course of life die of old age or otherwise. *Pl. Resp.* 540b-c: And the state shall establish public memorials and sacrifices for them as to divinities if the Pythian oracle approves or, if not, as to divine and godlike men. *Pl. Cra.* 398b-c: This, then, I think, is what [Hesiod] certainly means to say of the spirits: because they were wise and knowing (δαήμονες) he called them spirits (δαίμονες) and in the old form of our language the two words are the same. Now he and all the other poets are right, who say that when a good man dies he has a great portion and honour among the dead, and becomes a spirit, a name which is in accordance with the other name of wisdom. (*Republic* translation taken from Shorey (1969); *Cratylus* translation taken from from Fowler (1921)). Discussing this etymological approach, Burkert (1985) 180 n. 3 says that the ‘etymological meaning of the thoroughly Greek-looking word *daimon* is once again impossible to discover with certainty.’ Cf. Hermann (2007) 392.
whether this cult was established in a temenos dedicated to Hekate. This is where things get trickier, given the much later date of sources that explicitly connect Hekate to daimones. Was the tutelary nature of daimones connected with that of Hekate? Were such Hesiodic spirits associated with the goddess because of their intermediary status between gods and men? The possible reference to the ‘sanctuary at Lagina’ in a late fourth century B.C. inscription from Koranza, if indeed that is the reference being made, could allow for the assertion that Hekate was worshipped at this point, which would, in turn, flesh out conjecture pertaining

213 In Chapter Two, I will discuss Clay’s (1984) and (2003) interpretation of the Hesiodic ‘Hymn’ to Hekate. She argues that Hekate possesses a ‘critical mediating function’ in the Theogony, and forms a ‘crucial intermediary between gods and men.’ Thus, for Clay, ‘Hesiod develops Hecate’s functions by etymologizing her name’; she is the goddess ‘by whose will success is [divinely] granted or denied.’ (My emphasis). I give my reasons for being hesitant to accept this conclusion in Chapter Two. However, Burkert’s (1985) 180 thoughts on daimones come to mind in this context: ‘Daimon is the veiled countenance of divine activity … Hesiod allotted a precise place even for the common daimones: the men of the Golden Age, when their race died out, were transformed by the will of Zeus into daimones, guardians over mortals, good beings who dispense riches. Nevertheless, they remain invisible, known only by their acts.’ Could Clay’s argument be correct? Could it be the case that daimones were associated with Hekate because together they represented, in a Hesiodic context, the ‘veiled countenance of divine activity’ on account of their intermediary position between gods and humans?
to Hekate and daimones. We also know that Hekatomnos was dynast of Karia in the fourth century B.C. If his name did indeed refer to Hekate, the goddess’ cult would have been well established in the area by the time of these two inscriptions. Ultimately, however, I agree with Herring’s statement that the ‘number of lacunae is too great’ to argue for a conclusive reading of the Koranza inscription.

CLOTHING-RELATED ARCHAEOLOGICAL FINDS

Also excavated from the cella were several small finds, including fragments of terracotta and clothing-related items, such as golden discs used to decorate garments and loom weights. These are dated to the late third or early second century B.C. The idea of clothing being dedicated in a ritual context (as evidenced by the golden discs in the fill of the cella) is one that requires careful consideration, particularly in conjunction with the loom weights, which are clearly tools for the weaving of cloth. Dedication of clothing is an act generally associated with

---

214 ἐ[ν τῷ] [ἰερῷ ἐν Λ]αγ[η]-. See Robert (1937) 570; Hornblower (1982) 364, both of whom cite the inscription as proof of Hekate’s cult in the fourth century. The full text of the inscription (as suggested by Robert) is:

[*Ετοῦς Πρώτου Φιλίππου
betaiē̇ou̇ntos, Λαία–
δροῦ σατραπεύοντος,
ἐδοξεν Κοαρενδεύσιον, τ–
ήν ἀπάλειαν ἤν ἐδώκεν
Μαύσσωλλος Ἐκατόμνῳ
καὶ Κοαρενδεῖς Εἰς ἡς
του τῶν γεωργίων
τῶν νεωτύμων
[ἐγκόνοις τῶν ψαράκων–
[ν πάντων καὶ τῶν ἁλλῶν
[τῶν] ὀντῶν αὐτῶι πάντων–
[ον,] ἄναγραψα ἐν τοῖς
[ἰεροί ἐν Λαγη]-.
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Artemis, and—at a higher level of abstraction—with childbirth. One ancient commentator states that ‘[w]hen [new mothers] bear children, they dedicate clothing to Artemis.’ As Cole remarks, tools for the production of cloth may have carried a particular meaning. Trinkl describes a third century B.C. Milesian grave of a young, pregnant woman and a child, buried with whom were a spindle and distaff made of bone. The fact that only the discs and the loom weights are still extant, instead of actual textiles, means that any comments beyond those already stated are too conjectural. Despite the primary association with Artemis, it is arguably not a stretch to associate these pregnancy-related dedications with Hekate. Artemis and Hekate were identified with one another from the first half of the fifth century—particularly as a result of Ephesian Artemis and that goddess’ concern with women’s transitions—but remained distinct goddesses. The fact that many of their roles overlap has caused scholars, both ancient and modern, to conflate the two mistakenly. It is unlikely that these dedications of clothing were to Artemis.

217 Schol. Callim. *Hymn* 1.77. See Cole (2004) 212 n. 89. See also Johnston (1999) 239: ‘[W]omen frequently dedicated items of their clothing to Artemis or Eileithyia in thanks for safe delivery of children and in hopes of successful births in the future’. Artemis Kithone was worshipped at Miletos, where she was associated with clothing because ‘clothing and its fabrication were economically important to the city and culturally significant in the lives of its women.’ See Cole (2004) 217. See also page 221 of Cole (2004) and n. 132.


220 Trinkl (1994) 81-86.

221 The extent to which such textiles were finished would allow for comments relating to an ‘unfinished life cycle’. See Cole (2004) 221, who says ‘[u]nfinished weaving projects were a sign of interrupted life cycle rituals—and, indeed, of an interrupted life’.


Hekate is explicitly depicted in her Hesiodic kourotrophic function on the east relief of the temple that was to be erected on the same site to which these dedications are ascribed. It is important to remember that Hekate, too, was intimately associated with childbirth, and was known as a kourotrophos from Hesiod onwards. Moreover, the finds are similar in date—that is, around the turn of the third and second centuries—to the Menophilos Leontas inscription that mentions the priesthood of Hekate. So, even if it is not accepted that Hekate was worshipped during the fourth century, it seems very likely that her cult was established at least a century prior to the construction of the temple. Finally, we may once again remark at the possibility of Hesiodic influence, given Hekate’s Hesiodic role as kourotrophos.

THE FRIEZE OF HEKATE’S LAGINETAN TEMPLE AND THE IDEA OF HESIODIC INFLUENCE

A strong Hesiodic influence is to be found in parts of the frieze on the late second century Hekataion at Lagina. The exact date of the frieze is disputed; it is generally placed in the late second or early first century B.C. van Bremen’s recent piece argues that the decision to construct the monument was made between 150 and the early 130s, ‘before the Aristonikos revolt’ and during a time of ‘relative calm and prosperity’. The sculptural narrative is hugely ambitious and detailed, and while not as esteemed as those of the Great Altar of Pergamon in terms of quality, the

Funktionsverwandtschaft zugrunde’ captures the relationship between the two succinctly; he goes on to detail those particular functions. See Graf (1985) 257.


complex arrangements have nonetheless courted much scholarly discourse. The eastern frieze, which appears above the pronaos, is unfortunately in a relatively poor state of preservation. It is accepted, however, that the focal blocks of the frieze depict the birth of Zeus, with Hekate ferrying away the swaddled rock in order to deceive Kronos, while another nurse to the left flees with Zeus himself (Fig. 1). Alternatively, Hekate may be carrying the newborn Zeus himself. The most compelling factor in favour of the interpretation of this scene as the birth of Zeus is the presence of the Kouretes, the guardians of infant Zeus, who do not appear in other childbirth scenes. In another part of the eastern frieze, Simon argues that the female figure being garlanded by Hera is Hekate, who receives honour because of her role in the salvation of baby Zeus (Fig. 2). Hera, who stands alongside the throned Zeus, is honouring Hekate on behalf of Zeus, pursuant to Simon’s argument. It seems reasonably clear that the context for the eastern frieze

---

226 The restrictions of this study unfortunately do not permit a detailed discussion of the frieze and the temple in general. For significant studies of the frieze and/or its meaning, see Herring (2011); van Bremen (2010); Tuchelt (1979), Schmidt (1991), Simon (1993) and Osada (1993), Rumscheid (1994). See also P. Baumeister's very recent (2007) study. I will restrict my commentary to parallels between the context of portions of the frieze and Hesiod’s Theogony.


228 With the exception of Mendel, who argues that the birth of Hekate is depicted. See Mendel (1912-1914) 485-495.

229 Identified by her polos. See Schober (1933) 27-31, 70-72, plates 1-4, figure 18.

230 See van Bremen (2010) 503 who also says ‘The setting, with its many landscape personifications, so reminiscent of the Knidos altar frieze’s Delian scene-setting, may well be intended to represent Krete, birthplace of Zeus.’ See also Webb (1996) 109; Schober (1933) 70-71; Laumonier (1958) 350; Kraus (1960) 46.


233 Ibid. For Zeus and Hera in Karia, see Schober (1933) 78; Laumonier (1958) 351-352. Simon argues that that the depiction is ‘nicht im strengen Sinn kontinuierend, da zwischen Geburt und Thronen in Olymp zu viel Zeit liegt, wohl aber aitiologisch. Damit entspricht der Ostfries von Laguna einer typisch hellenistischen Denkart.’
is lifted from Hesiod’s *Theogony*.\(^{234}\) The use of a literary text for a sculptural program has precedents in the Hellenistic period, with its strong, scholarly culture.\(^{235}\) The Hymn to Hekate, which Hesiod concludes by especially highlighting Hekate’s kourotrophic function, immediately precedes the birth of Zeus and the deception of Kronos.\(^{236}\) It is clear that we have a combination of Hekate’s Hesiodic role with the birth of Zeus, whose ultimate supremacy the *Theogony* charts.\(^{237}\) In the second scene, if Simon’s interpretation is correct, we have an aetiological account of why Hekate was so greatly honoured by Zeus in the *Theogony*, and, accordingly, a pictorial reflection of the intimate relationship shared by the two deities in Hesiod’s work. Also particularly significant is the orientation of the temple towards the east, or sunrise.\(^{238}\) In the penultimate sentence of Hesiod’s Hymn to Hekate, the goddess—in exercise of her kourotrophic function—is intimately associated with the dawn.\(^{239}\)

On the western and rear side of the building appears the least-disputed frieze, a Pergamene-inspired rendering of the Hesiodic Gigantomachy, which is narrated in detail in the *Theogony* (Fig. 3).\(^{240}\) Hekate fights a giant alongside Artemis. The two goddesses closely resemble one another, and yet are not

\(^{234}\) Webb (1996) 110; Simon (1993) 279-280; Herring (2011) accepts this thesis at 213: ‘this subject was pulled directly from the *Theogony*.’

\(^{235}\) Simon, in another text, argues convincingly that Hesiod’s text was the inspiration for the gigantomachy frieze at Pergamon. See Simon (1975).

\(^{236}\) Although note that the sculptor has taken some liberties by inserting Hekate into the sculptural depiction of Zeus’ birth: she is not involved with it in the *Theogony* itself. See *Theogony* 453-491. See also Webb (1996) 110 who argues that ‘Hesiod places major emphasis on the roles of Zeus and Hekate in guaranteeing military victory. And it is military victory and political alliance that seem to be the underlying themes of the four friezes.’

\(^{237}\) Accordingly, having the ‘birth of Zeus on the east side (above the temple’s entrance) underlines this deity’s great prominence within the Chrysaoric religious system.’ van Bremen (2010) 503.

\(^{238}\) Simon (1993) 279.


1: RECONSIDERING THE GEOGRAPHICAL ORIGINS OF HEKATE
"syncretized—something that could potentially be accounted for with reference to Hesiodic genealogy.241 Simon makes another persuasive case in relation to the influence of the Hymn to Hekate: on the other side of Hekate appears Poseidon, with whom she is intimately connected in the Theogony given her share of honours in the realm of the sea.242 Webb and Simon provide divergent accounts of Hesiodic influence in the much more ambiguous southern frieze. First, Simon submits that, with the help of the Theogony, the figures of Asterie and Perses are able to be discerned with their young daughter Hekate, who receives her honours through Tyche (Fig. 4).243 In anticipation of any rebuttal that Hekate’s appearance as a child on an intermediate block would not make narrative sense, Simon points to the east frieze, in which the bearded Zeus appears next to the scene of his birth. Notwithstanding Simon’s defence, her interpretation of this scene is not conclusive. Second, focussing on an enthroned pair of male and female deities who are accompanied by two standing adult figures and four children, one of whom is an infant in the enthroned woman’s lap, Simon perpetuates Schober’s identification of the seated figures as Zeus and Hera (Fig. 5).244 Turning to the standing adults,


242 Simon (1993) 281. Webb (1996) 109 describes the western frieze as different from the other friezes in terms of ‘content and arrangement’, for several reasons. First, the western frieze has a ‘unified and recognizable theme’, while the other sides seem to have ‘several rare or idiosyncratic themes’. Second, the figures of the western frieze are generally ‘relatively easy to recognize’, while most of the figures from the other friezes are ‘difficult to identify with certainty.’ Third, the western frieze depicts a violent event, while the other friezes are ‘fairly pacific’. Fourth, the other three friezes have ‘focal scenes that stand out distinctly from the activity around them’, in contrast to the western frieze.


244 Simon (1993) 282. Schober was unable to identify any of the figures in this frieze as Hekate. He instead concluded that she played a central role in every frieze and that the block on which she appeared in the southern frieze had been lost. See Schober (1933) 79. Mendel (1912-1914) 446, 466-469 was the first to interpret this scene, and held that the two enthroned deities were Hekate and Zeus Karios—the most important, local gods. Accordingly, it would be a unique, localised depiction. Herring recognizes the ingenuity of the argument but is troubled by the lack of
Simon argues for their identification as Hekate and Hermes, because Hermes is allegedly carrying a kerykeion and was frequently connected with adolescents. This identification makes sense, according to Simon, because he appears with Hekate, with whom he also appears in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter—one of few deities to do so. Given that both are associated with the children, Simon argues that Hekate appears in the same, kourotrophic function as Hermes and as her Hesiodic representation on the eastern frieze. Herring takes issue with Simon’s identification of the veiled woman in the southern frieze as Hekate, given the lack of iconography presenting Hekate in such a way. Furthermore, Herring disputes Simon’s identification of the animal being led by the child adjacent to Hekate as a dog, suggesting that its long ears instead identify it as a hare or a rabbit.

Webb takes a different route altogether, identifying the enthroned figures as Zeus and Styx, the latter appearing in the lines immediately preceding Hesiod’s Hymn to Hekate. Webb argues that she is accompanied by her four children, Zelos, Nike, Kratos, and Bia. Because of her pledge to assist Zeus against the Titans, Styx was appointed as the personification of oaths and honoured greatly.
while her children were appointed to live with him forever. Disputing Webb’s theory, Herring demands a proper connection between Hekate and Styx outside their proximity in the *Theogony* and evidence of Styx’s worship in Laguna and/or Stratonikeia. I think Herring dismisses Webb’s argument too readily. As van Bremen states, the eastern and most prominent frieze’s depiction of Zeus’ birth reminds the viewer of Zeus’ exalted position within the Chrysaoric League. Although Hekate was the newly instated major divinity, we know that the Chrysaoric League worshipped Zeus Labraundos in the early third century, the same period from which comes the first evidence for the league itself. The next appellation for Zeus was Chrysaoreus, while Zeus Panamaros remained a major divinity throughout Hekate’s pre-eminence. Indeed, the *Theogony* itself is, in essence, an ode to the ultimate supremacy of Zeus. Given the obvious Hesiodic influence, it is quite possible that, although clearly a sanctuary of Hekate, her worshippers were nonetheless to be reminded that her exalted position was by virtue of Zeus himself. Accordingly, it is not unreasonable to postulate—at the very minimum—the presence of Styx on this frieze, because she too was honoured by Zeus, and represents the oath in relation to military victory, something which undoubtedly weighed heavily on the minds of inhabitants of Karia, which had been a ‘a theatre of conflict for some time’. Moreover, it is unreasonable for Herring to demand evidence of Styx’s worship in Laguna and Stratonikeia. This would surely require that every immortal figure on the entire frieze had religious followers in the area, whereas simple knowledge of their existence and role is all that would be required for identification. Ultimately, however, the significance of deciding which of these two interpretations of the scene is correct pales in comparison to the fact that both Webb and Simon detect Hesiodic influence.

---

249 Herring (2011) 214.
252 van Bremen (2010) 501. Bolstering the idea that Styx was depicted because Zeus honoured her is the fact that the τηρή-motif of Hesiod’s Hymn to Hekate is also especially prominent in the Styx passage. See Stoddard (2004) 11; Friedländer (1914) 124.
Indeed, the tide seems to be turning against interpreting the frieze in light of Karia’s political association with Rome, as signposted by van Bremen.\textsuperscript{253} The same scholar suggests that the frieze is derived from the mythic narrative, suggesting that the vastly more ambiguous northern frieze (about which I have offered no comment due to its ambiguity) represents a foundation myth, quite possibly a Chrysaorric one.\textsuperscript{254} If we are right in discerning a Hesiodic influence, what significance does this identification have? The \textit{Theogony} experienced a renaissance in the Hellenistic period in which the Hekataion was built, becoming the object of especial philosophical and scholarly (and therefore elite) interest.\textsuperscript{255} It was met with particular enthusiasm from Stoic philosophers.\textsuperscript{256} Moreover, we know that, in Pergamon—the Great Altar of which shows clear signs of Hesiodic influence—the Attalids erected a statue of Hesiod. Accounting for this statue, Simon argues that, as well as stemming from the Attalids’ love of epic poetry, it also speaks to the (paternal) Aeolian origins of Hesiod, which rendered him a ‘Landsmann der Pergamener’.\textsuperscript{257} Hesiod’s father was from Aeolian Cumae, but travelled the Asiatic coast interacting and trading with its people.\textsuperscript{258} Accordingly, he would have come

\textsuperscript{253} van Bremen (2010) 503.

\textsuperscript{254} Ibid. For discussion of the northern frieze, see also Schober (1933) 31-41; Junghölter (1989) 23-36; Webb (1996) 109-115; Baumeister (2007) 38ff.; Herring (2011) 218-227. Webb (1996) 114 argues that ‘[s]ince the temple friezes include the birth of Zeus and what seems to be the elevation of Styx and her children, the north frieze must have included a third episode from the \textit{Theogony}, possibly representing an aspect of the Hymn, such as the goddess’ birth of Hekate enthroned, honoured above all others by Zeus in granting victory.’ Given the opacity of the northern frieze to us ‘at the moment’ (van Bremen (2010) 503), it is dangerous to comment on any Hesiodic influence. The meaning of the frieze must become more transparent before any derivation can be safely ascertained.


\textsuperscript{257} Simon (1975) 59.

\textsuperscript{258} Hes. \textit{Op.} 633ff. See also West (1966) 42.
into contact with Milesian seafarers. Given that Milesians (as well as Megarans) were the first to colonise the Black Sea area,\textsuperscript{259} Hesiod’s father must have passed on the comprehensive geographic knowledge of the area demonstrated in the \textit{Theogony} to his son, who, in turn, would have acquired knowledge from conversations with other ‘seafaring men’.\textsuperscript{260} Hesiod’s father’s likely acquaintanceship with Miletos, and that city’s aforementioned links with Hekate mean that it is entirely reasonable to suggest that it was through this avenue that Hesiod himself acquired knowledge and appreciation of her cult. As West notes, if his father worshipped the goddess, it will be not be coincidental that Hesiod’s brother shares the same name as Hekate’s father in the \textit{Theogony}: Perses.\textsuperscript{261}

It strikes me that, in the case of the Laginetan frieze, Hesiod could be conceived as a \textit{religious} ‘Landsmann’ of the Karians, in the sense that he bore an especial allegiance to the Hekate encountered by his father. This is something I discuss in greater depth in Chapter Two. The Hesiodic Hekate was almost certainly an Asian goddess, and it would make sense for a group of people who strongly identified with a particular deity to rely on a particular depiction when reviving a cult. Hesiod had painted a devoted, flattering image of the goddess held dear by the Karians. Geographically speaking, his image was divorced from that cultivated by the mainland Greeks, which, although extremely varied in form, was sufficiently

\textsuperscript{259} Also important in this context is the possibility of Hekate worship in the Milesian colony of Olbia in the Black Sea region. In a discussion of the cult of Achilles on Cape Beikush, Burgess mentions hundreds of terracotta sherds with votive inscriptions from the late sixth and early fifth centuries discovered at Beikush, a settlement located just a few kilometres from Olbia (Burgess (2009) 128). As Burgess states, many of the sherds bear abbreviations of Achilles’ name, indicating worship of the hero in that region. Burgess does not mention, however, the abbreviation EKA, which was reported by Bujskih after his digs in 1985/1986 and 1995/1996: Bujskih and Kryjitckij (1999). These could be abbreviations of Hekate; if they are instead abbreviated, theophoric names, the possibility of them referring to Hekate is just as strong as in the case of the aforementioned theophoric names. See also Herda (2006) 288 nn. 2043-2044, who holds that ‘Der Hekate-Kult ist im archaischen Olbia indirekt durch den theophoren Namen Hekatokles nachgewiesen.’

\textsuperscript{260} These are the arguments of West (1966) 42, whose thoughts I find reasonable and not far-fetched.

\textsuperscript{261} West (1966) 278.
tarnished by negative depictions as to become more negative than not from the Hellenistic period onwards. He was, religiously speaking, inclined towards a goddess of the same geographical provenance as they, and his thoughts pertaining to Hekate could therefore be relied upon.

So, several factors could arguably frame the (Hellenistic) context in which the Hekataion was built. First, the *Theogony* enjoyed a renaissance amongst Stoic philosophers and Alexandrian scholars during this time. The depiction of the Gigantomachy, which is—notwithstanding the differences—perhaps the clearest allusion to the Laginetan temple’s Pergamene model,\(^{262}\) is most likely a manifestation of Stoic concepts in the sense that the Olympians and Titans are shown as ‘equal cosmic powers pitted against the troublemakers of the Cosmos, the Giants.’\(^{263}\) Second, the sculptors of the frieze needed some kind of basis on which to depict mythology—no mean feat, considering the fact that Hekate was a goddess to whom little in the way of mythology was attached.\(^{264}\) Indeed, as Kraus states, ‘[b]ei dem ganzen Bildprogramm des Tempelfrieses von Laguna ist zu berücksichtigen, daß Hekate eine Gestalt ist, die arm an alten Mythen war.’\(^{265}\) Moreover, the Hymn to Hekate in the *Theogony* provides a dearth of mythology ‘in the strict sense’ other than Hekate’s briefly specified lineage.\(^{266}\) The scenes in which Hekate appears on the temple frieze draw on Hekate’s *status* in the *Theogony* as a basis on which to construct mythology: the goddess’ appearance in the Gigantomachy is anomalous and not Hesiodic, so is arguably accounted for by her status as a Titan, which Hesiod makes clear; her role in the birth of Zeus has no basis in myth (other than the fact that the Hymn to Hekate immediately precedes the birth of Zeus), but is, of course, strongly derived from her status as kourotrophos, again something that is emphasized by Hesiod; the honour she receives from Hera

---

262 Simon (1993) 281; Schober (1933) 77; Junghölter (1989) 48. Another example of Pergamene influence is found in the ‘narrative character’ of the northern frieze, according to Simon (1993) 278; Junghölter (1989) 63 n. 155 and *passim*.

263 Simon (1975) 58.


265 Ibid.

in the frieze has no basis in the *Theogony* but instead provides an aetiological account for her status; while her depiction as a child in the presence of Asterie and Perses, although closest to the *Theogony* in terms of subject matter, once again drives home her status as a Titanic, and therefore very ancient goddess, whose power nonetheless persists.  

267 Simon argues that, on the south frieze, the composition of two goddesses (one standing, one sitting) is reminiscent of images of Demeter and Persephone. 268 In her view, since the assistance of Hekate in Demeter’s search for Persephone belonged to the small pool of mythology pertaining to Hekate, an allusion to the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* on the Laginetan frieze is to be expected. Certainly, Simon’s point is a reasonable one. However, most important in the contextualisation of the Laginetan temple, and my third point, is the likelihood of Hesiod having been perceived as a religious ‘Landsmann’ by the native Karians. A derivation from the Hesiodic depiction of Hekate, no matter how distorted it may have been, accounts for much. It tells us that the depiction of mythology fell subsidiary to the general goal of allusion to Hesiod. So, it seems that as long as inspiration was mainly derived from Hesiod, the accuracy of mythology was less significant.  

269 It accounts for the fact that Laginetan Hekate and Zeus Panamaros had an alliance that reminds us so vividly of their relationship in the *Theogony*. 270 From a broader perspective of Hesiodic theology and religious practices in the area, it would account for the worship of daimones, and possibly for any worship of Hekate as kourotrophos before the erection of the temple. It

---


269 Considering, of course, that any depiction of Hekate had to fall ‘within the local Karian or Chrysaoric pantheon’ and justify ‘her role in its mythical (foundation-) narratives’: van Bremen (2010) 503. Other references could be made, too, but still fell within a wider context of Hesiodic derivation. This explains the allusion to Hekate’s assistance with Demeter (something that is not described in the *Theogony*), if indeed we are correct that such an allusion was made.

270 Zografou (2010) 50. Zografou arguably has her influences around the wrong way: instead of Hesiod having been influenced by a divine alliance between Zeus and Hekate (as demonstrated by the Laginetan frieze and the relationship between the goddess and Zeus Panamaros), it is far more likely that it was the Karians who were influenced by Hesiod.
vindicates the statement of Georgoudi, that the Laginetan goddess was ‘une Hécate enfin qui retrouve, dans cette region, l’image majestueuse et imposante qu’Hésiode avait jadis brossée d’elle.’\footnote{Georgoudi (1999) 164.} In their revival of the cult of an ancient, native goddess,\footnote{For whatever reason such a revival took place. As stated earlier, Herring (2011) provides an account of why Hekate’s cult became so popular at this time, although she denies that this was a revival of a much more ancient cult.} it would make sense for the Karians to rely on what they perceived as the account of a man loyal to the ancient Karian manifestation of Hekate, such loyalty having been demonstrated through sonorous (and probably distorted) praise.

ARTEMIS EPHESIA AND CULTIC DISPLACEMENT

Examination of the cult of Ephesian Artemis may provide us with further indications of a Karian origin for Hekate. At Ephesos stood, of course, the great sanctuary of Artemis, one of the Seven Wonders of the World. Strabo and Pliny tell us that a shrine or statue of Hekate was located within the sanctuary.\footnote{Strab. 14.1.23; Plin. \textit{HN} 36.32. For more on Hekate’s (later) cult in Ephesos, see Aurenhammer (2004) 257-259, 278.} Pausanias states that the worship of Ephesian ‘Artemis’ antedated the arrival of Ionian settlers by many years.\footnote{Paus. 7.2.6.} He additionally states that the pre-Ionian population of Ephesus was composed of Leleges, who were a branch of Karians, and Lydians, the latter being greater in number.\footnote{Paus. 7.2.8.} However, Strabo makes no mention of a Lydian presence, describing the Ephesian population as a mixture of Leleges and Karians before the intrusion of Androklos.\footnote{Strab. 14.1.21. Even if Pausanias was correct in stating that there were more Lydians than Karians, this is not necessarily fatal to the ensuing argument. As Bengisu states ‘[Pausanias’] discussion of the antiquity of the Artemision in Ephesus … mentions that the sanctuary was populated by Carians, Lydians and Amazon women. This may well reflect an early religious kinship between Lydians and Carians’. Bengisu also provides commentary on a cultic connection between}
Pausanias and Strabo on Leleges, it seems that they were very similar to and yet distinguishable from the Karians. In any case, the mention of a Karian presence is a common denominator for both accounts, and the historical truth of this idea is supported by the relative proximity of Ephesus to Karia. It seems, therefore, that the Greek colonists came across a native deity of great antiquity in Ephesos for whom they used the appellation ‘Artemis’, as many modern scholars have assumed. On the basis of the apparent link between Karia and Ephesos, are we correct in assuming that ‘Artemis’ was actually an interpretatio Graeca for the Karian Hekate?

To help disentangle the conflation of the two goddesses, ancient evidence can be adduced in the form of a myth that may date back to the time of Callimachus’ Hypomnemata. The story recounts Artemis visiting Ephesos and being rudely treated by a woman in the city. To spite her bad behavior, Artemis changed the woman into a bitch, before pitying her and restoring her human form. Overcome by shame, the woman hanged herself with a girdle, after which Artemis used her own clothes to dress the corpse. Johnston provides a compelling reason for the angered Artemis in this story originally being Hekate herself. First, she compares the woman becoming a dog with the agalmata of other goddesses who replace transitioning girls. Iphigenia, for example, becomes a deer for incurring the wrath of Artemis, and the Proetides become cows for spiting Hera. The hanging, particularly with a girdle, is strongly associated with virgin suicide. The dressing of the corpse is, pursuant to Johnston’s argument, derived from cult, specifically, the

---

277 This seems to be confirmed by Philippos of Theangela, writing between the third and first centuries B.C., who points out that the Karians considered themselves distinguishable from the Leleges. See Herda (2013) 431-432 n. 36-37. Cf. Rumscheid (2009).


279 Callim. fr. 461 = Eust. Od. 12.85; Phot. Bibl. s.v. ἀγάλμα. Εὐκάτης (Theodoridis (1982)). This myth is also discussed in Chapter Two.

280 See Johnston (1999) 244-47, whose ideas are approved by Lesser.
I: RECONSIDERING THE GEOGRAPHICAL ORIGINS OF HEKATE

annual ritual of washing the cult statue and redressing it. Accordingly, Johnston deduces that the myth reflects an actual cultic displacement of Hekate by Artemis, as well as an intention by the Greeks to ‘tidy up’ the confusing clash of interests in women’s transitions between Hekate and Artemis in the mythic narrative (after Hekate had surfaced in the broader Greek religious consciousness). As a result, the Ephesian goddess who met the Ionian Greeks and, amongst other roles, effected the transitions in women’s lives was subordinated to the position of transitional victim, to borrow Johnston’s terminology. After usurping Hekate’s position, Artemis could resume her traditional role.

There are, however, some obstacles blocking an unmitigated acceptance of Johnston’s theory. As Lesser points out, there is also a possibility that Artemis Ephesia was a derivative of Kybele, who was evidently worshipped near Ephesos.281 Moreover, Knibbe claims that Artemis usurped Kybele’s tutelary role over graves along the sacred procession.282 Indeed, the later physical manifestation of the Ephesian goddess generally differs quite markedly from that of Laginetan Hekate, and hints at a connection with Kybele.283 From numismatic representations and replicas we are able to construct an image of the no-longer-extant cult statue of the Ephesian deity. Wearing a polos, she appears rigid, and wears a long, tightly-fitted and intricately-adorned dress. The headdress, of course, is a feature of both the Ephesian goddess and Laginetan Hekate, but also of Phrygian Kybele, and entrenches the chthonic aspects of all three. The decorations on the dress depict a variety of beasts, hinting at a relationship to animalia and, at a higher level of abstraction, uncivilized wilderness. The rites of Kybele aimed to blur the boundaries between civilized structure and extra-urban wilderness. Across the chest and abdomen are several breast-like lumps, the identification and meaning of which

283 Worship at the site probably dates back to the eighth century B.C.; it seems likely that the early image of the goddess was an archaic xoanon: LiDonnici (1992) 398. See Morris (2001) for the prehistoric background of Artemis Ephesia.
have provoked a variety of responses from scholars and are as yet unsettled.\textsuperscript{285} If this feature of the cult statue references a fertility function, we are reminded of the same domain being presided over by Kybele. It is clear from epigraphic evidence that the Ephesian goddess was intimately connected, in a tutelary capacity, to all aspects of the city: politics, commerce and health, to name but three.\textsuperscript{286} As indicated by the above reference to graves, and the depiction of her polos, the Ephesian goddess had a chthonic aspect. She was liminal, representing the spaces between life and death, the progression of women through the reproductive cycle\textsuperscript{287} and the space between civilization and wilderness. Indeed, her temple lay on the outskirts of Ephesos, in the very space that separated human society from unrestrained wild, just like Hekate’s temple at Lagina. Moreover, sculptural reliefs of Kybele, some of which depict her standing in a doorway, have been excavated at the boundaries of Boğazköy and Midas City.\textsuperscript{288}

\textsuperscript{285} LiDonnici (1992) 392 summarises the argument that they are breasts and proposes that they are instead a Hellenistic representation of the earlier, specifically archaic, clothing and jewellery that adorned the cult statue; Greaves (2010) 228 picks up this idea, stating that original adornments may have been ‘pendulous amber droplets’, the ‘natural iridescence’ of which may have been connected to solar cult; Morris (2001) 141-42 lists arguments in favour of and against the idea that the lumps may represent ritually-castrated scrota of bulls (the idea proposed by Seiterle (1979)), but argues that the protrusions represent a type of Hittite bag known as a kurša, which was scale-like in appearance and appeared on early representations of deities. Munn (2006) 165 argues for the scrota interpretation, stating that that the bulls’ ‘submission to the domesticating knife rendered these powerful beasts useful to humanity. Such sacrifice in the name of Artemis also validated the castrated status of her own attendant priests’. Another hypothesis submits that they were ‘large, globular dates harvested from the date palm under which Artemis was born in Ephesian Ortygia, according to local legend’. See Larson (2007) 110.


\textsuperscript{287} Being both virginal and kourothrophic; for analyses of this seemingly vexing contradiction through the lens of modern gender theory see Budin (2011) 31-32; LiDonnici (1992) 411; Zeitlin (1996) 77-79; Arthur (1982) 68-70.

\textsuperscript{288} Others also found between settled territories and verdant valleys, as well as near funerary monuments in an extramural context. See Roller (1999) 79, 83-85, 110-111; see also Vassileva (2001) 54.
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What we can glean from this discussion is the apparent interconnectedness between Hekate, Kybele and the post-Ionian Artemis Ephesia. It is likely that Ephesian Artemis represents a syncretism of the Greek Artemis with one (or perhaps more than one?) Anatolian goddess. Roller states that finds at the Ephesian sanctuary indicate that more than one goddess was worshipped at the site during the seventh century B.C., but that the ‘separate cults had been subsumed into the single cult of Artemis a century later.’

However, ‘[a]lthough there was a cult of Meter at Ephesos … it was not located in the area of the Artemision, but on the Panayir Dağ, several kilometers away.’ Lesser also challenges the common assumption that Greek settlers came across worship of Kybele, and thereafter fused Artemis with the Phrygian Mother, to the exclusion of all other cults. She applies the argument of Johnston to indicate the likelihood of Hekate having been originally worshipped at Ephesos. In either situation—that is, whether one or two goddesses were subsumed into the cult of Artemis Ephesia—the likelihood of Hekate having had a presence at the site that may stretch back to prehistorical times seems likely. Admittedly, the lack of comprehensive evidence relating to the worship of Hekate at Ephesos is troubling, but the various clues adduced in the last three paragraphs certainly do not render the conjectural comments of recent scholarship unreasonable.

---

289 Roller (1999) 127. She goes on to say ‘[i]f one of these were the cult of Meter, this might explain why an early cult of Meter left few traces in the archaeological material’. See also ibid n. 136: ‘the ivory statuettes of women carrying a hawk in their hands or on their heads … have often been thought to support a connection between Artemis and Meter because of the frequency of the hawk as an attribute of the Phrygian Matar. I am not persuaded by these arguments. The hawk-bearing figures may simply allude to Artemis’ persona as goddess of the hunt. Note that in Sardis, the site of another prominent Artemis sanctuary, the deities Artemis and Meter were clearly separate entities … Moreover, there is no evidence of the identity of the earliest deities worshipped at the Ephesian Artemision. It is quite possible that a native Anatolian cult underlies the Artemision; Strab. 14.1.21 reports that the shrine was founded on an earlier Karian site. Bammer’s statement that this deity was Meter/Kybele is, however, unfounded speculation.’
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or far-fetched. The most important of these clues are the ancient references to a Karian settlement (in combination with the other indications of a Karian origin for Hekate), the proximity to Karia (particularly Miletos) and the likely displacement of Hekate by the imported Artemis, in whose sanctuary a statue of Hekate in her new role as transitional victim was placed. It adds another piece to a puzzle increasingly indicative of a Karian origin for Hekate.

CONCLUSION

The path through this chapter has been a long and complex one. To impose a definite conclusion about the origins of Hekate on the hitherto published scholarship would be to (dangerously) ignore the fact that much uncertainty remains. What I hope to have achieved in this chapter is a careful reappraisal of the two main schools of thought relating to Hekate’s origins. We can be almost certain that Hekate did not evolve from the Thracian Bendis. Clear similarities exist between the two, but there is nothing to suggest derivation. Of course, that need not entirely rule out Thrace as Hekate’s place of origin, but it does not seem very likely. Where does this leave us? Herring’s thesis that the Laginetan manifestation of Hekate was a unique, Hellenistic creation stands, for the functions of a deity are ‘as wide as the needs of his [or her] worshippers … and the demands of … [those] worshippers … will determine what different faces the principal god’s predicated power will assume.’ However, the results of our study of evidence from the site of the temple, other areas in Karia, as well as places in which, according to ancient accounts, there was a Karian presence demonstrate that the date to which worship of Karian Hekate is ascribed can be incrementally drawn backwards. The early second century Menophilos inscription can be plausibly pulled back to the turn of the third and second century. Dating to the same period are the clothing-related finds, found in the fill of the late second century temple cella, which can probably be linked to worship of Hekate. The inscription mentioning the daimon of Leros and the Koranza inscription may testify to worship of the goddess in the fourth
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century, particularly given that Hekatomnos, the *hekat-* root of whose name may refer to Hekate, was already dynast several decades before, at the beginning of the fourth century. The obvious Hesiodic influence in the temple frieze can, among other reasons, be construed as Karian reliance on a religious compatriot. Further clues of a Karian origin may be tied up in Pindar’s curious, early fifth century epithet for Hekate, while the presence of Karians in both Miletos and Ephesos, together with other evidence, suggests that the goddess could have had a presence in either or both cities from the second millennium B.C. On top of the points already put forward by Theodor Kraus, the cumulative force of the evidence, I submit, increasingly points towards Hekate’s Laginetan cult as the revival of a much more ancient Karian cult as well as a discretely new one for a different population.
CHAPTER TWO

THE DEVELOPMENT OF HEKATE’S CHARACTER TO THE END OF THE FIFTH CENTURY B.C.

INTRODUCTION

Although the passages cited at the beginning of the introductory chapter demonstrate the extent of the gulf between early and later characterizations of Hekate, a thorough survey of all evidence that provides information about the character of the goddess is required. A diverse and quite fascinating variety of data is canvassed in this section, which has a strict chronological scheme: given that Hekate had acquired her unsavoury associations with death and black magic by the end of the fifth century B.C., it is unnecessary to survey any later evidence. To avoid unnecessary repetition, evidence that is discussed in detail in other chapters but fits within the chronological scheme of this chapter, such as Pindar’s second *Paean*, Milesian archaeological evidence, evidence for the Thessalian Enodia, and the Berlin terracotta, is either not included in this chapter (but alluded to where appropriate), or discussed in brief. As I stated in the introduction, it is best to avoid the subject of Samothrace entirely in this chapter, for, although Hekate almost certainly had a cultic presence on the island from the Archaic period onwards, the literary evidence that mentions Samothrace dates no earlier than the fourth century B.C.

HEKATE IN THE *THEOGONY*

Hesiod’s *Theogony* heralds the entrance of Hekate into Greek literature. The *Theogony* may indeed be the oldest extant piece of Greek poetry: it is dated to the
late eight century, and was written in Boeotia. Hekate appears in lines 411-452, the noticeable shift in emphasis of which section has prompted scholars to label it a ‘Hymn’ as well as a ‘gospel’. In Chapter One, the section was touched upon briefly in relation to the relief sculpture on the Temple of Hekate at Lagina. I also advanced the argument of M.L. West, one of the proponents of the authenticity of the so-called Hymn to Hekate. The goddess is, pursuant to West’s argument, the ‘chief goddess of her evangelist’, that is, Hesiod. Justifiably, the passage has long been the subject of debate and speculation among scholars. Why would Hesiod venerate an otherwise minor goddess beyond all but Zeus? The account of Hekate has led many to suspect interpolation, a damning charge that, if proven, obviates the need to account for the passage in relation to the poem as a whole. But even if we accept that the passage is authentic, can we maintain that it represents a bizarre divulgence of the poet’s personal beliefs? Or can Hesiod’s digression be understood as a ‘tailored’ account of the goddess motivated solely by the ‘requirements of the poem’? This is not the place for an extended treatise on the multifarious arguments advanced by scholars on this topic since the nineteenth century, but it would be dishonest to proceed without some mention and discussion of the viewpoints. This is particularly true given that the purpose of the current exercise is to discern the

1 See West (1966) 40-48 for an overview of the considerations that lead to this date. He roughly dates the Theogony to the years 730-700 B.C. This dating is not accepted by all; some scholars date the poem to post-700 B.C.


3 West (1966) 40-48; 90-91; 276-290.

4 See, for example, Rohde (1925) 323 n. 95a; Wilamowitz (1959) 1172; Nilsson (1955-1961) 1172. See Clay (1984) 27 n. 1 for a list of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century scholars who condemned the passage as an interpolation; as Clay remarks, such condemnation is ‘fairly universal among earlier editors.’

5 The main proponents of the passage’s authenticity are Mazon (1928); Solmsen (1970) and West (1966). See also Pfister (1928). For other interesting accounts of the Hymn to Hekate, see Walcot (1958); Boedeker (1983); Marquardt (1981); Clay (1984) and (2003), who usefully summarizes and comments on previous accounts; and Griffith (1983).

6 For the quoted terms, I am indebted to Griffith (1983) 55.
very earliest perception of Hekate’s character; if the passage is corrupt or distorted, then it is unreliable evidence.

Before such a discussion of these viewpoints can take place, however, it is necessary to examine exactly what the *Theogony* presents about the character of Hekate. From the outset (411), she is described as the daughter of Asteria and Perses. She is honoured above all by Zeus, from whom she is gifted a share (μοῖρα) in each of the earth, sea, and sky (412-415). The following lines (416-420) describe the wealth granted to men on earth who invoke Hekate in prayer whenever they sacrifice to the gods in the appropriate manner. This ‘universal role in sacrifice’ indicates that Hekate may be invoked together with other gods. This leads Marquardt to the assertion that Hekate may be invoked in something of an intermediary capacity, in order to ensure that favour was obtained from the ‘gods in general’. The words of Johnston, although written in relation to an argument put forward by Clay, are applicable in this instance: approaching the word ‘intermediary’ is to approach an analysis which ‘imposes too unified a theology on Hesiod.’ Before the enumeration of the classes of men whom she willingly helps,

---

7 For an exemplary discussion of Hesiod’s depiction of Hekate, see Marquardt (1981) 243-250.

8 And not Koios and Phoebe, as Athanassakis (1977) 127 correctly observes. See also Renehan (1980) 302-304 for a brief discussion about the scholars to whom Athanassakis imputed the initial slip.

9 Boedeker (1983) 83.

10 Indeed, line 441 describes those who pray to Hekate and Poseidon.

11 Marquardt (1981) 245. Tackling the ‘bizarre notion’ that Hekate was invoked at every sacrifice, Clay (1984) 35-36 n. 34 adduces evidence from Plato Com. Phaon (fr. 174.5-11: see Clay (1984)) that shows Aphrodite telling a chorus of women to invoke her as kourotrophos before other divinities are invoked. Clay draws together this custom and the establishment of Hekate’s role as kourotrophos at lines 450-452 in order to temper Hesiod’s extreme description of Hekate’s role in sacrifice.

12 Johnston (1990) 22. The words of Clay that Johnston cites are that Hekate is a ‘crucial intermediary between gods and men.’ See Clay (1984) 37; (2003) 136. See below for a fuller discussion of and a list of adherents to this idea.
we learn that Zeus did not strip Hekate of these honours, which she evidently received ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς among the Titans; on the contrary, he increased them (lines 421-428). Hesiod describes her as μουνογενής—an only child; this concept is repeated at lines 448-449. Lines 429-447 outline the various classes of mortals helped by Hekate. Boedeker composes a useful and succinct list, which I have taken the liberty of reduplicating, in modified form, below:

(a) kings ἔν δίκῃ and ἔν τ’ ἀγορῇ (434, 430);
(b) warriors in battle (431-433);
(c) athletes in competition (435-438);
(d) horsemen (439);
(e) sea-fisherman, who pray to Hecate and Poseidon (440-443);
(f) herdsmen, helped by Hecate and Hermes (444-447).  

Zeitlin (1996) 75 n. 39 makes the valid point that Hekate’s assistance is ‘reserved for men, in marked contrast to her later associations, which are restricted to women and feminine spheres of activity.’

For an interesting division of opinion relating to this point, see Walcot (1958) 14 and Clay (1984) 32-33. Walcot asserts that the goddess ‘receives great honours, though she is an only child’ (my emphasis), while Clay argues that ‘Zeus honors Hecate not despite the fact that she is μουνογενής, but because of it—in recognition of her unique status.’ I am more inclined to accept Clay’s argument. Through the description of Zeus’ preservation (and augmentation) of Hekate’s honours, the reader is conditioned to perceive Zeus as fair and just. Since Hekate is μουνογενής, she has no brothers to ‘defend her claim’. Zeus’ protection of her shares of honour because of her unique status serves to heighten the reader’s perception of his fairness. See Marquardt (1981) 245, who also discusses Hekate’s status as μουνογενής in relation to her pre-Olympian origin. Cf. also West (1995) 193.

Boedeker (1983) 83. I have omitted ‘participants in correct sacrifice’, which were discussed at lines 416-420; Boedeker also attaches kouroi to the end of her list, stemming from Hekate’s role ἐξ ἀρχῆς as kourotrophos, which is mentioned in lines 450-452. Boedeker brings these eight classes together in order to advance her novel point that Hekate’s functions reflect the Indo-European tripartite system of functions proposed by Georges Dumézil (sacrificers and kings = sovereignty (which can be split into magical-religious and legal-contractual authority): Boedeker (1983) 84); warriors, athletes, and horsemen = physical force (especially that of the
Boedeker’s tripartite model usefully demonstrates the extent and inclusiveness of Hekate’s benevolence: those engaged in the spheres of sovereignty, physical force, and fertility (which encapsulates ‘the production of food’ and ‘physical well-being’) are all within her purview.\(^{16}\) Johnston captures the essence of Hekate’s portrayal by holding that it ‘indicates her potential interest and participation in virtually every aspect of the relationship between humanity and divinity.’\(^{17}\) As well as the mention of Hermes and Poseidon, the activities related to athletics, war, justice, and politics hint at the spheres of influence normally attributed to Zeus, Ares, and Athena.\(^{18}\)

This far-reaching influence, together with the fact that no bigger portion of the poem is dedicated to one single divinity apart from Zeus, and the apparent lack of chthonic, magical, and nocturnal characteristics has led to the common assertion that Hesiod characterises Hekate in an anomalous manner. It must be noted, however, that despite the lack of chthonic aspects—indeed, the underworld is, conspicuously, the only sphere in which she is given no share—the possibility of negative volition is both implicit and explicit in the Hesiodic depiction. Note the repeated use of conjugations of the verb ἐθέλω at lines 429, 430, 432, 439, 443 and 446, which Marquardt describes as being in the ‘manner of a liturgical refrain.’\(^{19}\)

The idea of willingness, and the passage as a whole, carries a generally benevolent description of the goddess; lines 443 and 446-447 are the most telling examples,

---

\(^{16}\) See Boedeker (1983) 84-85.

\(^{17}\) Johnston (1990) 22.

\(^{18}\) See Marquardt (1981) 247.

\(^{19}\) Marquardt (1981) 247. In close proximity to these lie several repetitions of the adjective ἐσθλός (lines 435, 439, and 444) and the verb παραγίγνομαι (lines 429, 436, 432 and 439); West (1966) 285 describes these repetitions as ‘remarkable’ and attributes them to Hesiod’s ‘limited range of … expression.’ Griffith (1983) 51 n. 59 asserts that the ‘superlatives, jingles, and repetitions are characteristic of Hymnic address.’ For more on hymnic style, see Norden (1929); Wünsch (1914); Friedländer (1914) 1-16, Solmsen (1982) 8-9.
however, of the duality of Hekate’s volition. Line 443 states that ἐὰν δ’ ὀφεῖλετο φανομένην, ἑθέλοντα γε θυμῷ (my emphasis). The line refers to a catch of fish, the subject of lines 440-443, which she will make plentiful if properly supplicated. The end of line 446, taken with the entirety of 447, states that θυμῷ γ’ ἑθέλονσα, ἐξ ὀλίγων βριάει κάκ πολλῶν μείονα θῆκεν (my emphasis). Line 447 refers to agricultural stock, the subject of lines 444-447; there is no mention of supplication (as in 440-443), and accordingly the possibility of retraction seems more arbitrary and unpredictable.

The reader’s encounter with these lines allows for a coloured interpretation of the other conjugations of ἑθέλω that appear in the sequence; that is, the other mentions of Hekate’s willingness imply that she exercises her will autonomously and may retract support or perhaps not provide it to start with. While this duality is nothing new among Greek divinities, it must be noted that, although the typical aspects of Hekate’s later malevolence are absent, and the general tone is one of ‘goodwill and kindliness’, the Theogony does not present an entirely benevolent goddess. The final lines of the Hymn once again touch on her status as μοιωνογενής (lines 448-449) and introduce her role as kourotrophos (lines 450-452), which she has held ἐξ ἀρχῆς. In the context of her kourotrophic function, Eos is mentioned.

---

20 See Clay (2003) 135 n. 24 for a discussion of scholars who ‘postulate a Hesiodic etymology’ of Hekate’s name as ‘the willing goddess’. Zeitlin agrees that Hekate’s willingness, or lack thereof, is a decisive part of her Hesiodic characterisation. However, she keenly distinguishes volition from ‘caprice’, a word used by Clay (2003) 136. This stems from her hesitance to look too far beyond the ‘general tone of the passage’, which is one of ‘goodwill and kindliness’. See Zeitlin (1996) 75 n. 39. I agree to the extent that the word ‘caprice’ is perhaps a stretch, but nonetheless submit that the passage implies some degree of spite. See Marquardt (1981) 247-249 for a discussion of other elements of the poem that hint at Hekate’s ‘unpredictability’, to use Marquardt’s term. Herring (2011) 81 suggests that the ‘seeds of the dread goddess are already present here.’

21 See note above.

22 There is a contradiction in Hesiod’s words. He states that Zeus made (Θῆκε) Hekate kourotrophos (line 450), but then states that she held this position from the beginning (line 452). M.L. West (1966) 290 accounts for the contradiction with Hesiod’s lack of practice in historical thinking. Picking up on this thought, D.R. West (1995) 190 suggests ‘clumsy language’. As
As Clay asserts, the tide of opinion has, in general, shifted against the charge that the passage is an interpolation. Friedländer, Solmsen and Pfister have argued that the prominence of the τιμή-motif in the passage as well as the *Theogony* as a whole is strong evidence against the Hymn being un-Hesiodic. Moreover, Friedländer draws a link between the rhetorical style of the Hymn to Hekate and the poem to *Works and Days*. Proceeding on the basis that the passage is genuine, we are confronted with the following problem: is the passage an aberration that can only be accounted for on the basis that Hesiod is espousing his own views? If so, the evidence may be biased. Or can the structure of the Hymn and its position be accounted for in terms of the poem as a whole—that is, Hesiod’s purpose? If so, Hekate’s character may have been distorted to meet the poem’s requirements. Despite Boedeker’s warning that ‘[a]rguments explaining Hecate’s special status in the poem in terms of Hesiod’s beliefs … should be advanced with great caution’, I nonetheless submit that the most appropriate model of analysis for this passage is

Marquardt (1981) 246 says, ‘since Hecate was contemporary with the Titans (424), the implication is that Zeus gave her this honor before his own rise to power.’

23 Clay (2003) 130. In addition to the scholars cited in n. 5, see Arrighetti (1998) and Richardson (1974) 41: ‘it is fairly certain that we have the poet himself speaking.’

24 Friedländer (1914) 124; Solmsen (1949) 53 n. 169; Pfister (1928) 6. West also advances a persuasive and detailed case (in relation to stylistic concerns) in favour of the passage’s authenticity, see West (1966) 276-280.

25 Scholars who argue for personal devotion include Mazon (1928) 21ff.; van Groningen (1958) 269-270; West (1966) 276-290; and Burkert (1985) 171. Rudhardt (1993) 211-213, although arguing that the anomalous nature of the Hesiodic Hekate and the circumstances in which she is apportioned her share of honours justify the length of her hymn nonetheless concludes by suggesting that Hesiod bore a personal connection to the goddess.

26 Clay (2003) 130-131 holds that speculation that Hesiod included the goddess for personal reasons causes a discussion ‘extraneous to the structure and context of the *Theogony*’ and that it is ‘[f]ar more fruitful … to focus on what Hesiod actually says about [Hekate] and her place in his poem.’ Discussions which have focussed on the part in relation to the whole include Boedeker (1983); Arthur (1982; Griffith (1983); Caldwell (1987); Lamberton (1988); and Zeitlin (1996).

27 Boedeker (1983) 81. See also Solmsen (1949) 51-52, n. 169: ‘Whether it is correct to infer that Hesiod’s family had a special attachment to Hecate … is more than I can say’.
situated between the aforementioned two extremes. I think Griffith offers the most compelling argument for the artistic rationale behind the Hymn to Hekate; he states that it demonstrates the efficacy of divine power in the realm of mortals. Griffith goes on to provide three reasons why Hekate was chosen: her ‘absence from the Homeric pantheon’ means her Hesiodic duties ‘can overlap with some of the Olympians … without causing offence’; she is female and therefore a ‘less competitive associate for Zeus’; and she ‘embodies the continuing of the old order in the new.’ This reasoning accounts for her far-reaching benevolence (as well as her arbitrariness, given that divine will can also work unfavourably for mortals), and the placement of her Hymn directly before the birth of Zeus, the embodiment of the new order. Arguably, this also accounts for the lack of any other mention of Hekate, despite the extent of Hesiod’s praise.

I do not feel, however, that these reasons, or those advanced by other scholars, adequately account for the length and ‘peculiar terms of praise’ used

30 For example: Lamberton (1988) 85: A ‘celebration of the usefulness of Hekate (whose unpretentious and popular cult is richly attested, particularly in Aristophanes), of her potential to serve her devotees.’; Nagy (1982) 64: Hekate, a ‘synthetic’ deity, was used by Hesiod because of her Panhellenic qualities, which would allow the poet to produce a work to which all Greeks could relate; Boedeker (1983) 92: ‘I would argue then that the trifunctional model [see above, n. 15] 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.’; Judet de la Combe (1996) 263-299 and Wismann (1996) 21 interpret the goddess as the embodiment of disorder and a figure who prevents Zeus’ retributive justice, respectively. Their ideas represent a shift from the earlier scholarly tradition by asserting that the Hesiodic Hekate was not a cult figure to whom Hesiod wished to pay homage, but rather a continuation of an old chthonic force in the new order. How is it, though, that Hekate could be construed as a chthonic representative when she is apportioned no share in the underworld? Clay (2003) 138 (whose original work in 1984 explored the idea of Hekate as the continuation of a chthonic force more deeply than Judet de la Combe and Wismann): ‘The lengthy treatment accorded to Hecate at a pivotal moment in the Theogony attests
for the goddess. Even if Clay is correct in asserting that Hekate’s role is one of a critical intermediary, I do not think this can really account for a Hymn which is second only to Zeus in terms of the extent of its veneration. The passage can be fully accounted for only when recourse is had to the idea of an intrusion of personal beliefs. Griffith demands a reason for the lack of any other mention of the goddess, particularly in the Proem, where the Muses and Zeus are addressed, or of any indication that a personal or local connection existed between Hesiod and the goddess. Griffith has, in a way, already answered his own question: if, as he argues, the Hymn to Hekate is placed here to reinforce the continuation of the subordinated old order, then Hesiod may have restricted his mention of the goddess to these lines in order to drive home this point. What is more, the lack of an explicit mention of a personal or local connection is compensated for by the plurality of ‘superlatives, jingles, and repetitions’ which lead to the aforementioned characterisations of the piece as in the manner of a ‘Hymnic address’ or a ‘liturgical refrain’—that is, the style seems implicitly to suggest a personal connection. Moreover, while Griffith describes West’s comments about Hesiod’s father as a ‘very long shot’, I find them to be wholly reasonable conjecture. As we saw in Chapter One, it is entirely

not merely to a personal whim of Hesiod’s, but to the poet’s understanding of her critical mediating function.’; Zografou (2010) 50-51: ‘Quelle qu’en soit la raison, cette absence [dans l’épopée homérique] suggère déjà que la déesse agit à un niveau différent de celui des dieux homériques, qu’elle peut exister indépendamment de leur société bienheureuse … Se prenant un peu pour Zeus, le poète d’Ascra la réhabilitera parce que son autonomie lui permet de l’utiliser comme la force de cohésion d’un univers «bien réparti» … D’autre part, étant donné qu’Hécate, d’après nos sources les plus anciennes, ne semble pas avoir de grands sanctuaires à elle ni de grandes fêtes organisées en son honneur, il est fort probable qu’à l’époque d’Hésiode – comme plus tard d’ailleurs – elle ait surtout été honorée dans les sanctuaires des autres dieux ainsi que dans de petits sanctuaires privés. Ce type de culte serait compatible avec le modèle d’un pouvoir omniprésent, mais non total, tel que le dessine Hésiode.’


32 Remembering, of course, that Zeus is the divinity on which the entire Theogony is essentially based.

33 Griffith (1983) 51-52 n. 61.
plausible that Hesiod’s father might have come across worship of Hekate in Miletos, the location of the oldest known archaeological evidence of her cult. Stoddard’s comment that ‘[t]he results of research [that rejects the biographical approach in favour of an interpretation that uses the text of the *Theogony* itself] are more easily defensible than those based on theories of Hesiod’s personal religious or social sympathies’ is somewhat hollow.\(^{34}\) Certainly, text-based theories are more defensible, simply because we do not have a compendium of Hesiod’s personal ideas. The less defensible nature of speculation pertaining to Hesiod’s personal views is equalled by the fact that attempts to explain the Hymn in terms of the text of the *Theogony* itself have arguably not yet managed to account adequately for the length and peculiar terms of praise used by Hesiod.

Situating the analysis between these two extremes acknowledges that the passage may have been tempered by either consideration; both the requirements of the poem as well as any personal belief of Hesiod’s may well have resulted in a somewhat distorted characterisation of the goddess. To what extent any distortion may have taken place is hard to say, given the lack of corresponding evidence from the same period as the *Theogony*.\(^{35}\) It is strikingly anomalous, however, that Hesiod’s enumeration of Hekate’s honours explicitly omits any mention of the underworld. The goddess’ obvious connection to passage between the upper- and underworlds in her next literary appearance—the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*—is an alarming departure from her Hesiodic characterization. Could it be the case that, in pursuit of his goal to popularise the goddess,\(^{36}\) Hesiod omitted any chthonic connections because increasing anxiety about death in the Greek world was in its

\(^{34}\) Stoddard (2004) 11.

\(^{35}\) Marquardt (1981) discusses two eighth century Boeotian vases that she claims correspond to the Hesiodic depiction of Hekate. The correspondences, however, are very few, and an identification with Hekate is tenuous at best. See Griffith (1983) 51-52 n. 61; Kraus (1960) 25.

\(^{36}\) As Nilsson (1955-1961) 1\(^2\).725 states, ‘Der Dichter … [wollte] die neue Göttin popular machen’. This is also mentioned in Chapter Three.
nascent stages? If the goal, in alignment with poetic requirements, was to
demonstrate that the power of a representative of an old chthonic force persisted in
the new order, why would Hesiod fail to mention any chthonic association? In
Chapter Three, the idea of Hesiodic Hekate as Milesian is discussed, as is the
possibility that, in execution of her apparent civic role there, the goddess bore
chthonic characteristics. Any chthonic characteristics possessed by Hekate (and
potentially ignored by Hesiod) need not have been absolute: at Lagina, where
Hekate was clearly a civic deity, her chthonic properties were offset by the presence
of a raised altar, something more in line with the worship of an ouranic deity. By
the same token, a deliberate decision not to mention any underworld associations
would account for the apparently inflated dominion held by the goddess over every
other sphere (that is, earth, heaven, and sea): a deity of such importance would, at
the very least, command attention from all Greeks. The breadth of Hekate’s
influence is reflected by the extensive cross-section of pan-Hellenic society to
which the goddess is beneficial, as was pointed out through the use of Boedeker’s
tripartite model. If we are correct in discerning an artificial inflation of Hekate’s
influence for the purpose of her popularisation, we must also acknowledge that
cutting a deep swath across human existence would also demonstrate the efficacy of
divine power in the realm of mortals, the argument put forward by Griffith in
relation to poetic requirements. Such efficacy is a prerequisite for any continuation
of power in Zeus’ new order. Accordingly, while commentary pertaining to

---

37 Sourvinou-Inwood (1995) 299: ‘Already in the eighth century [that is, the century to
which the Theogony is generally dated] a certain shift in [attitudes towards death, which involved
increased anxiety about death and the preservation of one’s memory, and a more individual
perception of death] had begun to take place, which accelerated and crystallized in the archaic age’. For fuller discussion of these ideas, see Chapter Three.

38 See Judet de la Combe (1996) and Wismann (1996), touched upon in n. 30.

39 Herring (2011) 188-195. Laumonier (1958) 412ff. emphasises the chthonic characteristics
of Laginetan Hekate, namely the ‘flambeau, lampe, polos, clef de la klidagogie s’y rapportent.’

40 Clay (2003) 140 remarks that the classes of men envisaged are ‘great men, such as
heroes, kings and warriors to whom the gods grant kudos, but also, perhaps more surprisingly, those
of lower status’, but not people of ‘middle’ or ‘run-of-the-mill’ status.
distortion of character must remain squarely within a conjectural context, it is understandable how the considerations of both the requirements of the poem and personal piety could mould the description of Hekate.

More generally, we can remark at Hekate’s extensive, direct, and benevolent role in human affairs, as well as her arbitrariness. She is highly praised and displays no frightening aspects. However, I think that classifying the goddess as an intermediary or as having a ‘critical mediating role’, as we saw earlier, is a step too far. The trouble with this classification is thrown into particularly stark relief when the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* is used as a point of comparison. That *Hymn*, of course, demonstrates a true intermediary function for the goddess. In comparison, any classification of Hekate’s role in the *Theogony* as an intermediary pales. Cole cites the apparent overlapping of Hekate’s duties with those of other deities, her ‘propitious conjunction’ with other gods, as support for the argument that she is an intermediary and would be invoked as such; I would suggest instead that such overlapping is a corollary of the extent of her influence. The location of her Hymn reflects the continuation of the subordinated old order (and allows Zeus to be further venerated because of his just treatment of one of the ousted Titans) rather than her status as an intermediary between the two orders. Of course, she

---

41 Clay (2003) 136 calls this arbitrariness ‘essential’. See also Rudhardt (1993) 213. I am not sure if it is ‘essential’—I think, rather, that the goddess is depicted as essentially benevolent.


43 See also above, note 12. Although there has been scholarly support for describing the goddess as an intermediary in the *Theogony*: see Clay (2003) 136, upholding the stance she originally took nineteen years earlier (Clay (1984) 36). See also Klaüßen (1835) 452-458; Solmsen (1949) 71-72; Brown (1953) 28-33; Marquardt (1981) 245; Zeitlin (1996) 76; Herring (2011) 81.

44 See Clay (2003) 138 n. 33: ‘In the *Hymn to Demeter*, the goddess likewise fulfils the role of intermediary as she accompanies Persephone between the upper and nether regions.’


may well have been intended to be an intermediary by Hesiod, but even an extensive interpretative analysis is precluded from attributing this function to the goddess (and the intention to the author) from the words that are given to us. It is too drastic a leap, and seems to graft explicit, later evidence of Hekate’s liminal nature onto the *Theogony* in order to demonstrate the continuity of this aspect.  

**A TERRACOTTA, ATTIC STATUETTE OF HEKATE**

The very first archaeological artefact to depict Hekate on the Greek mainland is a late sixth century terracotta statuette from Athens (Fig. 6). The identification of the figure as a votive offering to Hekate is proved by its accompanying inscription in sixth century-style lettering, which reads ΑΙΓΟΝ ΑΝΕΘΕΚΕΝ ΘΕΚΑΤΕΙ. The votive measures 20 centimetres in height, and depicts a matronly figure seated on a throne wearing a crown. The sculpture is quintessentially archaic: her braided hair is highly stylized, her face quite sharply defined, and her lips are turned upward. Her arms are held close to her body, which is swathed in a long chiton, apart from her exposed feet. Besides these few features, the statuette wholly lacks defining attributes. As Sarian states, such a representation of the goddess poses problems of identification. Without the inscription, it would be a daring scholar indeed who would venture the assertion that such a generic votive depicts Hekate. The identification is entrenched, however, by the inscription and the fact that the

---

47 Herring (2011) 81 epitomises this stance when she says that it is ‘the mediating function of Hesiodic Hekate that connects her to the later incarnations of the goddess. In all periods and regions, here in the *Theogony* and in subsequent texts, Hekate is always defined by her liminality.’

48 See Kraus (1960) 27: ‘Es wäre sehr wichtig zu wissen, wo das Werkchen gefunden worden ist. Doch über die Angabe, es stamme aus Athen, kommt man nicht hinaus. Wenn diese Provenienz stimmt, stellt das kleine Votiv den ältesten Zeugen des Hekatekultes in Athens dar.’

49 IG I 836. ΘΕΚΑΤΕΙ = τα Ἑκάτει.

50 Kraus (1960) 26; Herring (2011) 74.

51 Kraus (1960) 27; Sarian (1992) 997 #105.

52 Ibid.
dedicator was a man, which removes the possibility that the worshipper was dedicating his own image to the goddess. Despite its plain appearance, there are a few things that can be said about the statuette. Farnell mentions that its monomorphic shape demonstrates that this was the earlier form taken by Hekate, an observation which is strengthened by the fact that no trimorphic *hekataion* is dated before the last quarter of the fifth century B.C.\(^53\) Johnston argues that the statuette’s plain appearance corresponds to a contemporary perception of Hekate as *looking* much like any other goddess.\(^54\) I am less inclined to accept this proposal. Rather, it is more likely that the coroplasts who moulded the seated goddesses (with whom Hekate is grouped by Winter)\(^55\) designed such attribute-lacking figures so that they could be interchangeably used to worship different goddesses. Through the intention of the worshipper the figure became the intended object of worship. Further, as Kraus remarks, ornamental painting was occasionally used to refine the identity of the particular goddess being venerated.\(^56\) It is another thing indeed to rely on the goddess’ generic portrayal in order to argue that she was perceived as looking like any other goddess, even if that really was the case.

Perhaps the most important aspect of this statuette’s characterisation of Hekate is the fact that she is enthroned. As Kraus has remarked, this portrayal does not, *prima facie*, indicate that the goddess was perceived—at least by the statuette’s clay moulder(s) and dedicator—as carrying any of the sinister characteristics she developed through the Classical and Hellenistic periods.\(^57\) Roller speculates that an enthroned pose may have imparted more of a sense of power and reverence to the Greeks.\(^58\) The Phrygian Kybele comes to mind, whose foremost representation was

\(^{53}\) Farnell (1896) 2.549; Kraus (1960) 84.

\(^{54}\) Johnston (1999) 204.

\(^{55}\) Winter (1903) 1.48, 1a-q.

\(^{56}\) Kraus (1960) 27.

\(^{57}\) Ibid, 28.

\(^{58}\) Roller (1999) 132. See also Connor (1988) 186 who, in his discussion of a seated nymph, states that enthronement presented a divinity in [his or her] ‘most awesome aspect’ and was normatively required of any ‘mighty divinity’. He further states that an enthroned image is a ‘natural
the seated pose. The enthroned Kybele first appears in the mid sixth century B.C., and spread from Ionia to the islands of the Aegean and through to the western Mediterranean. According, these statuettes introduced what would become Kybele’s standard Hellenic iconography until late antiquity. However, I do not think the statuette of Hekate hints at derivation from the cult and image of Kybele. Rather, the similarity to Kybele indicates the Near Eastern influence on the Hellenic custom of seated figures.

Further similarities with Kybele in relation to the throne are also explicable on the basis of an eastern custom. On the island of Chalke, near Rhodes, a double rock-hewn throne is epigraphically dedicated to both Hekate and Zeus. Rock thrones are, of course, commonly associated with the cult of Kybele. The location of the throne entrenches Hekate’s liminal aspects, particularly because rocks with a dedicatory inscription to Zeus are often located in marginal areas. On Rhodes itself, near Lartos, another throne-resentland rock formation sits opposite an inscription carved into a rock face. A road separates the two. The inscription, a votive couplet, dedicates a nonextant tablet to Soteira Phosphoros Enodia—that is, Hekate. Kraus asserts that the carving and inscription must be affiliated; his expression of power’, Cf. Munn (2006) 128-129, who states, with reference to Kybele, that the ‘goddess enthroned is no longer a maiden, but is the goddess as Mother in the fullness of her powers.’


60 Ibid, 132.


62 IG XII.1 958: Διός. Ἐξώτης. See Cook (1914) 1.141-142.

63 Gaifman (2012) 168 describes the site as ‘doubly liminal’ because of its position in relation to both the main cultic site and the hilly terrace where the throne is found.

64 IG XII.1 914: Εὐξέμενος ἱερὸς Σωτείρας τόνδε ἄνθρωπον Εὐδοκίῳ Φωσφόρῳ Ἐννοδ[η]. This inscription is also discussed by Berg (1974) 137 n. 41 and Kraus (1960) 28 n. 108.
proposition is strengthened by the fact they are both situated on (indeed, separated by) a road and Enodia is mentioned in the inscription. A connection to these rock formations, however, does not allow for the conclusion that Hekate originally occupied either of the thrones.

Both of these rock thrones are Hellenistic, which would seem to erode their significance in the present discussion. However, as Kraus argues, their late date renders any argument that the thrones were adopted from the cult of Kybele unsatisfactory, notwithstanding the blatant similarities. Moreover, Kybele and Hekate remained distinct (that is, were not syncretised) during the Hellenistic period, and there is no evidence of the former having played a significant role in either Chalke or Lartos. There is, however, evidence of the Near Eastern nascence and development of the rock throne concept—a geographical area within whose reach of influence the neighbouring islands of Chalke and Rhodes lay. What seems to have happened is the resurrection of a cultic form of great antiquity, which—on a very localised level—was incorporated into the cult of Hekate. Despite the much later date of these thrones, when they are taken together with the seated, Attic statuette, is an Oriental aspect of Hekate’s cult and image hinted at? The most we can say of the statuette (in isolation) with certainty is that the sculptural style originated in Asia Minor. We cannot definitively state that the

---

65 Kraus (1960) 28-29. For more on Enodia, see below and especially Chapter Three.

66 See Gaifman (2012) 165: ‘Like Near Eastern empty thrones of gods, these two vacant spaces could have prompted a mental picture of the divinities in human form, without direct representation of their appearance.’ That is not to say however, that representations of the deities definitely did not occupy the recesses. Any firm conclusion will be speculative, as Gaifman recognises at page 169.

67 Discussing the thrones at Chalke, Gaifman (2012) 164 states that the ‘lunar sigma and epsilon suggest … a date not earlier than the fourth century B.C. and more probably sometime later in the Hellenistic or Roman period.’ On the Rhodian inscription, Cook (1914) 1.141-142 asserts that the letters are ‘not later than the third century B.C.’

68 Kraus (1960) 28-29.

69 Kraus, citing Kretschmer. See Kraus (1960) 29 nn. 112-113.

70 Ibid, 29.
characterization is Near Eastern. But it seems reasonable to postulate that borrowing of style would go hand-in-hand with the borrowing of characteristics, too. Moreover, in the case of enthronement, it is difficult to separate style from characterization: the seated motif portrays a sense of divine might and demands reverence. The trouble is, of course, that the statuette conveys very little else in the way of characterization. Yet it stands in rather stark contrast to Hekate’s characterization in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, which is dated from the mid-seventh to the mid-sixth century.\(^{71}\) As we shall see, the *Hymn* seems to articulate, to an extent, the circumstances of Hekate’s introduction to the Panhellenic pantheon. It is difficult to reconcile the youthful, torch-bearing character of the *Hymn* with the enthroned, apparently matronly Berlin terracotta. On that basis, I think it is reasonably safe to assume that the statuette projects an Asia Minorian characterization of Hekate.

**HEKATE IN THE HOMERIC HYMN TO DEMETER**

Hekate’s next literary appearance is in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. A precise date for the work is difficult to fix, and has been the subject of some controversy. The assessment of a possible *terminus post quem* (*TPQ*) and *terminus ante quem* (*TAQ*) for the composition of the poem essentially hinges on two factors: *historical* and *cultural* considerations (that is, the most appropriate correlation between the ‘internal evidence’ of the *Hymn* and the external, ‘archaeological evidence’\(^{72}\) of Eleusis, as well as developing Athenian interest in the mysteries\(^{73}\)), and *stylistic*...
considerations. Richardson argues that a definite TPQ can ‘probably’ not be determined, but that a date after the second quarter of the seventh century is most likely.\textsuperscript{74} He bases this opinion on the composer’s (or composers’) apparent stylistic awareness of the \textit{Theogony}—which, as we have seen, is generally dated to the late eight century—and also perhaps the \textit{Iliad and Odyssey}.\textsuperscript{75} In the assessment of a TAQ, Richardson suggests that the lack of any mention of Athens in the \textit{Hymn} can reasonably support the notion that the poem was composed before Athenian interest in the Eleusinian Mysteries had developed; he accordingly sets a TAQ of the mid-sixth century.\textsuperscript{76} In conclusion, Richardson ventures a more subjective opinion, suggesting that, on stylistic grounds alone, a seventh-century date is preferable.\textsuperscript{77} Having established these matters, we can most safely proceed with a broad dating

\footnotesize{appropriately dated to the time of Theseus. Other ancient sources to discuss the conflict are Apollod. (\textit{Bibl.} 3.15.4-5) and Eur. (fragments of \textit{Erechtheus}). Despite variances in detail, each piece of literature places the event in prehistory. Hdt. (1.30) discusses the Athenians battling against τοὺς ἀστυγείτονας ἐν Ἐλευσίνῃ, but notwithstanding the location, the unspecified neighbours are not necessarily Eleusinians.

\textsuperscript{74} Richardson (1974) 6.

\textsuperscript{75} Richardson (1974) 5-6. For an enumeration of examples of stylistic similarity between the \textit{Hymn} and \textit{Theogony}, see Richardson (1974) 39. Janko (1982) 181-183 also argues that the language of the \textit{Hymn} more closely parallels Hesiod’s Boeotian tradition. For the dating of the \textit{Theogony}, see above. See also Richardson (1974) 5 n. 2.

\textsuperscript{76} Triptolemos, who plays a peripheral role in the \textit{Hymn} at lines 153 and 474, was the subject of a growth in Athenian interest c. 550 B.C., as evidenced by Attic vases from this period. As Richardson suggests, this is a strong indication that control of the Mysteries was, by this point, vested in the Athenians. Such interest in the Mysteries would have begun, at the very latest, with Peisistratos. See Richardson (1974) 6-11; Janko (1982) 182.

\textsuperscript{77} See also Janko (1982) 181, who states that the ‘date for the Hymn must be in the latter half of the seventh or the early sixth century: I consider that the linguistic evidence strongly favours a date earlier rather than later within this range.’ (My emphasis). On the other hand, and pursuant to archaeological and historical considerations, Burkert (1985) 443 suggests that if the temple to Demeter mentioned at lines 270-272 and 296-298 of the \textit{Hymn} is an early sixth century, Solonian building, a later date for the \textit{Hymn}’s composition would be more likely. See also Foley (1994) 29-30 and Janko (1982) 275 n. 10.}
of 650 – 550 B.C.

The *Hymn to Demeter* is arguably the best known of the *Homeric Hymns*. Time has not wearied its allure; its treatment of Persephone’s kidnap at the hands of Hades, Demeter’s mournful search, and the eventual reunification of mother and daughter ‘attests’, in the words of Clay, ‘to the humane genius of the Greek imagination, which links the eternal cosmic phenomena of the return of the seasons with the divine drama of loss and renewal.’ Hekate appears at three pivotal moments in the story, specifically lines 24-25, 52-59, and 438-440. Line 24 establishes the paternity of Hekate; other than the alternative spelling of Perses as Persaios, this aspect does not diverge from the *Theogony*. On the same line, Hekate is described as being ἀταλά φρονέουσα, ‘with youthful spirit’, according to Richardson. This characterization of the goddess as youthful is a point of interest; it seems to contrast with the immediately preceding description of Hekate’s Titanic lineage—that is, the line seems to switch from a maternal to a daughterly characterization. Titans, of course, are primeval, and it seems unnatural to characterize one as young. Arthur’s comment on Hekate’s Hesiodic characterization can be applied here; she asserts that ‘Hekate is thus both an old goddess and a new one’, for the *Hymn*, young could be used instead of new. This contradictory

---

80 Foley (1994) 124: ‘By naming her father, the *Hymn* seems to characterize her as a Titan, and thus from a generational perspective a figure more maternal than daughterly.’
81 Arthur (1982) 15, 68. In the *Theogony*, as we have seen, Hekate is representative of the old order, but has her honours both maintained and augmented by Zeus. Her preeminence among both the older and younger generations of gods allows for Arthur’s description, but she is not necessarily represented as being young; the *Hymn* differs in the sense that it describes her as of youthful spirit. The *Theogony*, on the other hand, seems to envisage a more matronly figure, as indicated by the extent of her honours (in three spheres), her pre-Olympian status, and the lack of
characterization may be accounted for by one or more of the following suggestions: a) the author(s) of the *Hymn* is alluding to Hekate’s Hesiodic embodiment of the continuing old order; b) characterizing the goddess as both matronly and youthful entrenches the role she plays with respect to Demeter and Persephone and allows her to mediate more effectively between mother and daughter; or c) to venture a more speculative opinion, such a characterisation may reflect the circumstances of Hekate’s introduction to the Panhellenic pantheon in the Archaic period.

By this I mean that the antiquity of the Karian goddess may well have been recognized, but her novelty required some kind of reworking of the ‘already firmly set’ Panhellenic pantheon that would reflect both elements of old and new. As we have seen, Hesiod blends both elements (and thereby further exalts Zeus), and makes Hekate the cousin of Artemis. Such a genealogical connection could be the corollary of a perceived similarity between the two goddesses. In the *Hymn*, the element of Hekate’s age, encapsulated in her Titanic heritage, is immediately juxtaposed with her youthfulness. What immediately springs to mind is Artemis’ mythic displacement of Hekate to the role of ‘mythic victim’, as discussed in detail any counter-balancing mention of youth. Her position as kourotophos ξ ῥ θ θ θ indicates an association with the young, but it does not necessarily mean that the goddess herself is young. When Budin (2011) 30 justifies the use of the term kourotophos in her study of Bronze Age images of women and children, she asserts that it ‘designates exactly what the images portray: an adult (mortal or divine) who nourishes and/or protects a child, regardless of whether or not that adult is to be understood as the child’s parent’. Although Budin restricts her study to images from the Bronze Age, her description can arguably be applied more expansively. On 31, she states that Hekate is ‘well established as a caretaker of the young. And yet, she remains a virgin and thus cannot be a mother per se.’ (My emphasis). It is true that Hekate is implicitly represented as virginal in the *Theogony*, but virginity is not always indicative of youth, as Athena demonstrates. See also Chapter One n. 287. For more on the generational divide between old and young, see Burkert (1985) 221-223.

82 A role which, following the reunion of mother and daughter in which Hekate partakes at lines 438-440, is ‘regularized’; she will eternally accompany Persephone on her ‘cyclical journey’. See Clay (1989) 257.

by Johnston.\textsuperscript{84} It will help to discuss two myths, one of which was mentioned towards the end of Chapter One, in order to establish how Hekate would have become such a ‘prototypical dying virgin’ \textsuperscript{85} in the first place, and to include extracts from Johnston’s commentary. According to a fragment of Stesichorus, who provides the earliest attested version of Iphigeneia’s myth, Artemis, having immortalized Iphigenia, caused her to ‘become Hekate.’ \textsuperscript{86} The second myth, which had currency at least as early as Callimachus (according to Eustathius and Photius), explicitly concerns the home of King Ephesos (an early monarch of the city of the same name), which Artemis is visiting.\textsuperscript{87} An unnamed Ephesian woman angers Artemis. Consequently the woman is caused to metamorphose into a bitch before

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{84} The Ionian colonization would have taken place before the composition of the \textit{Hymn}. See Laale (2011) 6-11.
\item\textsuperscript{85} Keeping in mind the fact that she ‘neither dies nor is transformed. Instead, in both versions of the story (about to be discussed), Hecate is what \textit{emerges} from the virgin’s death. She is the vengeful ghost uniquely created for the role, the divine prototype of all vengeful ghosts’. Johnston (1999) 247.
\item\textsuperscript{86} Stesich. fr. 215: Davies (1991). Essentially the same story is told in the Hesiodic \textit{Catalogue of Women} (fr. 23(a) 17-26: Merklebach and West (1967); cf. 23(b) = Paus. 1.43.1). The \textit{Catalogue} describes how Iphigenia was made an immortal πρόπολος of and by Artemis, and consequently became known as Ἁρτεμίς εἰνοδίαι. We are justified in assuming that Artemis E(i)nodia refers to Hekate for two reasons: first, the stories are undeniably similar; second, both sources are Archaic, and the \textit{Catalogue} most likely post-dated Stesichorus. (For the dating of the catalogue, see Janko (1982) 85-7; Cingano (2009); Rutherford (2012) 153-154; West (1985) 133-137; West (1999) 380; Fowler (1999); Hirschberger (2004) 48-51; Nasta (2006)). Arguably, it is safer to rely on these reasons than Pausanias’ comment affirming Ἀρτεμίν εἰνοδήν’s identity as Hekate (although this usefully bolsters our proposition), given the much later date of Pausanias’ work. The story also appeared in the epic \textit{Cypria}, judging from Proclus’ summary, lines 55-64. Cf. also Ant. Lib. 27 = Nic fr. 58. See also Chapter Three.
\item\textsuperscript{87} Callim. fr. 461 = Eust. \textit{Od}. 12.85; Phot. \textit{Bibl. s.v. ἕγαλμα Ἐκάτης}: Theodoridis (1982). For the story involving Iphigenia, neither the Hesiodic \textit{Catalogue} nor Stesichorus provide a geographical setting; the \textit{Cypria}, however, names Aulis as the place at which Iphigeneia was sacrificed and experienced her apotheosis. See Johnston (1999) 243 n. 123; Dowden (1989) 9-49. Johnston speculates that the myth of Iphigeneia’s transformation may have led Statius (\textit{Achil}. 1.447) to label Aulis as sacred to Hekate.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
having her human form restored by the goddess, who pities her. The resulting shame of the Ephesian woman induces her suicide; Artemis adorns the corpse and ‘names her Hekate’.

In both stories, Artemis is the common denominator: a divine catalyst causing the particular dying female (certainly a virgin in both cases)\(^{88}\) to become equivalent to Hekate. Conversely, Hekate’s origin in both myths is traced to a dying virgin—any dying virgin would do, it seems.\(^{89}\) Artemis, then, is what we might call the superior divinity to whom dominion over female transitions is connected, and Hekate, in both cases, appears to be the prototypical (divine) representation of a failed transition. Taken together, and with the aid of Johnston’s ‘disentangling’ (as explained in Chapter One), Callimachus’ story colours our interpretation of Stesichorus’ (‘essentially identical’)\(^{90}\) one: when Hekate appeared in the Greek religious consciousness, her strikingly similar role in relation to women’s transitions required her subordination to the Greek (and therefore superior) Artemis. Both were drawn ‘into alignment with a popular [and old] Greek mythic paradigm’ and allocated a dominate or subordinate role.\(^{91}\) Moreover, Hekate’s subordinate role did not attenuate her fundamental connections to feminine liminality; indeed, it entrenched them.\(^{92}\) To recapitulate my point more succinctly: the *Hymn* reflects a Greek (as opposed to an Anatolian) perception of Hekate and the way that she was accommodated by the multifarious institution of Greek religion. Her displacement and consequent association with the motif of an

---

\(^{88}\) See Johnston (1999) 242-243 for (convincing) argument pertaining to the Ephesian woman’s status as a virgin.

\(^{89}\) Johnston (1999) 243. ‘It is likely that Iphigenia was chosen for the part in one version because at the time it developed, she was the most famous of all virgins killed by Artemis, thanks to the incorporation of her story into the panhellenically popular Mycenean saga.’


\(^{91}\) Johnston (1999) 245.

\(^{92}\) Moreover, as Johnston (1999) 246-247 states, Hekate’s subordination did not mean that she was not an ‘important goddess in her own right’; her existence was, rather (according to these myths), a *fiat* of Artemis.”
incomplete female transition rendered a goddess of great, but indeterminate, antiquity at once a goddess of youth and demarcated an appropriate space for her within the Panhellenic pantheon. As we return to the *Hymn*, it is especially noteworthy that the *floruit* of Stesichorus, whose myth reflects Hekate’s subordination, falls at the turn of the seventh and sixth centuries B.C.—in the middle of the period to which we have suggested the *Hymn* may be ascribed.

The three points at which Hekate appears in the *Hymn* (lines 24-26, 52-59; 438-440) relate to the kathodos (abduction and ‘descent’) and anodos (‘ascent’) of Persephone, specifically Hekate’s initial aural cognizance of the abduction, Hekate’s relation of the extent of her knowledge to the grief-stricken Demeter, and Hekate’s presence at the reunion of mother and daughter, at which point we learn of the regularization of her role as Persephone’s πρόσωπος and ὀπτάων. It seems that the mythic conceit of an abduction by and consequent ‘marriage’ to Hades can be interpreted as the death of a maiden. Moreover, ‘the association with Persephone was a regular feature of funerary practices and funerary epigrams for girls who died young.’ She represents therefore, the paradigmatic, virginal girl who is frozen ‘in

---

93 Because her role, as prototypical dying virgin, generally sets youth as a prerequisite.
95 Segal (1999) 180. See *Anth. Pal.* 7.13, 182, 186, 221, 489, 507b, 599. Cf. Guépin (1968) 141 n. 35, who, citing Chamoux, states that an ‘assimilation of the dead, male or female, to Kore-Persephone, depicted in her anodos, has been suggested as an explanation for the curious tomb-statues at Cyrene’; Peek (1960) 203, 205, 276, 460.
the middle of her transitional period.

Moreover, the ‘transgression that leads to disaster … involves behavior that is inappropriate for the transitional girl’: she is raped, similar to Dictynna/Aphaea (threw herself into fishing nets to avoid being raped by Minos) and Aspalis (hangs herself to avoid being raped). How appropriate, then, that the first two scenes involving Hekate should be so intimately involved with the death of a maiden! There is a range of potential models that can be applied in order to understand further the death of Persephone in this context.

---

96 Johnston (1999) 218. Cf. Jenkins (1983) 142: ‘the bride’s status is akin to that of the soul who has departed the world of the living but not yet entered that of the dead’.

97 Dictynna/Aphaea: Call. Hymn 3.189-203; Diod. Sic. 5.76.3; Strab. 10. 4.12; Paus. 2.20.3; Paus. 3.14.2; Paus. 8.2.4; Paus. 9.40.3; Ant. Lib. 40; Nonnus, Dion. 33.332 ff.; Verg. Ciris 294-309. Aspalis: Ant. Lib. 13 = Nic. fr. 44.

98 Burkert (1986) 262, looking to the core of the Persephone myth, discusses a variant thereof ‘in which the agricultural connection completely disappears’. This variant is depicted in votive reliefs from Locri in Southern Italy, which show the maiden being surrendered to Hades. Burkert links these depictions to a ‘strange rite of maiden–sacrifice’ in Locri. The rite involved women giving themselves to foreigners in the temple of Aphrodite. It both signified an ‘exchange of roles in the critical transition from virginity to womanhood’ and guaranteed ‘great [military] success’ for the locale. For more on Locri, see Sourvinou-Inwood (1978). In the case of the Hymn itself, agricultural prosperity is the ‘goal answering to the surrender of the maiden’. Edwards upholds Burkert’s reasoning, stating that ‘maidens [dying] for the safety or benefit of the city is a leitmotif in Greek mythology’; he relates the story of the daughters of Leos as an example. See Edwards (1986) 315 n. 66. Ferrari, advancing her theory of ‘normative inversion’, argues that the ‘death of the woman of an age to marry is a violation of both the natural and the social order. It opens up the vision of the world upside down, where the young die and females do not give birth, where things can be truly perceived only by looking at them backwards.’ See Ferrari (2003) 36-37. Faraone advances a nuanced argument in relation to the sacrifice performed at the Brauronian temple of Artemis. He keenly distinguishes between ‘communal’ and ‘personal’ ursine sacrifices, stating that ‘neither … was in any way concerned with an age-grade initiation, a mystery cult or with any kind of preparation for or indoctrination about marriage. Rather both were forms of sacrifice designed to placate the deadly anger of Artemis and to ward off either the general threat to the city of plague and famine, or the more specific threat of death in childbirth to young women who were about to be married.’ See Faraone (2003) 61-62 and passim. Clearly, Faraone’s argument pertains to Artemis and her Brauronian rites; the Eleusinian Mysteries, the establishment of which the Hymn
Ultimately, however, such interpretation is peripheral to current concerns and in any case too lengthy to be properly treated in this study. What is most important for present purposes is what the Hymn can tell us about the character of Hekate at the time it was composed, or rather the way her character was perceived to be by its Greek composer(s). We need to tie this discussion back to the point from which it sprouted. Arguably, there is a case for the proposition that the Hymn’s characterization of Hekate as both maternal (a non-Greek goddess of great antiquity) and daughterly (subordinated upon entry) may indeed be reflective of the circumstances of Hekate’s introduction into the Panhellenic pantheon in the Archaic period. The discussion that inevitably ensued in relation to virgin death demonstrates to us that the poet(s) conceived of the goddess as, at that time, intimately connected with the transition of a nubile female. Of itself, this point may seem self-evident or even rather pedestrian. After all, as Johnston asserts, Hekate ‘arrived in Greece from Caria during the archaic period [with] two distinctive features: she was … concerned with women’s transitions and … liminal points.’

Let us consider Persephone’s transition more thoroughly, particularly in relation to the idea of a failed transition. Although Persephone’s abduction by and subsequent marriage to Hades is able to be conceived of as a virgin death, there is an obstacle blocking an unmitigated acceptance of the idea of Persephone representing a paradigmatic mythic virgin whose transition to motherhood is cut short: she is divine, unlike the mythical girls of stories involving failed transitions. However, while her story cannot fall within the ambit of the first of

---


101 Cf. the stories of Callisto, the Proetides, Ariadne, the daughters of Cecrops, Erigone, Carya, the Pandareids, Dictynna/Aphaea; Aspalis, and Iphigenia. Prehistorically, it is likely that
two paradigmatic types of myth outlined by Johnston (a girl or a member of her family angers a goddess concerned with female transitions), it fits within the second: someone from outside her family (Hades) occasions her harm.\textsuperscript{102} As we saw above, her rape fits under the rubric of transgressive, unsuitable behaviour that leads to disaster. Most important, ‘however the details of these myths may vary’, is the fact that a nubile, virginal girl dies or ‘is permanently removed from normal life’ before she becomes a wife and mother.\textsuperscript{103} For Persephone to complete a transition to wife, the marriage would have to be to anyone \textit{other} than Hades, given the previously discussed mythic conceit. Moreover, her (conditional) return to the upper world—her call back to life by the \textit{mater dolorosa}\textsuperscript{104}—does not cause the argument for a failed transition to break down; indeed, the salvation nonetheless costs Persephone her normal pursuit of life (given the requirement to spend one third of the year wedded to Hades), similar to the stories of Dictynna/Aphaea and Aspalis.\textsuperscript{105} If, however, it is not accepted that Persephone’s rape fits within the paradigm of a failed transition, it is certain that she is able to be classified at the very least as a ‘paradigmatic virgin’.\textsuperscript{106} Moreover, Hekate’s role is fundamentally connected to Persephone, a paradigmatic virgin who crosses the permeable threshold between the living and the dead: she is present immediately after both Persephone’s descent and her ascent. Given that Hekate’s mythic subordination to Artemis is arguably reflected by the \textit{Hymn}, we should expect her role to be of or pertaining to that of mythic victim, which ‘brought her into even closer contact with the vengeful ghosts’ that were the result of failed transitions—\textit{aōrai}.\textsuperscript{107} She was the ‘vengeful ghost uniquely created for the role’. This vengeful nature was, of course,

\begin{itemize}
  \item Iphigenia was an autonomous goddess rather than a mythical, marriageable girl; in the myths with which we are concerned, however, she is the latter. See Kerenyi (1959) 331
  \item \textsuperscript{102} Johnston (1999) 216-217.
  \item \textsuperscript{103} Johnston (1999) 217.
  \item \textsuperscript{104} Segal (1999) 180.
  \item \textsuperscript{105} Johnston (1999) 217.
  \item \textsuperscript{106} Johnston (1999) 18; Clay (1989) 209-222.
  \item \textsuperscript{107} Johnston (1999) 247, 161-199 (on \textit{aōrai}).
\end{itemize}
to become her foremost characteristic following its introduction by Sophocles and first full exploitation by Euripides.

It is clear that Hekate is conceived as the most appropriate goddess in the context of a paradigmatic virgin experiencing a crisis, given her aforementioned presence in relation to the kathodos and anodos, as well as the establishment of her role as πρόσωλος and ὁπάων, to be discussed more fully soon. On the face of it, however, vengeful malevolence is lacking from Hekate’s portrayal (and indeed Persephone’s) in the Hymn, notwithstanding the fact that the two are intimately associated on the basis of an untimely, virginal death. Indeed, Persephone is restored to life and light by her mother; she is not a vengeful ghost unleashed by Hekate to wreak havoc on mortals, particularly females undergoing (or having just completed) the transition to motherhood. While Homer connects Hades and Persephone with the Erinyes in the latter’s vengeful capacity, and there is some evidence for Homeric influence on the language and narrative construction of the Hymn, it cannot be conclusively said that the composer(s) of the Hymn drew on the Homeric characterization of Persephone in relation to the Erinyes. There is no proof, and Homer does not relate any element of the Kore myth. Moreover, to assert such a point would be to ignore the depiction of Persephone in the Hymn, which seems to lack such vengeful aspects apart from lines 364-369, where she is finally established as queen of the dead and endowed with the power to punish


109 Richardson (1974) 5, 31-33. ‘The evidence is nowhere sufficient to constitute a certain case. There does, however, remain a distinct possibility that the poet already knew the Iliad and Odyssey.’ As for Hesiodic influence, Richardson (1974) 33 states that the ‘reference to the Rape of Persephone in Hes. Th. 913b-14 is also closely parallel to Dem. 2b-3. Here again, the lines may be traditional’. This would be helpful if Persephone were presented as vengeful in the Theogony, but there is nothing to suggest this (like her Homeric depiction, she is characterized as a dread goddess of the underworld at Hes. Theog. 767-774, but this is discrete and unrelated to the Kore myth). As an aside, Richardson goes on to say that ‘Hecate … first appears in Hesiod’ but that her ‘presence in the Hymn is, however, due to [her] role in Eleusinian myth, rather than to Hesiodic influence.’

110 See above, n. 75. Cf. Hom. Od. 10.490-495.
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whomever should not sacrifice or perform the customary rites. It is noteworthy, although perhaps inconsequential, that it is only after Persephone is established as such—that is, with the power to be vengeful—that Hekate becomes her consummate guide. However, as Johnston says of Hekate in the *Hymn*, ‘we find her already fulfilling the duties for which she was most highly valued in later times’—that is, her duties in relation to the dead, particularly dead virgins, without necessarily exhibiting her later malevolence.\(^{111}\) This is probably because, in the earlier stages of this role, Hekate was entreated to protect from such beings, before associations with black magic caused her to become much more likely to lead them on.\(^{112}\)

Line 25 of the *Hymn* establishes Hekate’s association with caves. Scholars have put forth a variety of suggestions in relation to this motif. Richardson regards Kern’s link to the Zerynthian cave on Samothrace as a step too far—this is a metaphorical, rather than a geographical reference.\(^{113}\) Allen and Halliday assert that the cave would be an ‘appropriate’ home for a chthonic goddess or a lunar goddess.\(^{114}\) Many scholars argue for an interpretation of Hekate as lunar in the *Hymn*; this is a point to which we shall return shortly. I think the safest interpretation of the cave in relation to Hekate in this context is as a chthonic symbol.\(^{115}\) Caves are situated at points at which the threshold between the upper and lower worlds is gossamer thin. As Ustinova explains, they are ‘dark and menacing [and] seemed bottomless to people who did not dare to penetrate their damp depths.

---


\(^{112}\) For more on this, see Chapter Three.

\(^{113}\) Richardson (1974) 156; Allen and Halliday (1936) 134. See also Schwarz (1987) 142, upholding Kern. For more on the Zerynthian cave and its connection to Hekate, see Chapter Three.

\(^{114}\) Allen and Halliday (1936) 134); Farnell (1896) 2.510 also admits of the possibility of the cave being the home of a moon-goddess.

Unsurprisingly, they invited the image of the netherworld [and] were often considered entrances to Hades. This chthonic element is entrenched by the reference to Hekate’s symbolic torch, the earliest evidence of her torch-bearing nature, at line 52. Furthermore, Nilsson argues that Vassitz’s attachment of apotropaic significance to the torch is applicable in the case of Hekate.

Conversely, Hekate’s torch is used to corroborate the claim that Hekate is presented as a lunar goddess. West suggests that the picture of Hekate as a moon-goddess—for which the first irrefutable evidence does not date earlier than the first century A.D.—was not original, but may have derived from the use of σήλας. In anticipation of such an argument, Kraus asserts that σήλας does not justify a connection between the goddess and the Moon, since Demeter also carries torches (two as opposed to Hekate’s one) at lines 48 and 61. It is not enough, however, for Kraus to refer simply to Demeter’s torches without noting the linguistic distinction: while Hekate’s torch is referred to as σήλας, Demeter’s torches are instead described as αἰθομένας δαίδας at both of the aforementioned lines. The significance of σήλας, according to West, is that regardless of whether any etymological connection actually existed between it and Σελήνη, ‘this belief was held in ancient times.’ He goes on to cite Cleomedes, who reportedly etymologized Selene as σήλας ἀεὶ νέον. Athanassakis takes far too confident an

---

117 Kraus (1960) 63-64 n. 306.
119 Ibid.
120 West (1995) 201-203.
121 Kraus (1960) 63-64 n. 306.
123 Ibid. For Cleomedes, see Goulet (1980) 164 (2.5, 3). Contra, Zografou (2010) 65 n. 41: ‘Malgré la ressemblance σήλας – σελήνη, le mot n'est utilisé qu'une seule fois dans la poésie homérique pour désigner la lueur de la lune (σήλας ... μήνης); nous ne nous sentons pas, par conséquent, obligée d'y voir un élément lunaire.’
approach when he asserts that the ‘hymn definitely identifies Hekate with the moon, and the torch must be symbolic of the lunar light emanating from Hekate, the moon-goddess.’ But, as both Kraus and Richardson assert, the Greek moon-goddess does not have torches.¹²⁴ We must look to other evidence in the Hymn that supports a correlation between Hekate and the Moon.

Arguably the strongest case for Hekate’s lunar nature in the Hymn stems from her juxtaposition with Helios. Immediately after Hekate hears the voice of Persephone at lines 24-25, Helios is described as also bearing aural witness to the event at lines 26-30. Of the immortals and humankind, these are the only two entities to which knowledge of the abduction is attributed (lines 22-23).¹²⁵ Likewise, immediately after Hekate imparts her meagre knowledge of Persephone’s abduction to Demeter, the two goddesses rush to beseech Helios, ‘la source ultime de la lumière et de la verite’, to fill in the blanks.¹²⁶ It is significant that Hekate and Helios should be juxtaposed as the two deities with information about the abduction, since the Sun and Moon (and stars) are entities frequently supplicated for information in mythology and folklore.¹²⁷ There are other literary instances in


¹²⁶ Zografou (2010) 64. Arthur: ‘But in this section of the hymn, she only heard and did not see; the role of knowledgeable informer must thus pass to Helios’. She goes on to say that ‘[t]he contrast in the roles of Hekate and Helios, then, as well as their contrasting associations with darkness and light, respectively, point up the central opposition between the nature and power of the female and male deities.’ Arthur (1994) 221-222. Richardson (1974) 156-157 states that ‘Hecate … only hears, and cannot tell Demeter anything, whereas Helios both hears and sees [see line 62: Ἡλίων δ'/ ἱκνυο τεθών σφιρόν ἔδε καὶ ἀνάθρόν]. There is a slight awkwardness in this, since 24-6 suggest that Helios only heard. But we should not conclude from this that two separate versions are being run together’.

¹²⁷ Richardson (1974) 156; Arthur (1994) 221; Foley (1994) 93 n. 39 discusses her adaptation of Sowa’s 1984 model of the journey motif, where the protagonist, after experiencing a loss, conducts a search. While searching, the protagonist comes across two helpers, one of each
which Hekate and Helios are invoked together, but in relation to magic: in a fragment of Sophocles, and in *Argonautica*. Opinions are divided on whether Hekate appears as lunar in *Rhizotomoi*: Hekate is called upon as Medea’s mistress, Helios as Medea’s progenitor. In *Argonautica* the imperative ἱστω is used in Medea’s supplication of the two entities, which supports the proposition that they are once again juxtaposed in relation to knowledge or bearing witness (4.1019-1020). At 3.533, the ‘stars and paths of the sacred Moon’ (ἄστρα τε καὶ μήνης ἱερῆς ἔπέδησε κελεύθουσι) are mentioned as being able to be bound by Medea’s use of magic herbs, in which Hekate has schooled her (3.528-530). Hekate is, however, explicitly presented as a horrifying, powerful queen of the dead (ἐνέροισι ἄνασσαν: 3.862-863; see also 3.1211-1220) by Apollonius Rhodius. It is another thing to suggest that he intended to convey her as a lunar goddess.

I think a similar argument can be applied to the *Hymn*. Maybe, as Larson asserts, the ‘later concept of Hekate as a moon goddess’ is ‘implicit’ in her juxtaposition with Helios. But there are other ways to explain this juxtaposition. The fact that she heard Persephone’s scream is perhaps better explained by her chthonic nature. In this way, a nice symmetry is achieved between Helios, the upper

gender. Foley draws a link between Sowa’s model and Hekate and Helios in the *Hymn*. For more on celestial bodies as bearers of knowledge, see Richardson (1974) 154, where he recounts a modern Greek version of Persephone’s abduction, and 156-157. See also Apollod. 1.6.1; Grimm and Meyer (1875-1878) 2:590; and Ov. *Fast.* 4.575ff. In variants of the story, it is mortals who provide Demeter with details of Persephone’s abduction. The Orphic version, for example, attributes the role of informer to Eleusinian locals. Other locales are Hermione, Argos, Paros, and Pheneos. See Richardson (1974) 174 at 75ff. of his commentary for an exhaustive list of ancient references. Commenting on the combination of Hekate’s torchlight and Helios, Zografou (2010) 65 asserts that ‘les deux lumières semblent pareillement nécessaires pour la découverte de la vérité.’


129 Both Wilamowitz (1959) 13.173 and Kraus (1960) 87 oppose any lunar element in the fragment; Pearson (2010) 2.176, on the other hand, states that ‘there can be no doubt that Sophocles here connects Hecate with Helios as the moon-goddess’. See below for more on *Rhizotomoi*.

world, and Hekate, whose association with the underworld is hereby entrenched by the poet(s).\textsuperscript{131} What is more, Helios is represented as the superior bearer of knowledge: he is the only one that really \textit{knows} what happened. Hekate does not impart any information that Demeter is not already aware of; indeed, at lines 55-56, she asks Demeter who abducted Persephone. Those who identify Hekate with the Moon in the \textit{Hymn} could well be guilty of the same false demonstration of ‘continuity of aspect’ that was argued in relation to Hekate’s intermediary nature (or lack thereof, rather) in Hesiod. A definitive conclusion is elusive; there is at most a very tenuous \textit{association} with the Moon, but it is a step too far to establish an \textit{identification}.

There are a few other things to note about the \textit{Hymn}. The epithet \textit{λιπαροκρήδεμνος} is used at line 25. It is taken to mean ‘with bright headband’ or ‘veil\textsuperscript{132}’ and is also used as an epithet for Charis and Rhea.\textsuperscript{133} As Kraus asserts, ‘Das Epitheton … als Argument für die Lichtnatur Hekates anzuführen, geht kaum an, denn auch andere Göttinnen heißen so.’\textsuperscript{134} The veil tends to entrench the aforementioned matronly aspect of Hekate (and the contrast with her youthfulness), and is also connected to mother goddesses such as Kybele, Demeter, and the

\textsuperscript{131} Alderink (1982) 14 n. 3 recognizes this symmetry but goes too far into identifying Hekate with the Moon. Zografou (2010) 59 sees the spatial difference between Hekate’s (aural) position in a cave and that of Helios at the ‘top of the divine aether’ (omniscient) as corresponding to two levels (of enlightenment) in ritual: ‘En transférant cette différence au niveau de rituel, nous voyons qu’elle décrit en gros les deux degrés d’initiation, celui des mystères et celui des ἐπόπται: les premiers pouvaient surtout entendre, tandis que les seconds arrivaient à une vision complète.’ I am less inclined to draw connections between the \textit{Hymn} and Eleusinian (or Thesmophorian ritual). See below, n. 138.

\textsuperscript{132} Liddell, Scott and Jones (1940) s.v. \textit{λιπαροκρήδεμνος}.


\textsuperscript{134} Kraus (1960) 64 n. 306.
Oriental Artemis. At lines 54-58, the direct speech of Hekate is quoted as she offers her meagre knowledge to Demeter. Beck, in her interesting study of direct and indirect speech in the *Hymn*, asserts that Hecate, ‘receives prominence and emotional expressiveness because she is quoted directly.’ Beck also points to the sympathetic nature of Hekate’s speech, which contrasts with the rather peremptory words of Helios and ‘dramatizes the difference in perspective between the males of the poem and the females about the grief that Demeter experiences’.

At lines 438-440, we see the establishment of Hekate’s ongoing, presumably annual role as Persephone’s πρόπολος and ὁ πάων. Richardson sees in the lines an aetiological account for Hekate’s cultic role in the Eleusinian Mysteries.

---

135 Ridgway (1993) 186; see also Foley (1994) 132 who states that the veil ‘presents the image of the female integrated into the patriarchal order and contrasts with the torn veil of Demeter at the start of the poem.’


137 Ibid, 61.

138 Richardson (1974) 294 at 438-440. At 155, Richardson, citing Pausanias 1.38.6, asserts that it is ‘generally assumed that she is to be identified [at Eleusis] with Artemis Propylaea’. Kraus (1960) 63, 93 raises the same point and suggests that her integration into the *Hymn* could be the result of a cultic background in Eleusis. This is because the temple that most likely housed Hekate is not in alignment with the Greater Propylaea, which suggests it predates the Propylaea. See also Wilamowitz (1959) 131.167; Zografou (2010) 71-85. Clinton (1992), slightly adjusting the stance he took in 1986, remains opposed to the idea that Hekate was ever involved in the Mysteries, stating that it is ‘extremely unlikely that any evidence will ever be found to show that she had a significant role in this cult’ (33) and that her showing in the ‘enormous number of Eleusinian scenes in art’ is ‘rather meager’ (118). This stance draws support from Clay (1989) 218 n. 62. See also Farnell (1896) 2.550. Instead, Clinton argues that the ‘context in which we should expect to find Hekate at Eleusis is the Thesmophoria … specifically as a mythic analogue to Kourotrophos, a goddess worshipped in the cult.’ (119) While his negative argument does indeed highlight the lack of evidence of Hekate’s role in the cult, his positive argument concerning the Thesmophoria is not much help. Surely, if the Kourotrophos of cult is represented in story by Hekate Kourotrophos, then we would not expect to find both Hekate and Kourotrophos invoked separately. At yet at line 297 of *Ar. Thesm.*, Κούροτρόφῳ is invoked, while at line 858, Ἐκάτην φωσφόρον—an entirely different epithet—is invoked. Moreover, this flimsy evidence is the only ‘proof’ Clinton cites in support of Hekate’s role in the Thesmophoria; the rest is much more hypothetical. There are two
asserts that a literal interpretation of the aforementioned words entrenches Hekate’s role as a vigilant and thorough guide and that the words ‘imply that Hekate accompanied Persephone on a physical journey … to Hades and back’.\textsuperscript{139} It must be noted, however, that Hermes, rather than Hekate, is Persephone’s physical guide in the \textit{Hymn}; in Callimachus’ version, Hekate accompanies Persephone on her return.\textsuperscript{140} The noun πρόπολος can also refer to the servant of a deity, as von Rudloff points out.\textsuperscript{141} This provides some food for thought, as it would appear to be in contradiction with her description as ἄνασσα, which conveys a regal sense.\textsuperscript{142} Is other things to note here. First, as Richardson (2011) 52 notes, it is ‘unwise to be too dogmatic’ about the \textit{Hymn} and to which of the Eleusinian Mysteries or the Thesmophoria it is more directly connected. Zografou (2010) falls into this trap, and tends to make somewhat tenuous links between Hekate’s role in the \textit{Hymn} and specific elements of the Eleusinian mysteries. Second, Brown (1991) 47 n. 26 makes some valid points about the possibility of Hekate’s role in the Mysteries. He states it is ‘possible that her name and function in the Mysteries were considered part of the ἄρρητον, and this would account for the relative silence of our sources.’ He also describes the comments of Melanthios on sacrifices made to Hekate as ‘striking’ because such comments would not be included in the treatise if they did not pertain to the Eleusinian Mysteries. See Clinton (1992) 33-34, 116-120; Parker (1991) 16 n. 22; Foley (1994) 173; Brown (1991) 47 n. 26; Clay (1989) 218 n. 62; Zografou (2010) 83-85.

\textsuperscript{139} In the sense that she both precedes and follows Persephone. Johnston (1990) 23; Richardson (1974) 295 also discusses a strict interpretation.

\textsuperscript{140} Callim. fr. 466 = Orph. fr. 42 (Kern (1963)).

\textsuperscript{141} von Rudloff (1999) 24.

\textsuperscript{142} There may be three other instances in which Hekate is described as πρόπολος, although one is less certain. In Eur. \textit{Hel.} 570, she is referred to as νυκτίφαντον πρόπολον Ἐνοδίας. In the Hesiodic \textit{Catalogue of Women} fr. 23(a).26 (Merkelbach and West (1967)), as we have seen, ‘Iphime’ (Iphigenia) was made an immortal πρόπολος of Artemis, and is known as Ἀρτεμίς εἰνοδία – almost certainly Hekate (see n. 86). In Soph. fr. 535 \textit{(Rhizotomoi)}, πολοῦσα does not seem to fit the scansion of the line. Pearson (2010) emends the word to προπολοῦσα, citing Ar. \textit{Ran.} 1362, the \textit{Hom. Hymn Dem.}, and Warr (1895) 392. See also Radt (1977) 4.411; von Rudloff (1999) 161. It is interesting that in the three other literary instances in which Hekate may have been connected with the role of πρόπολος, she is also known as Enodia, an epithet that derived from her identification with the Thessalian Enodia, with whom she shared much in relation to physical liminality and women’s transitions. While the works of Euripides and Sophocles clearly postdate the
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this to be understood as an awkward conflation of two traditions (queen and servant of Persephone), as von Rudloff queries? This is a highly interesting point; if two traditions are at play, this could be another hint at the circumstances of Hekate’s displacement from an authoritative (Anatolian) status and her introduction to the Panhellenic Pantheon. At any rate, the regularization of Hekate’s role at lines 438-440 of the Hymn arguably stems from her position as mistress of the dead and her ability either to enable or restrain the occupants of Hades.

To a greater extent than the Theogony, the Homeric Hymn to Demeter anticipates Hekate’s characterization in various Greek media in the fifth century and later. Her youthful characterisation in the Hymn would become her ubiquitous depiction on Eleusinian vases in the fifth century, particularly in a guise resemblant of Artemis. The one realm in the Theogony in which Hekate is apportioned no share of honours—the Underworld—is the one with which Hekate is most conspicuously linked in the Hymn. Perhaps her most important attribute in the Hymn—in the sense that it is the characteristic from which other and latter attributes are derived or informed—is her liminality, specifically her mediating role in relation to temporal and physical transitions. This is the earliest evidence of her liminal role.

_Hymn_, the Hesiodic Catalogue could be roughly contemporaneous (for the dating of the Catalogue, see n. 86).

144 Hesiodic tradition vs. the Hymn’s tradition = Anatolian vs. Greek? Kraus (1960) 64.
146 Keeping in mind this statement of Kraus (1960) 64: ‘Es wäre überinterpretiert, wollte man den Demeterhymnus zu einem Markstein der Wesenswandlung Heaktes zwischen Hesiod und der frühklassischen Zeit stempeln.’
147 That is, vases that depict Eleusinian content, rather than vases that come from Eleusis.
148 Johnston (1999) 18. Arguably, at this point she was more inclined to restrain than enable—she was more protective than malevolent. See Johnston (1991).
149 Johnston (1990) 22.
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FIFTH CENTURY ARTWORK THAT DEPICTS HEKATE (EXCLUDING ALKAMENES’ STATUE)

The corpus of fifth-century artwork that depicts Hekate is limited, and is normally Eleusinian in context. The image of Hekate in these works is ‘remarkably consistent’, and appears to work in a tradition that closely approaches the Homeric Hymn to Demeter. As per the comments above (n. 137), it is more likely that Hekate’s presence in an Eleusinian context is connected to the Mysteries than the Thesmophoria. Furthermore, I think Kraus is correct when he holds that Hekate’s representation in vase images does not owe any less to her cult at Eleusis than her role in the Homeric Hymn. Hekate is most securely identified in the Anodos of Persephone or the mission of Triptolemos, both of which quite clearly pertain to the Eleusinian cycle. She may also appear in connection with the Rape of Persephone, as will be discussed below, and the Gigantomachy. Starting with

---

151 Clinton (1992) 33.
152 On the basis of the Geometric remains under the temple of Hekate. See Kraus (1960) 93; Richardson (1974) 155. The point of this is to urge caution before wholly attributing the tradition in which Hekate’s image on vases works to the Homeric Hymn.
153 In some cases, both scenes appear on one vase. Hekate also appears in a rather different association on a kalyx krater of the Peleus Painter in Ferrara. Her identification is secured by an inscription. The scene depicts the marriage of Peleus and Thetis, and presents unusual evidence for Hekate’s role as a wedding attendant. This role will be discussed in greater depth below in relation to Euripides’ Trojan Women and two other fifth-century vases. For now, it is important to note that Hekate is presented as a Greek maiden wearing a peplos, and that she carries torches. Also, this vase demonstrates that Hekate’s artistic representation at this time was mainly, but not wholly Eleusinian in context. See Kraus (1960) 93-94; Johnston (1999) 205; Herring (2011) 87-88; Edwards (1986) 317.
154 Sarian (1992) 995 #52-54; Kraus (1960) 94. In all three of the Gigantomachy vases on which Hekate may appear, the figure in question wears a peplos and carries two torches. As Kraus states, it is notable that Hekate may already be included in the Gigantomachy in the fifth century, which was originally reserved only for the Olympians. Conversely, in her discussion of Hekate’s Hellenistic depiction in a Gigantomachy scene (on the Great Altar of Pergamon), Herring (2011) 94
the Anodos of Persephone, our attention falls upon the so-called Fleeing Maiden of Eleusis (Figs. 7 & 8). The statue was found outside the enclosure wall of the Eleusinian sanctuary. It can be dated with some surety to the decade 490-480 B.C. Not including the plinth beneath her feet, the statue measures 64.5 centimetres. Given the plinth, however, it is clear that the statue was originally part of a pedimental composition. On the basis of sculptural details, Edwards quite reasonably deduces that the statue, which wears an open, maidenly peplos, is a torch-bearer. He then draws links between the iconography of torch-bearing Hekate in other fifth century representations to arrive at the well-accepted conclusion that the statue depicts Hekate. Herring rightly states that, if Edward’s identification is correct, Hekate’s inclusion ‘within scenes from the Eleusinian cycle was both popular and widespread’ and that she was a ‘more important goddess in the fifth century than is currently believed.’

There are several vases Edwards uses in support of his argument. The Berlin Painter’s kalyx krater, now in a highly fragmentary state, dates to the same decade as the statue, and is the earliest depiction of the Anodos of Persephone (Fig. 9). Hekate appears to the left of where Persephone would have been rising from the ground. To the right, Hermes stands. Hekate’s extended right hand bears a torch; her left hand probably also held a torch, but it is now missing. She is dressed in a chiton, over which she wears a mantel, while her hair is fastened in a bun. Schwarz takes this scene together with the one on the opposing side, which depicts the mission of Triptolemos, and interprets the vase as an expression of both the ‘agrarische Seite’ and the ‘Mysterium’ of the Eleusinian cult. On the lid of a lekanis vase, dated to c. 550-540 B.C., Hekate appears in a guise closest to that of

---

\(^{155}\) All details of this statue are derived from Edwards (1986).

\(^{156}\) Herring (2011) 85-86.


\(^{158}\) Schwarz (1987) 90.
2: THE DEVELOPMENT OF HEKATE’S CHARACTER TO THE END OF THE FIFTH CENTURY B.C.

the Fleeing Maiden (Fig. 10). She is depicted running ahead of the ascending Persephone. She holds two torches and wears a peplos. The name vase of the Persephone Painter in New York, c. 440 B.C., is entirely intact (Fig. 11). Torch-bearing Hekate appears in the centre of the composition, lighting the way for a bejewelled Persephone after she emerges from the underworld. An inscription entrenches Hekate’s identification. As per Edwards, the depiction of Hekate is ‘almost a mirror image’ of the Fleeing Maiden. Her open peplos indicates youth.

As I stated above (n. 43), Triptolemos was the subject of a growth in Athenian interest c. 550 B.C., to which the number of vases depicting his mission attests. The mission of Triptolemos is, of course, an event that pertains to the Eleusinian cycle. The name vase for the Painter of London, housed in the British Museum (E 183), depicts Demeter pouring a libation for Triptolemos (Fig. 12). It is dated to c. 440 B.C. There are two torch-bearing women in the scene; Hekate, however, is securely identified by an inscription. Hekate appears as a young girl

---

159 Edwards (1986) 313; Bérard (1974) 99-101; Clinton (1992) 118-119 n. 22 describes interpretation of the lid as ‘varied and speculative’ and says that its ‘Eleusinian character is not clear.’


161 But despite the centrality of her position, her appearance, which is plainer than that of Persephone and Demeter, may reflect the painter’s attempt to characterize delicately the role she actually plays in the event. See Kraus (1960) 93.


163 Together with the matronly status of Demeter and the nubile Persephone, Edwards (1986) 314 argues that the three women represent the ‘three ages of woman’. In addition to these Anodos scenes, Bérard (1974) adds a krater from Bologna by the Alkimachos Painter. Edwards (1986) 313 n. 49 states that the scene on the vase seems ‘completely foreign to the myth of Kore’s return.’ See also Sarian (1992) 990 # 12; Beazley (1963) 1.532 no. 44.

164 Kraus (1960) 92 cites this vase as representative of the potential problem of torch-bearers: if two are depicted, and neither carries an inscription, the identification of Hekate becomes rather speculative. He therefore omits ‘solche [probematischen] Darstellungen’ from his overview.
in an unbordered peplos (in contrast to Demeter and Persephone, whose peploi are identical and have solid borders), and may represent the entrance to the sanctuary.\textsuperscript{165}

On a fifth century kalyx krater by Polygnotos at Duke University, Hekate again appears at the departure of Triptolemos, and is identified by an inscription. She carries a torch. The scene may be an artistic rendering of the establishment of Hekate’s role as πρόπολος and ὄπάων at lines 438-440 of the \textit{Hymn}, or it may be a summarised version of the aforementioned London hydria; Clinton prefers the latter.\textsuperscript{166} Edwards identifies Hekate at the departure of Triptolemos on a pelike in Brussels by the Painter of Tarquinia.\textsuperscript{167} However, this identification is tainted by the lack of Triptolemos-identifying attributes, and we cannot be sure the torch-bearing figure is Hekate. Finally, Edwards’ analysis leads him to speculate that running figure G (who wears an open peplos) on the east pediment of the Parthenon may represent Artemis-Hekate (Fig. 13).\textsuperscript{168}

However, I think Clinton (1992) 118 takes a more sensible approach in saying that ‘Kraus surely is a bit too exclusive. If Hekate’s identity is secured by an inscription, her role in the scene may then allow us to identify her in a similar scene.’ See also Herring (2011) 87.


\textsuperscript{166} Schwarz (1987) 131 V104 confuses Hekate and Demeter, which results in Hekate bearing a torch and a sceptre. For an image of the vase, see Schwarz (1987) XIII.24 Clinton (1992) 118 n. 21 recognises this confusion and states that the inscription ‘leaves no doubt’ that the torch-and sceptre-bearing figure is not Hekate. The sceptre is unusual iconography for Hekate, and weakens Edwards’ identification of Hekate on an Eleusinian skyphos from c. 430 B.C. It is one of two multfigured representations of the Rape of Persephone. (The other is a Würzburg kalpis that may depict a statue of Hekate, which is also discussed below. See Edwards (1986) 316; Clinton (1992) 62; Sarian (1992) 993 #46.) The figure on the skyphos is more commonly identified as Demeter. See Edwards (1986) 316; Clinton (1992) 118 n. 22; Beazley (1963) 1\textsuperscript{2}.647 no. 21. In support of Edwards’ identification, however, is the figure’s ungirt (and therefore maidenly) peplos, her running stance, and the fact that Demeter does not bear witness to Persephone’s rape.


\textsuperscript{168} Edwards (1986) 317-318; Harrison (1967) 41-43, 46, 56; Palagia (1998) 21. There are two other vases included under Edwards’ discussion of the mission of Triptolemos, the presence of Hekate in which scenes he persuasively refutes. See Edwards (1986) 316-317, as well as Clinton
There is quite a clear pattern in these artistic representations. During the fifth century, particularly in an Eleusinian context, Hekate is invariably presented as a young girl. She frequently wears an open peplos, an attribute that entrenches youth. She is often in a running pose. If the identification of running figure G on the Parthenon as Artemis-Hekate is sound, it would represent the ‘culmination of the tradition going back to the [Fleeing] Maiden’ discussed above.\textsuperscript{169} The facts that this image of Hekate is present in a non-Eleusinian context as well\textsuperscript{170} and the persuasiveness of Edwards’ identification of the Fleeing Maiden lend support to the suggestion that, particularly in Athens, this image of Hekate took precedence, and was popular and widespread.\textsuperscript{171} By 430 B.C., Hekate’s first famous statue, crafted at the hands of Alkamenes, heralded a change in direction for Hekate’s popular image, and ‘released for other uses the running little girl.’\textsuperscript{172} This is an important point; although the monomorphic, torch-bearer was overtaken, she did not cease to exist.

**FIFTH CENTURY LITERATURE THAT DEPICTS HEKATE**

As we turn to fifth century literary evidence, our attention shifts to the three great tragedians. It is important to note the words of Nilsson, who highlights the difficulty in distinguishing between the views of dramatic poets and areas where their characterisation of people results in views that the poets themselves would not


\textsuperscript{170} See below: Peleus and Thetis vase and two other fifth century vases.

\textsuperscript{171} Although when discussing the popularity of the goddess in the fifth century, it pays to note the remarks of Kraus (1960) 92: ‘Entspricht die letztere Tatsache [dass die Vasenbilder, auf denen Hekate inschriftlich ausgewiesen ist, ‘ausnahmslos der Zeit nach der Jahrhundertmitte angehören’] dem anhand der Textstellen gewonnenen Ergebnis, daß die Popularität der Göttin erst im Verlauf des fünften Jahrhunderts zugenommen zu haben scheint? Die Lückenhaftigkeit der Überlieferung dort und hier warnt davor, dies einfach zu bejahen.’(My emphasis).

\textsuperscript{172} Edwards (1986) 318.
necessarily defend.\footnote{Nilsson (1955-1961) 12.749; upheld by Kraus (1960) 86. Speaking of Aeschylus’ \textit{Suppliants}, Nilsson states that the chorus acts in no way as conduit for the poet’s views. Out of the three great tragedians, Aeschylus is most deeply struck by religion; this translates to the action of his work, which is almost always viewed through a pious lens.} In \textit{The Suppliants}, Aeschylus characterises Artemis-Hekate as a guardian of parturient women (lines 676-677). We have seen instances of Hekate’s \textit{association} with Artemis that predate Aeschylus. This, however, is the earliest \textit{identification} of the two.\footnote{Note IG XII.8 359, an inscription on Thasos identifying Artemis and Hekate. Dated to c. 450 B.C. See Graham (2000) 302; Zeleny (1999) 12; Zografou (2010) 102-103 n. 56. The inscription reads: Αρτέμιδο[[ς Ἐπαυλίης Ἑκάτης. Zografou translates Ἐπαυλίης as ‘Gardienne de l’enceinte’ and states that the inscription is ‘without doubt’ from a private home. Other evidence from Thasos suggests that Hekate was, in that locality, above all the guardian of doorways. The late fifth century inscription Ἑκάτης (IG XII, Suppl. 401) comes from the Gate of Silenus. She was also worshipped at the Maritime Gate and the Gates of Hermes. Kraus asserts that ‘die Form, in der sie seit dem fünften Jahrhundert in Thasos faßbar wird, deckt sich im Gegensatz zu Abdera und Samothrace viel mehr mit den Vorstellungen im griechischen Mutterland – sagen wir genauer: in Attika’. For more on Thrace, See Kraus (1960) 69-73; Johnston (1999) 207.} The conflation of the two goddesses has sparked controversy among scholars. Friis Johansen and Whittle provide a useful summary of the range of opinions, and the problems stemming from each particular stance.\footnote{Friis Johansen and Whittle (1980) 41-43.} First, to regard Aeschylus’ reference to Hekate to the exclusion of Artemis is problematic since \textit{explicit} evidence for Hekate as a goddess of childbirth comes much later.\footnote{For example, \textit{Hymn. Orph.} 2.7; Plut. \textit{Quaest. Rom.} 277b. On the other hand, there is \textit{implicit} evidence for Hekate as a birth goddess that predates Aeschylus. If Iphigenia becomes Hekate, it most likely follows that the two have mutual interests. As Johnston (1999) 242 says, ‘this was [probably] their shared concern with birth and nurture.’ Perhaps Hekate’s established (i.e. since Hes. \textit{Theog.} 450-452) role as kourotrophos not only allowed for her Aeschylean role as overseer of births, but necessarily encompassed it. It is not a stretch to associate a nurse of the young with the process of bearing them in the first place.} Second, on contextual grounds, it is unlikely that ἕκατης—‘though legitimate in itself’—can be interpreted as an epithet of Artemis, to the exclusion of...
Hekate. In this context, ἕκαταν would be taken to mean ‘far-darting’ (thus establishing a symmetry with her brother, Apollo) and would accordingly characterize the goddess in a hostile fashion; this would be in conflict with the supervisory, beneficent role granted to her in The Suppliants (see lines 144-150 and 1030-1031). The most plausible explanation is that Aeschylus intentionally identified these two goddesses in relation to a specific concern—child-birth. This concern was able to be fitted under the rubric of femininity, with which both Hekate and Artemis were intimately associated. And so while it is reasonable for Kraus to suggest that this identification was based on an older tradition (the extent of which is impossible to tell), it is also distinctly possible that Aeschylus—known for his creativity and piety—was innovative in his approach, and took the matter of accounting for (his perception of) Hekate in the greater sphere of Greek religion into his own hands.

A fragment from an unknown, early fifth-century Aeschylean work depicts a different aspect of Hekate’s character. This is the first time Hekate is addressed as δέσποινα, and the first instance in Greek poetry where she is entrusted with

---

177 See Friis Johansen and Whittle (1980) 42 for references; Berg (1974) 136 n. 37 also ventures this opinion while discussing other instances of the goddesses’ conflation, suggesting that Aeschylus’ reference ‘need not invoke Hecate at all’.

178 Kraus (1960) 86; Burkert (1985) 171; West (1990) 177-178 seems to perceive the goddess as solely Artemis when he says ‘whoever first connected the name Ἑκάτη with Iphigeneia must have thought of this Ἑκάτη as a figure closely related to Artemis, inseparable therefore from the Ἀρτέμις Ἑκάτη named by Aeschylus’.

179 Kraus (1980) 86. See also Mastronarde (1994) who says that the ‘syncretism of Artemis and Hecate is either recorded or alluded to’ by Aeschylus.


181 For a detailed discussion of the title δέσποινα, the feminine equivalent of δεσπότης, see Henrichs (1976). It is also used of Hekate in the following instances: Eur. Med. 395-397 (for which, see below); Charicleides (see Edmonds (1959) 634): δέσποινα Ἑκάτη τιμωδίτι, τριμορφή
the tutelage of entrances.\textsuperscript{182} This vigilant aspect was to become widespread; after the creation of Alkamenes’ trimorphic representation of Hekate later in the fifth century (c. 430 B.C.), miniature statues of the same type—\textit{hekataia}—became commonplace in front of houses. As Johnston remarks, Aeschylus’ depiction of Hekate as πρόδομος of ‘kingly palaces’ is similar in date to the Anatolian inscriptions that associate her with tutelage of city gates.\textsuperscript{183} This observation could allow for the argument that Hekate developed this role after her introduction to Greece before it was adopted by her homeland of Caria. However, as Johnston notes, there are two obstacles impeding such an argument: 1) Why would the Greeks demarcate this role for Hekate when Hermes was already entrusted with the protection of entrances? 2) If the Greeks \textit{were} responsible for the creation of this role, is it really plausible that it was adopted and developed so quickly by her homeland that a new temple was erected at the city gates of Miletos within a century? It is more likely that this aspect of Hekate’s character was so entrenched upon her arrival in Greece that Aeschylus was able to use it with the likely recognition of its audience.

At any rate, the Aeschylean Hekate is still divorced from the uncanny image of the goddess. In this respect, Sophocles’ depiction of Hekate in \textit{Rhizotomoi} marks

\begin{quote}
\textlt;θεά\textgreater, τριπρόσωπε, τρέγλαις κηλευμένα; and of Hekate-Selene at \textit{PGM} IV.2786 (Betz (1986), cf. Theoc. 2.162), \textit{PGM} VII 788 (Betz (1986)). Morris (2001) 137 briefly discusses δέσποινα, as well. Her most important points: the title is ‘best known for the goddess of Lykosoura in Arkadia’, on which see \textit{IG} V.2 514; Paus. 8.37.1-10; ‘[a]t the Artemision in Ephesus, the earliest Greek inscription’, which dates to the mid-sixth century B.C., may read ‘[Δεσπόινα] Ἐφέσια. However, the letters are too poorly preserved for any reading with confidence, and thus can only be introduced as a possible early name for Ephesian Artemis.’ Zeleny (1999) 13 describes it as a title that ‘vor allem orientalischen Gottheiten zugehört’, while Henrichs (1976) 259-260 stresses that ‘[e]s ist nicht genügend beachtet worden, dass dieser Titel vorzüglich einer religionsgeschichtlich fest umrissenen Gruppe von naturverbundenen Götinnen zukam: Kybele, Aphrodite, Artemis, Demeter und Persephone, Hekate, gewisse Nymphen und schliesslich Isis wurden so angeredet.’ For references to the works in which the title attaches to these figures, see Henrichs.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{182} Kraus (1960) 86. For more on entrances, see Chapter Three, n. 147.

\textsuperscript{183} Johnston (1999) 208. See Chapters One and Three.
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a watershed in her characterization. While familiar elements persist (such as her juxtaposition with Helios and the torch as her attribute), Sophocles displays innovation and brings her association with death and malevolence (although on a more subtle level than Euripides) to the fore. *Rhizotomoi* seems to centre on Medea and her ‘root-cutters’. The latter comprised the chorus and aided Medea in the collection of botanical drugs for the purpose of sorcery. Hekate is crowned in oak leaves, a depiction which is mirrored by Apollonius Rhodius. The oak was one of several plants sacred to Hekate. In *Rhizotomoi*, the oak wreath seems like an appropriate component to entrench further her (sorcerous) connection with plants. The invocation by Medea of Hekate (as her mistress) in this context suggests not only Hekate’s interest in black magic but also her patronage of it. Entrenching the dark image is Hekate’s serpentine hair. Such hair was associated with the Erinyes and the Gorgons. Snakes, of course, are chthonic. They are ‘constantly associated with the dead and the powers of the death’.

Also of great significance in this fragment is the equation of Hekate with Enodia—the first instance of this identification in the literature. Enodia, meaning

---

184 Fr. 535: Pearson (2010) 2.176
185 Ogden (2002) 82-83.
187 Note Odysseus’ fear at Hom. *Od.* 634-635 that Persephone might let loose the head of Gorgon against him. The Gorgon is a chthonic creature as early as Homer.
188 Fontenrose (1980) 117; Kraus (1960) 87 n. 429 cites various sources in support of his assertion that snakes ‘gehören zur chthonischen Natur, zu ihrem Wesen als Totengöttin’. He denies, however, that this attribute allows for a link back to the Minoan snake-goddess, citing a lack of evidence. Brown (1991) 47-48 cites an extract from Aristophanes’ missing play *Tagenistai* (fr. 515: Kassel and Austin (1984) 3(2).271)) which both depicts Hekate with serpentine hair and connects her with Empousa; elaborating on this he too draws a connection with the Erinyes and states that such hair ‘was perhaps their most salient physical characteristic at least in post-Aeschylean depictions (they can be more generally snaky as well.’ On the subject of the Erinyes and serpentine hair, see also Paus. 1.28.6, where he states that Aeschylus was the first to depict them in such a manner. See also Wilamowitz (1959) 13.173.
‘In-the-Road’, was an independent Thessalian goddess whose name in connection with Hekate could be used as both a modifying adjective or an outright substitute.\(^{190}\) As Kraus states, in order to ascertain Enodia’s undiluted character, we must proceed from Thessaly itself.\(^{191}\) Given that this evidence is discussed in full in Chapter Three, only the concluding remarks of that discussion will be mentioned here: Enodia is chthonic, liminal, associated with urban areas, and seems to have been connected to women and children. None of the evidence, however, allows for the conclusion that Enodia was intrinsically connected to black magic, and so it is fallacious to suggest that the identification of the goddesses in this context caused Hekate to become associated with the same, as she so clearly is.\(^{192}\) We can state two things. First, Hekate’s relation to the crossroads, and her similarity to Enodia in this respect, is here fully developed when Einoδία (giving the meaning of the name) and τρίοδος are taken together.\(^{193}\) It is a ‘single aspect of the broader [transitional] role [Hekate] played from early times’.\(^{194}\) Second, their similarity in relation to women, particularly women who have not successfully transitioned to motherhood or withheld their status as mothers, is arguably alluded to here: the goddess(es) is invoked by the (all-female!)\(^{195}\) root-cutters of Medea, who was, by this point, mythically infamous for the murder of her own children;\(^{196}\) while the snakes that fall upon Hekate’s shoulders in Rhizotomoi imbue the goddess with an appearance approaching that of the post-Aeschylean Erinyes, whose snaky hair was their ‘most salient physical characteristic’.\(^{197}\) The visual allusion to the Erinyes, with their well-known, macabre connections to the transition to motherhood and the mother-child

\(^{190}\) Johnston (1990) 23-24. The spelling of the goddess’ name alternates between En(n)odia and Einodia.

\(^{191}\) Kraus (1960) 79.

\(^{192}\) This idea is discussed extensively in the second half of Chapter Three.

\(^{193}\) For more on the τρίοδος, see Chapter Three.


\(^{195}\) Ogden (2002) 82-83.

\(^{196}\) For full details, see Chapter Three.

\(^{197}\) Ibid.
relationship, arguably has important ramifications for the basis on which the Hekate-Enodia identification is being made. The acquisition of powers in relation to black magic, and the inherent malevolence of such magic, undoubtedly caused Hekate to acquire the nocturnal, frightening, and uncanny character she has in this fragment. We must, however, resist attributing this acquisition to the character of Enodia, given the evidence of the former’s character and the fact that they had been previously associated with no apparent allusion to witchcraft and sorcery. In Chapter Three, the idea of a Thessalian reputation for such things (and how that may have affected Hekate) is discussed and located within a new historical and chronological framework.

Besides Rhizotomoi, Sophocles offers only scrappy evidence for the character of Hekate at this stage. In a fragment of Clytemnestra, the epithet ἀνταία ὥρας is used for Hekate, the meaning of which is disputed. The epithet does, however, relate to Hekate’s ghostly nature and her connection to apparitions. In another fragment, there is a reference to Hekate’s ‘suppers’. These dedications were made at the crossroads at the time of the new moon—a ‘disquieting point of temporal transition’. The suppers supplicated Hekate at the crossroads to avert the malevolent spirits that gathered at this doubly liminal (i.e., temporally and spatially) point. It is clear, then, that Sophocles’ depiction of Hekate was in the vanguard of her mutating characterization. She is, above all, an uncanny goddess of the crossroads, strongly associated with the night and restless spirits.

---

198 Soph fr. 334 (Radt and Kannicht (1977)): τὸν δὲ ἀνταίον περιδινέοντα οὐχ ὅρατε
202 Johnston (1991) 219. See also n. 12, which outlines Johnston’s emphasis on Hekate’s role as averter, rather than a figure to be averted along with the other spirits. For more on Ἑκατης δειπνα, see below, and Johnston (1991) 219-221. The ἐνοδίαν θεόν of Soph. Ant. 1199 should be construed as Persephone: Wilamowitz (1959) 1.169; Kraus (1960) 88.
It is Euripides, however, who is the first to exploit fully and develop these new characteristics. His references to the goddess are numerous. In *Medea*—the play that heralded the domination of Hekate’s chthonic and sorcerous associations in literature—*Medea* calls upon Hekate as the goddess (δέσποινα) she worships most (lines 395-397). She assists Medea in her murderous sorcery and dwells in the innermost chamber of her house. In *Helen*, Menelaos uses the epithet φωσφόρος and sees in Hekate the commander of ghosts, who is able to send favourable apparitions (line 569). In *Ion*, the chorus equates Hekate Enodia with Persephone (lines 1048-1051). She rules over night wanderers and is called upon to lead a δυσθανάτων κρατήρων against Ion; this is quite clear evidence for Hekate’s malevolent, rather than protective association with death.

In the *Trojan Women*, Kassandra calls upon Hekate as a wedding goddess (lines 323-324). There is some evidence of Hekate having occupied such a role, all of which is sourced from fifth century vases. We saw on the Peleus Painter’s kalyx krater (c. 440-430 B.C.) that Hekate is identifiable by inscription at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis (Fig. 14). There are two other vases on which Hekate may be depicted in relation to a marriage scene. The first is the Würzburg kalpis (c. 450 B.C.), which presents a marriage scene; Hekate may appear to the left of the scene as a torch-bearing statue wearing a peplos (Fig. 15). The second is an Attic cup (c.

---


204 Kraus (1960) 88 n. 435 suggests that Pestalozza’s interpretation of line 397 (‘nella casa del re e nel luogo piu sacro di essa’) and attempt to find parallels in Minoan culture may be ‘[belastet] mit allzu großem religionsgeschichtlichen Gewicht’. For Hekate’s connection to the hearth vis-à-vis the cult of the dead, see Rohde (1925) 297, 323 nn. 93-95.

205 ὦ φωσφόρ Ἑκάτη, πέμπε φάσματ᾽ ὑμενή.

206 The goddess is referred to as θύγατερ Δάματος. The reference could conceivably be to Persephone (since she also uses the epithet Enodia), were it not for the ἔφοδοι, which belong to Hekate. See Wilamowitz (1959) 170, who also makes the valid point that ‘[s]olche Stellen, die Hekate und Persephone gleichsetzen, während Hekate noch viel häufiger Artemis ist, machen begreiflich, wie Aischylos Artemis zu Demeters Tochter machen konnte’.

207 Kraus (1960) 89, 93-94 says that other than this vase and Euripides, there is no evidence for Hekate as a wedding goddess.
460-450 B.C.) that may depict torch-bearing Hekate (in a peplos) on the threshold of a house (which is symbolised by a column and a door). The scene depicts a procession of newlyweds.\textsuperscript{208} The identification of Hekate on the kalpis is strengthened by the similarity to her depiction on the London hydria (E 183).\textsuperscript{209} Discussing both vases, Johnston claims that the figures tentatively identified as Hekate are iconographically ‘so close to … the figure labelled ‘Hecate’ on the Peleus and Thetis vase that it is hard to imagine who else it could be.’\textsuperscript{210} It was Artemis, however, who was more commonly invoked in a nuptial context. This has led some scholars and commentators to assert that Euripides has Kassandra invoke Hekate in order to reflect her ill-omened marriage.\textsuperscript{211} Yet, as Johnston says, ‘nothing in the passage indicates that we are to interpret this way’.\textsuperscript{212} At this stage, the most we can say is that the scholiast on the passage states that Hekate has connections to both death and marriage: τὴν Ἑκάτην παρέμιξε διὰ τὸ μετ’ ὀλίγον ἀποθηνύσκειν· χθονία γὰρ ἢ θεός. ἢ ὡς γαμήλιος ἢ Ἔκατη.

However, if we dig a little deeper, and take an intertextual perspective, there is evidence of Hekate potentially representing a sinister side of Artemis in the \textit{Phoenician Women}. When Antigone beholds the Argive army, she invokes Hekate as the daughter of Leto: ἰὼ πότνια παῖ Λατοῦς Ἑκάτα, κατάχαλκον ἀπὸν πεδίον ἀστράπτει (lines 109-111). The identification itself is, of course, not new. But given the stipulated maternity, we would expect Artemis to be invoked. Speculating on this identification of the two goddesses, Kraus suggests that Hekate’s appearance in place of Artemis may be because the context pertains to ‘Unheil’ and ‘Düsternis’.\textsuperscript{213} But on the other hand, the invocation could carry apotropaic force.\textsuperscript{214} If this were the case, we would expect to find Hekate in the

\textsuperscript{208} See Sarian (1992) 993 #45.
\textsuperscript{209} Clinton (1992) 62 n. 194.
\textsuperscript{210} Johnston (1999) 205.
\textsuperscript{211} Kraus (1960) 89; Barlow (1986) 174-175; Lee (1976) 129-130.
\textsuperscript{212} Johnston (1999) 205.
\textsuperscript{213} Kraus (1960) 89.
\textsuperscript{214} Mastronarde (1994) 183-184.
guise of protectress of entrances.\textsuperscript{215} Compared to other invocations, Antigone’s summoning of Hekate does not come across as so blatantly apotropaic;\textsuperscript{216} it is, indeed, more of a proclamation of fear, with which Hekate is associated, as if the sending of such harm (the army) is to be attributed to her. Indeed, in Hippolytus, the shocked chorus queries whether lovesick Phaedra’s frenzied behaviour has been sent by Hekate (lines 141-144).\textsuperscript{217} With this in mind, and returning to the Trojan Women, I think it is reasonable to say that Hekate is invoked where we would normally expect Artemis in order to entrench the ill-fated, morbid nature of Kassandra’s nuptials. Euripides most likely drew on the association of Artemis and Hekate,\textsuperscript{218} the latter’s attested association with marriage, and his own sinister characterization of Hekate. It seems likely that Euripides employs a similar tactic in Phoenician Women, where Hekate’s description as πατὶ Λυττοῦς suggests a goddess who, although certainly independent from Artemis, represented the sinister aspects of Artemis—at least in the mind of Euripides.

The final Euripidean evidence is a fragment\textsuperscript{219} that names the dog as

\textsuperscript{215} As Kraus (1960) 89 n. 440 asserts, this interpretation does not fit as well with the invocation as ‘daughter of Leto’.

\textsuperscript{216} See, for example, lines 152-154: ἀλλὰ νῦν ἡ κατ᾽ ὅρη μετὰ μάτερος Ἀρτεμις ἴημένα τόξοις δαμασσεὶ ὅλεσεν, ὃς ἐπ᾽ ἐμάν πόλιν ἐβα πέρσαον; lines 182-184: ἵω, Νέμεσι καὶ Δῖος βαρύβρομοι βρονταί, κεραυνων τε φῶς αἰθαλόεν, σὺ τοι μεγαλογορίαν ὑπεράνοια κοιμίζεις; and lines 190-192: μήποτε μήποτε τάνδ’, ὦ πότιαν, χρυσεοβόστρυχον ὦ Δίος ἐρνος Ἀρτεμι, δουλοσύναν τλαιγήν. All of these invocations (of Artemis and Nemesis) carry a much more apotropaic character. See Mastronarde (1994) 183-184.

\textsuperscript{217} Note the association of Hekate in a context of madness with Pan, Kybele, and the Korybantes. As Kraus (1960) 89 notes, this seems to be oldest textual association of Pan and Hekate. For the association between trimorphic Hekate and Pan, see Sarian (1992) 1005-1006.

\textsuperscript{218} From Aeschylus through the Thasian inscription (although it is obviously not Attic) and, most importantly, the accounts of the treasurers of the Other Gods from the year 429/428. This index mentions Hekate’s identification with Artemis as her cult name: Ἀρτ[ε]μιδος [Ἐ]χάτες (IG I\textsuperscript{1} 383, lines 124-126).

\textsuperscript{219} Eur. fr. 968 (Nauck (1871)).
Hekate’s ἄγαλμα, ‘a show-piece in which she takes delight.’ This was to be an enduring association: henceforth, the dog remained Hekate’s loyal companion, as well as sacrificial victim (at the crossroads in particular), until late antiquity. As Kraus states: ‘Diese Hundeopfer sind in erster Linie Reinigungsoffer, und als soche komme sie nicht nur der Hekate zu, der nächtlichen herrin der Dreiwege, sondern auch den reinen Geburtshelferinnen, wie etwa [Eileithyia] oder Genetyllis.’

Johnston is inclined toward the dog having originally been a benevolent companion, whose association with Hekate arose from the dog’s connection with birth-goddesses. At any rate, the dog was to become a more ghostly, demonic companion, potentially because dogs can be both ‘vicious carnivores and excellent guardians.’

More details on Hekate’s character can be sourced from Euripides’
Syracusan contemporary Sophron, a fifth century mime. One fragment seems to have centred on women attempting to expel a malevolent goddess through a purificatory rite.\textsuperscript{224} Johnston suggests that the women may be trying to avert Hekate in order to protect parturient women and newborns.\textsuperscript{225} This fragment may be connected with one that describes a ritual taking place in the inner room of a house.\textsuperscript{226} Although Hekate is not named (only the title πότνια is used), the incantation could refer to no other. The ritual involves the sacrifice of a puppy, the extinguishing of a torch, and the preparation of a δέιπνον. Hekate is imagined to be present by the end of the invocation.\textsuperscript{227} The connection between this fragment and another that clearly invokes Hekate is more tenuous, given that this other fragment (**8) imagines Hekate to be absent.\textsuperscript{228} Furthermore, we cannot certainly state that Sophron was the author of this fragment—although it is likely.\textsuperscript{229} The contents are quite horrific; among them are a hanging, the murder of a parturient woman, corpses, a murderer, and—crucially—the crossroads. The murder of a woman in labour entrenches Hekate’s childbirth associations, and renders them infernal. This strengthens Johnston’s above suggestion on the women performing a rite.\textsuperscript{230} According to scholiasts on Theocritus (\textit{Idylls} 2), Sophron equated Hekate with Persephone and called her a ‘prytanis of those below’ (πρύτανις νεφέλων), which may refer to the dead or ‘infernal spirits’.\textsuperscript{231} Finally, Sophron calls Hekate

\textsuperscript{224} Hordern (2004) 41, 124-126.
\textsuperscript{225} Johnston (1999) 212.
\textsuperscript{227} Hordern (2004) 125-126.
\textsuperscript{228} Sophr. fr. **8: Hordern (2004) 49, 142-144.
\textsuperscript{229} The passage is transmitted through Plut. \textit{De superst.} 170b. Hordern (2004) 144 states that ‘the fact it is both prose and has Doric elements suggests Sophron as the author.’
\textsuperscript{230} See also Kraus (1960) 90 for interpretation of this fragment.
Before the literary analysis of this chapter can be concluded, it is imperative to mention the works of Aristophanes. Although we have clearly seen how dramatically Hekate’s character was exposed and developed, we have seen a paucity of evidence pertaining to her integration into everyday life. This is where some passages of Aristophanes are particularly helpful, keeping in mind the defamatory and parodic nature of much of his work.\textsuperscript{234} In \textit{Ploutos}, Aristophanes cynically addresses the rite of leaving meals for Hekate at the crossroads (lines 594-597). Placed by the rich, it is apparent from Aristophanes’ words that the meals were commonly snatched up by the poor.\textsuperscript{235} I am sceptical of some of Kraus’ claims in relation to this passage. First, his argument that Hekate was goddess of the common man is unfounded.\textsuperscript{236} I also do not uphold Kraus’ interpretation that the meal was shared with the goddess, and not considered theft. The implication of this argument is that the passage depicts Hekate as beneficent, which is not necessarily true.\textsuperscript{237} I think, rather, that Aristophanes is making a point about the dire circumstances of poverty; namely, that the poor are driven to stealing from gods. This is a defilement of Hekate’s shrine that Demosthenes mentions.\textsuperscript{238}

\textsuperscript{232} Hordern (2004) 69, 166-167. Cf. her manifestations in Abdera (Radt (1958) 73) and in Pind. \textit{Pu.} 2.77. For more on Pindar, see Chapter One. His account of Hekate presents important fifth century evidence of her benevolent attitude towards the people of Abdera.


\textsuperscript{234} Kraus (1960) 91.

\textsuperscript{235} For other instances of Hekate’s meals being taken, see Luc. \textit{Dial. mort.} 1.1; Luc. \textit{Catapl.} 7.

\textsuperscript{236} Kraus (1960) 91. He is citing Pfister. See Clay (1984) 29, who states that there is ‘no evidence that Hecate was the goddess of the ‘common man’’. See also note 13 of Clay. For a more extensive discussion of this idea and Nilsson’s advocacy of it, see the beginning of Chapter Three.

\textsuperscript{237} Although, equally, she is not presented as malevolent. See also Zeleny (1999) 13, who upholds Kraus’ interpretation.

\textsuperscript{238} Dem. 54.39. Cf. Ar. \textit{Ran.} 366. See also Sommerstein (2001) 178. It is strange, however, that after citing Johnston (1991), Sommerstein falls into the very trap against which Johnston so
2: THE DEVELOPMENT OF HEKATE’S CHARACTER TO THE END OF THE FIFTH CENTURY B.C.

In *Lysistrata*, a feast for Hekate is described (lines 700-705).\(^{239}\) The main grievance of the leader of the chorus of women is the fact that she was not able to source a Boeotian eel, a ‘one-of-a-kind delicacy’.\(^{240}\) This invocation of Hekate by women is one of many in Aristophanes’ works.\(^{241}\) Kraus offers some insightful comments on this passage. He sees in the text a custom of holding feasts for Hekate in a domestic context. These feasts seemed to be held by women and presented an opportunity to eat delicacies. Aristophanes does not say *why* such feasts take place, but I think it is reasonable for Kraus to draw a link between housewives and Hekate’s role as protectress of the household.\(^{242}\) There is another reference in *Lysistrata* to Hekate in relation to the household, as well as to travellers (63-4). The wife of Theogenes appears to consult superstitiously the image of Hekate before the house before making a journey to meet the eponymous heroine and other women. It seems, then, that it was customary for people (women?) to make an apotropaic invocation in front of a house’s *hekataion* before setting off on a journey.\(^{243}\) The *hekataion* is referred to by Philocleon in the *Wasps* (804), where he states that one

---


\(^{240}\) Henderson (1987) 162.


\(^{242}\) Kraus (1960) 91.

\(^{243}\) Kraus (1960) 91-92. This reading of lines 63-64 is a variant handed down by scholiasts. The main interpretation is that Theogenes’ wife was ‘hoisting her boat-sail (*akateion*)’, which meant ‘to prepare for rapid travel’. The hoisting of a drinking cup (which would mean a reference to bibulousness) is less likely. See Sommerstein (1990) 158; Henderson (1987) 74-75.
stood before every door in Athens. This claim must be an exaggeration, but nonetheless demonstrates the popularity of these little cultic images.

**HEKATE AND ALKAMENES: A NEW REPRESENTATION OF THE GODDESS**

Pausanias provides the only ancient communication about Alkamenes’ statue, which was to become the prototype of the popular trimorphic *hekataia*. He tells us that the sculptor was, in his opinion, the first to fashion a trimorphic Hekate, who was known as Hekate Ἐπιπυργιδία and stood on the Athenian Acropolis. This epithet in combination with Pausanias’ description of the statue’s location (ἐστήκε δὲ παρὰ τῆς Ἀπτέρου Νίκης τὸν ναόν) unambiguously places this Hekate on the Athena Nike bastion adjacent to the temple erected ca. 425 B.C. Fullerton persuasively refines this location to a more specific, triangular area between the north walls of the Nike temple and temenos. Despite the fact that no replicas exist, there is much on which we can base our reconstruction of the appearance of Alkamenes’ statue. Of each of the three figures, the free-flowing drapery of the

---

245 ‘Although there exist no certain replicas of Alkamenes’ Hekate’: Fullerton (1986b) 671. See also Faraone (1992) 8.
246 This Epipyrgidia may be the Hekate Propylaia to whom Hesychius refers, as Johnston (1990) 24 points out.
247 Fullerton (1986b) 670. For the dating of the statue, see Kraus (1960) 96; Willers (1975) 48-49.
248 Fullerton (1986b) 670: ‘[t]his intersection could have been perceived as a Dreieck [and in ‘mid-fifth century Athens, triple-bodied Hekate was especially associated with the three-way intersection of roads’]; ‘[s]econd, this location provides a possible explanation for the curious fact that Pausanias, who was clearly well aware of the Hekate’s existence, never mentions it in his description of the Akropolis’, for ‘if the Hekate stood in the location proposed, it would in Pausanias’ time have been largely or entirely obscured by the Nike parapet.’ For earlier discussions of the location of the statue, see Petersen (1908); Kraus (1960) 95-96
249 Taking heed of Ridgway’s warning that ‘although the basic composition is the same, individual renderings and attributes vary, so that a one-to-one copying of Alkamenes’ work on the
upper half of the body was, stylistically speaking, typical of the later fifth century, while that of the lower body was distinctly archaizing, given its much more rigid style.\textsuperscript{250} What significance is to be derived from this novel depiction of Hekate?\textsuperscript{251}

Akropolis should be excluded, even if echoes of his work are undoubtedly to be recognized in many of these replicas.’ See Ridgway (1984) 62 n. 32. The evidence on which reconstruction is based is marble archaistic hekataia (two Athenian examples in particular, which show fifth century style: the largest piece from the Agora group and the hekataion from the British School at Athens – see below), Hellenistic coins from Athens, and two monomorphic representations from fifth century reliefs. For analysis of this material, see Kraus (1960) 84-118; Eckstein (1965) 27-36; Harrison (1965) 27-36; Willers (1975) 48-52; Schuchhardt (1977) 27-30; Fuchs (1978) 32-35; Ridgway (1981) 174-175; Ridgway (1984) 62 n. 32, 70-71, 78-79 n. 37; Simon (1985). Harrison makes a convincing case for the date of the hekataia recovered from the Agora, submitting that ‘no stone example we have can be dated earlier than the Hellenistic period’, preferring a date in the first centuries before and after Christ for this group that Kraus originally placed in the fourth century B.C. Moreover, it seems that the two large hekataia (one in the British School at Athens and the largest hekataion recovered from the Agora), which have been considered the earliest of all hekataia given their approximation of fifth century style, probably belong to the Roman period, pursuant to Harrison’s deconstruction. Both Kraus and Eckstein argued for a fifth century date for the British School hekataion. Notwithstanding these much later dates, Harrison argues that ‘the likelihood that the Hekate of Alkamenes was in fact archaistic is stronger than ever before, since the excavations have brought new proof of a taste for archaistic figures in the late fifth century’. Harrison’s reasoning is upheld by Ridgway (1984) and Simon (1985), while Willers (1975) argues that ‘a simple and unanimous decision in either direction is not possible.’ Simon (1985) publishes a fragment from an Attic red-figured skyphos of the late fifth century (420-410 B.C.) that depicts a triple-bodied hekataion. This shard, a stray find from the Kerameikos, provides the earliest dateable representation of such a triple-bodied image. Accordingly, it determines once and for all that triple-bodied hekataia did exist in the fifth century B.C., notwithstanding the fact that none of the extant hekataia are able to be dated before the Hellenistic period.

\textsuperscript{250} Fullerton (1986a) 215; Fullerton (1986b) 671-2: ‘the Hekate displays a careful blending of Classical forms and Archaic style, of Archaic forms and Classical style. The garment, for example, is the Classical Doric peplos, but the overfold is rendered in an Archaic swallowtail. The symmetry of the fold pattern over the legs is an Archaic feature but the curving folds reveal a more Classical modeling mentality’; Kraus (1960) 98; Willers (1975) 49. For arguments against the archaism of Alkamenes’ Hekate, see Havelock (1965).
2: THE DEVELOPMENT OF HEKATE’S CHARACTER TO THE END OF THE FIFTH CENTURY B.C.

Willers submits that the Hekate of the Dreiweg is in particular an ancestral goddess, hence the connection to the archaic style. Expanding on this position, he states that the aforementioned date of the work around 430 B.C. may suggest that a return to the laws and religiosity of the ancestors during the Peloponnesian War may have formed the historical basis of the work. Fullerton suggests that the archaistic style of Epipyrgidia may have been employed to recall that ‘Athens … was untainted by the Dorian invasion, that [it] served as a refuge for other autochthonous Greeks, and that it was from here that the Eastern Aegean was hellenized.’ Moreover, the choice of Hekate atop the Nike bastion, ‘which was itself the very symbol of the city’s security’ is suitable given Hekate’s status as an averter of unknown evils. Fullerton also sees political implications in Hekate Epipyrgidia, given her oriental origin and her especial popularity in Ionia, which would render her a guardian of both Athens itself and also the entire Delian League. In addition to these considerations, and in furtherance of the religiosity of Alkamenes, we might suggest that the components of old and new made sense in relation to Hekate given the circumstances of her introduction to the Panhellenic pantheon—something we came across during our discussion of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*.

CONCLUSION

The earliest literary mentions of the goddess in the *Theogony* and Homeric *Hymn to Demeter* are, comparatively speaking, quite extensive, and therefore warrant considerable reflection. Hesiod’s ‘Hymn’ to the goddess remains a highly

---

251 It was novel because no evidence exists for a tradition of archaizing images of the goddess prior to the Epipyrgidia. See Fullerton (1986b) 672; Willers (1975) 52.

252 Willers (1975).

253 Fullerton (1986b) 674. ‘Such an allusion was politically pertinent during the Archidamian War since it refers to the two basic necessities of Periklean policy – that the city should hold out the doriens, as they did once before, and that the Ionian allies should remain faithful to their Attic cousins, to whom they owed their very existence.’

254 Of which Willers (1975) 51 speaks.
controversial subject. The Hekate of the *Theogony* is probably an Anatolian goddess.\(^{255}\) It was my contention that the most appropriate model for analysis is one that draws on the possibility that both Hesiod’s personal belief and the requirements of the poem may have shaped the anomalous characterization of Hekate. Scholarship has shifted beyond classifying the passage as an interpolation, and most recent studies resist analysing the passage through a biographical lens. It must be conceded, in line with Stoddard’s statement, that text-based, rather than biographical, analyses are much more easily (empirically) corroborated, but that does not mean that recourse to Hesiod’s personal beliefs is necessarily wrong. For the speculative nature of biographical approaches is equalled by the inability of purely text-based approaches to account adequately for the superlative, encomiastic, and lengthy nature of the Hymn. Generally speaking, and taken at face value, the Hymn presents a picture of an extensively powerful, benevolent goddess who seems to have no uncanny attributes. However, it is possible that some of Hekate’s Hesiodic functions are mirrored in Milesian archaeological evidence, which could in turn suggest she was chthonic.\(^{256}\) Apparently also lacking in uncanny attributes (although this does not necessarily mean she was not chthonic) is the Berlin terracotta, a seated statuette of Hekate. Although, admittedly, the lack of defining attributes stunts complete development of this hypothesis, it is reasonable to suggest that the enthroned figure imparts a Near Eastern characterization of Hekate. The similarity to images of Kybele does not necessarily point to derivation from that goddess’ cult, but it is tempting to suggest that enthronement was used for powerful, chthonic deities from the Near East. This idea, however, must remain

\(^{255}\)In addition to West (1966), discussed above, see: Laumonier (1958) 421 n. 4: ‘L’Hékate d’Hésiode, comme le poète lui-même, est sans doute originaire d’Asie Mineure’; Kraus (1960) 60 n. 288: ‘…die … hesiodische Hekate [ist] ohne Zweifel kleinasiatischen Ursprungs’.

\(^{256}\) On the evidence from Miletos, see Chapter One and especially Chapter Three. As we will see in the third chapter, there is a plausible comparison between the Milesian evidence and Hekate’s Hesiodic characterization. This, however, is conjectural, as are comments pertaining to whether the goddess could have been chthonic on account of her civic functions (also addressed in Chapter Three).
within the sphere of conjecture.

Turning to the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter*, we come across a goddess at once both young and old—a telling sign that the goddess’ incorporation into the pan-Hellenic pantheon has been negotiated and is now being narrated. It is clear that Hekate is conceived as the most appropriate goddess in the context of a paradigmatic virgin experiencing a crisis. She mediates between mother and daughter, demonstrating empathy to both young and old and yet attachment to neither. Indeed, her role in the Homeric *Hymn* provides the first incontrovertible evidence of Hekate’s intermediary role, particularly in relation to the permeable threshold that demarcates the underworld. It is her chthonic role in the Homeric *Hymn*, entrenched by her association with caves and the torch, which is so glaringly conspicuous by its absence from the *Theogony*. Hekate is not malevolent in the Homeric *Hymn*, but her duties in relation to the underworld are much more closely in sync with those for which the goddess was feared and valued in later (especially Hellenistic) times. Turning to fifth century art, we saw the consistency of the image of Hekate, and how closely the tradition in which it worked approaches the Homeric *Hymn*. Until the image crafted by Alkamenes around 430 B.C., the depiction of Hekate as a youthful girl was predominant, something that surely reflects the circumstances of her introduction to pan-Hellenic religion. Fifth century literature, on the other hand, develops a discrete and much more sinister image of the goddess, as Simon has pointed out. While early depictions by Pindar (as seen in Chapter One) and Aeschylus stress benevolent, intermediary, and custodial roles, from Sophocles onwards, audiences encountered a goddess of much more uncanny nature, connected with the night and restless spirits. This image was to be further inflamed by Euripides and particularly Sophron, while Aristophanes presents a picture of Hekate as a goddess primarily concerned with women and protection of the domestic sphere, demonstrating that, although her benevolent nature had been

---

257 Simon (1985). Apart from Pind. *Pa.* 2,27, which was thoroughly discussed in Chapter One. This is arguably because Pindar projects a goddess who is much more akin to her eastern manifestation(s): she is a benevolent protectress of the city of Abdera who acts as a messenger.
seriously besmirched, she nonetheless continued to serve a variety of purposes. It was, however, her macabre associations that were to predominate for the rest of antiquity, just as the statue crafted by Alkamenes became the traditional image of Hekate in the popular imagination.
CHAPTER THREE

A DECONSTRUCTION OF HEKATE’S MILESIAN PRESENCE AND A REAPPRAISAL OF HER CONNECTION TO ENODIA

INTRODUCTION

How, then, did Hekate become such a frightening deity? How was it that a goddess who originally seemed to be so mighty and benevolent became strongly associated with terrifying apparitions and black magic? Contrary to what the earliest evidence for Hekate in the Theogony tells us, is there some way we can deduce whether Hekate was in fact originally and inherently connected with the dead? The first half of this chapter tests Nilsson’s proposition that the goddess must have possessed essential connections to ghosts and magic—even if these connections were slight—because there is no other way to account properly for her status in Greek religion by the end of the fifth century B.C. While it is not the case that no other model for the explanation of this change in character exists, Nilsson’s idea is nonetheless worth reconsidering. To test his idea, a comparison of Milesian archaeological evidence and some of Hekate’s Hesiodic functions is conducted. With reference to the ideas of Kolb and Hekate’s placement at the Milesian gates by the mid fifth century, the following idea is examined: could it be the case that Hekate’s Milesian presence was inextricably bound to her role in relation to the dead? Can Milesian burial practices bolster this idea at all? Furthermore, does her Samothracian presence, and the cultic links between that island and Karia, provide further support for a goddess inherently connected with death? We must, of course, exercise caution in this respect: first, the sources for Samothracian Hekate, as we have seen, are late; second, worship for deities can fundamentally differ between locales, as is emphasised at the very beginning of this chapter. Moreover, even if she had been associated with the dead—and that is far from a certainty—how are we to account for her quite dramatic dive into a realm of baleful magic and, in some cases (such as
Sophron, for example), considerable violence? At this stage, we shift to a re-examination of the complex connection between Hekate and Thessalian Enodia, which has already been touched upon in both of the previous chapters. Given that the first instance in which the two deities are firmly identified is set in a context of herbal magic, many scholars have assumed that the identification of the goddesses was the source of Hekate’s downfall, if we may term it so. But is that really the case? What can Enodia’s character tell us about the nature of their relationship and how the Thessalian goddess may have affected Hekate? Moreover, what can the Thessalian reputation for witchcraft and sorcery tell us, and in what historical context should such a reputation be examined?

STUDYING DIVINE PERSONALITY: A METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

To start with, it is necessary to make a few comments about the study of divine personality. In an article on Persephone and Aphrodite at Locri, Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood begins her analysis by proposing a ‘bias-free approach’. She states that:

…[T]he study of Greek divinities must not be based on the assumption that the divine personality of a deity was substantially the same throughout the Greek world. Consequently to avoid the danger of distortions we must study each local divine personality of a deity separately from the Panhellenic one, and not use evidence from the latter to determine the former. … Moreover, we must not extrapolate from one local cult to another, … [n]or should we conflate evidence from different parts of the Greek world.¹

There is a distinction between extrapolating from one locality to another, which may distort evidence, and drawing reasonable links between different pieces of

circumstantial evidence. For example: it is unreasonable to suggest, in the face of an evidential vacuum, that Hekate’s malevolent associations in Athens by the end of the fifth century help us to ascertain her Panhellenic persona up to this temporal point. On the other hand, there may be solid grounds for drawing a link between two different cults. From there, we may be able to infer that some degree of influence has taken place because both localities were connected in some respect—for example, through mutual trade or a military bond. It also pays to point out that, because of this chapter’s temporal limit at the end of the fifth century, later evidence will only be included where it is absolutely necessary to help elucidate earlier materials. While this approach may seem self-evident, it must be adhered to in order to produce reliable conclusions.

NILSSON: INHERENT UNCANNINESS AND THE FALLACY OF A COMMONERS’ GODDESS

Nilsson is the main proponent of the view that Hekate was an inherently uncanny goddess. This view has found favour among several scholars. The essence of his opinion is found in three of his studies. In Geschichte der Griechischen Religion, Nilsson states that in Karia Hekate must have been a great goddess who nonetheless had close ties to ghosts and magic—otherwise, he questions, how would one explain her uncanny Greek manifestation? In Greek Popular Religion, Nilsson holds that the Greeks had a place for a goddess of witchcraft and ghosts. Accordingly, these latent characteristics were brought to the fore. This, in turn, caused her dissipation, since superstition was so widespread, particularly among the ‘Unterschichten.’ In Griechische Feste, Nilsson accounts for Hermes’ lack of association with ghosts and magic, despite sharing much of Hekate’s transitional

---


3 Rohde (1925) 323 n. 95a, Appendices VI-VII; Heckenbach (1912) 2769-2782, esp. 2770 and 2775; West (1995) 316; Farnell (1896) 2.505.
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nature, by alluding to her ‘Plebejerin’ status. Before we can assess Nilsson’s idea of inherent uncanniness, a problem needs to be addressed. It seems that Nilsson is placing undue weight on the fallacy that, in Greece, Hekate was a goddess of the common man. This, in turn, would cause a distorted analysis of the circumstances of Hekate’s introduction into Greece, as well as her inherent nature. As Clay has pointed out, there is no evidence to support Hekate having occupied such a position. One gets the sense that Nilsson is relying on this fallacious argument in order to extrapolate backwards. That is, superstitious beliefs in ghosts and magic, which were predominantly held by common folk, were widespread and resulted in Hekate’s popularity and the domination of her association with such phenomena, given that she was inherently aligned with the lower class in Greece. Accordingly, one can extrapolate backwards to the point of Hekate’s entry into Greece and account for the circumstances of her introduction, while also explaining why such associations were latent in Karia (given that she was a ‘große Göttin’ there). This is a dangerous position because, as Nilsson himself acknowledges, the lower classes are not given a literary voice. If the Greeks needed a figure that was exclusively associated with witchcraft and ghosts, why would they borrow the Karian Hekate, who, as above, Nilsson calls a ‘große Göttin, die sich nicht ausschließlich mit Spuk und Zauber befaßte’? How does he account for the fact that there is no evidence for

---


5 See above, n. 2, for the references.

6 As mentioned in Chapter Two. This fallacy has been perpetuated by several scholars, including Pfister (1928) 8; Aly (1913); Kraus (1960) 91.

7 Such claims of inherent nature also risk conflating the worship of deities in different localities, as discussed above.

8 Clay (1984) 29; Stoddard (2004) 9-10. Clay is citing Pfister and Aly. She claims that their interpretations are derived from the ‘naïve but still tenacious view of Hesiod as the singing peasant.’

9 Nilsson (1955) 725.
Hekate’s associations with magic and witchcraft in Greece before Sophocles’ *Rhizotomoi*?}

**NILSSON’S HYPOTHESIS, THE THEOGONY, AND MILESIAN EVIDENCE**

Nevertheless, it is still important to test Nilsson’s hypothesis that Karian Hekate was always associated with the uncanny to some degree. We have already gone through the *Theogony* in some detail, so further comments can be kept brief. The Hymn to Hekate is most likely not an interpolation, and the passage probably presents an Asia Minorian (possibly Milesian?) manifestation of the goddess.\(^{11}\) Given that the account could be tempered by both personal belief and thematic necessity, its evidential utility is questionable. However, it presents a goddess entirely devoid of uncanny characteristics.\(^{12}\) The only sphere in which Hekate is apportioned no share is the underworld. She has the capacity to act arbitrarily, but is overwhelmingly benevolent. We have also come across the late Archaic evidence to Hekate in the precinct of Apollo Delphinios in Miletos.\(^{13}\) It is the earliest archaeological evidence of the goddess, and ostensibly presents nothing uncanny. Admittedly, the scope for comment is restricted by the fact that the dedicators are

---

\(^{10}\) ‘…no certain evidence … dates this play before 455 B.C.’. See Webster (1967) 34.

\(^{11}\) Ibid.

\(^{12}\) Cf. Johnston (1991) 218: ‘This assumption [that Hekate is inherently uncanny] has presented difficulties for scholars attempting to explain situations in which she manifests no uncanny aspects at all, such as in the *Theogony*.’

\(^{13}\) See Chapter One. *Milet* I.3: 129 (Kawerau and Rehm (1914)).
mentioned but not the occasion; nor are any facts of the cult or religious beliefs.\textsuperscript{14} But the inscription’s location within the Delphinion and before the prytaneum is suggestive, as is the fact it was dedicated by Milesian prytaneis; both demonstrate that Hekate was incorporated into official cult and was not marginal.\textsuperscript{15} Moreover, as I noted in Chapter One, an altar in front of this most auspicious of community symbols would tend to strengthen the argument in favour of the goddess possessing beneficent, and perhaps protective characteristics.\textsuperscript{16}

There is an interesting, alternative case for Hekate’s Milesian character. In his 1981 study, Frank Kolb advances a case in relation to the Archaic Greek agora.\textsuperscript{17} His argument needs to be unpackaged in order to clarify its relevance in the

\textsuperscript{14} Kraus (1960) 11.

\textsuperscript{15} Johnston (1999) 204. Sourvinou-Inwood (1990) says that Hekate ‘apparently had a civic aspect in [Miletos]’. Also important is her comment (on the same page) on the Delphinion, the sanctuary of Apollo. She states that it was the ‘main sanctuary with which were associated the Molpoi, a college with religious functions which was also closely connected with the civic life of the polis: their leader was the annual chief magistrate of the city, and the college has responsibilities pertaining to civic law; in the Delphinion were set up the sacred laws of the Molpoi and also state treaties, proxeny decrees, and the like.’ All of this points towards a Hekate who was intimately connected with civic life. On this basis, any connection with ghosts and witchcraft seems highly unlikely.

\textsuperscript{16} Herda (2011) 68-69 states that ‘Hekate appears here primarily as a political goddess, not a dark and secret ‘goddess of the outside’ or goddess of witchcraft’. In the first century B.C. (78/77), another altar was dedicated to Φωσφόρος by a certain Pausanias. This is a common epithet of Hekate. Another of Hekate’s Milesian epithets was known to Hsch. s.v. Υπολάμπτειρα: ‘Εκάτη ἐν Μιλήτῳ (Liddell, Scott and Jones (1940)). Both of these sources are much later than the Archaic period (Hesychius, in particular, flourished at the end of the fifth century A.D.), so it is with great caution that I advance Herda’s conjecture: he states that ‘eine ‘lichtbringende’, ‘leuchtende’ … Hekate mag zwar in Kontrast zum ‘dunklen’ Bild der Göttin stehen, im Falle eines Entemenios-Verhältnisses zum Apollon Delphinios, wie es hier nahelieg, stünde diese ‘leuchtende’ Hekate jedoch neben dem Lichtgott per se, Apollon.’ See Herda (2006) 282-283, 285; Johnston (1999) 206 n. 15; Zeleny (1999) 73. On Hekate Φωσφόρος (and her relationship to Artemis), see especially Graf (1985) 229.

\textsuperscript{17} Kolb (1981) 5-15, 58, 101.
present context. Kolb argues that the (Homeric) ‘holy circle’ at the Archaic agora, which was dedicated to the most important deity of the particular political community concerned, was an orchestra. Within this orchestra was held a variety of activities: assemblies of the people, councillors, and elders (in their judicial capacity), agonistic contests, as well as cultic choral dances in honour of the relevant deity. Kolb asserts that it was chthonic gods, and not their Olympic counterparts, who originally ruled over the agora. The sanctuaries of such chthonic gods were, above all, located in the vicinity of necropoleis. Drawing on the literary and archaeological tradition, Kolb goes on to say that the Greeks were wont to hold their assemblies and locate their agorae at the graves of their mythical and historical ancestors. Agones, including choral dances, were developed at the same location, in the course of worship of heroes and the dead, particularly after a burial. The orchestra and its concomitant choral dances rose in importance over other agones held in the agora, and the significance attached to dance in Geometric

19 The various appellations for this area (e.g. ἱερὸς κύκλος; χορός κυκλόεις; θρόνος; see Kolb (1981) 14-15) alternated depending on the function for which the space was being used. They simply recognize different aspects of the same locality, according to Kolb.
20 In his definition of ‘chthonic’, Kolb proposes a three-fold classification. See Kolb (1981) 5-6 n. 5.
22 Kolb (1981) 7 n. 8 cites Hom. Il. 10.414 (Hektor holds a council at the tomb of Ilos); Polyb. 23.10.17 (Macedonians army, in the course of its gathering, conducts purificatory and piacular offerings on the grave of the hero Xanthos; cf. Suda s.v. ἐναγίζων); Paus. 9.16, 2.19.3, 2.31, 8.39.4/8.41.1 (hero-tombs at the agorae of Thebes, Argos, Troezen, and Phigalia (respectively). See Kolb for archaeological references.
and Archaic Greece is attested to by pictorial, epigraphic and literary sources. Kolb cites various literary allusions to a circular space in which political functions took place, and concludes that the architectural form corresponds so closely to the early orchestra that it would be nonsensical for two constructions of this type to be located next to one another. Tying these ideas together is the idea that the choral dance—the original act for which an orchestra would have been most appropriate—was an act performed in veneration of the most significant god of the deploying city. As Kolb states, ‘Der Zusammenhang zwischen Agora und Agonen war folglich kein rein topographischer, sondern ein kultischer und damit auch politischer’.

How is this relevant to Hekate? In note 15 above, I drew attention to the nature of the Delphinion in which we find the earliest archaeological evidence for Hekate. Sourvinou-Inwood states that the space was closely associated with the Molpoi, who in turn were a society concerned with religion and civic life, such as laws, treaties, and decrees. It is interesting, then, that the earliest literary account—the Theogony—states that Hekate is ‘eminent among the people in assembly, whom she wishes’ (ἐν τ’ Ἀγορᾷ λαοῖς μεταφέπει, ὃν κ’ ἐθέλησιν), that she ‘sits by reverent kings in judgment’ (ἐν τε Ἀγορᾷ βασιλεύσαι παρ’ αἰδοῖοι καθίζει), and that she ‘is also good when men compete in the contest; then also the goddess assists and benefits them’ (ἐσθλὴ δ’ αὐθ’ ὑπὸτ’ ἄνδρες ἀθλεύουσιν ἄγωνι, ἐνθα θεῖα καὶ τοῖς παραγίγνεται ἢ ὅνινησιν). It is at this point (that is, his reference to the Theogony) that Kolb’s argument falters slightly. Instead of floating the possibility of Milesian reference in the Hymn to Hekate, Kolb uses Hesiod’s account to verify the juridical nature of Sophocles’ κυκλόεις ἄγωρας θρόνος at

25 Kolb (1981) 8 n.11.
26 Hom. Il. 18.490-526; Eur. Or. 919; Soph. OT 161.
27 By political, I mean everything that concerns the polis.
the Theban agora, of which Artemis Eurekleia is the patron. He does this by identifying Hekate with Artemis Eukleia, asserting that such an identification of the two goddesses has been overlooked in scholarship. However, Kolb’s case for their identification is very weakly corroborated. The major problem with drawing the

30 Kolb (1981) 11, citing Soph. OT 160-161. Kolb also cites Paus. 9.17.1, who states that the daughters Artemis Eukleia of Thebes stood in cultic connection with the daughters of Antipoinos, given that they were buried within the sanctuary. Kolb etymologizes Antipoinos, stating that it contains the word ‘poinē’, blood money. Therein, Kolb sees an allusion to the juridical trials dealt with in the Homeric ‘holy circle’ which pertain to the settlement of blood money. See Kolb (1981) 11 n. 30. Herda (2011) 69, while in support of the argument that Milesian Hekate possesses no dark characteristics, also sees Hesiod’s account as reflecting Boeotian custom. In his 2006 account of Apollo Delphinios at Miletos, however, he is keen to see a parallel between the potentially hymnic nature of the paean sung to Hekate and the Hesiodic account of the goddess. See Herda (2006) 285 and below. For the potentially apotropaic nature of the paean, see below.


32 He uses the term γαιάοχος as a point of reference for the identification of the goddesses. (In this context, the term seems to impart a protective aspect. Cf. Aesch. Supp. 816, where the epithet is used for Zeus. This is the Doric spelling; its alternative γαιήοχος is a common epithet of Poseidon). I must admit that I am quite puzzled by this argument. While γαιάοχος appears at Soph. OT 160, there is no trace of any derivative of the word at Hes. Theog. 430, contrary to what Kolb claims. At lines 413 and 426, mention is made of Hekate’s privileges pertaining to the earth, but that does not approach the meaning required of γαιάοχος. Next, Kolb claims that while Hekate appears in Hesiod as the ruler of the agorae of Boeotian poleis, Artemis assumes this position in our other sources (see above, as well as Plut. Arist. 20.6). Given that Hesiod is Boeotian, it is understandable why Kolb assumes that a Boeotian cult is being referenced. Moreover, we cannot definitively state that Hesiod is referring to an Asia Minorian, specifically Milesian goddess. However, as we have seen, there is a good case for the Hesiodic Hekate being Milesian, and it seems strange that Kolb attempts to link Hekate to Boeotia through an awkward conflation with Artemis Eukleia when Milesian evidence for a civic aspect of Hekate is available. For Hekate in Boeotia, see Serafini (2013), who states that ‘[i]n conclusione, il culto di Ecate in Beozia non sembra così diffuso e popolare, né antico, da spiegare il privilegio concesso alla dea da Esiodo.’ Some other points: Why would Hesiod’s Hekate be identifiable with Artemis Eukleia when Artemis is named separately on two other occasions (lines 14 and 918)? Would not the name Artemis-Hekate be used if the two were to be identified, as in Aesch. Supp. 676-677, the earliest known identification of the two? Even the association between Eukleia and Artemis is a loose one. See Nilsson (1957) 237-238.
3: A DECONSTRUCTION OF HEKATE’S MILESIAN PRESENCE AND A REAPPRAISAL OF HER CONNECTION TO ENODIA

*Theogony* into a discussion about Hekate’s relationship to civic functions and its potentially chthonic nature is clear: the only realm in which the Hesiodic Hekate is apportioned no share of honours is the underworld.33 I am also troubled by the predominant use of Homeric references in relation to conjecture concerning Hekate’s chthonic origins; it must be stressed that Homer makes absolutely no mention of the goddess. However, this does not necessarily mean that Milesian Hekate did not possess chthonic attributes; perhaps, contrary to what I have argued, Hesiod’s goddess is not the Milesian manifestation of the goddess after all. Maybe Nilsson is correct to the extent that behind the Hymn to Hekate was an intention to popularise the goddess,34 which could, in turn, have derived from personal piety. Such propaganda could well have omitted any mention of chthonic connections to suit a Greek world increasingly distanced (both geographically and conceptually) from, and therefore fearful of, death.35 At any rate, these ideas relating to chthonic deities and agorae, as well as the distancing of death, should be borne in mind for the duration of our Milesian discussion.

MILESIAN HEKATE-AT-THE-GATES AND CHANGING ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE DEAD

Another piece of evidence in Miletos is a late archaic calendar of sacrifices. Found in one of the halls of the Delphinion, the calendar was written on the walls and mentions a rite that involved the crowning of Hekate.36 By the fifth century, it is apparent that the goddess possessed a temple at the Milesian city gates. No

33 Both Kolb (1981) and Kenzler (1999) mention Hekate’s appearance in the *Theogony* in relation to a discussion of chthonic deities and agorae. Neither specifically mentions Miletos, but this is immaterial; both fail to mention the Hesiodic Hekate’s lack of a connection to the underworld.

34 Nilsson (1955-1961) 12.725. I do not agree that the passage is an interpolation, as Nilsson states.

35 See Chapter Two, nn. 36 and 37.

archaeological traces of this temple have been found within the range of the Milesian city gates. However, the mid fifth century B.C. inscription found within the Delphinion which details the sacred law of the Molpoi makes it clear that Hekate was present in front of the city gates. Although use of the epithet Προπυλαία in Miletos is not directly proven, it is safe to assume that, in this context, Hekate is fulfilling the same function. The inscription states that the Molpoi—which is best translated as ‘singers and dancers’—are the only participants in the procession. Immediately outside the gates of the city, a γύλλος, besprinkled with unmixed wine and garlanded, was to be placed at the shrine of Hekate, and a paean was to be sung to the goddess. A second γύλλος was to be placed at the gate to the sanctuary, thus creating a ‘sakralisiert’ passage. As Graf notes, ‘the space traversed is the space outside, where unsafe conditions require greater, often supernatural protection.’ He states, however, that Hermes Enkelados alone will ensure that the journey to Didyma is safe, and seems to argue that Hekate is the guardian of passages through the city gate (as opposed to

---

37 ‘παρ᾽ Ἐκάτην πρόσθεν πυλέων’: LSAM 50.25-29 (Sokolowski (1955)).


39 Herda (2011) 62 advances this translation because it reflects ‘the importance of music in the cult of Apollo, especially the performance of the hymnic paian.’ Johnston (1999) 206-207 calls the Molpoi a ‘guild of musicians’.

40 Υύλλοι may be cubes of stone (Nilsson (1955-1961) 1:722: ‘Steinwürfel’) and/or aniconic images of Apollo Agyieus: Hock (1905); Nilsson (1955-1961) 1:722. Fontenrose (1988) 14, 74 views the gylloi as offering baskets, while Graf (1996) 60-61 argues that the objects were simply stone markers used to demarcate the sacred route.

41 ‘ἐπὶ θύρας’


43 Graf (1996) 56.

44 The meaning of this epithet is uncertain; it may mean ‘with a Loud Voice’. See Gorman (2001) 184.
3: A DECONSTRUCTION OF HEKATE’S MILESIAN PRESENCE AND A REAPPRAISAL OF HER CONNECTION TO ENODIA

the sacred passage itself).\textsuperscript{45} Herda states that the paean, which was recited as a prosodion or a stasimon, addressed Hekate as protectress of the holy Milesian gates.\textsuperscript{46}

A liminal guardian such as this requires something against which the worshiping group can be guarded. It is interesting that, while the first Milesian evidence for Hekate is \textit{inside} the Delphinion, the fifth century Molpoi inscription places her \textit{outside} the city walls. First, we must admit of the possibility that Hekate had an earlier presence outside the city, for which no archaeological (or other) record survives.\textsuperscript{47} But what if this was the first time Hekate’s shrine had been

\textsuperscript{45} Graf (1996) 60-61. The eighteen kilometre procession involved worship at seven different stations along the way. Paeans were performed, and occasionally additional sacrifices. The seven stops were: Hekate at the city gates; (the sanctuary of) Dynamis (a protector of the Milesian magistrates? Graf (1996) 60 n. 44); the meadow on the Akron at the nymphs; the (statue of?) Hermes in (the sanctuary) of Kelados (rivergod ‘Clamour’); Phyllos (Apollo the ‘tribesman’?); in the area of Keraîtes (the ‘horned’ one, another Apollo?); and the statues of Chares. See Graf (1996) 60-61 n.44; Georgoudi (2001).

\textsuperscript{46} Herda (2006) 285. Herda also states that it is to be assumed ‘daß der Paion in irgendeiner Weise auf Hekate Bezug nahm, sie etwa neben der Bitte um den Schutz der Tore in einem ‘epischen’ Teil beschreibend pries. Ein solcher ‘Hymnos’ an Hekate, der gleichzeitig das älteste Zeugnis ihres Kultes darstellt, ist in der «Theogonie» des Hesiod erhalten.’ This is an interesting point, and could provide another pillar in the case for the Hesiodic Hekate as Milesian. Were it the case that this paean was derived from the \textit{Theogony} in the slightest, it would be plausible that the contents of both bore resemblances.

\textsuperscript{47} As Sourvinou-Inwood (1995) 437 states, sacred spaces could be demarcated for gods both inside and outside settlements. It is interesting, however, to note the remarks of Roller (1999) 110-111 in her summary of the Phrygian evidence for Kybele: ‘The placement of the images of the goddess provides further clues to her identity. The location of these images suggests that the goddess’ most frequent positions were on the edge of city settlements, particularly on the walls of these settlements, as in reliefs from Boğazköy and Midas City, or on the boundaries of settled territories, as in the Arslankaya and Maltaş monuments, both placed on the edge of fertile valleys. They were also placed near water sources (Gordion, Faharad Çeşme), on funerary monuments (the Bahçelievler and Etlik reliefs), or in extramural shrines in mountainous landscapes, such as the rock façades and altars in high places (Pessinous, Dömrek, Kalehisar, and many others.) Smaller images were found in private houses. No monument was found attached to a building in the middle of an
shifted from inside? This is clearly the same locality (Miletos), but there is a temporal gap between the dedication by the prytaneis in the Delphinion and the Molpoi inscription. Let us examine whether any ideological shift could have taken place between the dates to which these two pieces of evidence are ascribed. Sourvinou-Inwood states that, in the Dark Ages, intramural and extramural burial were practised alongside one another.\(^\text{48}\) The eighth century, on the other hand, saw a strengthening tendency towards the latter, which culminated in the ‘termination of intramural burial in archaic times’.\(^\text{49}\) Sourvinou-Inwood is careful not to oversimplify the causes which led to this shift in social norms, locating ‘disappearance of intramural burial’ in a ‘context of a shift in attitudes to death which was itself part and result of a series of social, economic, political and intellectual changes’.\(^\text{50}\) It will help to set out her argument in full:

… [T]he disappearance of intramural burial … must be connected with the receding familiarity in the attitudes towards death and the dead apparent in other aspects of archaic death-related behaviour. The growing fear and revulsion generated by death expressed itself through the—inherited but flexible—concept of pollution, a conceptual and ritual mechanism for articulating boundaries. Much of the earlier trend towards greater use of extramural cemeteries was

\(^{48}\) A post-Homeric shift in Greek attitudes towards death has been the subject of some debate between Sourvinou-Inwood and Morris. For Sourvinou-Inwood’s initial articulation of her views, see her 1981 and 1983 publications. For her specific treatments of burial rites, see (1981) 35-37, (1983) 47. Morris’ 1987 and 1989 critiques of Sourvinou-Inwood are addressed by the latter in an appendix to her 1995 monograph. She criticizes Morris’ model and defends her own. Others to treat the subject of shifting attitudes towards death are Seaford (1994) 79-84 and Johnston (1999) 95-100.

\(^{49}\) Sourvinou-Inwood (1983) 47.

probably urbanistically inspired. But the diminished physical contact with, and proximity to the dead which ensued contributed to the shift from the familiar model of death, and so fuelled the tendency to remove burials outside the city, which again reinforced the recession of familiarity, and so on.\(^{51}\)

**BURIAL PRACTICES IN MILETOS, FUNERARY LEGISLATION, AND THEIR SUPPORT (OR LACK THEREOF) OF THE HEKATE-AT-THE-GATES HYPOTHESIS**

Was it due to an inherent chthonic nature that Hekate was relocated outside the Milesian city walls, in order to keep the polluting influence of the dead at bay?\(^{52}\) To test this hypothesis, Milesian burial practices must be considered, keeping in mind the aforementioned timeframe (late sixth century to mid fifth century), and the fact that ‘in the 5\(^{th}\) century intramural burial is almost unknown outside Sparta and Taras, except for children and a few exceptional individuals’.\(^{53}\) Not a great deal is known about burial rites in Miletos. There is, however, some evidence that can be adduced. The location of the Archaic necropolis has become clearer on account of accidental discoveries.\(^{54}\) Five Archaic burial sites have been excavated, and an Archaic Anthemion Stele has been discovered. One of the five burials was a monumental tomb, known as the Lion Tomb, which was discovered amongst Hellenistic burials in the hillside of Kazartepe, to the southwest of the city. On account of the contemporaneous sherds found within the tomb, it can be dated to the second half of the sixth century. Two well-preserved, life-size lion statues were found to the left of the entrance, which may have served as guardians of the tomb,

---


\(^{52}\) Another way of putting this: Was Hekate so inherently connected with necropoleis that, following the final termination of intramural burial, she too was relocated outside in order to guard the city from the polluting dead?


and could indicate that the inhumed remains belonged to a person killed in battle.\(^{55}\)
The lengthy dromos that led to the tomb could indicate inheritance of Anatolian, specifically Karian and Lydian, burial customs.\(^{56}\)

Four Archaic monolithic sarcophagi were found just to the east of this site (Kazartepe).\(^{57}\) The burials were found within a small area. The remains of an elderly man (60-65 years), a mature man (45-55 years), a young adult (22-25 years), and a child (4-6 years) were found.\(^{58}\) Like the Lion Tomb, sherds in the monolithic sarcophagi indicate a date in the late sixth century. Strengthening this hypothesis is the fact that very few artefacts were buried with the deceased, which is characteristic of eastern Ionian burial practices in the second half of the sixth century.

---

\(^{55}\) Kurtz and Boardman (1971) 239; Kleiner (1968) 127. von Graeve (1989) 143-144 outlines the arguments of Blümel and Kleiner pertaining to the original use of the lions. The former submits that they originally flanked an avenue lined with lions; the latter argues, like Kurtz and Boardman, that they performed a tutelary function at the entrance to the grave. As von Graeve submits, ‘der Fundsituation macht letztere These wahrscheinlicher’.


\(^{58}\) Schultz and Schmidt-Schultz (1991) 165-182. We may be able to derive some significance from the fact that a young child was buried amongst adults. Sourvinou-Inwood (1981) 34 argues that ‘[t]hrough the Dark Ages and until c. 760, almost all Athenian children were inhumed intramurally, sometimes under a house-floor (in the family’s life-space), while adults were cremated or inhumed, depending on the fashion, and mostly buried in extramural cemeteries (where child burials are extremely rare). From c. 760 intramural burials of children no longer predominate over the intramural burials of adults, and children’s burials in the extramural cemeteries become common. … This change seems to coincide chronologically with the appearance of the tendency, all over Greece, to incorporate single graves into groups, family-plots. Both phenomena, I suggest, reflect the fact that community involvement in each death began to become looser in the eighth century and correspondingly family involvement became stronger.’ In turn, this weakening community involvement stemmed from an increasing desire to limit the visibility of death in the community. We cannot be certain that such weakening differentiation took place in Miletos as well, nor am I arguing that these four separate remains constitute a family. However, the strong possibility of Sourvinou-Inwood’s argument being applicable in this context must be noted. For more on child burial, see Sourvinou-Inwood (1983) 44-45; (1995) 429-431; and Morris’ (1989) response, 315-316.
century. Unfortunately, the location of the modern village of Balat hinders further excavation of the area where the sarcophagi were found, which would probably shed much more light on Archaic burial rites and locations in Miletos. But despite the small sample, this was probably the city’s primary cemetery. Kleiner and Gorman agree that the Archaic, Hellenistic and Classical necropoleis probably would have all been located ‘south or southwest of a line drawn from Kalabaktepe to the Sacred Gate, the approximate course of the [old] city wall.’ Moreover, the two most recent authorities on Milesian archaeological history agree that these constituent graves would have been part of a resting place through which the Sacred Way passed. Grave markers such as the aforementioned Stele, which was found further south in Akköy, probably served as monuments en route to and from Didyma. Pausanias’s statement that the grave of Neileus was located to the left of the Sacred Way, close to the Sacred Gate, provides further support for this assumption. If this was the case, is there a link to be drawn between the Sacred Way’s association with graves, and Hekate’s placement at the very beginning of it, worship for whom was required before the sacred procession along the road? As far as I am aware, there is no mention or archaeological trace of her presence at the

---


64 Paus. 7.2.6.
Lion Gate, the second monumental gateway of Miletos.\textsuperscript{65}

The three intramural burials that took place after the establishment of Hekate at the Sacred Gate are not destructive of the possibility that, by the time Hekate had assumed her liminal position, extramural burial was the norm. That is because all three are heroa. The oldest of these graves is Hellenistic.\textsuperscript{66} As Sourvinou-Inwood argues, ‘there is a difference in behaviour towards on the one hand gods and heroes, installed not just inside the living space but also at the very centre of the polis, and on the other the dead, gradually excluded from that living space.’\textsuperscript{67} Mention of intramural burial is made by Plutarch, who describes Thales’ desire to be inhumed in an obscure and remote part of the city, believing that it would one day be Miletos’ central market place.\textsuperscript{68} Thales lived from c. 624 B.C. to c. 547-546 B.C. Perhaps his desire reflects the vestiges of customary intramural burial in the sixth century before it was terminated outright. Alternatively, an interment within the city may have been, like the aforementioned intramural

\footnote{65 See the following website, last accessed on 24/09/2013: http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/artifact?object=Building&name=Miletus%2C%20Fortifications\&redirect=true}

\footnote{66 Kleiner (1968) 129-134, who asserts that ‘Sie müssen alle hervorragenden Bürgern Milets gehört haben. Sonst hätte man die Bestattung innerhalb der Mauern nicht geduldet.’ (My emphasis). We cannot be sure who occupied the graves; see Kleiner for discussion. At any rate, the tombs speak of privileged status. As Kurtz and Boardman (1971) 298 assert, ‘a few classes of privileged people might be accorded burial or some form of mnema within a city’s walls, or be allowed heroic status.’ It is not inconceivable that the lack of any earlier intramural finds is due to such burials having been shifted outside the city walls. Delos, for example (although slightly different, due its not being a polis and having a revered, sacred nature), was purified of all graves as beliefs concerning death and its polluting influence hardened. See Thuc. 3.104. Likewise, death was something the gods no longer came into contact with (Eur. Alc. 20-3; Eur. Hipp. 1437-9) unlike in Homer (Il. 16.676-80, 23.185-7, 24.610-2).

\footnote{67 Sourvinou-Inwood (1995) 437.}

burials, tolerated on account of his status. As the argument below aims to demonstrate, there was probably some form of sumptuary funerary legislation passed in Miletos toward the end of the sixth century, which was probably in reaction to shifting attitudes towards death, the death ritual and the cult of the dead.

From as early as the time of Solon, funerary legislation\(^{69}\) began to be implemented in numerous poleis around the Greek world.\(^{70}\) Solon’s legislation, for example, restricted extreme forms of behaviour at funerals, and pertained to the indoor preparation of the corpse (prothesis), the pre-dawn funeral procession (ekphora), the burial or cremation of the corpse, graveside sacrifices, ritual lamentation (especially by women), and subsequent visits to the grave.\(^{71}\) Accordingly, such legislation ‘restricted death’s encroachment on community life by limiting the disruption, and lowering the emotional tone, of the death-ritual.’\(^{72}\) By the end of the sixth century (probably c. 530 B.C.), a specifically sumptuary element was added to the Solonian laws, probably by Peisistratus.\(^{73}\) Due to a lack of evidence, we cannot be certain whether any such legislation was passed in Miletos; but a few comments can be made. Let us return to the aforementioned sarcophagi found in the Archaic Milesian necropolis. It was noted that the scarcity of grave goods within these sarcophagi was typical for that time (late sixth century) and place (eastern Ionia). Müller-Wiener locates this scarcity among several other similarities in burial custom between Miletos and Samos, while also describing the

---

\(^{69}\) Which Seaford (1994) 74 n. 1 describes as ‘law regulating private death rituals and their associated activity (including the construction of the tomb)’.


\(^{72}\) Sourvinou-Inwood (1983) 47.

practice as typical of eastern Ionia in general.\textsuperscript{74} He notes in particular the contrast between the (lack of) grave goods and the use of stone sarcophagi, the masonry and transportation involved which would have come at some expense. This similarity in practice between the neighbouring poleis of Samos and Miletos is important. Speculating on the generally ‘scaled down’ consumption of grave goods in Samos, Morris suggests that the tyrant Polycrates, who seized power in \textit{c.} 535 B.C. and was in power until \textit{c.} 522 B.C., may have passed a sumptuary law.\textsuperscript{75} Given that there was a strikingly similar trend of using few grave goods in Miletos at this time, it is quite plausible that a similar law was passed, or that the decree of Polycrates had jurisdiction in this city as well. Indeed, Herodotos speaks of the power held by Polycrates in Ionia; he also describes Polycrates’ conquest and enslavement of the navies of the Milesians and the Lesbians, the latter having come to the aid of the former.\textsuperscript{76}

This contrast between (internal) goods and (external) sarcophagi requires further explanation. As Müller-Wiener asserts, the effort and expense behind burial was clearly poured into the sarcophagi.\textsuperscript{77} Grave markers, as well, may have been funerary objects of some expense. The late Archaic Anthemion Stele, made of white marble and topped with a palmette, provides an example of how elaborate and sophisticated grave markers could be in Miletos at this stage.\textsuperscript{78} As Graeve

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{74} Müller-Wiener (1988b) 262.
\item \textsuperscript{75} Morris (1987) 148. As noted above, the Athenian sumptuary law was probably passed around 530 B.C. This fact could lend further support to the argument that Polycrates passed sumptuary funerary legislation during his rule; it potentially speaks to a contemporary phenomenon spanning the Aegean.
\item \textsuperscript{76} Hdt. 3.39.
\item \textsuperscript{77} Müller-Wiener (1988b) 262. Speaking of sarcophagi in eastern Ionia generally, Philipp (1981) 154-155 asserts that the bulk belongs to the second half of the sixth century and the fifth century. Moreover, there are painted and unpainted examples. While the four Milesian examples were not painted, the practice, evidence for which is found in Chios, Samos, Ephesos, Smyrna etc., may well have been used in Miletos to individualize graves further.
\item \textsuperscript{78} Despite its badly fragmented state and the fact its bears an illegible inscription. As Philipp (1981) 157 states, these Stelae were found with or without the name of the deceased.
\end{itemize}
asserts, the find provides the first evidence of the tall, slim Anthemion Stele-type in Miletos. In eastern Ionia, it seems that this type was the grave marker of choice in necropoleis, just as it appeared in the Samian finds.\textsuperscript{79} Graeve also discusses an unfinished \textit{kore} found south of Kazartepe. It was probably—although not certainly—used for burial purposes, and could suggest that a sculptor’s workshop was located in the area, which in turn could suggest that, at this point, such statuary grave markers were in high demand.\textsuperscript{80} If the lions found at the monumental tomb had flanked the Sacred Way, they would provide another example of heightened expenditure on grave markers. The comments of Philipp are highly relevant in this context. In her discussion of Archaic graves in eastern Ionia, Philipp compares the lack of grave goods in sixth century Milesian graves to Athenian burial practices. Drawing a comparison between seventh and sixth century Athens, Philipp states that the increased expenditure on sophisticated grave structures and decorations mirrored the decreased use of grave goods, before that expenditure was also curtailed by the fifth century.\textsuperscript{81} Like Sourvinou-Inwood, Philipp concludes that such shifts in custom reflect changing attitudes to death and the cult of the dead.\textsuperscript{82} However, there is a problem in drawing comparisons between Athenian and Milesian cults. Given the lack of seventh century burial evidence in Miletos, Philipp questions whether the frugality of grave offerings in sixth century Miletos can be fruitfully compared to Athens, or rather that such a practice was also commonplace in Miletos in the seventh century, therefore rendering any sixth century similarity

\textsuperscript{79} Von Graeve (1989) 148.

\textsuperscript{80} Von Graeve (1989) 144-145 also discusses archaic seated female figures from the same region, which the Parisian Louvre designates as from the Milesian necropolis. Von Graeve submits that some of the figures have been ruled out of the equation because their inscriptions indicate they are votive offerings, and therefore have nothing to do with the necropolis. Concluding his remarks on the \textit{kore} and the seated figures, von Graeve states the ‘Die Umschau unter den alten Grabungsfunden bleibt also ambivalent oder negativ und zeigt damit nur, daß die Nekropolenforschung in Milet noch in den Anfängen steckt.’ See also Kleiner (1968) 127; Philipp (1981) 150.


between the two poleis coincidental and without substance. In this context, a comparison with Samos, with which Miletos appeared to share many burial practices, is arguably more fruitful.

It is nonetheless plausible that a Milesian legislative restriction on expenditure on funerary offerings (hence the paucity of grave goods) caused greater expense to be poured into sarcophagi and markers (hence the contrasting expense of the tombs, and the Anthemion Stele, which provides the first irrefutable Milesian proof of a monument that was to become widespread). The significance of this possibility lies in the fact that such late Archaic funerary restrictions would have been a reaction to highly complex changes in attitudes towards death. Perhaps the outright termination of Milesian intramural burial had taken place before the end of the sixth century, and any sumptuary legislation banished the vestiges of communal involvement in death. On the other hand, termination may have taken place in the late sixth or early fifth century, before Hekate was located at the Sacred Gate, for which the first evidence dates to the mid fifth century. Ultimately, ascertaining a precise date for any termination of intramural burial is not strictly necessary. Restriction on funerary expenditure is symptomatic of a ‘recession in the familiarity

83 Philipp (1981) 163. On 162, Philipp discusses a part of the seventh century city of Miletos that has been discovered. The temple to Athena which was found dates to the last quarter of the seventh century. Despite its significance, the structure is rather modest (whatever Philipp means by this subjective term), and does not seem to be the product of a wealthy township. Philipp questions whether the modesty of this temple could not have correlated with the use of grave goods and the decoration of graves. This could be the case, but it is important to stress the public nature of something like a temple, and the inherently private nature of a funeral for an ordinary citizen. As Burkert (1985) 194 states, the cult of the dead ‘remains the foundation and expression of family identity’. While funerary legislation curbing expenditure was probably passed in reaction to the waning communal desire to have death so conspicuously staged, it also asserted the ‘claims of the [public] polis … against pretentious displays by powerful [private] kin groups’. Accordingly, it is conceivable that a discrepancy existed between public and private expenditure on monuments.

84 Particularly given the widespread evidence for such laws across the ancient world: See Seaford (1994) 74-78.
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with dead, and a desire to push away death’s physical reality.\textsuperscript{85} Accordingly, any policy aiming to restrict the physical presence of death would surely have prioritised the removal of graves from amongst the living; such a policy was probably underway or being completed towards the end of the sixth century in Miletos.

MILESIAN HEKATE: CONCLUDING REMARKS

It will help to recapitulate the ideas that have been put forth in relation to Hekate’s Milesian manifestation. If it is correct that Hekate’s presence within the Delphinion was owing to her chthonic nature,\textsuperscript{86} is it the case that the Molpoi inscription’s mention of the goddess at the Sacred Gate provides evidence for a relocation outside the city walls on account of these chthonic associations? Too little is known about Milesian burial practices to answer incontrovertibly, but there does seem to be a prima facie case for the city having curbed funerary expenditure in the sixth century, which in turn would have been a reaction to mutating attitudes towards death, the death ritual, and the cult of the dead. If the dead were relocated outside, it

\textsuperscript{85} Sourvinou-Inwood (1983) 47-48, where she discusses the legislation of Athens (under Solon), Delphi (under the phratry of the Labyadai), and Keos. In all of these places, restrictions on expenditure are accompanied by other restrictions (e.g. suppressing the shrill lamentations of women in Athens and covering the face of the deceased in Delphi, both of which are evidenced in Keos) which demonstrate a desire to remove the polluting influence of death. Of course, we must remember that Solon was appointed in Athens to resolve the ‘severe crisis of indebtedness’, in which ‘eventually the rich enslave[d] the poor’: Seaford (2004) 93-94, 197. Seaford also states, at 166, that ‘[i]t is no coincidence that Solon, whose legislation [to resolve the crisis] is so prominent in the earliest evidence for money … and who made the first extant statement of the unlimit of money, is also the first to believe that there is a hidden measure (of intelligence) that holds the limits of all things, and to recommend the principle of moderation.’ So, broadly speaking, while it is the principle of monetary unlimit that Solonian legislation aims to address, it is reasonable to locate sumptuary legislation within a context of restricting death’s presence in the polis, given the other limits on funerary practice (as outlined above).

\textsuperscript{86} Such gods being located, above all, in the vicinity of necropoleis. See above.
would make sense to do the same with the sanctuary of a deity who was traditionally found in their vicinity. Strengthening this idea is the fact that Hekate was located at the Sacred Gate, which heralded the beginning of the Sacred Way to Didyma, and not the Lion Gate. It is more than likely that graves would have flanked the Sacred Way close to the Sacred Gate, worship at Hekate’s shrine at the latter being required before passage through the necropolis could take place. The physical and (attendant) conceptual distancing of death would undoubtedly have heightened superstitious fears. Plutarch, for example, speaks of extramural burial being done away with by the Spartan Lycurgus in order to curb the superstitious terror that it caused.\textsuperscript{87} It must also be stressed, however, that Hekate may have protected the dead as well as the living. Graves represent the deceased of a polis, and despite any distancing of the concept of death,\textsuperscript{88} it is implausible to argue that any endearment to loved ones and any desire to keep them protected was lost outright posthumously. Ultimately, any conclusion relating to Hekate and her possible chthonic associations in Miletos must remain conjecture. However, the point of this discussion has been to highlight the fact that the exiguity of the Milesian evidence for Hekate does not allow for a firm conclusion either way. Just as we cannot certainly state that Hekate bore chthonic associations in Miletos, we cannot unconditionally dismiss Nilsson’s argument that Hekate, although a great goddess, was originally and inherently connected with death and the uncanny.

\section*{HEKATE AND SAMOTHRACE}

Mysteries of Hekate took place on the island of Samothrace. Unfortunately, our

\textsuperscript{87} Plut. Lyc. 27.1: ‘πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ ἀνελών δεισδαιμονίαν ἀπασάν ἐν τῇ πόλει θάπτειν τοὺς νεκροὺς, καὶ πλησίον ἐχειν τὰ μνήματα τῶν ἱερῶν σφικτέωσα, συντρόφοις ποιῶν τὰς τοιχώμας δήσει καὶ συνήθεις τοὺς νέους, ὥστε μὴ ταράτησθαι μὴδ’ ὁρμοδεῖν τὸν θάνατον ὥς μαίνοντα τοὺς ἀψιμένους νεκροῖς σώματος ἢ διὰ τάφων διελθόντας.’

\textsuperscript{88} Which would, in turn, require an appropriate representative to keep the respective spaces of the living and the dead separated and demarcated and prevent the polluting influence of the latter on the former.
knowledge of how Hekate may have appeared in this region is scrappy. Moreover, as Kraus reminds us, our information regarding Samothracian Hekate is drawn from later, literary sources; cultic messages are lacking.\textsuperscript{89} The Hellenistic Lycophron mentions Zerynthos, a cave that belongs to a goddess for whom dogs are sacrificed.\textsuperscript{90} He does not mention the goddess’ name. At line 1178, Lycophron makes another reference to the cave of Zerynthos. The context of the passage is Kassandra’s prophecy that her mother, the metamorphosed Hekabe, will be made an attendant by Brimo. In her capacity as a (post-metamorphosis) dog and an attendant, Hekabe will bay by night to terrify those who do not worship with torches the Zerynthian queen of the Strymon, the queen of Pherae.\textsuperscript{91} It is clear that Lycophron is equating Brimo with Hekate (‘\textit{Περσεως δὲ παρθένος}, Βριμώ Τούμοφος’)\textsuperscript{92} and Pheraia.\textsuperscript{93} This equation points to Enodia. Brimo is also equated with Enodia.\textsuperscript{94} As if Lycophron’s references to hellhounds, nocturnal, torch-lit processions and canine sacrifice were not enough, the connection with Enodia

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{89} Kraus (1960) 67.
\item \textsuperscript{90} Lycoph. \textit{Alex.} 77-78: ‘Ζήμυνθον ἄντρον τῆς κυνοσφαγούς θεᾶς, ὕπαιν ἐφυμόν κτίσμα Κυββάντων Σάου’. Lehmann has reservations about the translation of κυνοσφαγούς, stating that whether the word is ‘necessarily related to sacrifices of dogs seems questionable. So far we have no evidence of such sacrifices.’ Kraus (196) 67 n. 326, on the other hand, states that ‘Dieses Epitheton paßt vorzüglich zu Hekate und ihren Hundeopfern sowie ihren späteren mit κύων zusammengesetzten Beinamen’.
\item \textsuperscript{91} Lycoph. \textit{Alex.} 1175-1180.
\item \textsuperscript{92} Lycophr. 1175-1176. (My emphasis).
\item \textsuperscript{93} Wilamowitz (1959) 1\textsuperscript{3}.171; Zeleny (1999) 41. Ap. Rh. also connects Hekate with Brimo at \textit{Argon}. 3.1211. For more on Hekate and Brimo, see Zografou (2010). Schol. Lycophr. 1180 relates a story that Hekate was the daughter of Pheraia and was exposed on the crossroads, before being raised by shepherds: ‘Φεραιαν - Ἐκάτη, ἐκ Φεραίας, τῆς Αἰώλου θυγατρός, κάκ τοῦ Διός ἐτέχθη, καὶ ἐν τριόδοις ἐφορίθη ... Φεραιαν δὲ ὡς ἐν ταις Πέραις τιμωμένην.’ Wilamowitz (1959) 1\textsuperscript{3}.171 claims that ‘Das ist nicht ernst zu nehmen und hat keinesfalls in Pherai gegolten.’
\item \textsuperscript{94} Kraus (1960) 79; Zeleny (1999) 35 n. 225. Enodia was the goddess of Thessalian Pherai. See Miller (1974) 251; Kraus (1960) 77-78, who also states that the cult of the Pheraia (Enodia) was not limited to Pherai, but rather widespread over the whole of Thessaly.
serves to entrench the deeply chthonic overtones of Hekate’s characterization. The scholiast to Lycophron explains the Zerynthian cave mentioned by Lycophron at lines 77-78 as belonging to Rhea or Hekate. Nonnus mentions the youth of Hekate, the torches borne by her ‘mystics’, and refers to the Corybantes in relation to the Zerynthian cave. Elsewhere, Nonnus mentions the Corybantes as well as the Kabeiroi in the same context as Hekate. In his discussion of the Samothracian cult, Strabo includes the remark that some believe the Kouretes were the same as the Corybantes, and were Hekate’s servants. This is significant because, according to Strabo, writers have identified the Samothracian Great Gods with the Corybantes, as well as with the Kouretes and Kabeiroi, despite actually not being able to identify who the Kabeiroi themselves are (other than as the Cyrbantes and Corybantes). Nilsson suggests that these complex interrelationships with Hekate as the common denominator allow for the conclusion that the goddess was the leader of the Samothracian gods. However, this is a venture into unsafe territory; as Bowden states, the identifications discussed by Strabo are of questionable

---

95 And potentially also connections to magic: see the second half of this chapter.

96 Schol. Lycoph. Alex. 77: Ζήρινθον το Θρακικόν οπηλαίον καταλιπὼν τῆς Ῥέας ὁ Δάρδανος, ὡς δὲ τινὲς φασι, τῆς Ἐκατης, καὶ γὰρ Σώφρων ἐν τοῖς μúdoις φησίν αὐτὴ κόνας θύεσθαι.

97 Nonnus, Dion. 13.400-402: ἀντρα Καβείρων, χαίρετε, καὶ σκοπαί Κορυβαντίδες: οὐκέτι λεύσσω μητρφης Ἐκάτης νυχὴν θιασώδεα πεύκην.

98 Nonnus, Dion. 4.184-186: καὶ ζαθέην Ζήρινθον ἄκοιμητων Κορυβάντων κτίσμα φατιζομένης Περσηίδος, ὡς πέθι κούρης μυστιπόλων δαίδων θιασώδεις εἰσιν ἐφίνυναι.

99 Strab. 10.30.20.

100 Strab. 7 fr. 50 (Jones (1924) 3.370-371): Ὄτι τοὺς ἐν τῇ Σαμοθράκῃ τιμωμένους θεοὺς εἰρήκασι πολλοὶ τοὺς αὐτούς τοῖς Καβείροις, οὐδ’ αὐτοῖς ἔχοντες λέγειν τοὺς Καβείρους, οἱ τινὲς εἰναι, καθάπερ τοὺς Κύρπβαντας καὶ Κορύβαντας, ὡς δ’ αὐτοῖς Κοφήτας καὶ Ἰδαιόντας Δακτύλους.

101 Nilsson (1957) 400.
reliability.’

While the nature of any nexus between Hekate and the aforementioned groups is unclear and not elucidated by physical evidence, the literary evidence presents a consistently chthonic depiction of the goddess. The scholiast to Aristophanes describes the Samothracian mysteries as ‘spells against dangers’, alluding once again in the same context as Hekate to the Corybantes, the Zerynthian cave, and mysteries involving canine sacrifice. Moreover, Aristotle, referencing Eudoxus, states that on Mount Berecynthius a stone is produced called ‘The Sword’. Should anyone find this stone while the mysteries of Hekate are being celebrated, that person would be inflicted with madness. This reference could well suggest that Hekate’s mysteries dealt with madness, or the aversion thereof. If we take the latter two pieces of data (Schol. Ar. and Arist.) together with the generally chthonic characterization of Samothracian Hekate in the literature, an interesting picture emerges. It seems that the mysteries may have been related to the (magical?) aversion of danger, specifically madness, by a chthonic deity. Interestingly, the author of the late fifth century B.C. Hippocratic treatise On the Sacred Disease reveals traditional Greek opinion relating to ‘supernatural causality’ of terrors, unreasonable fears and madnesses: such aberrations could be attacks by heroes or by Hekate-Enodia sending forth the servile dead.

However, before we can go forward with these ideas, a few remarks need to be made. First, the settlement history of Samothrace needs to be touched upon. Greek colonists probably arrived about 700 B.C, most likely from northwest

---

102 Bowden (2011) 63.
103 Schol. Ar. Pax 277: ἐν Σαμοθράκη ἦσαν τελεταὶ τινὲς ἀς ἐδόξουν τελείωθαι πρὸς ἀλεξιφάρμακα τινὰ καὶ δυνάμει τὰ τῶν Κορυβάντων ἢν μυστήρια καὶ τὰ τῆς Ἑκάτης καὶ διαβόητον ἢν τὸ Ζήρινθον ἀντρον, ἐνθα τὴν Ἑκάτην ὁργάζειν ἐλέγετο καὶ τελετὰς ἴθους καὶ πόλις ἐθιόν καὶ ὁ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδραν πεποιηκαὶ μέμνηται.
104 Mir. ausc. 173. (Author unknown).
Anatolia and/or Lesbos.\textsuperscript{107} They came across a native group of people, with whom they peacefully blended their civilization.\textsuperscript{108} On account of (an archaeological and linguistic analysis of) the non-Greek, Samothracian language, which was still in use for cultic purposes in the first century B.C., it is assumed that the latest pre-Greek population was Thracian.\textsuperscript{109} The name Zerynthia, as well, is pre-Greek. Accordingly, Kraus is probably correct that different aspects of this native goddess’s nature were expressed by the Greek colonists through \textit{Interpretatio Graeca}.\textsuperscript{110} A corollary of this dual \textit{Interpretatio Graeca} is arguably that the Zerynthian goddess, the age of whose cult is unknown,\textsuperscript{111} possessed both ouranic and chthonic properties.\textsuperscript{112} It would seem, therefore, that Hekate was used to express the dark side of this native goddess.\textsuperscript{113} Significantly, there seems to exist a close cultic relationship between Samothrace and Karia. It is likely that the Karian Hekate was

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{107} Lehmann (1975) 15. Lehmann bases this argument on the close relationship between these areas and Samothrace in terms of legend and archaeology.
\textsuperscript{108} Lehmann (1975) 15; Kraus (1960) 66.
\textsuperscript{110} Kraus (1960) 66-69, 76-77. Aphrodite was also given the epithet Zerynthia: \textit{Etym. Magn.} s.v. \textit{Ζηρυνθία: Ἀφροδίτη ἐν Θρᾴκῃ}. See also Hemberg (1950) 36 for a list of sources (Plin.; Serv.; Aen. Tact.; Nonnus) pertaining to Aphrodite’s presence on Samothrace, although these sources do not specifically mention Aphrodite \textit{Zerynthia}. Hemberg’s identification of the Zerynthian goddess as Aphrodite at ll. 449 and 958 of Lycophron is disputed by Kraus (1960) 67 n. 326. Cf. also Ehrhardt (1985) 41. Hera: Schol. Nic. \textit{Th.} 461-462; Rhea: Schol. Lycophr. 77. Zerynthia must not be confused with the Great Mother, a trap that Hemberg (1950) 83, Kraus (1960) 69 and Ehrhardt (1985) 41 fall into. It is also noteworthy and important that Apollo took the epithet Zerynthios on the Thracian mainland. See Livy 38.41.4: inde Aeniorum finis praeter Apollinis, Zerynthium quem vocant incolae, templum superant. As Kraus (1960) 67 n. 326 states, it would be interesting to know how exactly Apollo came to use the same epithet as Hekate, to which he has many ties of great antiquity. This is particularly intriguing given the previously-mentioned etymological connection between Hekatos and Hekate.
\textsuperscript{111} Kraus (1960) 67.
\textsuperscript{112} Kazarow (1936) 508-509.
\textsuperscript{113} Kraus (1960) 67.
\end{flushright}
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brought to the island amid a slew of Asia Minorian cultic concepts.\footnote{Kraus (1960) 76; Hemberg (1950) 128.}

What exactly were these cultic influences that flowed to the island? Hemberg identifies several, and concludes that Samothrace was a base for those journeying between Thrace and Asia Minor, and that the religious circumstances of the island should be interpreted in light of this fact.\footnote{Hemberg (1950) 128-130. Some of the cultic influences identified by Hemberg: the juxtaposition of an old and a young deity, as we find on Samothrace, is quite certainly from Asia Minor; the unusual appearance and floor plan (with the entrance on the long side) of the Ionic temple and the Anaktoron probably indicates Near Eastern influence; the name Kadmilos is attested on Lesbos and Imbros, and probably bears a Proto-Hattic origin; the name Kadmos, whose wedding to Harmonia on Samothrace is set forth by Diod. Sic. 5.48.2-5.49.6 and Books 3-4 of Nonnus, \textit{Dion}, may well be connected to Mount Kadmos in Karia; the sacrifice of dogs was probably derived from Eastern custom (see also Laumonier (1958) 419-420, who states that dogs were commonly sacrificed to deities other than Hekate in Karia).} Is it possible, then, that Hekate was brought to Samothrace by Asia Minorian, specifically Karian travellers and matched to the chthonic aspects of the Zerynthian goddess because the Karian manifestation of Hekate was inherently chthonic? The problem with advancing this thesis is clear, and has already been mentioned: the late, literary (i.e. non-cultic) and non-Samothracian nature of the tradition relating to Hekate and the mysteries on this island. Not one of our sources dates before the fourth century B.C. Accordingly, it is conceivable that the Samothracian Hekate transmitted to us through these literary sources was described in accordance with the generally sinister characterization of the goddess that had developed in mainland Greece by the end of the fifth century.\footnote{For example, Lycophron’s indirect equation of Hekate and Enodia (see above) seems to draw upon Hekate’s tutelary function and her presence at crossroads. As Johnston (1999) 208 states, it was ‘probably her role as guardian of entrances that led to Hecate’s identification by the mid fifth century with Enodia’, while Burkert (1985) 171 states that ‘Hecate is the goddess of pathways, \textit{Enodia}, especially of cross-roads’. As Kraus (1960) 68 argues, the Zerynthian goddess has nothing to do with the Greek goddess of crossroads and protectress of gates and doors. Moreover, it is clear that Schol. \textit{Ar. Pax} 277 is drawing on Lycophron’s description, given that ‘the author of the}
powerful underworld deities in Samothrace. Invoked as Axiokersos and Axiokersa in the native language, they were identified by the Greeks as Hades and Persephone respectively.\textsuperscript{117} Despite the native appellations, Lehmann states that it is still possible that these two chthonic deities were imported by the original Greek colonists, i.e. the Lesbian or northwest Anatolian colonists. They were absorbed into the worship of the Great Gods by the seventh century B.C.\textsuperscript{118} Such an importation would mean that another pre-Hellenic chthonic deity could easily have been worshipped on the island. Any dark side that may have been possessed by the Zerynthian goddess and equated with Hekate by Karian travellers could well have persisted despite the arrival of two deities specifically connected with rule of the underworld. What is more, Lehmann conjectures that Hekate could be another name for Axiokersa, a possibility that would serve to entrench the former’s chthonic association.\textsuperscript{119} Perhaps, however, the \textit{Interpretatio Graeca} of the couple as Hades and Persephone was more of a given, which required Hekate to be equated with a goddess of more unfamiliar and ambiguous character (Zerynthia). At any rate, the evidence for Samothracian Hekate is far too lacunose to allow for a conclusion that goes beyond conjecture. It is important, however, to remark at the possibility of an inherently chthonic goddess having been brought to the island by Karian travellers.

In Thrace itself, as we have seen, Hekate bore essential similarities to (the thus-developed picture of) Bendis in the sense that both were chthonic. However, this point must remain subsidiary to Samothrace, just as Thrace itself remained subsidiary to Samothrace in terms of the flow of cultic influences: ‘Eine Verbindungslinie scheint von Kleinasien über Samothrake nach Thrakien zu

\textsuperscript{117} For a description of the Samothracian Pantheon see Schol. Laurent. Ap. Rhod. \textit{Argon.} 1.917-918.

\textsuperscript{118} Lehmann (1975) 26-27. Dated to this century is a pit for chthonic sacrifices that was dedicated to the couple.

\textsuperscript{119} Lehmann (1951) 8.
Accordingly, to establish that Karian Hekate was chthonic on the basis of her similarities to Bendis is dangerous for two reasons: first, our image of Bendis is overwhelmingly reliant on non-Thracian sources; second, if Hemberg is correct in his description of the aforementioned ‘Verbindungslinie’, any chthonic manifestation of Hekate in Thrace speaks more to her Samothracian incarnation than her Karian one—although, to be sure, it is unlikely that she could have ever developed such chthonic associations on Samothrace had she not brought them with her from Karia.

HEKATE AND ENODIA: INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

It is necessary, then, to revisit the complex relationship between Hekate and the Thessalian Enodia. The earliest known explicit identification of the two goddesses took place in a fragment of Sophocles (which, as we saw above, cannot be dated to earlier than 455 B.C.). We have seen, however, the story transmitted by Steisochorus, which speaks of Iphigenia’s immortalization by Artemis and her subsequent appellation as Hekate. More or less the same story appears in the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women, but the name Ἀρτεμισίνοδινη is used instead of Hekate. We are justified in assuming that Artemis E(i)nodia refers to Hekate for two reasons: first, the stories are undeniably similar; second, both sources are Archaic, and the Catalogue most likely post-dated Stesichorus.

Arguably, it is safer to rely on these reasons than Pausanias’ comment affirming Ἀρτεμισίνοδινη’s identity as Hekate (although this usefully bolsters our proposition),

---

120 Hemberg (1950) 29-30.

121 Mysteries were also conducted in honour of Hekate on the island of Aegina, but whether or not they can provide information about the carryover of any characteristics from Karia is contentious. This point deserves fuller consideration, but is somewhat peripheral to the matters at hand. Given that a footnote on the subject would be simply too long, a brief discussion of Aegina is appended to the thesis.

122 See Chapter Two, n. 86.
given the much later date of Pausanias’ work.\textsuperscript{123} This is important because, although an explicit identification of Hekate and Enodia is not made in the \textit{Catalogue}, it nonetheless demonstrates that the tradition of Hekate and Enodia having at the very least been associated with one another goes back this far, considerably further back than the aforementioned Sophoclean fragment.

The effect of the connection between Hekate and Enodia is something on which numerous scholars have made comment. Kraus remarks that Hekate can only have taken from Enodia’s character, given that the latter remained impervious to foreign syncretism in her homeland until the Hellenistic period. Crystallizing his argument, Kraus cites Enodia’s influence as the ultimate cause of Hekate’s gloomy, funereal, and nocturnal nature. Moreover, he refers to Thessaly’s reputation as the classical land of sorceresses, and Hekate’s eventual dominion over sorcerers.\textsuperscript{124} Likewise, Larson asserts that Thessaly’s ‘longstanding’ reputation allows for the ‘logical’ conclusion that Hekate’s role as a ‘patron of magical practitioners originated’ with her syncretism with Enodia.\textsuperscript{125} In \textit{Hekate Soteira}, Johnston argues that Polyaenus ‘echoes the pervasive view during antiquity that Thessaly was the home of witches and others versed in the use of drugs [and] indicates that Enodia herself was considered to be patroness of such activities.’\textsuperscript{126} Marquardt asserts that Enodia ‘appeared in Athens in the fifth century carrying with her the strong traditions of Thessalian witchcraft’, while West perpetuates the idea of ‘contamination’ (of Hekate) by the Thessalian goddess on account of the region’s ties to sorcery.\textsuperscript{127} Generally speaking, then, Kraus’ proposal in 1960 has been seminal to the extent that many have adopted the idea that Enodia was the cause of

\textsuperscript{123} Cf. \textit{Cypria} = Procl. summary 55-64; Ant. Lib. 27 = Nic. fr. 58.
\textsuperscript{124} Kraus (1960) 82-83.
\textsuperscript{125} Larson (2007) 166.
\textsuperscript{126} Johnston (1990) 24 n.10.
\textsuperscript{127} Marquardt (1981) 252; West (1995) 228. It is also worthwhile to mention the comments of Farnell (1896) 2.505. In his discussion of Thessaly’s ‘evil reputation’, he makes no mention of Enodia, but instead theorizes that it can be accounted for by reference to the ‘original taint’ of Hekate’s worship which ‘struck deep roots upon this soil.’
the exponential rise in connections between Hekate and witchcraft and sorcery. At this point, keep in mind Kraus’ claim that Enodia ultimately caused Hekate’s gloomy, funereal, and nocturnal nature. In terms of causality, we can see, from the literature, that two ideas are at stake: first, the idea that Thessaly had a ‘longstanding’ connection with witchcraft and sorcery and; second, the idea that, given that Enodia was Thessalian, connections to witchcraft and sorcery must have inhere in the goddess. Accordingly, to prove the assertion that Enodia had the aforementioned effects on Hekate, causation must be demonstrated in one or both of these cases. So, in the first case, if Enodia was a goddess intrinsically and overwhelmingly connected to witchcraft and sorcery, it is clear how identification would have caused such attributes to infiltrate Hekate; alternatively, if Enodia possessed such attributes but they were not ultimately dominant enough to affect the character of Hekate, we must turn to the reputation of Thessaly in general in order to prove causation.

THE THESSALIAN EVIDENCE FOR ENODIA

Let us start with the construction of the character of Enodia based on Thessalian evidence, in order to ascertain, to the greatest extent possible, whether such connections to witchcraft and sorcery really did inhere in Enodia. The first shrine that may well have been dedicated to Enodia at Pherai was located immediately to the north of a sizeable Proto-Geometric and Geometric cemetery. This burial plot

128 The problem with this approach is that if Enodia bore such strong connections to these magical spheres, and Hekate was associated with her, would we not expect that such an association was made on the basis of both goddesses being intrinsically similar in this respect? If that were indeed the case, then the syncretism with Enodia was not the cause of Hekate’s dominion over magical practitioners, but rather the result of Hekate bearing an intrinsic, essential connection to magic.

129 As Morgan (2003) 135 states, ‘there is no direct evidence for the deity worshipped during this early period, [but] there is also nothing to indicate a later change in cult and so at least as strong a case for Enodia as Zeus Thaulios’. See also Kraus (1960) 82 and nn. 405-408, who cites doubts that the inhabitant of the (later) temple was male.
had only just gone out of use, and was situated close to the road to Larissa. If this shrine, the foundation of which probably took place by the latter part of the eighth century at the latest, was indeed dedicated to Enodia, its location in the vicinity of graves speaks strongly of early, and therefore entrenched, chthonic characteristics. A total of 3,739 items, most of which are Late Geometric or early Archaic (seventh century) in date, have been linked to the shrine with some certainty. Female terracottas seem to have gained currency at the shrine from the seventh century onwards. A large number (nearly half of the extant votive objects) of fibulae at the shrine may indicate a connection between the goddess and funerary imagery. As Morgan asserts, comparison with burial artefacts from the contemporary graves at Pherai ‘reinforces symbolic links between the two contexts and thus the character of Enodia’, although development of this thesis is stunted by insufficient comparative sanctuary evidence. Figurines of dogs, horses and potentially also bulls and snakes are typical of the types of species we would normally associate with chthonic deities. A Doric temple was constructed on the same site in the late sixth century. Its Hellenistic successor was constructed in the fourth century. In addition to its aforementioned proximity to graves, the temple was located close to the gates of Pherai. As Kraus states, such a location would, prima facie, seem to attach well to a goddess of the road, particularly one whose very name means ‘In-the-Road’. Miller speculates further, suggesting that Enodia may have been so especially

130 On the temporal gap between the use of the cemetery and the institution of the cult, see Morgan (2003) 138, who states that it ‘may have been as little as fifty years (i.e. within the ancestral memory of the living community), and this could be closed further’.

131 Morgan (2003) 138. ‘[T]he paucity of pre-eight-century votives at the shrine is a powerful argument against any early institution of cult.’ For more on the dating of the shrine, see Morgan (2003) 92, 136-138; Graninger (2009).


134 Ibid.

135 Kraus (1960) 82.

revered at Pherai because of its pivotal location at a crossroads and the strategic importance of controlling the route from Thessaly’s only usable harbour at the Gulf of Pagasae to the city and beyond.\(^\text{137}\)

Fifth century Larissan epigraphic evidence furthers this proposition. One inscription is found on a statue base from Larissa, which also contained a hole with an iron key inside. The inscription asks Enodia for assistance with a child. The small size of the statue base and the inscription together suggest a domestic setting, while the presence of the key suggests an original location for the statue near something that was able to be literally or figuratively unlocked.\(^\text{138}\) The curious epithet Wastika implies that Enodia was a ‘civic tutelary deity’ associated with urban, rather than rural, centres.\(^\text{139}\) The second dedication was also found on a statue base. It, too, mentions a child, and was found in the ruins of a house.\(^\text{140}\) We cannot be certain, but it is likely the statue served a similarly protective function. The epithet Stathmia seems to imply a (physical and conceptual) link between the goddess and an obstacle or station of some kind pertaining to a threshold.\(^\text{141}\) The third inscription bolsters these claims, as it invokes Enodia as an Averter: a figure that has the power to avert would naturally be associated with the threshold across which potential danger could pass.\(^\text{142}\) The inclusion of the epithet Patroa in the fourth Larissan inscription demonstrates that Enodia was an ancestral goddess.\(^\text{143}\)

\(^{137}\) Miller (1974) 252.


\(^{141}\) Wilamowitz (1959) 1.170.

\(^{142}\) IG IX.2 576: Ἐννοδία Αλεξειατίς.

\(^{143}\) Ἐννοδία: Στρογκά | Παττόρας: ὅνεθεκε | Κρατέτας: Μαλάναιος. SEG 54:561; SEG 49:622. A fifth Larissan inscription, IG IX.2 578 is discussed by both Kraus (1960) 79 n. 391 and Wilamowitz (1959) 1.171. It dates to c. 145 B.C. The cultic connection of Zeus Meilichios and Enodia in the inscription demonstrates that the chthonic associations of Thessalian Enodia were entrenched and enduring.
The first phase of a shrine from Melitaia lies within close proximity of the city walls. Dated to the late fifth century, it is identified by a dedicatory inscription and has a cult building similar to an oikos.\textsuperscript{144}

The evidence of Enodia up until the end of the fifth century paints an image of a goddess strikingly similar to Hekate. The proximity of the earliest shrine that was probably dedicated to Enodia to both a cemetery and the Pheraian city gates is indicative of a deity closely connected to both the living and the dead, and yet occupying a space that belongs to neither. Allowing for the spaces that belonged to both groups to be demarcated, the liminal space Enodia arguably occupied was itself a type of ‘permanent chaos’.\textsuperscript{145} The artefacts that can probably be linked to this shrine reinforce the goddess’ chthonic connections. The evidence from Larissa and Melitaia strengthens Enodia’s association with thresholds and the protection thereof. As a corollary, her association with whatever is averted is naturally strengthened—that is, her chthonic associations. Moreover, her association with urban areas is explicitly testified, as are her kourotrophic functions. Whether she was invoked to watch over conception and birth or rather to protect a young child is a matter that we need not dwell upon.\textsuperscript{146} Therefore, while a greater range of data would allow for a firmer conclusion, the most we can say is that the goddess was probably a chthonic, liminal deity with connections to women and children. Chthonic functions are a discrete set of capabilities that are not necessarily linked to witchcraft and sorcery.

\textsuperscript{144} Morgan (2003) 139-140. For the inscription, see Dakoronia (2001) 403-409. Morgan also mentions the hypothetical presence of Enodia at Pharsalos and Atrax. Given the ‘similarity of shrine circumstances’ between these two localities (vis-à-vis their respective cemeteries) and the aforementioned shrine at Pherai, the hypothesis is plausible and attractive, but given the highly inconclusive state of evidence (in comparison to that which has already been canvassed in relation to Enodia), must unfortunately remain peripheral in the current discussion. See Morgan (2003) 139-140 and nn. 156, 159.


\textsuperscript{146} Johnston (1999) 214: ‘The difference is probably insignificant, … for like Hecate, a goddess who helps with one usually helps with the other.’
HEKATE, ENODIA AND AÔRAI

We can now turn to a closer examination of the nature of the identification between Hekate and Enodia. From the evidence canvassed in relation to Enodia, we can see that both deities shared liminal functions in relation to space and women. It was this particular combination that led to a close nexus between both goddesses and aôrai, untimely dead women, such as ‘childless mothers’ and ‘blighted virgins’. Johnston deals extensively with the question of how this combination brought about such an asosciation, but it will help to recapitulate her main points. First, let us momentarily return to entrances. While it is highly likely that Hekate was originally a chthonic goddess, guardianship of a threshold brings with it another tier of chthonic functions and, accordingly, associations. As we have seen, the guardian is tasked with aversion of nuisance. The nuisance is the malevolent spirits and demons that were imagined to gather at such thresholds. A deity who was entreated to

147 The earliest connection between Hekate and entrances is arguably sourced from the Homeric Hymn to Demeter, where, implicitly speaking, a fairly strong association between the goddess and the threshold between the under- and upper-world is demonstrated. The earliest evidence of a clear, ritual association with guardianship of physical barriers is closer to the mid fifth century. Aeschylus’ fragment, mentioned in Chapter Two, uses the epithet δέσποινα to describe Hekate as a guardian of palaces. (Johnston (1999) 208. See also Chapter Two, n. 180. Interestingly, Hesychius tells us that δέσποινα was also a Thessalian term that simply meant γυνή. We have seen that the term has eastern connotations as well; which, if either, of these deeper textual meanings is conveyed by Aeschylus is hard to say.) We know that Hekate was present at the Milesian city gates by the mid fifth century. In Selinus, a precinct, probably dedicated to Hekate, was found adjacent to the propylon, the only entrance to Demeter Malorphos’ sanctuary, itself outside city limits (IG XIV 270: [Ἀναξία]ήλις ὁ Ἑνόνος / [ἀρξά]ίς Ἑλλῆς τῷ κενατῷ / ἡλιακὸς. See Miles (1998); Johnston (1999) 207; Graf (1985) 258). The clear implication is that Hekate was worshipped at this entrance. The capital bearing the dedication is usually dated to c. 450 B.C.: Miles (1998) 44 n. 27. Miles cites Gabrici’s idea that the precinct of Hekate may have already existed when the propylon was built.


150 As discussed in the first half of this chapter.
3: A DECONSTRUCTION OF HEKATE’S MILESIAN PRESENCE AND A REAPPRAISAL OF HER CONNECTION TO ENODIA

protect from such phenomena naturally becomes more associated with the thing he or she is asked to repel. The association with entrances, which was probably imported from Miletos,\textsuperscript{151} was relevant in a climate of increasing concern with the demarcation of spatial areas and distancing of the dead. The polis was sharply distinguished, ‘symbolically and physically’ from extramural space; the ‘integrity of the oikos’ was segregated from space outside the oikos, as Hekate’s Aeschylean placement at palaces and eventual presence (in the form of hekataia) at the doors of households demonstrates.\textsuperscript{152} These spatial considerations, which go hand in hand with the removal of death’s encroachment on polis life (and heightened belief in the permeability of the threshold between living and dead), meant that Hekate was endowed with significant capabilities.

These capabilities, however, were not enough to distinguish her from Hermes. It seems most likely that a combination of Hekate’s role as entrance guardian and her connection to women’s transitions brought her into particularly close contact with āōrai, as Johnston has proposed. This nexus was rendered particularly intimate given that Hekate had been mythically subordinated to Artemis, as we have seen. Once a goddess who oversaw or blighted the female transition, she had now become, as Stesichorus and the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women tell us, the result of such a blighted transition. Accordingly, the goddess held sway over not just the dead, but such formidable, ghostly creatures—āōrai—as gelloudes, lamiai, mormones, mormolukai, and striges.\textsuperscript{153} They were reputed to murder babies and women on the cusp of motherhood.\textsuperscript{154} Indeed, Gello, Lamia, and

\textsuperscript{151} See the discussion of Aesch. fr. 388 in Chapter Two.

\textsuperscript{152} Johnston (1999) 210; Ar. Vesp. 804 (see Chapter Two).

\textsuperscript{153} Such names are actually adjectives. Lamiai are ‘devourers’ (the name derives from λαίμος, ‘neck’ or ‘throat’; mormones are ‘fearsome ones’. For Mormo as the epitome of fear or mormō as a synonym for phobos, see Ar. Eq. 693; Xen. Hell. 4.4.17; Schol. Ar. Ach. 582; Schol. Ar. Pax. 474. The derivation of gellō is unclear; Johnston (1999) 174 submits that it, too, is probably adjectival.

\textsuperscript{154} Being on the ‘cusp of motherhood’ includes the category of virgins who died before they became married. Ultimately, the failure to fulfill the expectations imposed on a woman meant the
Mormo all failed to fulfill their obligations as women in ancient Greek society: Gello died before she could wed, Lamia’s children died as infants, and Mormo, a type of lamia, ate her own offspring. Accordingly, the extent of their transgression is illustrated by the reprehensible and culturally distant beings (as killers of babies and reproductive women) that they became postmortem. (We shall return to this idea of cultural distance soon). To phrase it differently: failure to become a stereotypically successful mother is ‘tantamount to murder’ and ‘virtually an attack against the most important structure by which human culture organized itself: the family.’

Details from the literature in which Hekate and Enodia are first associated and identified flesh out these ideas. Given that the first association between Hekate and Enodia in the Catalogue is made in the very context of mythic subordination, we may justifiably assume that the Greeks perceived their functions as being fundamentally alike in relation to untimely dead females (and the control thereof), functions that stemmed from a connection to entrances and women’s transitions. Although tarnished with the witchcraft and sorcery apparently lacking from the Catalogue’s depiction, Rhizotomoi also gives us hints of the fundamental connection between the two. First Sophocles uses the word τρίοδος, which is significant. Plutarch has Epaminondas state that statues of Hekate were placed at

---

155 Gello: Zen. Prov. 3.3 = Sapph. fr. 178 (Campbell (1982)). Heyschius also reports that Gello died unmarried; Lamia: Diod. Sic. 20.4.3-5; Duris (FGrH 76 fr. 17) = Phot. and Suda, s.v. Lamia; Schol. Ar. Pax 758; cf. Apostol. (Leutsch and Schneiderin (1839-1851) 2.497-98); Schol. Aristid. (see Johnston (1999 183 n. 60) and Hor. Ars P. 340; Mormo: Schol. Aristid. (ibid). Striges were not derived from a particular mythic character; rather, they seemed to be ghosts connected with similarly infanticidal activities. See Johnston (1999) 166 n. 6; 167 n. 15.

the τρίοδος in front of city gates—that is, an ‘entranceway that intersects a tangent road.’ This fits well with Hekate’s association with entrances, and particularly the Hekate-at-the-Gates transmitted to us by the Molpoi inscription. Moreover, this aligns seamlessly with the Thessalian evidence for Enodia. Second, the fact that the two are invoked by the (all-female) root-cutters of Medea, who was, by this point, mythically infamous for the murder of her own children, is not coincidental. Third, the snakes that fall upon Hekate’s shoulders in *Rhizotomoi* imbue the goddess with an appearance approaching that of the post-Aeschylean

---

157 Plut. *Regum*. 193f.: ἐνταῦθα δὲι οὐ τρόπαιοι ἐλλὰ Ἐκάταιον [the manuscript uses the later form Ἐκατήριῳν] ἐστάναι τὴν γὰρ Ἐκάτην ἔπεικὼς ἐν ταῖς πρὸ τῶν πυλῶν ἰδρύοντο τριόδοις. Faraone (1992) 16 n. 51. Faraone suggests that this may be ‘the source of the assimilation or confusion over the hekataia ‘at the triodoi’ vis-à-vis those before the door.’ Moreover, ‘the Propylaia itself was a triodos, which probably suggested to Alkamenes the shape of the triformed statue and created (or added to) the confusion between Hekate’s roles at the doorway and the crossroads.

158 Which is significant given that, as has been argued, the function in relation to entrances was probably imported from Miletos.

159 Ogden (2002) 82-83.

160 Our earliest extant reference to Medea’s infanticide is in Euripides’ *Medea* of 431 B.C. For over a century, scholars have disputed whether this particular Medea was a product of a single mind—that is, Euripides—or, rather, that the tragedian inherited the idea and developed it idiosyncratically. More recently, scholars have argued that Neophron set the precedent for the infanticidal Medea. Drawing on these arguments, Johnston (1997) dismisses the need to attribute this figure to one particular classical author; rather, she states that this Medea ‘evolved out of one variant of the original myth.’ That is, Hera originally caused the death of Medea’s children, which, in turn, would cause the latter to become a sort of homicidal aôre. Finally, myth would have shifted Medea to the position of infanticidal mother. Pursuant to this logic, any classical author could have drawn on this mythical paradigm of Medea. What I am suggesting is that Sophocles was aware of Medea’s status as aôre and associated her with Hekate-Enodia because ‘[c]reatures such as these [including Mormo and Lamia, with whom Medea can be equated: see Johnston (1997) 64] would have been foremost amongst those whom Hecate was expected to avert in order to protect the health of babies and women and ensure the continuation of the family as a whole.’ See Johnston (1999) 215.
Erinyes, whose snaky hair was their ‘most salient physical characteristic’. The visual allusion to the Erinyes, with their well-known, macabre connections to the transition to motherhood and the mother-child relationship, arguably has important ramifications for the basis on which the Hekate-Enodia identification is being made.

There are three important points to discuss in relation to a connection to ᾠραι. First, we may return to Kraus’ claim that Enodia ultimately caused Hekate’s gloomy, funereal, and nocturnal nature. If Hekate was connected to a band of restless, dangerous, female souls, we can understand how such a connection could give rise to the grim characteristics mentioned by Kraus (as having been derived from Enodia). However, as Johnston has argued, Hekate’s earlier relationship with restless souls would have been built on a foundation of aversion, and so, despite having dominion over a rather terrifying bunch of creatures, she could and would easily retain beneficent characteristics. However, when a connection to witchcraft and sorcery was thrown into the mix—that is, unconscious or conscious harm done to others—it is easy to see how gloomy, funereal, and nocturnal characteristics could materialize so quickly. For the goddess in charge of the dreaded ᾠραι now seemed capable of, and indeed likely to lead her minions on against people in a vengeful, baleful manner. It becomes clear, then, how Kraus’ argument is fallacious in this respect: it need not have been the character of Enodia that catalyzed Hekate’s characterization as gloomy, funereal, and nocturnal. The injection of any associations with harm and/or malevolence, in this case witchcraft and sorcery,

---

161 Brown (1991) 47-48 (see Chapter Two, n. 187). Their repulsive, unconventional appearance following their Aeschylean stage debut in 458 B.C. undoubtedly served as a marginalization device. Given the rough contemporaneity of this Aeschylean debut and Sophocles’ Rhizotomoi, the allusion to the Erinyes would probably have been easily recognized. My use of the word ‘approaches’ in this sentence is important; her appearance could not entirely mimic that of the Erinyes (‘snakey-haired, pustulant, snaggle-toothed monsters’) because Greek divinities were not depicted as wholly ‘physically repulsive or grossly deformed’ until much later in antiquity. See Johnston (1999) 250-251.

162 For a detailed analysis of the Erinyes, see Johnston (1999) 250-287.

flipped the way she interacted with her *aōrai* on its head. Clearly, this still leaves the question as to the acquisition of witchlike and sorcerous functions open.

The second point pertains to cultural distance, which was briefly alluded to earlier. *Aōrai* were depicted in ways that stressed their conceptual foreignness and situated them outside the sphere of Greek normality. This was achieved by either equating ‘cultural distance’ with ‘spatial distance’ or by associating such anomalous women with ‘hermaphroditism, theriomorphism, ugliness [and] filth’. Any goddess who could control such beings, regardless of whether she averted them or drove them on, would be bound to absorb this conceptual foreignness. The ‘cultural distance’ of Hekate’s associations were arguably linked with the ‘spatial distance’ of Enodia. As we will see, Thessaly was certainly more marginalized during the fifth century; even before any shift in Greek attitude towards the region, however, it was, like Thrace, always on the geographical periphery of Greek civilization, which fits Gordon’s equation of spatial and cultural distance. In support of the idea of marginalization is the fact that this was an entirely unilateral identification; in no Thessalian inscriptions is Enodia’s name connected with Hekate. Even on late

---

164 I am indebted to Gordon (1987) 71 for these terms pertaining to distance. See Johnston (1999) 176-183 for details on how *aōrai* were depicted. In terms of spatial distance, Lamia is called the daughter of Belus (Schol. Ar. *Pax* 758), which probably reflects a desire to situate her outside of Greek society; she is also said to have been of Libyan origin. Lamashtu is labelled a ‘foreigner’, while Egyptian spirits who kill children are believed to be of Asian descent. For detailed references, see Johnston (1999) 182-183 nn. 60-62.

165 At this point, it is important to address the fact that Hekate herself had a spatially distant provenance, since she was Karian. Why not simply account for her conceptually foreign functions by emphasizing her origins? Association and eventual identification, however, proved doubly effective in this instance: Hekate was very much *like* a Thessalian goddess, but not necessarily herself Thessalian. The fact that she was aligned with a deity from this particular region nevertheless allowed her to be marginalized to the periphery of the Greek world.


167 Kraus (1960) 78.
Hellenistic Thessalian dedications to Enodia, there is no trace of Hekate’s name.\textsuperscript{168} Indeed, the evidence for Hekate in Thessaly is exiguous at best, consisting of rather scattered \textit{hekataia}.\textsuperscript{169} Attempting to account for Enodia’s lack of identification with Hekate in Thessaly at a time when Greek deities of all regions were being syncretized with one another, Kraus argues that Enodia was ‘strong enough’ to resist influences from elsewhere. More rigorous than this model is the one that I have proposed, that draws on a Greek desire to situate Hekate at the periphery of Greek civilization.\textsuperscript{170} Note also the testimony of Hesychius, who describes Pheraia (and therefore Enodia) as a ‘foreign’ or ‘strange’ divinity at Athens,\textsuperscript{171} while Graninger asserts that it is likely the Athenians maintained a Pheraian provenance for the deity\textsuperscript{172}—therefore a Thessalian, and marginalized provenance.

The third, final and most important point (for present purposes) pertains to magic. Did some kind of connection between the two goddesses and magic inhere before both were thoroughly immersed in it by Sophocles? As Johnston states, ‘[w]hen we find a dangerous force being averted, we often find it being appeased in some way, as well; frequently, the aversion occurs on the level of what often is called magic (e.g., by means of erecting \textit{apotropaia} … ) and the complementary appeasement on the level of more formal, cultic religion.’\textsuperscript{173} The ritual precedent set by Milesian Hekate constituted the singing of an apotropaic paean during the placement of \textit{γύλλοι}, which were probably also protective on account of their connection with the paean.\textsuperscript{174} This, of course, took place at Hekate’s apotropaic statue, situated at the \textit{τρίοδος} at the Milesian Sacred Gate. The term ‘dangerous

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{168} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{169} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{170} As we shall see below, fifth century Thessaly was marginalized and (therefore) introverted by, principally, the Athenians, on account of treachery during Xerxes’ invasion. Its reputation came to be besmirched by tales of social and religious deviance.
\item \textsuperscript{171} Hsch. \textit{s.v. Φεραίας: Αθήνης ξένως θεός} (Alberti and Schmidt (1965) 4.236).
\item \textsuperscript{172} Graninger (2009) 117.
\item \textsuperscript{173} Johnston (1997) 60.
\item \textsuperscript{174} Faraone (1992) 6, 73 n. 102.
\end{itemize}
force’ encapsulates both the dead, against whom the goddess probably protected the Milesian citizenry, and the more specifically gendered aōrai in mainland Greece. Significantly, the aōrai are frequently mentioned in post-Classical Graeco-Roman magical texts. More relevant, from a chronological (i.e. fifth century or earlier) perspective, is allusive information from Archaic and Classical texts on the magical methods used against such creatures. The references demonstrate both the visceral extent of fear of these demons, and that recourse to magic was the most effective way to avert them. Significantly, the texts describe the use of plants, drugs, and incantations to ward off potential assaults on both infants and parturient women. The fact that root-cutting for the purposes of magical aversion of demonic attacks on infants is referenced as early as the Homeric Hymn to Demeter has a major implication: the Hekate-Enodia association in the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women (in the context of Iphigenia, the quintessential transitional victim, ‘becoming’ Artemis-Enodia or Hekate) and identification in Rhizotomoi (the very title of which means ‘Root-Cutters’) is also probably shown to be made on the basis of their perceived similarities in relation to the magical aversion of aōrai. So, both were probably perceived as bearing some connection to magic. This, however,


176 See Johnston (1995) 382-383. For convenience, I will briefly paraphrase her findings, with reference to Richardson (1974) 220-231. In the Hom. Hymn Dem., the language used at lines 227-230 resembles that of magical incantations through repetition and chiasmus, which suggests that Demeter may have used chanted spells as well. Demeter describes how she will be able to fend off demonic attacks of pain and fever suffered by children (ἐπηλυσίη πολυπήμων; Richardson (1974) 229 compares these attacks to the ἔφοδοι of Hekate and the Erinyes) as well a more specific force (ὑποτραμύνων, ὑλοτόμον: ‘undercutter’ or ‘plant-cutter’) from the infant Demophon. Aversion will be achieved through use of a superior plant (ἀντίτομον: ‘counter-cut’, therefore ‘counter-root’ or ‘counterplant’, i.e. antidote). Demeter also mentions a general method of aversion (‘ἐσθλὸν ἐφοδομάν’), which Johnston argues is a plant relevant to parturient women. The root-cutting for the purposes of magic in these lines is the very act on which the title of Sophocles’ Rhizotomoi is predicated. Socrates describes the ‘drugs’ and ‘incantations’ (φαρμάκια and ἐπαίδευσαι) used by midwives to abate or increase pain or aid or inhibit birth (Pl. Tht. 149 c-d), while in Pl. Phd. (77e) he states that charms can be sung to avert a child’s fear of mormolukeia. (ἀλλὰ χοή, ἡφι ὁ Σωκράτης, ἐπάδειν αὐτῷ ἐκάστης ἐμέρας ἠς ἄν ἐξεπάσητε).
brings us to a stalemate: if both were equally connected to magic given their association with aōrai, neither could have contributed ‘more’ magic to the other. Having found nothing to support the suggestion that the intrinsic character of Enodia could have contributed to Hekate’s role as patroness of magical practitioners, we must turn to a deconstruction of Thessalian reputation and its role in the same.

THE THESSALIAN REPUTATION FOR BLACK MAGIC

The first surviving mention of a Thessalian reputation for witchcraft and sorcery is found in the Athenian Nubes of 423 B.C., where the powers of a Thessalian witch to draw down the moon are mentioned. The scholiast on Aristophanes’ play elucidates, stating that Thessalian men are ‘slandered’ as being ‘magicians’, while Thessalian women are called ‘sorceresses’. The use of διαβάλλονται is significant, because it implies that a misrepresentation has taken place. Interestingly, an alternative explanation in one of the manuscripts states that φαρμακίδες are called Θετταλῆς. As Phillips notes, this inversion is the first in a trend towards the adjective ‘Thessalian’ losing its ‘geographical determination’ and acquiring the ‘more general sense of ‘magical’’. The next description also appeared in an Athenian source—in Plato’s Gorgias of c. 380 B.C, where the same ability to draw down the moon is mentioned. Later in the fourth century, a fragment of the Syracusan Sosiphanes’ Meleager states that this ability was a

---

177 Ar. Nub. 749-752. This reputation clung steadfastly to Thessaly right down to the time of Apuleius and the Golden Ass (second century AD): see Hornblower (2011) 101.


179 Ibid.


181 Pl. Grg. 513a.
fraud.\textsuperscript{182} It is clear, then, that the reputation had gained sufficient currency to be recognizable to an Athenian audience by the time of the production of \textit{Nubes} in 423 B.C.\textsuperscript{183} This, however, was several decades \textit{after} the first identification of Hekate and Enodia by Sophocles. Given this date, how can the Thessalian reputation for witchcraft and sorcery have affected Hekate? Might we be able to propose a new chronological and historical framework in which such a Thessalian influence on Hekate could have taken place?

\textbf{MAGIC AND THE ‘OTHER’: THE THEORY OF PERSIAN ORIGIN AND THESSALIAN MEDISM}

In his discussion of foreign cult and magic, Gordon focusses on the theory of a Persian origin for magic. He argues that magic, ‘despite its evident incoherence as a category, could be represented as a single entity by showing that it had only one origin.’ Elaborating, he states that:

\begin{quote}
[T]he theory of Persian origin … offered an ‘empirical’ pattern for an activity otherwise necessarily shrouded in mystery. In practice, this meant that an incoherent jumble of motifs, sacrifices to Hekate, drawing down the moon, herbalism, incantation, ritual magic, necromancy, various sorts of divination and much else could be loosely amalgamated into a variable collective representation of ‘foreign’ and therefore illicit practices.\textsuperscript{184}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{182} Snell and Nauck (1964) 819 = Schol. Ap. Rhod. 3.533b: μάγοις ἐπιδοταὶς πάσα Ἐθσαλίς κόρη ψευδὴς σελήνης αἰθέρος καταβάταις. According to a scholiast on the Suda (863), Sosiphanes’ \textit{floruit} took place in the third quarter of the fourth century (he died in either c. 336/3 or 324/1). The other (Greek) mentions of Thessalian sorcery are third century or much later. See Ap. Rhod. 4.47-65; Plin. \textit{HN} 30.6; Plut. \textit{De def. or.} 417a; Plut. \textit{Coniug. praecept.} 48, \textit{De Pyth. or.} 400b. Polyaenus, \textit{Strat.} 8.43. Cf. West (1995) 243.

\textsuperscript{183} Likewise, the lack of any connection by Homer between the Thessalians and divination means that such a reputation cannot have existed in his day. See Gordon (1987) 74-75.

\textsuperscript{184} Gordon (1987) 77-78.
How, then, are we to account for the attribution of witchcraft and sorcery, particularly drawing down the moon, to Thessaly? It is plausible that Thessaly was tarred with the same ‘otherness’ as Persia, Greece’s arch-enemy. In Herodotos, we find a list of the Greek states who had ‘offered earth and water to the [Persian] king prior to the start of 480’.\(^{185}\) For Thessaly, this act of medism had occurred in 485 B.C., at which point it probably seemed rational to the rulers of Thessaly as a whole to submit to a foreign power rather than the ‘dictates of fellow Greeks’.\(^{186}\) The Aleuadae, whom Herodotus labels the ‘kings of Thessaly’, were more enthusiastic about medizing in this first instance than the majority of Thessalian rulers, who nonetheless eventually submitted, recognizing the necessity of ‘making a politic gesture’.\(^{187}\) Also in Herodotus is a description of the Thessalian expedition of 480 B.C.\(^{188}\) Facing imminent invasion by Xerxes, Thessalian envoys negotiated with Greek loyalists for military help, which, crucially, ended up being ‘the greatest effort of the war’.\(^{189}\) Unusually, the loyalists withdrew and disbanded after a matter of days, perhaps some six weeks before Xerxes’ army approached the Thessalian mountains.\(^{190}\) Following the withdrawal, the Thessalians sided with the Persians ‘wholeheartedly and unequivocally’, according to Herodotos.\(^{191}\) Medism probably

\(^{185}\) Hdt 7.132. See Keaveney (1995) 33 n. 20.

\(^{186}\) Keaveney (1995) 35.

\(^{187}\) Ibid. Keaveney argues that this is the ‘compulsion of which Herodotus speaks in 7.172’.

\(^{188}\) Hdt. 7.172-174. For more sources, and a helpful discussion thereof, see Robertson (1976) 100-102.

\(^{189}\) Robertson (1976) 120: ‘To check the Persians at the northern limit of Greece was sound strategy but required a huge effort of planning and co-operation. In fact it was the greatest effort of the war; for in the Plataea campaign the various contingents gathered on short notice and served close to home. The unexpected failure of the Thessalian expedition explains why the subsequent operations of 480 were inadequate or irresolute; the allies had been demoralised.’ Cf. also Westlake (1936).

\(^{190}\) Robertson (1976) 117, bearing in mind Robertson’s caveat that ‘[a]ny estimate of time elapsed must be very rough’.

\(^{191}\) Hdt 7.174. Translated words taken from Godley (1920).
lay behind the withdrawal of the Greek loyalists, as well. The Aleuads, hereditary rulers of Larissa (not to be confused with the federal Thessalian authority, which arguably co-operated with the loyalists to the fullest and did not medise) were ‘active and dangerous medisers’. An act of collusion between Alexander of Macedon and the Aleuads of Larisa, who were allies, probably caused the withdrawal. Alexander, himself a mediser, instigated the treachery of the Aleuads and revealed it to the loyalists in pursuit of mutual gain: both wanted the Greeks out for different reasons. Herodotos claims that the Aleuad dynasty medised early on in the piece; this claim is not necessarily true and may have been coloured by subsequent passion. As Robertson claims, it is entirely possible that their medism did not take place until Xerxes and his army approached.

Although this medism grew from being practiced by a localized, fractious sect to becoming a widespread Thessalian policy following the loyalists’ withdrawal, a number of passages in Herodotos’s narrative indicate the (non-Aleuad) Thessalians were never sincere in their anti-Persian sentiment. What is

---

192 Robertson (1976) 108. While the Aleuads were a ‘fractious local sept [sic] who could not influence the [anti-Persian] undertakings of the federal [Thessalian] government and the rest of the Greeks’, (Robertson (1976) 119), they were also the wealthiest and most powerful Thessalian settlement’ (Stamatopoulou (2007) 310). Accordingly, any stance taken by them, while not enough to influence federal government, would nonetheless have political implications for the rest of Thessaly.

193 It is unnecessary to go into excessive detail on this point. For full discussion, see Robertson (1976) 118-119. The treachery of the Aleuads exposed a significant weakness in the Greeks’ line of defence. If the loyalists could not trust the natives in this particular geographic spot, their army would be crucially vulnerable to the Persians in its line of supply and retreat.

194 At 7.6.2, Herodotos claims that an embassy sent by the Aleuads compelled the newly-crowned Xerxes to invade Greece. Robertson (1976) 108 argues that this episode is not trustworthy and ‘belongs to a portion of the drama which is more than suspect.’


196 Hdt 7.191.1; 9.89.2 (Persians distrusted the Thessalian popular feeling); 7.232, 7.182 (Greek loyalists could enter Thessaly even during Persian occupation); 9.67 (Thessalians were disobedient at Plataea, like the loyalists). Keaveney (1995) 35-37 argues that the Thessalians would ‘willingly fight for Greece but only if other Greeks came to their aid.’ Eventually, ‘when they saw
important for present discussion, however, is how the entire episode was perceived by the Greeks, and how this perception would have coloured subsequent opinions of the Thessalians. The remarks of Stamatopoulou are helpful. She argues that the Thessaly of the sixth century was not as marginalized from the wider Greek world as one is led to believe. In the fifth century, however, the Thessalians were ‘rather more inwardly orientated’. Picking up on this thought, Hornblower suggests that such introversion could have been the result of ‘memories of Thessalian medism’, despite (or, indeed, because of) the fact that Athens and Thessaly were in a nominal alliance during the Periclean period. At this stage, it is necessary to address a point made by Keaveney. He states that ‘if we speak of the medising of Thessaly we should not speak of it as if it were unique’, and cites a failure to appreciate this as the vitiator of Brunt’s approach. However, as we saw above, the Thessalian medism of 480 B.C.—their second instance of Persian allegiance in five years—occurred after the allies had expended the biggest effort of the second Persian invasion in order to guard the northern Greek threshold. What is more, they withdrew after only a few days, their considerable efforts having been rendered entirely in vain and their spirits demoralised. It is this crucial element that sets the

---

197 Stamatopoulou (2007).
198 Hornblower (2011) 338 n. 21. On the alliance, see Thuc. 1.102.4; 2.22.2-3; 4.78.2-3. As Westlake (1936) 24 states, ‘the Athenians had little joy of their alliance.’ See, for example, the desertion of the Thessalian cavalry, who joined the Spartans at Tanagra in 457 (Thuc. 1.107.7; Diod. Sic. 11.80.1-6; Paus. 1.29.9); the failure of an expedition to Pharsalus (Thuc. 1.111.1; Diod. Sic. 11.83.3-4); the defeat of Thessalian cavalry in another skirmish at Phrygii and their apparent return home without bothering to furnish further assistance (Thuc. 2.22.2-3). Accordingly, it was ‘only for brief moments during the lifetime of Herodotus that the Athenians could feel any debt of gratitude to the Thessalians,’ like when they contributed to the Athenian victory at Oinophyta.
medising of Thessaly apart from that of other regions.\textsuperscript{200}

The earliest reference to Thessalian treachery\textsuperscript{201} seems to be in a Euripidean fragment, where the Thessalians are represented as untrustworthy.\textsuperscript{202} The scholiast on Aristophanes who transmits the Euripidean fragment to us explains that Thessalian natives were slandered as being slave-traders, sordid and greedy of gain.\textsuperscript{203} In \textit{Phoenissae}, Euripides mentions a ‘crafty Thessalian trick’ in the context of combat.\textsuperscript{204} In terms of the way Thessalians are depicted by non-Thessalians, these passages are inextricably connected to the ones mentioning that region’s reputation for magic. In all but Plato’s account, the words φαρμάκις, γόης, and μάγος\textsuperscript{205} are used. The latter two are used to describe ‘fraudulent showmen who deceive by claiming to perform what cannot be performed.’\textsuperscript{206} The familiar ideas of untrustworthiness, sordidness and greed persist. The former noun attaches to women who use drugs for sorcerous, and therefore murderous and dangerous means.\textsuperscript{207} This depiction not only imbues the sordid nature of Thessalians with a heightened element of malevolence, it presents an inversion of nature both because the moon is being drawn down, and because of the cultural distance between these women’s actions and those expected of a woman. In short, the reputation is quintessentially eccentric and anomalous—it is non-Greek. Furthermore, to divorce

---

\textsuperscript{200} On which, see Keaveney (1995).
\textsuperscript{201} In the general sense, as no specific mention of a treacherous deed is made.
\textsuperscript{203} As does Aristophanes himself. Ibid.
\textsuperscript{204} Eur. Phoen. 1408.
\textsuperscript{205} Itself a word with Persian connotations for, as Gordon (1987) 77, states ‘[a]lthough it is obvious to us, and was known by a few classical writers, that the true Persian priestly class (Old Persian maguš) had no connection with the magoi of the Graeco-Roman world, their continued existence was in a sense critical for the representation of magic in the ancient world.’
\textsuperscript{206} Burkert (1962). See also Gordon (1987) 90 n. 5.
\textsuperscript{207} Gordon (1987) 62-63.
all of the aforementioned passages\textsuperscript{208} perpetuating this eccentricity from the (stigmatized) Thessalian medism of the Persian Wars (particularly given that this treachery took place during the largest effort of the war) would be a difficult and, indeed, contrived exercise. It is not hard to understand how Thessalian treachery in this context, regardless of the presence of insincere medism,\textsuperscript{209} would lead to the Thessalians acquiring a reputation for sordidness, untrustworthiness, and greed.

Moreover, it is also comprehensible how Thessalian religion could be indelibly tainted. As Gordon remarks, ‘Xerxes’ invasion of Greece … turned an initial response of curiosity into a belief which identified Persian religion with an activity deemed hostile to the polis conceived as a politico-religious entity.’\textsuperscript{210} This politico-religious element is vitally important. Magic became, as Gordon puts it, the ‘enemy of the state’. The inseparability of polis and religion meant that an archrival such as Persia was diametrically opposed to the Greek ideal in all respects.\textsuperscript{211} If the Thessalians were perceived as committing an act of medism after having requested so expansive a military effort from the Greek loyalists, equation with the Persians would inevitably ensue. This equation would infiltrate all elements of the Thessalian reputation, as we have seen. The element with which we have the most immediate concern, however, is the politico-religious one. Although, ostensibly speaking, our earliest source for an explicit link between Thessaly and magic is Aristophanes’ Nubes, and the earliest mention of Thessalian treachery is found in the Euripidean fragment, either of these links—pursuant to my logic—could be

\textsuperscript{208} That is, both the passages mentioning magic and those which make no mention of it.
\textsuperscript{209} What I am suggesting here is that the sincere medism of the Aleuads had been imputed to the region as a whole. Any insincerity of sentiment was purely theoretical in comparison to the act of siding with the Persian enemy.
\textsuperscript{210} Gordon (1987) 78-79.
\textsuperscript{211} Cf. Bremmer (1999) 6; Hall (1989) 56-100 and passim. We should not, however, ignore the fact that the Greeks were, in many respects, in awe of the Persians and adapted many elements of their culture. See Bremmer (1999) 6; Miller (1997) passim.
made anytime following the much more serious medism of 480 B.C.\textsuperscript{212} It seems probable that the marginalization (and consequent introversion) of Thessaly in the mid to later fifth century texts we have discussed is mainly a result of the nominal alliance during the Periclean period, which would have elevated the presence of Thessaly in the Athenian consciousness but also renewed memories of medism.\textsuperscript{213}

Let us return, then, to Sophocles’ \textit{Rhizotomoi}. The entire play seems to have been centered on Medea’s plot to kill Pelias in the context of herbal magic.\textsuperscript{214} Medea is our first port of call, for, as Gordon states, ‘[i]f there was anywhere that Medea belonged it was in Thessaly … and it was in Thessaly that she performed one of her most famous feats of magic’.\textsuperscript{215} Moreover, a mythical invention by Euripides draws an indirect ancestral link between Medea and the Persians. In his lost play \textit{Aegeus}, the playwright tells us that after Medea had borne her child Medos by King Aegeus, her exile led her to Asia, where Medos became the ancestor of the Medes.\textsuperscript{216} The Greeks connected this group with the Persians, hence the terms \textit{μηδίζω} and \textit{μηδισμός}.\textsuperscript{217} Also important is the fact that Medea’s name derives from the verb \textit{μέδομαι}, which can carry the sense of planning, plotting, or contriving.\textsuperscript{218} Implicit in its use, therefore, is a sense of deceit and malevolence. Entrenching the Thessalian connotations of \textit{Rhizotomoi} are Pelias, who has clear connections to Thessaly, and the use of \textit{εἰνοδία} as an epithet during the choral

\textsuperscript{212} For, in the case of their first act of medism, there was no other inflammatory circumstances to set them apart from the other medisers listed in Hdt. 7.132.

\textsuperscript{213} Hornblower (2011) 338 n. 21.

\textsuperscript{214} Gordon (1987) 85; Ogden (2002) 82-83.

\textsuperscript{215} Gordon (1987) 81. The feat was the ‘rejuvenation of a ram and the consequent murder of King Pelias through the ingenuous stupidity of his daughters.’ See also the aforementioned comment of Schol. \textit{Ar. Nub.} 749, who draws a close connection between Medea and Thessaly. At the same time, it must be stressed that Medea does not belong to Thessaly simply because she belongs nowhere—she is essentially transient.


\textsuperscript{217} For a detailed discussion of the origins of the term ‘medism’, see Graf (1984).

\textsuperscript{218} Gordon (1987) 63.
invocation of Hekate in fragment 535. Based on these details, I submit that Sophocles’ fragment presents an earlier account of bias towards Thessaly based on the politico-religious divisions forged by the 480 B.C. expedition.

CONCLUSION

This analysis has allowed us to locate the discussion of Thessaly’s reputation for witchcraft and sorcery and its effect on the character of Hekate within a new historical and chronological framework. In so doing, we hopefully have been able to vindicate the second approach to the problem of Hekate and Enodia’s relationship: there is insufficient evidence to allow for the conclusion that the character of the Thessalian goddess was a causative factor in the rise of the Karian goddess’ magical properties. Turning to the reputation of Thessaly, a consideration of the historical context allowed us to move past the chronological barrier of 423 B.C., to which date the earliest mention of such a reputation is recorded. Between the Hesiodic Catalogue and Sophocles’ Rhizotomoi, the connection between Hekate and Enodia had grown from an association to a complete identification; the connection between the two, then—despite the gap in evidence between these two sources—had obviously strengthened and become an established facet of Greek religion. Given Hekate’s connections to a Thessalian goddess, and that region’s marginalization in the fifth century, it is comprehensible how the character of Hekate could be invaded by perceptions of magic and witchcraft. Surely, the fact that magic and the aversion of forces against parturient women and newborns were strongly connected could only have opened the gates to Hekate and Enodia becoming more associated with magic. But ultimately the downfall of the reputation of Thessalian religion was to lead to Hekate’s overbearing connection to witchcraft and sorcery, rather than any element of Enodia’s character.
CONCLUSION

The culmination of my study represents a reconsideration of the broadly-construed ‘beginnings’ of Hekate. The reason for persistent controversy in this area is the increasingly lacunose state of evidence that concerns this goddess the further back, chronologically speaking, one stretches. What I hope to have achieved through my research is a thorough reconsideration—a renewal, of sorts—of scholarly opinions dating principally from the second half of the twentieth century. Throughout my thesis, I have frequently cited the work of Theodor Kraus; his foundational study has had a broad influence on subsequent works, and yet some of his findings are now a bit dated. While Zografou’s work represents, in many ways, a new starting point for future studies of Hekate, her work does not stop to reconsider deeply, for example, the Karian origins of Hekate or the way that Hekate’s connection to Enodia may have caused the former to become much more intimately associated with unsavoury aspects of classical Greek religion. Through both the introduction of newer evidence and different approaches to older data, this thesis has aimed to reappraise and bolster previous research and also provide new insights.

In Chapter One, the inadequacy of theories claiming that Hekate was of Mycenaean, Mesopotamian, and Thracian origin was demonstrated. A fundamentally flawed methodology prevented D. R. West’s thesis from gaining traction, while the tenuousness of Berg’s positive argumentation has prevented his theory from receiving widespread approval; since the publication of Berg’s article, however, his strong negative argumentation pertaining to the Karian theory, has not been comprehensively rebutted by a Karian proponent. Before turning to Karia, I set out as detailed a comparison between Hekate and the Thracian Bendis as possible. This, I hope, allows Farnell’s Thracian theory, which is essentially predicated on a supposed likeness between the two goddesses, to be ultimately debunked. Turning to Karia, I agree with Herring’s thesis to the extent that the Laginetan Hekate of the late second century was a unique, Hellenistic creation.
CONCLUSION

However, what I hope to have demonstrated in my analysis of the Karian theory is that the data canvassed probably allows us to rethink the chronological boundaries within which Hekate’s presence in Karia is usually discussed. The Menophilos inscription points to a date around the turn of the third and second century, as do the clothing-related finds, which can most likely be linked to Hekate. Although this evidence is, roughly speaking, only around a hundred years prior to the late second century evidence that is usually discussed in relation to Laginetan Hekate, the point remains that the temporal barrier that so many scholars have struck in this field appears to be less concrete than originally thought. This idea was bolstered by reference to other pieces of evidence. The inscription mentioning the daimon of Leros and the Koranza inscription may testify to worship of the goddess in the fourth century, particularly given that Hekatomnos, the hekat-root of whose name may refer to Hekate, was already dynast several decades before, at the beginning of the fourth century. The obvious Hesiodic influence I discussed can, among other reasons, be construed as Karian reliance on a religious compatriot. Further clues of a Karian origin may be tied up in Pindar’s curious epithet for Hekate, which, although made to bear a heavy weight for a single word, arguably sheds further light on the goddess’ origins. Moreover, the presence of Karians in both Miletos and Ephesos, together with other evidence, suggests that the goddess could have had a presence in either or both cities from the second millennium B.C. On top of the points already put forward by Theodor Kraus, the idea that Hekate’s Laginetan cult was both a revival of an ancient cult as well as a discreetly new one for a different population seems increasingly likely, and ought not to be so readily discounted.

The purpose of Chapter Two was to trace the development of Hekate’s character in a variety of sources up until the end of the fifth century B.C., by which point her macabre associations with ghosts, witchcraft, and sorcery had become familiar. The earliest literary mention of the goddess in the Theogony continues to court controversy. Although a recent trend in scholarship seeks to resist any analysis of the passage with reference to what Hesiod personally believed, I am still not entirely satisfied with a text-based approach. In the discipline of history, scholars will always feel most secure, of course, when a text is the primary focus of
an analysis. There are obvious merits to this approach. In a field such as this, however (that is, the study of Hekate), conjecture is essential: the scholar who will not stray from a text in order to account for a situation will not say much at all. Why, indeed, would Hesiod have dedicated such an alarmingly great portion of the *Theogony* to Hekate, and in a style that venerates her so greatly? We cannot be certain of the ideas of West and others who advocate a biographical approach to the Hymn; but, equally, we cannot be entirely satisfied that a textual approach accounts for this strange diversion in the middle of Hesiod’s poem. It is these problems that led me to conclude that something of a halfway mark between the biographical and textual approaches was the best starting point for an analysis of the *Theogony*. Generally speaking, and taken at face value, the Hymn presents a picture of an extensively powerful, benevolent goddess who seems to have no uncanny attributes. Apparently also lacking in uncanny attributes is the Berlin terracotta, a seated statuette of Hekate. Although, admittedly, the lack of defining attributes stunts complete development of this hypothesis, it is reasonable to suggest that the enthroned figure imparts a Near Eastern characterization of Hekate. The similarity to images of Kybele does not necessarily point to derivation from that goddess’ cult. That it could suggest that enthronement was used for powerful, chthonic deities from the Near East is tempting, although must remain conjectural.

The Homeric *Hymn to Demeter* deviates considerably from the image of Hekate presented in the *Theogony*. Her depiction as a much younger goddess, although of Titanic heritage, seems to suggest that the goddess’ place within the pan-Hellenic pantheon has been negotiated and set. It seems that Hekate’s maturity was a casualty of the overlap in interests between her and Artemis. A new goddess from the east was subordinated to Artemis, and the result is a deity who is closely connected to both the paradigmatic virgin in crisis and the grieving mother, but attached to neither. It is here, I conclude, that the first incontrovertible evidence for Hekate’s role as an intermediary can be found. Moreover, her link to torches and caves betrays a chthonic aspect of the goddess apparently lacking in the *Theogony*. The depiction of the goddess stops short of painting her in a malevolent light, but her duties in relation to the underworld are much more closely in sync with those
CONCLUSION

for which the goddess was feared and valued in later (especially Hellenistic) times. Fifth century art developed a consistent image of the goddess, and appeared to work in a tradition that was closely modelled on the Homeric Hymn. Literature from the fifth century appears (eventually, at least) to work in a much more deviant and sinister tradition. While early depictions by Pindar (as seen in Chapter One) and Aeschylus stress benevolent, intermediary, and custodial roles, from Sophocles onwards, audiences encountered a goddess of much more unsavoury and frightening nature, connected with the night and restless spirits. This image was to be further inflamed by Euripides and particularly Sophron, while Aristophanes presents a picture of Hekate as a goddess primarily concerned with women and protection of the domestic sphere, demonstrating that, although her benevolent nature had been seriously besmirched, she nonetheless continued to serve a variety of purposes. It was, however, her macabre associations that were to predominate for the rest of antiquity, just as the statue crafted by Alkamenes became the traditional image of Hekate in the popular imagination.

The third and final chapter of this study focussed on a reconsideration of the apparently yawning divide between earlier and later manifestations of Hekate, as demonstrated by the chronological approach in Chapter Two. In my analysis of the Theogony in Chapter Two, I submitted that it was likely that the character of the goddess was distorted by two considerations. What is most important in this context is the idea of distortion: was Hekate actually a goddess who originally possessed unsavoury traits that were suppressed in pursuit of her pan-Hellenic reception? Scholars have not accepted Nilsson’s argument that, in her native Karia, the goddess would have borne some connections to magic and the supernatural, but it is worthy of reconsideration. As we saw in Chapter One, the earliest archaeological evidence for the goddess in Miletos is probably attributable to a Karian presence in that city. Given that the sixth-century inscription in question was dedicated by two prytaneis, we can conclude that Hekate was a part of official religion. Her relationship to the prytaneum suggests benevolence and perhaps protection. The fact that the inscription was located within the Delphinion, a space closely

1 Simon (1985).
CONCLUSION

associated with the Molpoi, who were in turn concerned with religious life and laws, treaties, and decrees, concretises the idea that Milesian Hekate was a goddess of civic nature, something that could be strengthened even further with reference to the *Theogony*. After applying the ideas of Kolb, and observing the fifth century Milesian evidence for Hekate at the gates, we turned to a consideration of Milesian burial practices. Given the lack of chronological indicators (did the burials or the sanctuary come first?), however, it is a ‘chicken-and-egg’ scenario. Did the extramural burials encourage a chthonic aspect for a goddess whose sanctuary was nearby simply because she was a goddess of city walls and gates? This eventually brought us to the conclusion that Hekate *possibly* had a strong connection to the dead at Miletos, although a firm conclusion in either direction remains elusive. What is more, even if Hekate had borne connections to death and the uncanny at Miletos, this still does not account for her acquisition of sorcerous traits, which was a part of Nilsson’s argument. The reason that so much emphasis was placed on Miletos is, of course, that it yields the earliest archaeological evidence for the goddess in Asia Minor. It is important to remember, however, that her characterization could and *would* change from place-to-place. If she was *not* chthonic at Miletos, she could well have been so at, for example, Ephesos. If we accept the idea discussed in Chapter One, that Artemis Ephesia displaced the cult of Hekate in that region, the idea that Hekate was originally chthonic becomes stronger. The problem with this argument is twofold: first, the argument that Hekate had a cult in this time and place must remain conjectural; second, if the cults of *two* goddesses were subsumed by the coloniser’s goddess, it remains a possibility that the chthonic traits of Artemis Ephesia were taken from Kybele, or some other goddess. We certainly see chthonic traits in the goddess at Lagina (as discussed in Chapter One), but, even if my furtherance of the revival argument for the Laginetan cult is accepted, it is nonetheless anachronistic to cite Hekate’s character in that place and time to support the statement that the goddess originally bore chthonic traits in Karia. We then shifted our focus to a discussion of Samothrace, where, once again, lacunose evidence prevents a firm conclusion. However, the analysis revealed the strong possibility of an inherently chthonic goddess having been
brought to the island by Karian travellers. The problem is the late date of the sources: by the date (fourth century B.C.) of the first sources describing Hekate on Samothrace, she was predominantly associated with ghosts and sorcery. Was it the case that these authors had anachronistically depicted a chthonic goddess?

Turning to Enodia, a detailed examination of Thessalian evidence revealed a chthonic goddess who was associated with roads, urban centres, kourotophric functions and spaces in-between. Between this Thessalian data and the arguments of scholars such as Kraus, Larson, Johnston, Marquardt, and West, who argue that Enodia was intrinsically connected to witchcraft, a discrepancy emerges. Although the evidence does not allow for as comprehensive a picture of Enodia as would be desirable, nothing seems to suggest that the goddess bore an intrinsic connection to magic or witchcraft that ultimately tarnished the character of Hekate in the mainland Greek world. A more rigorous analysis of their syncretism revealed that the chthonic characteristics of both, as well as their mutual concern for liminal spaces, particularly in relation to women, would have necessarily led to their association with what they were expected to avert: scary, conceptually foreign beings known as *aōrai*. While made on the basis of fundamental similarity, a syncretism with Enodia also allowed for a convenient location of Hekate on the geographical periphery of Greek society. It is likely that, as early as their association in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* both would have been associated with magic on account of their ability to avert dangerous forces, particularly those that could strike against infants and parturient women. However, neither could have contributed more ‘magic’ to the other, since both had the same abilities that necessarily led to an attachment to magic. If the character of Enodia did not influence Hekate, was it the reputation of Thessalian witchcraft? The problem with this argument is that the earliest evidence for such a reputation does not predate 423 B.C., the year in which Aristophanes’ *Clouds* was first produced. This brought us to a reconsideration of the historical framework in which Thessalian religion first became tainted. The souring of political relations (in a politico-religious context) following the second instance of Thessalian medism indelibly affected the perception of Thessalian religion as something befitting of the sordid,
untrustworthy, and greedy people in that region. Given that the Thessalian expedition took place in 480 B.C., we are justified in assuming that the marginalization of Thessaly that took place during the fifth century B.C. occurred from this point onwards. Between the time of the Hesiodic *Catalogue* and Sophocles’ *Rhizotomoi*, Hekate and Enodia’s relationship had evolved from association to identification. Despite the lack in evidence between these two literary sources, it seems likely that this evolution had become firmly recognized. Given Hekate’s connections to a Thessalian goddess, and that region’s marginalization in the fifth century, it is comprehensible how the character of Hekate could be invaded by perceptions of magic and witchcraft. For, while the two may have been perceived as being intrinsically foreign before Thessalian medism, it was now possible to perceive them as being intrinsically malevolent. Hekate was now more predisposed to leading on the restless dead as opposed to averting them. Surely, the fact that magic and the aversion of forces against parturient women and newborns were strongly connected could only have further developed any latent association between both goddesses and magical powers. But ultimately, I conclude, the (tarnished) reputation of Thessalian religion preceded itself, and it was this reputation that was to lead to Hekate’s overbearing status as a deity of witchcraft and sorcery, rather than any element of Enodia’s character.

Although Hekate is a goddess to whom much in the way of scholarly attention has been devoted, gaps remain; detailed, extensive studies in relation to the goddess’ presence in the magical papyri, her exploitation by theurgists, and her place in the philosophical speculations of late antiquity have yet to be published, as Zografou notes.\(^2\) The interest that originally brought me to a study of Hekate, however, was the idea of her beginnings. Although I hope to have brought some extra clarity to areas of particular trouble, I can in no way profess to have solved the problems and controversies in a Master’s thesis. Something that has increasingly struck me throughout my research as a crucial key to understanding Hekate’s origins is Hesiod’s *Theogony*. There has been much recourse to the epic throughout my thesis. I think that many more advancements will be able to be made with an

\(^2\) Zografou (2010) 301.
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extended study of the *Theogony* in relation to as much evidence as possible from that same period to which the poem dates. Something that I have consistently emphasised is the idea that Hesiodic Hekate is Milesian. Perhaps as exhaustive a study as possible of the *Theogony* and contemporary Milesian evidence through to the end of the sixth century B.C. (when we find the first archaeo‌

gical evidence for the goddess, of course) would yield beneficial results. Ultimately, however, much depends on the exposition of new archaeological finds in south-western Anatolia, or indeed elsewhere in the Near East, for example Ephesos. For the greater our knowledge about the original character of the Karian Hekate, the more refined our conclusions as to the development of her character in the Greek world.
APPENDIX

HEKATE’S PRESENCE ON AEGINA

In Chapter Three, we briefly came across the cult of Hekate on the island of Aegina. Whether or not the evidence for this cult can provide information about the carryover of any characteristics from Karia\(^1\) is contentious, but appending some thoughts on the idea to this study seems valuable, and prevents (what became) a peripheral subject from impinging on what is an already-dense third chapter. Again, our literary sources are late. Pausanias tells us that the Aeginetans worshipped Hekate above all other gods, and attributes the institution of these mystic rites to the Thracian Orpheus.\(^2\) He also describes a wooden statue within the Aeginetan temple: it depicts Hekate, is monomorphic, and was sculpted by the Athenian Myron. Lucian calls them the rites of Enodia, while Libanius mentions Poseidon in the same context as Aeginetan Hekate, and tells us of the leader of a thiasos.\(^3\) Finally, Dio Chrysostom provides important information about the nature of the rites. He states that 'those involved with initiations and purifications say that by appeasing the wrath of Hekate they can make a person sane; and before they [begin] the purification process they invoke and point to many and various sorts of phasmata, which they say the angry goddess has sent.'\(^4\) Moreover, Aristophanes describes Aegina as a centre for healing when discussing Bdelykleon’s ‘trialophile’ father; he

---

\(^1\) (And therefore enlighten us further as to whether Hekate was originally chthonic in Karia).

\(^2\) Paus. 2.30.2
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does not, however, mention Hekate—only Asklepios.\(^5\)

From a holistic perspective, the literature seems to envisage a goddess of
great civic importance. Such ‘full integration into any civic pantheon’ was rare for
Hekate;\(^6\) her main civic centre was, of course, Lagina, and she arguably possessed
civic aspects at Miletos. However, any development of the Aeginetan manifestation
of Hekate is (currently) foreclosed by the lack of archaeological remains of a
temple or shrine dedicated to the goddess. Two reliefs have been found on the
island. One is dated to \(c.\ 330-320\) B.C., and depicts a monomorphic, seated, torch-
bearing figure. A young man presents a horse to the goddess, and a dog is seated
next to the goddess.\(^7\) The identification of the figure as Hekate is likely, although
the horse is unusual iconography for the goddess.\(^8\) A third century hekataion-relief\(^9\)
was found in Aegina. In terms of iconography and appearance, the hekataion barely
deviates from the canonical Athenian hekataion.\(^10\) The proximity of the island to
Athens meant that the popularity of the Aeginetan mysteries amongst Athenians

---

\(^5\) Ar. V. 122.


\(^7\) Athens NM 1475. The dog is sometimes identified as a lion. See Kaltsas (2002) 237;

\(^8\) See Kraus (1960) 80, who discusses a Thessalian (Krannon) relief housed in the British
Museum (BM 816 (1839,0806.3). The goddess in this relief, who crowns a horse (and is also
accompanied by a dog), has been identified as Hekate, too. The central pillar of Kraus’
argument against this identification is the lack of dedications to Hekate in Thessaly and the
Krannian provenance of a fourth century votive to Enodai. He also cites Hekate’s lack of equine associations,
and instead proposes that the figure is Thessalian Enodia. However, this shift in identification
exposes another problem: what significance does the dog have in relation to Enodia? Kraus’
argument that any canine associations are probably similar to those of Hekate is inconclusive. Given
the very similar composition of the two reliefs, and the likely identification of the figure on the
Aeginetan relief as Hekate, I would argue that the figure can plausibly be identified as the latter. A
firm decision is elusive. Cf. Miller (1974) 251, who discusses a Macedonian relief that depicts
Enodia riding side-saddle and holding a single torch, and Kraus (1960) 80, who mentions the coins
of Pherai that depict Enodia bearing two torches, also riding side-saddle.

\(^9\) A variation on the usual form.

\(^10\) Herring (2011) 93.
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could persist from as early as Aristophanes until as late as Libanius (fourth century A.D.). However, we cannot be certain whether Hekate’s mysteries were being celebrated as early as Aristophanes, given that the earliest irrefutable evidence is late fourth century B.C. If Pausanias’s representation is correct, a statue of Hekate would have been present from anywhere between c. 480-440 B.C., that is, the time during which Myron worked. Accordingly, a cultural proximity between Athens and Aegina may have existed from this early date, given that an Athenian sculptor was reputed to have been commissioned for the work. Perhaps a date after 457 B.C. would be most appropriate, as in the summer of that year Aegina suffered a humiliating defeat to Athens in a ναυμαχία μεγάλη. Following the naval defeat, a nine-month siege of Aegina by Leocrates ensued. Aegina eventually surrendered, and was forced to become a tributary member of the Delian League, paying thirty talents annually. From this payment of tribute would have been taken aparche, as well as a ‘presumed contribution of gifts to the Athenian deities, [which] would have been a sufficient fulfilment of the Athenians’ religious obligations deriving from their control of Aigina’, namely the sharing of state profits with the gods in order to acknowledge divine participation in the territorial conquests (as well as other human successes). It is not difficult to conceive of such a defeat as causing (an expansion of?) Athenian religio-cultural colonization of Aegina, in order to

---

11 Rohde (1925) 322 n. 89.
12 Although Farnell (1896) 505 and Johnston (1999) 144 both state that Hekate’s mysteries were being celebrated from at least the fifth century. The evidence on which they base this argument is not made clear.
13 von Rudloff (1999) dates the statue to c. 460 B.C. Most scholars do not doubt Pausanias’ words, and assert that Aegina was a major cultic site for Hekate. See, for example, Farnell (1896-1909) 505; Steuding (1886-1890) 1887; Kraus (1960) 49; Larson (2007) 167. Herring (2011) 78 n. 18 expresses skepticism.
14 Thuc. 1.105.2; Lys. 2.48.
15 Diod. 11.78.4; Thuc. 1.108.4. For detailed, historiographical discussions of the late sixth and early fifth century conflict between Athens and Aegina, see Podleck (1976); Figueira (1985); Figueira (1988).
entrench the latter’s subjugation.

However, would this Aeginetan contribution to the Athenian deities have been dedicated to Hekate? Polinskaya suggests that, had such a contribution taken place, it probably would have been in support of festivals for Athena, Dionysos, and the Eleusinian deities.\(^\text{17}\) There is certainly a place for Hekate within the Eleusinian cycle; it seems implausible, however, that any Aeginetan cognizance of so minor a deity following enforced, monetary contribution to foreign deities could have resulted in an entire sanctuary being dedicated to Hekate. Moreover, the Athenians probably would not have caused such religious colonization. First, there is no evidence for any confiscation of Aeginetan land by the Athenians following the defeat in 457 B.C.\(^\text{18}\) Second, when such confiscation took place during Athenian occupation of the island from 431-404 B.C., the temene that were demarcated by Athenian horoi were arguably used for agricultural, and not cultic purposes. Such temene were still dedicated to Athenian gods in order to acknowledge their role in the acquisition of foreign territory; this does not mean that the land was appropriated for a specifically cultic purpose.\(^\text{19}\) Third, had property been appropriated for cultic use, and therefore in furtherance of Athenian religious propaganda, would we not expect such temene to be dedicated similarly to how the agricultural temene were dedicated during Athenian occupation of Aegina? Athena, for example, was allotted temene, since the Athenians ‘owed traditional homage to their own gods.’\(^\text{20}\) Moreover, ‘Poseidon Erechtheus, or Sounios, or Kalaureios, and Apollo Delios, or less likely, Zosterios’ may all have been dedicated Aeginetan temene. Poseidon, in his various manifestations, was widely worshipped by Athenians. Moreover, Apollo was the patron of the Delian League, and continued to be of great significance to Athenians following Athena’s usurpation of his Delian role.

It will help to recapitulate these points in relation to Hekate’s Aeginetan

\(^{17}\) Ibid.

\(^{18}\) Ibid, 250.

\(^{19}\) Ibid, 253-254.

\(^{20}\) Ibid, 258.
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presence. Following Aegina’s defeat in 457 B.C. and enforced (tributary) membership in the Delian League, there is no evidence for the confiscation of land by the Athenians. Evidence for this practice exists only after Athenian occupation of the island commenced in 431 B.C. Had *temene* indeed been established earlier, for agricultural or cultic purposes, it is likely that they would have been in honour of Apollo or Athena—whoever was the patron/ess of the Delian League at the time—of Poseidon, a deity of great import to the Athenians. Any argument for a *temenos* to Hekate being established by the Athenians at this point, when she had only just begun to gain currency, albeit in a minor role, is tenuous at best. It is not the case, however, that land was confiscated at this point, and so it is unlikely that new *temene* were established. Moreover, as Polinskaya states, there are no parallels to suggest that the Athenians would have either embraced or attempted to take control of pre-existing, cultic activity on conquered territories. Accordingly, there was probably a fiscal contribution by Aegina to Athenian religious activities, in the latter’s capacity as a nominal ally. This contribution probably would have been in support of festivals for Athena, Dionysos, and the Eleusinian deities. Such enforced contribution was in pursuit of the Athenians’ post-conquest religious consciousness, rather than the religious subjugation of the Aegean. It is hard to conceive of this unilateral arrangement having had an influence on the religious composition of Aegina. Had any Athenian influence flowed back to the island, is it really plausible that an entire sanctuary for Hekate, who played a comparatively minor role in the Eleusinian cycle, would be constructed? Based on these ideas, it seems unlikely that Hekate was brought to Aegina from Athens during the fifth century B.C. Accordingly, if the goddess had been present on the island at that time, as Pausanias claims, she must have come from elsewhere. If Hekate’s aforementioned role in the aversion of attacks by her servile dead (and consequent avoidance of madness) was not influenced by Athenian conceptualizations of the goddess, whence did she come?

---

21 The shift of the Delian League’s treasury from Delos to Athens, at which point Athena took over Apollo’s role as patron, may have occurred in 454 B.C. or earlier. See Hornblower (1992) 183 n. 50.
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to the island? Could it have been Samothrace, given the striking similarities in terms of mysteries that seem to have dealt with madness? If that was the case, however, we fare no better in terms of a more concrete idea of Karian Hekate vis-à-vis potential chthonic connections, for the same reason as was stated in Chapter Three in relation to Thasos: it would have been a cultic subsidiary of Samothrace, rather than Karia. Ultimately, with Aegina, the evidence is tantalizing but not productive of firm conclusions.
Fig. 1: Lagina frieze, east. Birth of Zeus. To the right, Hekate hastens away with either the newborn Zeus or the swaddled stone. Courtesy of Deutsches Archäologisches Institut.
Fig. 2: Lagina frieze, east (not directly aligned with Fig. 1). Courtesy of Deutsches Archäologisches Institut.
Fig. 3: Lagina frieze, west. Gigantomachy scene. Hekate appears directly in the middle of the scene. Courtesy of Deutsches Archäologisches Institut.
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Fig. 4: Lagina frieze, south. Courtesy of Deutsches Archäologisches Institut.
Fig. 5: Lagina frieze, south. Courtesy of Deutsches Archäologisches Institut.
Fig. 6: Late sixth century terracotta, Attic statuette of Hekate. Courtesy of Oxford University Press.
Figs. 7 & 8: Running Maiden from Eleusis and pictorial reconstruction of statuette, drawn by C.M. Edwards. Courtesy of Archaeological Institute of America.
Fig. 9: Bell krater by Berlin Painter. Courtesy of Archaeological Institute of America.
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Fig. 10: Fragmentary lid of a lekanis, now lost. Courtesy of Archaeological Institute of America.
Fig. 11: Bell krater by Persephone Painter. New York. Metropolitan Museum of Art 28.57.23. Courtesy of Institut Suisse de Rome.
Fig. 12: Hydria, London E 183. Courtesy of Svenska Institutet i Athen.
Fig. 13: Parthenon, East Pediment. Figure G. Courtesy of Archaeological Institute of America.
Fig. 14: Calyx krater by the Peleus Painter, Ferrara T 617. Courtesy of Archaeological Institute of America.
Fig. 15: Würzburg kalpis. Courtesy of Philipp von Zabern.
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