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Research activity in Indo-European comparative mythology has been regularly pursued at the University of California, Los Angeles, since the academic year 1959-60, when the Seminar in Indo-European Mythology was held for the first time. Other organizational milestones have been the creation of the Center for the Study of Comparative Folklore and Mythology in 1961 and of the Section of Indo-European Studies as an autonomous part of the Department of Classics in 1964.

Workers from many fields—anthropology, classical languages, English, folklore, Germanic languages, Indo-European studies, Slavic languages—have participated in these endeavors. Numerous research papers have been written and discussed over the years. A succession of research assistants (Anastasia Demetriades, C. Scott Littleton, Robert Gartman, Eleanor Long, Antoinette Botsford) have helped lay an exhaustive bibliographical and documentary groundwork under the auspices of the mythology section of the Center. At least two published doctoral dissertations have drawn their inspiration and inception from these efforts (C. Scott Littleton, *The New Comparative Mythology: An Anthropological Assessment of the Theories of Georges Dumézil* [Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1966], and Donald Ward, *The Divine Twins: An Indo-European Myth in Germanic Tradition* [Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1968]).

In a purely historical sense, the activity has centered on discovering and understanding the mythic, religious, social, and legal underpinnings of the ancient Indo-European-speaking continuum in terms of their oldest or most archaic manifestations. In a comparativistic vein, these materials have been used as starting points for prehistoric reconstruction. The theoretical viability of such attempts is enhanced by the renascence of the discipline of Indo-European comparative
mythology during the past several decades through the efforts of such scholars as Georges Dumézil, Jan de Vries, Stig Wikander, and others. Thereby the long lacuna that ensued upon the largely abortive theoretical beginnings by F. Max Müller, Adalbert Kuhn, and others in the nineteenth century can securely be declared closed, and a present-day comparative mythology proclaimed as firmly established, fortified by the material gains and theoretical lessons of an entire century.

Most of the works gathered into this volume were originally presented at a symposium held under the joint auspices of the Center and of the Section of Indo-European Studies on March 17–18, 1967. Postfixed to their printed versions is a bibliographical inventory of scholarly works that constitute the documentation of the new Indo-European comparative mythology.

Thanks are due the Chancellor of the University of California, Los Angeles, for a subsidy toward the cost of publication, Wayland D. Hand, the director of the Center for the Study of Comparative Folklore and Mythology, Antoinette Botsford for editorial assistance, and Anne-Marie Virgint for help with the index.
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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAHG</td>
<td>Anzeiger für die Altertumwissenschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSA</td>
<td>Annual of the British School at Athens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>L'antiquité classique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AESC</td>
<td>Annales économies, sociétés, civilisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHES</td>
<td>Annales d'histoire économique et sociale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIPhO</td>
<td>Annaire, Institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales et slaves, Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJA</td>
<td>American Journal of Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJPh</td>
<td>American Journal of Philology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANF</td>
<td>Arkiv för nordisk filologi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO</td>
<td>Archiv Orientali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPhS</td>
<td>Acta Philologica Scandinavica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArchClass</td>
<td>Archologia Classica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASNP</td>
<td>Annuale della Scuola normale superiore di Pisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASoc</td>
<td>L'année sociologique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSt</td>
<td>Asiatische Studien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACILg</td>
<td>Bulletin, Association des classiques, Université de Liège</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARB</td>
<td>Bulletin, Académie royale de Belgique (Classe des lettres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFS</td>
<td>Bulletin, Faculdé des lettres, Strasbourg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BO</td>
<td>Bibliotheca orientalis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSL</td>
<td>Bulletin, Société de linguistique de Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSOAS</td>
<td>Bulletin, School of Oriental (and African) Studies, University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPh</td>
<td>Classical Philology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Classical Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Cahiers du Sud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLZ</td>
<td>Deutsche Literatur-Zeitung</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Études celtiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECl</td>
<td>Les études classiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG</td>
<td>Études germaniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFC</td>
<td>Folklore Fellows Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJF</td>
<td>Giornale italiano di filologia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRM</td>
<td>Germanisch-romanische Monatschrift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUA</td>
<td>Göteborgs Universitets Årsskrift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hum (RES)</td>
<td>Humanités: Revue d'enseignement secondaire et d'éducation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HZnMTL</td>
<td>Handelingen der Zuidnederlandse Maatschappij voor Taal- en Letterkunde en Geschiedenis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF</td>
<td>Indogermanische Forschungen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH</td>
<td>L'information historique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIJ</td>
<td>Indo-Iranian Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>L'information littéraire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
<td>Journal asiatique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAF</td>
<td>Journal of American Folklore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAOS</td>
<td>Journal of the American Oriental Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JGS</td>
<td>Journal of Cuneiform Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEGP</td>
<td>Journal of English and Germanic Philology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JFI</td>
<td>Journal of the Folklore Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPsych</td>
<td>Journal de psychologie normale et pathologique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRAI</td>
<td>Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRASB</td>
<td>Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRS</td>
<td>Journal of Roman Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JThS</td>
<td>Journal of Theological Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARB</td>
<td>Mémoires, Académie royale de Belgique (Classe des lettres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>Midwest Folklore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NClio</td>
<td>La nouvelle Clio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNRF</td>
<td>La nouvelle nouvelle revue française</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRF</td>
<td>La nouvelle revue française</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>Orientalia Suecana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBA</td>
<td>Proceedings of the British Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBB(T)</td>
<td>(Paul-Braunes) Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur (Tübingen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PICO</td>
<td>Proceedings of the International Congress of Orientalists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMLA</td>
<td>Publications of the Modern Language Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>Revue archéologique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBPh</td>
<td>Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Revue celtique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REA</td>
<td>Revue des études anciennes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REArm</td>
<td>Revue des études arméniennes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResSR</td>
<td>Recherches de science religieuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REG</td>
<td>Revue des études grecques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>Revue des études latines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESl</td>
<td>Revue des études slaves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RevP</td>
<td>Revue de Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH</td>
<td>Revue historique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHA</td>
<td>Revue hittite et asiatique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHPh</td>
<td>Revue d'histoire de la philosophie et d'histoire générale de la civilisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHPhR</td>
<td>Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHR</td>
<td>Revue de l'histoire des religions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHSE</td>
<td>Revue historique du Sud-Est européen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoB</td>
<td>Religion och Bibel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPh</td>
<td>Revue de philologie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPhilos</td>
<td>Revue philosophique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSPT</td>
<td>Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSS</td>
<td>Revue des sciences religieuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSym</td>
<td>Revue de synthèse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RU</td>
<td>Revue universitaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>Studia linguistica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMSR</td>
<td>Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Scandinavian Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCAAS</td>
<td>Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPAS</td>
<td>Transactions of the Philological Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>La table ronde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UUA</td>
<td>Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDI</td>
<td>Vestnik drevnej istorii (Akademii Nauk SSSR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VJ</td>
<td>Visveswaranand Indological Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSLA</td>
<td>Vetenskaps-societen i Lund, Arsbok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSLS</td>
<td>Vetenskaps-societen i Lund, Skrifter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF</td>
<td>Western Folklore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZDA</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZDMG</td>
<td>Zeitschrift der Deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZDPH</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEthn</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für Ethnologie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZRGG</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Language of Gods and Language of Men: Remarks on Some Indo-European Metalinguistic Traditions

CALVERT WATKINS, Harvard University

The fundamental work on “language of men” and “language of gods” is Hermann Günther's *Von der Sprache der Götter und Geister* which presents a detailed examination of this figure in two Indo-European traditions: the Homeric poems and the *Alvissmál* of the Old Norse *Poetic Edda*. More recently, the figure has been analyzed by R. Lazzeroni. In Homer we have a total of six instances of the figure. Four of these contrast two lexical items, as belonging to the language of men and gods, respectively; the typical formula is (Iliad 14. 290-291)

\[
\text{όροι λατρεων ἄταλαγων, ὡς ἀν ὡς ἔσται.}
\]

Here we have the contrast between two appellations for the same bird: *έλατος* (men) and *χαλέης* (gods). In the other three, we have personal and local names. Thus, giving first the name in the language of men,

- a hill *Bartea*: στύμα πολυσκύλων Μορφής (Iliad 2.813-814);
- the river *Συνηρίας*: Εἰσθην (Iliad 20.74);
- a giant *Λυκον*: Βροχέως (Iliad 1.129, etc.).

1 Halle, 1931.
2 *ASNP*, ser. 2, 26:1-25 (1957), with intervening literature.
In two instances we have only the "gods' word": μόια δέ μεν καλλονεῖν θεοὶ (Odyssey 10.305) and Παγετών δέ τοι τά τε γε θεῶν μικρῶν καλέσσιν (Odyssey 12.61).

In all the cases where there is an opposition, as Günert recognized, the term attributed to the language of men is the normal Greek designation of the object, place, or being, and that attributed to the language of the gods is a "poetic he Umschreibung allgemeiner Art." Thus χαλές, 'the χαλές-colored'; Βραχύς, the strong (Θρακός; note that the synizesis in the line of ἐν from ἐν is generally a mark of recentness). In σήμα Μυθης (following the scholia) we have a "scholarly" reference to a heroine cult which is quite Hellenistic in effect.

In these cases we have a metalinguistic poetic figure setting forth explicitly a hierarchy in the lexicon: the relation between the designations of the same entity on two levels of discourse. The lower level, that of ordinary language, is figured as the "language of men," while the higher and more restricted level of formal, poetic, or otherwise exotic language is figured in this ancient metaphor as the "language of the gods." This metaphor represents a conscious signalization of an opposition existing in the lexicon, between the common, semantically unmarked term, and a rarer, more "charged," semantically marked term. On the plane of discourse the opposition is most commonly (and clearly in the Edda, as we shall see below) that between ordinary and poetic language in the widest sense.

There are words in the lexicon which for reasons having to do with the culture have an immanent semantic charge or mark, without there necessarily existing any semantically unmarked equivalent. Such a form is μόια, with its aura of black magic and taboo comparable with that of mandrake, mandragora, and the like. It is a semantically marked term, and as such is assigned to the language of the gods; there simply is no unmarked equivalent designation, hence the absence of a term for men. It is characteristic of the Greek examples that they are precisely not common ordinary lexical items, in contrast with the Old Norse material. We do not have, for example, a putative opposition between a "human" term ἄιω and a "divine" ἄος as the word for "blood." For this reason it is well not to insist too much on the Homeric examples, which are complex in character. There are particular reasons in the Homeric poems why the paired designations appear when they do (only six times in some 25,000 lines); these are connected with the metaphor itself and

Despite the superficial proliferation of synonyms and associate divine beings, we have in reality merely the elaboration of a poetic figure opposing a single genuine pair of lexical items as "human" and "divine." The greater complexity of the "divine" set is a reflex of a more complicated pantheon of divine and otherworld beings and of the necessity of filling out the system. In all cases but two ("sea" and "grain") the word used by Thor in his question "how is it called" is the ordinary, unmarked "human" word; the exceptions are introduced for the sake of alliteration. That the poet saw no contradiction in Thor's using the human word is to be expected, and shows that the metaphor was indeed just a metaphor. Similarly in Homer, where the gods speak men's Greek.

Perhaps the greatest merit of Günert's work was to point out the "divine association" of the entity or personage in question. They have been quite well analyzed by Lazzeroni, and there is no need to go into them here. What is basic is the possibility of the contrast itself; Lazzeroni when separating entirely the Greek facts from those of Old Norse and other traditions goes too far in ignoring the basic fact that the human term in both traditions is the neutral, semantically unmarked member.
role of alliteration in the distribution of the synonyms and the beings assigned them. The verse scheme requires a bridge of alliteration between the two hemistichs of the first line, which always begins with the men's word in the first hemistich. We may in fact set up two basic ordered rules: (1) if the men's word begins with a vowel, the gods are called *eisir* for alliteration and the choice of the god's word is free; (2) if the men's word does not begin with a vowel, the gods are called *god* and the god's word must alliterate with the men's word.

When rule 1 applies, we get a genuine opposition between the unmarked term and the raven, poetic term: 

- **earth** (st. 10) *iprd* : *fold*
- **fire** (st. 26) *eldr* : *femi*

The case of **gl** (st. 9) is apart, for technological reasons; the hierarchy is there, but it is an economic or gastronomic one rather than a semantic one, the opposition being apparently between the old native brew without hops (pl) and the new, more expensive, and better-tasting brew with hops (biorr).

In the remaining cases, where rule 2 applies, there may be a genuine opposition, if the existing poetic synonym happens to alliterate:

- **heaven** (st. 13) *himinn* : *hýrnir*
- **moon** (st. 14) *miði* : *mylinn*
- **sun** (st. 16) *sæl* : *sumna*
- **calm** (st. 22) *logn* : *langi*
- **night** (st. 30) *nótt* : *niól*
- **grain** (st. 32) *bygg* : *barr*

But if the poetic word does not alliterate with the normal word, it is assigned to a group other than the god, and an alliterative word is invented for the designation by the god.

- **sea** (st. 43) *saur* : *marr* (dvergar)

and probably

- **wood** (st. 28) *víðr* : *eldi* (firewood) (götmer)

In the remaining two cases, **sky**, 'cloud,' and **wind,** 'wind,' no genuine opposed term existed which could be brought into the system of alliteration, and the terms in the whole series are simply inventions of the poet, as Güntert showed.

The remaining terms attributed to other beings are in a large measure *keld* (leið): they are all kennings, transferred meanings, or other poetic creations, doubtless the work of the author of the *Avismol* itself. Their repartition among the remaining divine or otherworld beings is to a large extent governed by alliteration, as is the occasional permutation of one divine group for another. Compare the constant of words in initial *v-* for the *vanir,* in *h-* for the beings *helio.* The whole is, as H. Gering termed it, "ein versifiziertes Kapitel aus der skaldischen Poetik," and indeed a quite artificial literary showpiece and tour de force.

It is thus clear that in the *Avismol* text what is basic is the binary opposition "human : divine," the poetic figuration of an opposition in the lexicon **semantically unmarked term : semantically marked term.** There may be genuinely more than one of the latter, as probably in Old Norse *bygg* : *barr, såd,* and more can always be freely created, as the rest of the *Avismol* shows, but this does not alter the fundamental structural set; an English equivalent would be *horse : steed, mount, charger,* and so on. As E. Benveniste has so well expressed it: "Il est dans la nature des faits linguistiques, puisqu'ils sont des signes, de se réaliser en oppositions, et de ne signifier que par là," and this is equally valid for the lexicon of a language.

Güntert further pointed out the existence of the same poetic figure in early Sanskrit literature, in the *Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa* (104.6.1). Since he cites only the translation, I give the passage here:

> háyo bhūvā devān avahād vajj gandharvan ārvā śūrān āvō mamāyan

> as háya he carried the gods, as vējin the gandharvas, as árvō the asuras, as ávō men.

The semantic opposition is *dīva* : *hāya, vējin, árvō;* the unmarked term is the normal inherited Indo-European word for "horse" (Lat. *equus*).

It is important to note, as Güntert did not, that all three of the semantically marked, noble, poetic terms are also found as such in earlier Vedic literature, in the *Rig-Veda* passim. The choice of one or the other of them is indifferent; what is relevant is only the semantic opposition of each to *dīva* as marked to unmarked.

In the hymn to the sacrificial horse (1.163) we find *vējin* and *árvō* several times as terms of direct address (vocatives) to the horse about to be sacrificed, whereas in this hymn *dīva* is used only in neutral, declarative context.

---

4 CL Güntert, op. cit., p. 132.
In another hymn (7.74-4) we find ásva and hāya coexisting in the same manner:

\[ \text{ásva} \text{ yé vām ásū ḍāsū̃n dhāsū̃n} \]

(you are the horses that fly, bringing you to the house of the sacrificer, with [these] swift horses come here for us, O heroes, O gods Asvin.

The relative sentence is worth noting, for it shows a sentence of an archaic paratactic Indo-European type which recurs most clearly in Hittite: the antecedent of the relative clause appears both in the relative clause and in the succeeding main clause. (This type is also of interest for the general syntactic theory of the relative sentence.) Thus in Hittite:

\[ \text{nu-}n\text{u} \text{E-ir kuit ēsa} \]

\[ \text{nukān ISTU Ė-YA ISTAR} \text{umāsamūhā ḥantiyannu} \]

\[ \text{and the house which I had,} \]

\[ \text{and with my house I was true to Istar of Samuḫa.} \]

\[ \text{nu-nu KUR umāTapapanuwa kuit dān EGIR-pa ēlas} \]

\[ \text{nu KUR umāTapapanuwa arā warnu} \]

\[ \text{and the land which I had,} \]

\[ \text{and they burned the land of Tapapanuwa.} \]

Such Hittite relative sentences have an evident structural similarity to the Vedic relative sentence quoted above. But there is an interesting stylistic difference. The noun ásva modified by the relative clause is not simply repeated in the following main clause; rather it is there replaced by the equivalent but more semantically marked noun hāya. Thus for an underlying relative sentence of the Indo-European type:

\[ \text{ásvā yē dīyām āsūvihīr a ḍāsūmā} \]

\[ \text{the horses that fly,} \]

\[ \text{*āsvā yē ḍāsūmā come with the horses} \]

It is clear that such a particular stylistic “transformation”—of lexical substitution in a determined syntactic position—is explicable only in terms of a semantic hierarchy in the lexicon: unmarked ásva → marked hāya. It is equally evident that this hierarchical relation between the terms ásva and hāya existed in Indic prior to Rig-Vedic times, and was continued intact until the time of its different poetic configuration as “language of men” and “language of gods” in the Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa. It is the semantic hierarchy that is basic, and the metaphor of “language of men” and “language of gods” is derived from it; for this reason I would hesitate to ascribe the metaphor itself to a putative Indo-European poetic “doctrine” as some have done; I prefer to regard it as an independent (and quite natural) creation in the traditions that show it.

It may be that the semantic hierarchy of ásva and hāya is older still. As noted, ásva is the well-known IE *ásvo-. The word hāya, alone among the semantically marked words for “horse,” has a cognate in Armenian, ji (gen. jiyo), the normal (semantically unmarked) word for horse; vis-a-vis Sanskrit it has moved down a step in semantic mark. But Sanskrit ásva has also an exact cognate in Armenian (aše R. Godel): the word is ēl (gen. ēlyo) and the meaning is ‘donkey.’ We know from Iranian tradition (Fīrūzdād 7.42) that the donkey (Āvestan xara-) was considered the least worthy of the ēlyo, ‘Great-viel,’ below the horse, and it is not unlikely that a similar view prevailed among the Iranianized Armenians. But the semantic shift from “horse” to “donkey” would be difficult to understand except in the context of such a semantic hierarchy between ji and ēl in preclassical Armenian as we can observe between hāya and ásva in Vedic.

Since Güntert’s time the figure of language of men and language of gods has been reported for one other tradition: ancient Anatolian, by J. Friedrich.9 Here we have such passages in Hittite as

\[ \text{tandukesni Tasimmetis, DINGIR.MES-nas-a šarka} \]

\[ \text{ISTAR-ii SALLUGAL-ii xik} \]

\[ \text{to mankind you are Tasimmetis, but among the gods you are Istar the queen.} \]

10 Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazkê, VIII 41 11 8-9.
Such passages in fact come from bilingual texts in Hittite and Hattic; they are edited by E. Laroche.\textsuperscript{8} Some of the tablets are in the archaic cuneiform ductus of the Old Kingdom, as noted by H. Otten.\textsuperscript{12} The tradition is thus old; but it is likely that this figure is a Hittic one borrowed by translation into Hittite.

All the examples of this figure concern the names or epithets of deities; we never have any reference to an ordinary lexical item being assigned to the language of men or to the language of gods. For this reason the Anatolian figure is not really comparable with that in Greek, and particularly Old Norse or Indic. Rather it reflects a specific Anatolian cultic practice; it is basically more akin to the Greek hymnic tradition of invoking a divinity by a number of different names or epithets than it is to the Homeric language of gods and language of men.

To my knowledge it has never before been noted that there exists in early Irish an analogue to the figure of language of gods and language of men. It is found in one of the most curious of all Irish texts, the \textit{Auraicept na n-Eces}, the "Scholar's Primer" or "Handbook of the Learned," as it is called by its editor and translator George Calder.\textsuperscript{13} It is a treatise on grammar and poetics, \textit{Fíldeach}, and compiled out of elements of variable antiquity; the language is in the main Middle Irish, but has numerous traits requiring the supposition of antecedent Old Irish material. Whereas the text shows considerable influence of Isidore and the grammarian Virgilius Maro, this element clearly represents an overlay upon a basic purely native Irish doctrine of poetic learning which is of equal interest. The text and its doctrine have been virtually untouched in Irish scholarship since Cal-der's (scarcely definitive) edition of 1917, and it remains a fertile field for investigation of Irish poetical and grammatical theory.

At a certain point in the text (1457, cf. 1236 \textit{et passim}), the compiler is discussing the principle \textit{dráit didú bunad cacha Gaeilge acht mod 7 tod 7 tróth}, "syllable [dialt] however, is the origin of all Gaelic except moth, toth, and tróth [the verbal symbols for masculine, feminine, and neuter gender]." Calder correctly saw (pp. xlvi-xlvii) that this curious asseveration actually means that while the grammatical categories of number, case, person, degree, tense, and mood are all expressed by overt morphemes (prefixes, suffixes, endings), thus "syllables," gender alone is not; it has no formal correlate in Irish substantives, but is simply an inherent, immanent property. It is a remarkable observation for the native Irish grammarians to have made.

Continuing the discussion of moth, toth, tróth, the compiler adds (1493–1496): \textit{secundum quosdam cumad etarscarad indsci: esse, is, is sid iar Macaib Miled; vindius, vindis, ondor iar Feraib Bolg; mod, tod, trath iar Tuathaibe De Danaan, accumad to some, it is a distinction of speech: \textit{es} [it is he] es \textit{si} [it is she] es \textit{ed} [it is it] according to the Sons of Milesius; vindus [voilà (the man)], vindasi [voilà (the woman)], ondus [voilà (the thing)] according to the Fir Bolg, moth [everything male or masculine], toth [everything female or feminine], tróth [everything neuter] according to the Tuatha Dé Danann."

In the long version of the \textit{Yellow Book of Lecan} the passage reads (4554–4556): \textit{etargairi a n-annsíb: is \textit{e} is \textit{i} is eath iar Macaib Miled; masgoul, feimin, neutor laiain Laitnseoir; vindie, vindis, ondus iar bFeraib Bolg; moth, toth, trathad la Tuatha De Danaan, thus adding: "masculine, feminine, neuter with the Latinis." In view of the late character of these loan words, whose Latin origin was of course well known to the compiler of \textit{Auraicept}, this passage is probably an interpolation.

The three ways of specifying gender are thus attributed to successive "legendary races" of men and gods which occupied Ireland: the Milesians (Sons of Mil), ancestors of the Gaels; the Fir Bolg invaders; and the ancient Celtic pagan gods, the Tuatha Dé Danann.\textsuperscript{14} Of the terms themselves, the most "normal" and semantically unmarked is that of the syntagm of copula plus pronoun, \textit{is \textit{e} \textit{is} \textit{ed}. That the Irish in fact regarded these forms as giving the "key" to the gender of a word is clear from \textit{Auraicept} 617–620 where the phenomenon is discussed, under the technical term \textit{erlonn} (\textit{aurlann, aurlan}), [preceding word, leading word [lit. butt end, handle]]: \textit{nadfreidgar a tri urlundinnsc Æ. a iis remsonnudh Æ. slóiní remnpi Æ. risma hinscihb Æ. tae iis tae}. 'They are the man/she is the woman (who is). On the term \textit{erlonn} (\textit{aurlann}) see the \textit{Contributions to a Dictionary of the Irish language} (Royal Irish Academy), i.e., \textit{aurlan} the editors suggest it

\textsuperscript{8} JCS 17:297–216 (1947).
\textsuperscript{9} Religionsgeschichte des alten Orients, Handbuch der Orientalistik, Abt. 1, Bd. 8, Abschn. 1, p. 100.
\textsuperscript{10} Edinburgh, 1917.
\textsuperscript{13} Edinburgh, 1917.
may be the same word as *airlann, ‘correspondence, analogy.’ One wonders whether it may not also be ultimately connected with *air-lann, ‘forecourt, open space before a residence, fort, or city,’ despite the variation in declension.

The forms *uindse, *uindi, ondar are doubtless artificially introduced here; they have nothing to do with gender, and the repartition of the three forms as ‘volit’ implying a masculine, feminine, or neuter object to be looked at (cf. *Auraicept 648–649) finds no confirmation whatever in other texts. Probably the reason for their introduction is the earlier section of the *Auraicept (705 ff.), where there is discussion of the difference between *uine, ‘voila, voila,’ and is é, ‘it is he, he is.’ There is é is specifically called a “denotation of gender” (is *uindse, is *uindi, is ondar see M. A. O’Brien, Études 11:65 (1932); *uind is doubtless imperative 2 sing, active of the rare verb *uindim, meaning ‘see, behold,’” and -ef/-ai are simply variant later spellings of the Old Irish 2 sing. suffixed subject pronoun -siu. The ‘neuter’ ondar would be the imperative 3 sing, passive of the same verb. If the inclusion of these terms for gender is thus artificial, it follows that its attribution to the Fir Bolg is likewise artificial. The real opposing member is the following one.

In *moth, *toth, *traeth, particularly in view of the often repeated maxim that “syllable is the root of all Gaelic save *moth, *toth, *traeth” discussed above, we have a genuine and archeic designation of masculine, feminine, neuter. The terms are glossed respectively as *cach ferda, ‘everything masculine,’ *cach mbanda, ‘everything feminine,’ *cach neoturda, ‘everything neuter’; specifically the first two are also used for the male and female sexual organs as well. As R. Thurneysen once said of another form, the terms *moth and *toth can “beliebig alt sein”; they were compared by O’Brien and Thurneysen with the Latin divine name Mfit [mētis] TuThns,18 which shows the suffix -tīms occurring in other ancient Latin divine names like Neptūns.19

The origin of *traeth is obscure; but it seems to be connected with the weak verb traethad, ‘subdues, abates’ (verbal noun traethad, a variant of *traeth in *Auraicept 4508), and certainly was by the Irish themselves (cf. *Auraicept 1:186). If so, we would have a noun meaning ‘abatement, suspension [of the categories masculine and feminine, or the difference between them]’ and a concept akin to the modern linguistic one of “neutralization.”

We may venture the speculation that in the system *moth, *toth, *traeth were also *erlonn (aurlann, airlann), ‘leading word,’ but belonging to a grammatical doctrine of gender on a more theoretical plane and/or older chronological level than the purely empirical system is é, is si, is ed; the latter system can of course be only as old as the emphasizing construction is é in fer (as), which is a Celtic innovation. But in any case, however complex the legends involved, the two sets are fundamentally opposed in the metaphorical figure of language of men (Gael, the Sons of Míl) and language of gods (the Tuatha Dé Danann), the two basic opposing groups in the Irish invasion legend.

Such a figure as this is to my knowledge unique in Irish literature. That the compiler of the *Auraicept introduced the figure by secundum quosdam indicates that there was some sort of tradition; but in view of the artificial character of some of the forms so contrasted, and their attribution to vaguely historical or pseudohistorical as well as divine figures, all unique to Ireland, it is scarcely likely that the figure or metaphor can be in any way considered an inheritance. Rather it would indicate the naturalness of the figure of attaching variant forms in the lexicon to whatever contrastable groups exist in the traditional lore; Mait Macrul, Fir Bolg, and Tuatha Dé Danann in Ireland; mātnyā, dēth, gāndharvā and anāth in India; menn, god, ēsī, ēvan, šāmun, āfors, āvēr, āvēr, or cover terms like upregin in Iceland. From these examples it should be clear that the social groups can be multiplied to fit the number of synonyms or quasisynonyms in the lexicon to be contrasted. By the same token, as is quite clear in the Akkāmsi, the number of “synonyms” can be arbitrarily increased (by the invention of kennings and the like) to correspond to the number of groups of divine or semi-divine beings.

But however high the number of synonyms, it can always be reduced to a basically binary opposition between the neutral, semantically unmarked member and one or more charged, semantically marked members. It is this basic opposition, a synchronic hierarchy existing in the lexicon, which is metaphorically figured in the contrast of the language of men (= unmarked member) and the language of gods (= marked member), as in Greece and Anatolia (both Indo-European Hittite and non-Indo-European Hattic). If more than one marked member exists, it is a simple matter to multiply (or subdivide) the divine or semi-divine groups, as in India and Iceland.

18 Cf. the discussion and references in A. Erosz and A. Meillet, Dictionnaire éymologique de la langue latine (4th ed.), s.n. neutus; also the skeptical remarks of A. Wace and J. B. Hofmann, Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch (3d ed.) s.n., likewise with references.
In Christian Ireland, the attribution of the opposition directly to men: (pagan) gods would scarcely have been a natural one; hence we find here the opposition correlated with successive legendary races invading and populating Ireland. The unmarked member is that of the language of the Sons of Mil, ancestors of the Gaels, whereas the marked member is attributed to the historically antecedent divine figures of the Táith Dé Danann.

Yet this unique and isolated figure is not really the basic opposition in the semantic hierarchy of the lexicon in native Irish tradition. For this we must consider another passage in the Auraicept (1302) and scrutinize the technical terms which it employs:

\[
\text{it e coic gne berla tobaide l. berla Fene na filed 7 berla etars-
garta 7 berla forchide na filed trias a-nugalit cehc dib a checele 7 farmberla}
\]

These are five species of the Selected Language, viz: Language of the Irish, Maxims of the Poets, Separated Language, Obscure Language of the Poets through which each of them addresses his fellow, and Unascended Language.

It is probable here that berla Fene, 'Language of the Irish,' is to be taken to mean 'Ordinary Language,' mentioned some time later (1358) as the fifth category: \(\text{it e in coiced gne in gnathberla fogni do e} \text{epof[F]}\), the fifth kind is the ordinary language that serves for everyone. Compare from the Book of Ballymote (godse) in gnathberla fogni do chadh is e in berla bannaid no is berla topace, 'ordinary language which serves for everyone, that is the foundation language; or it is the Selected Language.' Note especially that in Gorman's glossary gnathberla is opposed to semberla.15

Berla tobaide is the normal term for Gaelic in the Auraicept and related glossatorial texts: tobaithiu (in Old Irish form), 'cut; defined, selected,' is the past participle of to-fa-to-ben. An alternate form is berla teipide (in Old Irish form belre teipide), 'cut, excised, fashioned, selected,' from to-eess-ben. These participial formations are particularly interesting in that they form a perfect pendant to the Indic terms sanskrita-, 'perfected: Sanskrit,' beside prakṣa- from prakṣa, 'the matter of the language,' as L. Renou defines it in his brief but characteristically illuminating discussion of these terms.16

The compiler of the Auraicept goes on to report that some authorities equate berla Fene, 'Language of the Irish,' with Fáisige

15 Cf. Contributions to a Dictionary of the Irish Language, Royal Irish Academy (Dublin), 1. 209.

16 Histoire de la langue sanskrite (Lyon, 1950), pp. 5-6.


neuter nom. *g*en, gen. *g*en-s, whereas I prefer an animate (or feminine) nom. *g*en-s, acc. *g*en-n (whence archaic Old Irish *bein*, acc. of *ben*), gen. *g*en-de. The latter paradigm is, I suggest, also indirectly attested in Hittite nom. SAL-za (once SAL-anza), acc. SAL-ana, gen. SAL-na.21 The form *bein* in the word for “woman” may well have served as an important channel for the spread of *n̂* (*n̂*-en) as the accusative of feminine *n̂*-stems. The nom. *tūath* < *teuta*, acc. *teuth < *teutu* would thus imitate nom. *g*en (replacing *g*en-s), acc. *g*en-n. It is more likely that the word was originally animate (feminine) gender, as in Hittite. The transfer of a monosyllabic consonant-stem noun to neuter gender in Irish may be observed also in the neuter dél, ‘tooth,’ beside the animate (masculine) gender of the cognates in all other Indo-European languages.

The term **iarnbērла** in Irish grammatical tradition always means ‘unstressed word,’ and it is a remarkable tribute to the Irish grammarians that they registered this feature of sentence phonetics: **focal**, ‘word’ = “stressed word.” The list of forms in **iarnbērла** includes such categories as prepositions (far, ’after, ar, ’for’), particles, conjunctions, and some adverbs (dano, ’then,’ immorro, ’moreover’) including conjugated prepositions functioning as adverbs (arum, ’their; lit. ’after it’), preposition plus article (forsna, ’on the’), the substantive verb stat, ’there are,’ and constructs like edon, ’id est,’ cine, ’how many are.’ All these are termed **dialt n-etarlemmi**, ‘interpolating syllable’ for the poet, that is, they constitute the **temps jaible** line) gender of the cognates in all other Indo-European languages.

The term **iarnbērла** in Irish grammatical tradition always means ‘unstressed word,’ and it is a remarkable tribute to the Irish grammarians that they registered this feature of sentence phonetics: **focal**, ‘word’ = “stressed word.” The list of forms in **iarnbērла** includes such categories as prepositions (far, ’after, ar, ’for’), particles, conjunctions, and some adverbs (dano, ’then,’ immorro, ’moreover’) including conjugated prepositions functioning as adverbs (arum, ’their; lit. ’after it’), preposition plus article (forsna, ’on the’), the substantive verb stat, ’there are,’ and constructs like edon, ’id est,’ cine, ’how many are.’ All these are termed **dialt n-etarlemmi**, ‘interpolating syllable’ for the poet, that is, they constitute the **temps jaible** line) gender of the cognates in all other Indo-European languages.

The final term is **bērла fortchide na filed**, ‘Obscure language of the poets’: *fortchide is another past participle, ’covered, concealed,’ from *fort-∗-tugethar*. It is more commonly referred to in Irish tradition as **simply **bērла na filed**, language of the poets:** Bērla na filed represents a higher, more elevated, and more obscure form of poetic language than the “straightforward” poetic language termed *fāusīge na filed*, ‘maxims of poets,’ although the difference is merely one of degree. It is the language of the “rhetorics” in Old Irish sagas, passages of verse or rhetorical prose clearly valued for precisely their obscurantism and their bold contrast with the surrounding and transparent prose narrative.

**Bērla na filed** relied for its effect partly on poetic devices like alliteration, partly on perturbations of normal Irish word order, but mostly on obscure lexical items that were otherwise lost in the ordinary language; in other words, archaisms. Compare *senbērла* opposed to *fāusīge na filed* above.

The five categories of language enumerated by the compiler of *Auraiccept na n-Eces* as such represent only a conventional pentad; compare the five provinces of Ireland, the five banquet halls of Ireland, or the Five Ways to Judgment. We may at once exclude **iarnbērла** (unaccented words), as referring to a ubiquitous feature of the language. Similarly **bērла etarlemmi** (separated language) may be excluded, as referring to a particular technique, of native exegesis, rather than to a type of discourse. Of the remaining terms, the first, **bērла Fēne** (‘language of the Irish’) is equated by the Irish tradition with either *gnāthbērла* (ordinary language) or *fāusīge na filed* (pronouncements of poets): a genuine ambiguity or ambivalence that requires explanation.

As Binchy informs me, we know from the statements of later jurists that certain rules are found *isin bērла*, a phrase sometimes expanded to *isin bērла Fēne*. We can thus equate *bērла* alone with *bērла Fēne* (the “professional” language). The fact that *bērла* is used alone shows that it must be the unmarked member of any semantic opposition to a contrasting term. We may note also that *bērла Fēne* (= *bērла*) appears first in the list of the five sorts of language, another indication that it is the unmarked member. Compare in grammar the Latin first declension, first conjugation, or the first class of verbs of the Hindu grammarians.

The hesitation of the Irish tradition on the position of *bērла Fēne* is genuine, and reflects the relative position of the same element on two levels of discourse: it is marked, poetic language by opposition to ordinary language, but it is unmarked, ordinary “professional” (gnomic-poetic-legal) language by opposition to the particular and specialized poetic form of speech known technically as *bērла na filed*. Following the lead of grammatical parallelism, we can establish three oppositions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Ordinary</th>
<th>Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>gnāthbērла</em> : <em>senbērла</em></td>
<td><em>bērла</em> (the “Irish”)</td>
<td><em>bērла na filed</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bērла</em> : <em>fāusīge na filed</em></td>
<td><em>bērла</em></td>
<td><em>bērла</em> : <em>fāusīge na filed</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>fāusīge na filed</em></td>
<td><em>bērла</em></td>
<td><em>fāusīge na filed</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus the most highly marked form of discourse in Irish is that which is archaic, uniquely poetic, and obscure: precisely the characteristic of the so-called “rhetorics” in Irish saga. It is in these oppositions

---

that we find the genuine Irish counterpart of the opposition of language of men and language of gods in the metalinguistic traditions of other Indo-European languages.

It is possible to make a further comparison, this time with Indic, which might suggest that we have to deal here in Irish with a genuine inheritance from an Indo-European poetic doctrine, a doctrine of the nature of poetic language and its relation to ordinary language. Consider the following mantras from the Rig-Veda (7. 87.4):

uvāca me vārvuna mēdhirāya
triḥ sapṭā nāṃī śghnāya bhūbasat
vīḍēn padāya guḥāya nā vocad
yugāya viprā āparāya ś Śāyan
Varuṇa said to me, the wise one:
"The cow bears thrice seven names.
He who knows the spoor should tell them like secrets
if he wishes to serve as poet to the later generation."

Let us note at once that the speaker of the quotation in the hymn is Varuṇa and the hymn is addressed to him, one of the principal deities of Dumžil's first function and one associated here with the patronage of poetry. R. Jakobson points out to me the poet who is Velesovu vnuků, 'grandson of Veles' (root *wel-as in Old Irish *fili, 'poet') in the Slovo o Polku Igoreve.

Yet the Vedic poet is in fact calling to mind the same set of oppositions between ordinary and poetic language as the Irish tradition. The opposition between ordinary and old (Irish gnathberla : senberla) is figured in the yugya vipra āparāya: the poet is old vis-a-vis the later generation.

The opposition between the simply professional and specifically poetic (OIr. bērla Féine : bērla na filed) is precisely figured in the contrast of the poet (the ego of the hymn) who is mēdhirā before Varuṇa speaks to him, and becomes viprā after the intervention of the deity.

Finally, just as in Ireland, one of the characteristics of this archaic, poetic language is its obscurity (Irish forchuíde). Just so the thrice seven names of the cow are guḥāya, 'secret.' And in Rig-Veda 4.5.3 padām na gōr apagīthaṃ vivideṇā (guh, 'hide') we have a participle in -tā, 'hidden,' comparable both with the formation of sanskṛta, prakṛta and with OIr. forchuíde, 'hidden.'

Indeed in the Rig-Veda the "secret name" or "word" (pada) of the cows, gods, and so on is a quite common figure (some nine examples). Note especially guḥyaṁ nāṃa goṇām, 'the secret names of the cows,' a formula occupying the same metrical position (from caesura to verse end) in both Rig-Veda 5.3.3 and 9.87.3. This metrical feature is in itself an index of archaism. The figure of the "secret name" or "word" frequently plays on the basic meaning of pada which is 'spoor,' as in the preceding example. Probably it had something to do with the semantic development of pada, for example, originally "secret word."

Another typical example is Rig-Veda 8.41.5.

yet, uṣhrānaṃ apiṣpā
vēḍā nāṃnāṃi guḥyā
sā kavih kāvyaḥ purā
rūpām dyāur āva puṣyaśi
He who knows the secret hidden names of the cows,
as a poet/seeer he greatly prospers poetic art
as the bright sky its color

The message is virtually identical to that of 7.87.4 above: knowledge of the secret names establishes the poet in his prerogative. And I further suspect that when the Vedic poet uses śghnāya, 'she not to be harmed,' or uṣrā, 'she the gleaming one,' for 'cow' here, instead of the neutral go- as in other passages, he is consciously utilizing one of these "secret" names for the cow. We have to deal with a versified "synonymy," in a fashion similar to that of the Alvissmål in Old Norse.

Specifically the technique is the introduction of a semantically marked synonym in place of the unmarked, "normal" variant, that is, go. We noted earlier the replacement of unmarked āsva by marked háya in a determined syntactic context. Here we have another instance of the same poetic process. We have a formula guhyan nāṃa gānām, which on metrical grounds may well be old. The version in 8.41.5 uṣrānaṃ . . . nāṃnāṃi guhynā is just such a stylistic transformation of this formula, by means of the semantic hierarchy go —> uṣrā, śghynā, . . . plus other trivial transformations of word order, grammatical number, and so on, which may be discounted here.
EUHEMERISM

It may be best to admit\(^1\) that my reflections on Euhemerus were motivated by the Wikander-Dumezilian interpretation of the *Mahābhārata.*\(^2\) It is one of the contexts in which the words "euhemerism" and "euhemerization" come up. Certain gods, functioning in an early Indo-European mythical structure, are "transposed," so it is said, into heroic figures. And as we know, Indo-Europeanists have to deal with a number of such "euhemerizing" transpositions. Next to the *Mahābhārata,* there are the first books of Livy, the saga of Hadding in Saxo Grammaticus, and several themes and narrations in Snorri Sturluson, to name some of the best-known euhemerizing texts.

If anything is clear, it is the variety of these documents, and indubitably, the "transposition" remains an enigmatic procedure. Since the name of the Greek Euhemerus is linked with the discussions, euhemerism as a Western intellectual fashion deserves some reflections. Thus I venture on this excursus in defense of Euhemerus with the hope that in the eyes of specialists it will not be a raid on his behalf.

It is a curious manner of reading and explaining myths which is

---

\(^1\) I am indebted to Professor Jacques Duchesne-Guillemin and to Professor Truesdell S. Brown for their counsel in bibliographical matters.

generally, and somewhat too easily, attributed to this romancer Euhemerus (ca. 340–260 B.C.). This method can be summed up in two words: historization and humanization. The information we have about Euhemerus is scanty. The most important fragment of his work, the most unmistakable one, we owe to the famous early Christian church historian Eusebius (ca. A.D. 300), who in turn owed his information to Diodorus (first century B.C.), who quoted Euhemerus. (Book 6 where Diodorus begins to speak explicitly about Euhemerus is among the lost books of his history.) This information, given to us in such a roundabout way, is nevertheless most important. The story is well known and needs no elaborate rendering here. Euhemerus narrates how he once traveled to some islands in the East and visited the people named the Panchaeans. The story is rather fantastic. Euhemerus would have us believe for instance—assuming, as is generally done, that this information given by Diodorus elsewhere also comes from Euhemerus—that from one of these islands, at least from a promontory on it, on a clear day one could see India. On the principal island a temple of Zeus is situated, Zeus Triphylios, to be exact. There is a large golden pillar in this temple on which Zeus himself had made inscriptions. In these inscriptions were recorded the deeds of Zeus, of his father Kronos, and of his grandfather Ouranos. For Zeus, like his grandfather and father, at one time was king of the inhabited earth. Like his ancestors, he received the honor of divinity because of the great tasks he performed for mankind. The nucleus of the theory, then, is simply that the gods at the time were human beings, who came to be worshiped as gods because of their acts on behalf of men. Admittedly, as a scholarly theory on the origin of myth Euhemerus’ romance is hardly worth considering. But the story is well known and needs no elaborate rendering here. Euhemerus narrates how he once traveled to some islands in the East and visited the people named the Panchaeans. The story is rather fantastic. Euhemerus would have us believe for instance—assuming, as is generally done, that this information given by Diodorus elsewhere also comes from Euhemerus—that from one of these islands, at least from a promontory on it, on a clear day one could see India. On the principal island a temple of Zeus is situated, Zeus Triphylios, to be exact. There is a large golden pillar in this temple on which Zeus himself had made inscriptions. In these inscriptions were recorded the deeds of Zeus, of his father Kronos, and of his grandfather Ouranos. For Zeus, like his grandfather and father, at one time was king of the inhabited earth. Like his ancestors, he received the honor of divinity because of the great tasks he performed for mankind. The nucleus of the theory, then, is simply that the gods at the time were human beings, who came to be worshiped as gods because of their acts on behalf of men. Admittedly, as a scholarly theory on the origin of myth Euhemerus’ romance is hardly worth considering. But the reason why a specific method of interpretation became associated with his name was perhaps precisely that he wrote not a learned treatise but something with a more popular appeal. And it seems to me that there are two very important reasons why euhemerism is worth considering from the point of view of the historian of religions. The most conspicuous point of interest in euhemerism is its tenacity in intellectual circles in the West; unabated it survived in eighteenth-century scholarship and lingered even in the nineteenth century. Generally critical evaluations of the ancient traditions were not novel. Two centuries before Euhemerus another Greek, the famous philosopher Xenophanes of Colophon, spoke words that testify to the occurrence of more or less “euhemeristic” tendencies even then. These words have been quoted many times since: “But the mortals think that the gods are born and dress, speak, and look just like they themselves do.” And “the Ethiopians imagine that their gods are black and have smub noses, but the Tracians think of their gods as blue-eyed and having red hair.” “If cows, horses and lions had hands and could use them to paint and make artifacts, as people do, then the horses would paint divine images like horses, the cows like cows; they would create images appearing like themselves.” It may be useful, though, to remind ourselves that this is not the irony of some modern demythologizer. Another fragment of Xenophanes adds: “[For there is] only one single God, the supreme one among gods and people, unlike the mortals both in appearance and in thought.” For every good and severe criticism or serious doubt has another, positive side to it. In this context we may think also of that philosophical giant Aristotle (384–322 B.C.), an older contemporary of Euhemerus. Aristotle can hardly pass as an adherent to traditional religion. Yet he was most impressed by perpetual, regular motion. This he found in the cyclical course of the heavenly bodies, as stated in De Caelo (e.g., 285a2g, 292a20, 292b21). Corresponding statements are made by Aristotle in his Metaphysics (see 1074a30). He makes a sharp distinction between traditional beliefs and the divine nature of the heavens, and even speaks of the celestial bodies as “divine” (hēōne) bodies (Metaphysics 1074a30). One passage is so revealing that I like to quote it in full:

A tradition has been handed down by the ancient thinkers of very early times, and bequeathed to posterity in the form of a myth, so the effect of these heavenly bodies are gods, and that the Divine pervades the whole of nature. The rest of their tradition has been added later in a
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3 The texts of ancient authors by and concerning Euhemerus have been collected by Felix Jacoby, Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker, I (Berlin, 1923), 300–313.
In the same context in which Diodorus quotes Euhemerus a distinction is made that is not without analogy to Aristotle's exposition. Certain of the gods are said to be eternal and imperishable. It is interesting to note that Diodorus expressly mentions that the ancients have always known that. Such gods are, for instance, "the sun and the moon and the other stars of the heavens" ("Fragmenta Libri VI," 1.2). And further "for each of these the genesis and duration are from everlasting to everlasting."10 The appeal to tradition may be invalid in terms of modern scholarship, both here and in the case of Aristotle, but this question does not concern us here. The Dutch scholar Schippers has shown convincingly that this type of distinction must have been part of Euhemerus' world of ideas;11 evidently it was a distinction of a sort that was already accepted in intellectual circles. We learn from Diodorus that Euhemerus' theory deals with the second type of deity, and presumably also Euhemerus, makes a reference to tradition: "But the other gods, we are told, were terrestrial beings, who attained to immortal honor and fame because of their benefactions to mankind" ("Fragmenta Libri VI," 1.2).12 This is the group to which Zeus belongs, and the other deities who play a role in Euhemerus' story.

Certainly the existence of critical evaluations like those by Xenophanes and Aristotle should not lead us to believe that Euhemerus was equally sharp in his criticism; if anything, he was conservative in comparison. The distinction between natural gods and divinized
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12 Ibid.
14 Oldfather, op. cit., p. 531.
When it comes to the divinization of people, ideas of a biblical origin are much easier to fathom. Such divinization is a sinful affair. The idea itself that the gods were glorified men is not limited to Euhemerus' text becomes the crystallization of a sociopolitical ideology: a process of religious decay. In the Wisdom of Solomon 14:16-17 we read:

For a father afflicted by unsimply grief made a likeness of his child that had been quickly taken from him, and presently honored as a god him who was once a dead man, and handed down to his subjects mysteries and rites. Then the ungodly practice, strengthened by time, came to be observed as law, and by the orders of monarchs carved images were worshipped. And when men could not honor them in their presence because they lived far away, they imagined how they looked, far away, and made a visible image of the king they honored, so as by their zeal to flatter the absent one as though he were present."

Ideas like these, nourished by the biblical tradition spreading in the process of European Christianization, helped to form a matrix for improper Euhemerism. An important religious role in late antiquity was played by the oracular writings known as the Syllinyte Books. The third book begins with a biblical story (the Tower of Babel) and a euhemeristic narration of a motif in Greek religion, whereby euhemerism serves to show the inferiority of paganism. Euhemerizations provided with a new edge by the biblical tradition occur frequently in the Church Fathers and the medieval bishops.

By the fourth century A.D. euhemerism, albeit of an amalgamated nature, has become so widespread that Saint Augustine devotes some lengthy reasonings to it. Specifically he feels that it is necessary to discuss the honor paid by Christians to their martyrs in order to point out that such worship, such honor, differs from paganism. Many reasonings of Saint Augustine are clearly euhemeristic. (In some passages he shows himself familiar with the name of Euhemerus.) Thus in The City of God (8:26) it is said: "with such blindness do impious men, as it were, stumble over mountains, and will not see the things which strike their own eyes, that they do not attend to the fact that in all the literature of the pagans there are not found any, or scarcely any gods, who have not been men to whom, when dead, divine honours have been paid." But for Augustine the pagan customs are also an affair of demons. He concludes in the same section with a peroration that clearly shows the amalgamation I mentioned before: "it was the grief of the demons which was expressing itself through his [Hermes Trismegistus' mouth, who were sorrowing on account of the punishments which were about to fall upon them at the tombs of the martyrs. For in many such places they were tortured and compelled to confess, and were cast out of the bodies of men, of which they had taken possession."

Considering the strength of Christianity and its spokesmen, it is astonishing that euhemerizations could continue to flourish which were not totally improper and could indeed serve as vehicles for mythical motifs, for example, in Saxo Grammaticus. It would seem sometimes as if the negative potential of euhemerism provided the framework within which a "proper" euhemeristic construction could go on, preserving the mythological material.

THE POWER OF PRESERVATION

There is indeed one exceedingly important point in all those euhemerizing reasonings which a modern man is inclined to overlook. It is simply this: that the historization and humanization, which, in
our terms, involve the making up of stories, do not rob a god of his reality. In this respect euhemerism differs fundamentally from all nineteenth- and twentieth-century popular intellectualism that declares gods and spirits nonexistent. The Christian apologist Lactantius is one of our sources for Euhemerus; he does not quote Euhemerus but provides a little treatise about him, and even this militant Christian says that it is *Jupiter* who in the way he went about things, constituting his own worship, was very clever ("quod ille artusitissime excogitavit, ut et sibi honorum divinum et hospitalium suum perpetuum nomen adquiret cum religione coniunctum.").

Schipper, in discussing this passage, adds a footnote to the effect that actually it should have been Euhemerus who had thought these things out so cleverly. It is revealing that Lactantius did not see it that way and apparently saw in Euhemerus an authoritative interpreter. He found no reason at all to make a point that the very figure of *Jupiter* was a figment of the imagination.

Euhemerism's power to preserve may well serve as a point of departure in reflecting on some Indo-European fragments, on the curious tenacity of the theory in intellectual circles and on its rejection by modern scholars.

Even though it is difficult to establish Euhemerus' own psychological attitude, it is obvious that he did not sneer at the gods. Certainly no one would accuse Diodorus, that storehouse of facts, of an overgrown sense of irony. Now it is interesting to note the manner in which Diodorus (in one of the preserved books: Book 5) speaks of the gods in the fabulous land of Panchaea (for the information drawing on Euhemerus in all likelihood). For example, in 5.44 he renders the local tradition concerning Ouranos. In this record the relationship of Ouranos and the sky—of course, well established in traditional lore—is perfectly preserved under the new euhemeristic garb. There is a lofty mountain, he says, which is made sacred to the gods and is called the "Throne of Ouranos" (θρόνος Οὐρανοῦ); and he continues: "For the myth relates that in ancient times, when Ouranos was king of the inhabited earth, he took pleasure in tarrying in that place and in surveying from its lofty top both the heavens and the stars therein . . ." (5.44.6).

Apparently the mythical narrative traditions were too strong either for Diodorus or for his spokesmen to simply transfer Ouranos into the realm of "natural deities," in spite of the fashionable fascination for the heavens. Instead, Ouranos is presented humanly—not, however, *just* humanly but as some ancient king-astronomer. Thus a theme constitutive of the Ouranos myth is preserved. In the fragments of Book 6 the image of Ouranos is completed with explicit reference to Euhemerus: "... that Ouranos was the first to be king, that he was an honorable (κλέον) and beneficent (έκπληκτος), who was versed in the movement of the stars, and that he was also the first to honour the gods of the heavens with sacrifices, whence he was called Ouranos or Heaven" (6.1.8). Clearly the words "historization" and "humanization" to sum up euhemeristic procedure must be used cautiously. The euhemeristic wordings contain much more than a reduction to mere human conditionings. Ouranos' primary kingship, his knowledge of the stars, and his institution of sacrificial ceremonies for the gods of the heavens give Euhemerus' account itself the flavor of a myth of origin.

Traits of a positive evaluation of ancient mythological tradition can be pointed out in later Western texts. Not only were certain themes of myths preserved, but I think we can see evidence of this positive attitude itself, in spite of the increased interest in demonology, in spite of changes brought by Christianity. Most eloquent is a certain inner contradiction in Saxo Grammaticus (ca. 1100) and in Snorri: on the one hand the traditional gods are not gods, on the other hand the author cannot be silent concerning their divinity.

In the first book of Saxo's *Danish History* a well-known curious passage occurs about Odin, much like an interlude in the historical account. It begins as follows: "At this time there was one Odin, who was credited all over Europe with the honour, which was false, of godhead (falso divinitatis titulo censeretur) . . . " (1.7.1). This introduction hardly sets the tone for a sympathetic exposition of devotion to Odin, and the next couple of pages certainly strengthen that impression. But one soon begins to wonder about the astonishing abilities of this "false" godhead. The kings of the North are eager to worship Odin and make a golden image for him in his likeness, much to his pleasure. Then Frigg, Odin's wife, enters the story. She is portrayed as a most wanton woman. She has the image stripped
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21 Jacoby, op. cit., p. 312.
23 Oldfather, op. cit., p. 221.
24 Ibid., p. 185.
by smiths, to use the gold for her own splendor. Odin hangs the smiths and then Saxo tells us that he "mounted the statue upon a pedestal, which by the marvellous skill of his art he made to speak when a mortal touched it" (ibid.). Still this famous magic of Odin as reported does not conflict with Saxo's personal reserves. He elaborates on Frigg's low morals and greed, who even goes so far as to submit herself "to the embraces of one of her servants" and to break the image. And Saxo sighs: "... but what should I here add, save that such a godhead was worthy of such a wife?" (ibid.). Yet Odin is not depicted as deprived of a sense of honor. Filled with shame, he goes into exile. In his absence another person, Mit-Othin, "famous for his juggling tricks ... was likewise quickened, as though by inspiration from on high to seize the opportunity of feigning to be a god" (ibid.).

The period of his reign is described as a catastrophe. When we speak of Saxo's euhemerism—chances are that Saxo did not even know the name of Euhemerus—we should understand it in a condescendingly less defensible way: as a broad popular and intellectual movement in which storytelling meant something; it was less a matter of elaborating on one sweeping causal explanation than a matter of recording what had already been experienced in previous narrations.

Whatever the merits are of Saxo Grammaticus, the works of Snorri Sturluson, his younger contemporary, show a much greater artistic balance. His narratives are also known so much more widely that a few observations suffice to indicate that he too shows the same fascinating "inner contradiction" in his euhemerizations. As we know from the prologue of his Prose Edda, he has the god Thor travel from ancient Troy in a northern direction, making a deep impression wherever he passes through. The whole narration gradually fills the Nordic pantheon, and it is as if Snorri applies a most "orthodox" euhemerism, making use—like Euhemerus in the case of Uranos—of striking etymologies (to which all modern scholarship hastens to add that they are fanciful). Thor, of course, is of royal descent. He is the son of a king in the area of Troy. His mother was a daughter of King Priam himself. Priam was called Tróð, and Thor's original name was Tróð. Thor's character is in no way changed in the euhemerizing process. At the age of twelve he has attained his brutal strength, kills his foster parents, to whose care he had been entrusted, and afterward on his journeys through the world kills berserkers, giants, a huge dragon, and wild beasts left and right. Among his descendants is Odin, who with his wife Frigg likewise travels north and finally settles in Sweden. Odin and his companions bring blessings wherever they go. They were called Aesir which, Snorri assures us, meant
from an “improper” euhemerism. The two are aspects of the same power to preserve old themes in a new clash of traditions, each of which is irrefutably valid.

Of course, the question can be raised—and is hard to repress in the study of the Indo-European materials of which we should like to have so much more than we have: How much was lost of the earlier tradition in these euhemerizing processes? It is a moot question. It is somewhat like asking: How much more history is there than the history of which we have documents? Yet, I think that we have enough data to reflect on euhemerism by making a distinction different from that between “proper” and “improper”: I have in mind the simple distinction between earlier and later euhemerism. The former is the intellectual tradition characterized by narration, integrating existing traditions and for that reason able to preserve earlier mythological motifs; it shows a structural kinship with the procedure of Euhemerus himself, even when its negative propensities stand out too (as in the case of Saxo). These historizations, although the work of artistic individuals, thus show themselves a specific religious structure of which the popular appeal is noteworthy. They relate to other well-known historizing efforts of the time; I think of the devout descriptions of the life of the Lord (especially in Christmas songs with miraculous and almost romantic details)34 and of the Mary-legends. In fact these historizations and humanizations should be considered a religious structure worthy of attention as much as “mysticism” and “gnosticism.” Because of its popular appeal and inner relation to widespread devotional forms this type of euhemerism is especially worthy of attention, much more worthy of attention than would appear from such general labels as “pseudo-history.” Narration occurs as a vehicle of the sacred.

Later euhemerism is of an entirely different nature. It has played such an uncritically accepted role in scholarship that this alone can explain why earlier euhemerism has often been explained on its terms. Scholars have been so preoccupied with the question of origins

31 Jean J. Young, trans., The Prose Edda of Snorri Sturluson (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1965), p. 27.
32 Ibid., p. 25.
34 I think of some lines in a traditional Dutch song about the Lord’s childhood: ‘t At pap uit een pannetje, ’t en maakt hem niet vuil,
‘t Vliel op de aarde, ’t en had er geen buil. . . .
He ate porridge from a bowl, but did not make himself dirty,
He fell on the ground, and he did not get a bruise. . . .

This type of literature, in the form in which it was given in the Netherlands in the Middle Ages, has been described by M. H. v.d. Zeyde, “De letterkunde in de Lage Landen,” in J. S. Bartrum and W. Banning, Nederland tussen de naties (Amsterdam, 1910), I, 218-225.
of myths that all attention was given to the thematic causes of existing euhemeristic documents. It was taken for granted that these documents were not the real myths—justifiably so, but a genetic obsession too easily leads to a methodological reductionism.

LATER EUHEMERISM

The watershed between early and later euhemerism is the Enlightenment period. To be sure, many eighteenth-century scholars dealing with religion had as “naive” an idea of history as Saxo and Snorri. It was not unusual to begin the discussion of man’s religion, as Fontenelle (d. 1757) did, with the question if and how the original (biblical) revelation was lost in the history of the other nations. Perhaps in some cases—with scholars taking all the bible as history, just as Herodotus took Homer—we might think of reverential bows made in the direction of the clergy. We can think of a man, however, who did not make a habit of reverential bows, David Hume, and we shall see in him at the same time a reflection of the old and the new, more clearly than in anyone else at the time of transition. On the one hand, there is an acceptance of the naïve, pseudohistorical side of the euhemeristic procedure. On the other hand there is an unmistakable interest in general theories concerning the causes of the mythical world. If with some caution we may use the words historization and humanization for early euhemerism, we are here justified in speaking of system and reduction. The Natural History of Religion is a small treatise, not interested in rendering or preserving mythical themes but devoted to a general analysis of religion.

Polytheism is for Hume principally a matter of “uninstructed mankind.” With this idea Hume is very much a child of his age. Speaking of this uninstructed mankind, incapable as yet of conceiving one supreme creator, Hume says: “They suppose their deities, however potent and invisible, to be nothing but a species of human creatures, perhaps raised from among mankind, and retaining all human passions and appetites, together with corporeal limbs and organs.” Although this euhemerism of the search for general causes is quite different from early euhemerism, it is of a negative sort that is strangely reminiscent of the Church Fathers. The negative factor of fear is much more effective in the making of gods than hope in Hume’s estimation. Generally, “men are much oftener thrown on their knees by the melancholy than by the agreeable passions.”

The search for sufficient explanations makes one question indeed inevitable: how precisely can human beings be raised to a superhuman status? This question was not an urgent one for the early euhemerists, for somehow they were convinced of the more than human qualities from the outset. It did not even disturb the Church Fathers very much in their reasonings, for the image of demons for them was a reality. Hume makes an attempt to answer the question, for he seems to realize that a general psychological observation about man’s fear will not do. Fear and the lower passions by themselves are not creative and could hardly be credited with a good many stories about the gods. It is surprising to see that Hume’s critical mind did not penetrate into these questions more profoundly than it did. This is what Hume’s euhemerism sounds like:

The deities of the vulgar are so little superior to human creatures, that, where men are affected with strong sentiments of veneration or gratitude for any hero or public benefactor, nothing can be more natural than to convert him into a god, and fill the heavens, after this manner, with continual recruits from among mankind. Most of the divinities of the ancient world are supposed to have once been men, and to have been behelden for their apotheosis to the adulation and affection of the people. The real history of their adventures, corrupted by tradition, and elevated by the marvellous, became a plentiful source of fable; especially in passing through the hands of poets, allegorists, and priests, who successively improved upon the wonder and astonishment of the ignorant multitude.

It is really surprising that Hume, who took no philosophical idea from the ancient philosophers for granted but reexamined every single one of them critically, did not judge euhemerism. He simply accepted it in its negative, “improper” form, embellished only with some features (allegory, priestly and poetical changes) that were as traditional as this euhemerism itself. The overridiing concern for a general explanation of religious materials as expressed here sets the tone for nineteenth-century scholarship. It is leaning on euhemerism without critically examining it. Exactly for that reason it distorts it. By its very nature, this new concern can view euhemerism as nothing but a theory on the causes of polytheism.

Later euhemerism actually did not deal with myth as early euhem-
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erism did. The typical nineteenth-century students of religion, particularly under the influence of the budding science of anthropology, dealt with religion in general. It has been rightly observed that Herbert Spencer's theory on the evolution of religion was flavored by euhemerism—"later euhemerism"—I should like to say. Spencer wanted to see in ancestor worship the first form of religion. This theory implied the raise in status of humans upon their death. E. B. Tylor's theory of animism as the first and basic form of all religion can be understood perfectly as a theory fermented with later euhemerism. Its principal content is the ghosts of the dead. Myths figured only on the fringes of these new scientific undertakings, and it is not hard to understand that the narration that played the central part in early euhemerism and had grown on the basis of mythology was a closed book for that scholarship.

Now the same question raised before may be raised again in an intensified manner: Does not euhemerism leave out elements that were important in the traditions it pretends to deal with, and does it not distort those traditions? The answer must be: Later euhemerism stands guilty in many respects. In terms of a philosophy of culture it can and perhaps must be argued that destruction of myth is always an optical illusion. Is not the scientific search for origins by nineteenth-century evolutionists itself a rejuvenated myth of the utmost value? Within the small scope of the present topic, however, it must be said that later euhemerism by its very nature was very much more destructive than early euhemerism. We may remember that the Church Fathers were able to transform gods into demons; they did not have to deny their existence. By comparison, many missionaries of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries were thoroughly modern, post-Enlightenment men. They did not have that peculiar power. They could only say of the gods, of this, that, or the other people in the wide world, that they did not really exist. Later euhemerism has indeed been destructive in its reductionism. Endeavors to establish a foundation myth of the ancient empire of Fu-nan in Southeast Asia stood guilty in many respects. In terms of a philosophy of culture it can and perhaps must be argued that destruction of myth is always an optical illusion. Is not the scientific search for origins by nineteenth-century evolutionists itself a rejuvenated myth of the utmost value? Within the small scope of the present topic, however, it must be said that later euhemerism by its very nature was very much more destructive than early euhemerism. We may remember that the Church Fathers were able to transform gods into demons; they did not have to deny their existence. By comparison, many missionaries of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries were thoroughly modern, post-Enlightenment men. They did not have that peculiar power. They could only say of the gods, of this, that, or the other people in the wide world, that they did not really exist. Later euhemerism has indeed been destructive in its reductionism. Endeavors to establish a foundation myth of the ancient empire of Fu-nan in Southeast Asia celebrated the marriage of an Indian immigrant and a local princess; it is impossible to separate the myth from the actual cultural historical of Fu-nan (and Cambodia). Historical causes deserve some scholarly consideration in some cases, even though they can never explain the whole myth and all its themes. Above all, one should
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not confuse an interest in historical causes of certain myths with the
the supposed original mythopoetic age. There is a widespread tendency
to speak of euhemerization and degeneration, or at least chances of
decay, in one breath. Even our esteemed friend Littleton, in his ex-
cellent exposition of Dumézil’s work, gives in to this pattern: “despite
the presence of Christian symbolism and euhemerization, the tri-
partite ideology persisted.” 44 Bayet, whose sympathy for Dumézil’s
work is quite evident, speaks outright of “ce processus de désintégration
religieuse et d’historisation des mythes.” 45 The examples he
gives of historization of myths on the same page, however, are prin-
cipally inventions of new etiologies for taboos that were no longer
understood. Hence here also, the modern theory of explanation forms
the telescope through which all euhemerism is viewed. I want to
underline that these views cannot be easily refuted, for there obviously
are phases in Roman history on which we are so abundantly and
diversity documented that the impression of a religious confusion is
hard to avoid. Historizing explanations in the texts seem to be pre-
sented at random. Bayet adds: “de telles actions ne s’expliqueraient
dans un milieu où l’esprit mythique aurait été vivant.” 46 And quite consistent in his views of a
certain process of decay, Bayet continues to say: “And when it occurs
that fundamental Indo-European myths, like those studied by G.
Dumézil, are included in the historical fabric with a national and
ethic value, certainly we have in that case the completion of a de-
sacralization that began long before then.” 47

I am not competent to present an alternative arrangement of his-
torical details. But a discussion of euhemerism requires an open eye
for more nuances than are perceived in these quotations. It is justi-
fiable to repeat that euhemerizations are not all explanations of old

44 Littleton, op. cit., p. 18.
45 Bayet, op. cit., p. 47.
46 1662.
47 1665.
that we can recognize the mythical character of early euhemerism. From a certain point of view the present paper is a case study in secularization. There is a definite break between the myth of euhemerism and, if you allow me to put it this way, the myth of finding origins characteristic of post-Enlightenment scholarship. It would be wrong to go on confusing the two. I am far from saying that no effort is necessary to avoid the confusion. There is, however, a constant and useful reminder with us in the fact that in all specialized areas of study the problem of finding an original myth, a "mythe fondamental," causes difficulties that we cannot ignore. They are not only philosophical problems, but above all problems for a sound historiography. From a philosophical point of view it may be true that myth is given with human existence and that there is no human life without myth. It may even be defensible to do what Claude Lévi-Strauss so brilliantly proposed: to study all versions of a myth regardless, and therefore, by way of example, to consider Freud's version of the Oedipus myth on a par with the Greek versions. 48 Indubitably, it is a radical solution of the problem of how to transcend evolutionism. But to me, it seems an inadmissible procedure for the historian of religions. It is a manner of confusing a mythical story with a reductionism, or one mythical structure with a very different one; in other words, adding apples and pears.


The Romantic movement in German literature, which began in the first few decades of the nineteenth century, was responsible for a new surge of interest in the semilegendary (if not wholly legendary) world of pre-Christian, agricultural Germany. Essentially and often avowedly anti-intellectual, it substituted emotion for reason and intuition for systematic investigation. It attempted to recapture an age that was in almost total opposition to the very real situation of an ununited Germany then undergoing the painful transition into the urbanized, cosmopolitan world.

The social problems engendered by the rather rapid change from an agricultural to an industrial economy, plus a massive migration from rural areas into cities, were viewed as constants of a system regarded *ab initio* as evil; industrialized, urbanized society. The chronological coincidence of Romanticism with the industrial revolution had the effect of neither solving nor significantly ameliorating these problems. Rather, it would produce a reaction, more appropriately a revulsion to them and substitute, for programs that might lessen the social consequences of a changed society, a yearning for bygone centuries, when Germany was by definition rural and agricultural, untouched by the contaminating effects of contemporary society. Parallel to this would occur a burgeoning nationalism that glorified things German and rejected things international, such as the exchange of ideas and past and present foreign influence. Since the present was not good, the past must have been better. If the past had
been so much better, why had it not survived? Because of external, foreign influences upon a Germany politically divided into territorial states, city-states and cities, and thus divided unable to withstand external forces upon her.

It would fall to Romanticism, when it had discarded the bonds of creative literature and moved into the arena of social comment, to venerate the past as a means of escaping the present. This veneration of the pagan, heroic Germanic past led to an upsurge of antiquarian research into such areas as archaeology, ethnography, literature, and folklore. Prior to this time interest in the Germanic past had been negligible. We are reminded of the reaction of Frederick the Great to an edition of the Nibelungenlied by Christoph Heinrich Müller. Frederick wrote, "... dass dieser miserable Plunder kein Schuss Pulvers wert sei." Although we are admonished that a general's opinion of a work of literature may not be especially worthy of serious consideration, de Vries comments that this evaluation of one of the cornerstones of Middle High German literature is representative of the climate of cultural opinion during the age of German Classicism, and that the Romantics would evaluate such literature differently.

The Age of Romanticism was the time of an energetic search of monastery cellars, of monastery and cathedral libraries, to unearth the literary remains of medieval Germany. By 1830 (the end of the Romantic Period), such representative works as the Old High German Hildebrandslied, the Middle High German Kudrun, the Old English Beowulf, and the Old Saxon Heliand were rediscovered. With passing decades still more manuscripts would come to light, be edited, published, and integrated, where possible, into Germanic historical, cultural, and literary evolution. From a conscious rejection by the intelligentsia of the Germanic past, the pendulum had swung to the opposite extreme, and the momentum generated by the Romantic Period would keep the pendulum extended long after Romanticism had faded into the twilight world of literary history. Romanticism as a cultural idée fixe would continue to affect future antiquarian scholarship for years to come, and although it would never actually become a bar to such scholarship (the many nineteenth-century editions of folk literature, medieval literature, and legal documents bear witness to this), it did produce a certain uniformity of critical consideration of the data under investigation and attempted to draw more substantive conclusions from these data than
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1 Cited in Jan de Vries, Heldenlied und Heldensage (Bern, 1961), p. 84.

Comparative Legal Reconstruction in Germanic
The rejection by linguistics of a Romantic approach to the phenomenon of language should have served, if not as a warning, at least as an indication, that to retain the Romantic approach to legal antiquities in an age that was becoming more and more scientific in its handling of data, would at best reduce comparative Germanic law to the purview of dilettantes (although commentators would not regard their work as dilettantish), at worst make comparative Germanic law an impossibility. In this case I am not referring to occasional excellent works on individual laws themselves or on specific topics, but to the broader subject which is comparative Germanic law. A much-awaited event in the study of Germanic law is a reissue of Benjamin Thorpe's Manic Law, first published in 1828. Yet this work is a collation of laws, with some grammatical commentary, nothing more. In a more recent book containing several Old English laws and a modern English translation, it is stated that it is an advance in utility over Liebermann's book because those who cannot read German now have an English translation provided. Surely the twentieth century deserves more than yet another publication of early legal codes and their translation.

It cannot be denied that the comparative grammars of Indo-European of the nineteenth century are still "highly useful," but these were, as their description states, comparative, not merely reproductions of texts in the various languages. Above all, conclusions were drawn from the comparative evidence. It is reasonable to say that we await the appearance in print of advances in a field, far more than a reprinting of a very early contribution, however highly it may be regarded. The large number of nineteenth-century works ostensibly dealing with Germanic law which are still considered "highly useful" bear witness to a state of stagnation, or perhaps inertia, and not to the fact that all required research has been done. Real comparison cannot begin until all the data to be compared are in usable form, and at this time they are not.

2 The only truly comparative study of the laws of the Germanic peoples is the two-volume work by Garabed Arin Davoud-Oghlou, Histoire de la législation des Anciens Germaines (Berlin, 1845), a work apparently unknown (or if known, inaccessible) to scholars in this field.

Comparative legal reconstruction in Germanic

I have omitted in this account a statement and/or definition of what constitutes Germanic law. But before this can be answered, a distinction must be made between Germanic law (that is, the law of the Germanic people) and later laws applicable only to individual tribes. A while ago, during an investigation of a more restricted problem of Germanic law, I attempted to resolve this distinction, but could not. I began in the usual manner, by consulting the relevant commentaries on the laws themselves, and traditional handbooks, especially those that synthesized the data provided by the laws and provided from this synthesis a picture of what was posited as the customary law of the pre-Völkerwanderung, pre-Christian, ethnographically undifferentiated Germanic people. I was trying to do in law what Germanists do when they compare the earliest written records of the Germanic languages in order to reconstruct Proto-Germanic, an evolutionary offshoot of late Indo-European, prior to dialect differentiation into the various Germanic languages. As a point of departure I intended to see if one could apply the methods of comparative and historical linguistics to law. I wanted to ascertain whether, by comparing similarities and differences in the earliest laws of ethnographically (and linguistically) differentiated tribes, one could reconstruct a Proto-Germanic law: an "Urrecht" on the same basis as an "Ursprache." Working forward in time, I might then discover whether legal differences and similarities paralleled linguistic differentiation. It was at this still theoretical level that new problems arose. The first was the result of handbook treatments of comparative legal evidence. Instead of attempting to reconstruct this "Urrecht" (I had thought that nineteenth-century commentators had already done this, and that I would merely have the opportunity to modify, emend, or otherwise offer suggestions), this stage had been omitted. Despite such omission, conclusions had been drawn about social behavior based upon sanctions and prohibitions of the laws themselves. This procedure seemed, in a word, unscientific. I could not imagine that it would be possible to generalize from evidence as fragmentary as laws whole patterns of behavior for a period when no direct written evidence was available. It appeared as if we knew more about the life and customs of the pre-Völkerwanderung Germanic people than we knew about their language. This was and is a fundamental inconsistency. At first I thought that I was on the wrong track; that my ideas about the reconstruction of proto-laws were a vestige of linguistic training and unsuited to the legal data at hand; that conclusions drawn from legal citations were overwhelming, and
that as early as 120 years ago Wilda, in *Das Strafrecht der Germanen*, had provided as complete a picture as one could wish for. I felt as one might after reading massive tomes of virtually any given subject; that the field is closed, and that one had better set about investigating other areas.

In this connection I found that one aspect of comparative Germanic law is not restricted to the laws themselves and merits comment because of the place it still has in legal research and in folkloristic studies. This is something that for want of a better term, and because no other term is known to me, I call "law in literature." This is the extraction from works of literature of accounts of the actions of individuals either in their relationship to other characters or in response to events, actions that are interpreted as a reflection of behavior in conformity with or in rejection of some aspect of Germanic customary law. There is surely no lack of these citations which may be found in the literature of any of the older Germanic dialects. The best examples, and those most frequently cited, are found in Icelandic saga literature. To what extent citations found in rather late medieval literature may be taken as reflections of Germanic law will remain moot until it has been determined what constitutes Germanic law and what are later developments of the legal systems of particular cultures. It is tempting to use such literary citations to build up an impressive case for dogmatic statements about the customary law of the Germanic people, but they should be used with care at this stage of investigation.

Another topic included in studies of Germanic law is worthy of mention especially for the reason that in this case linguistic methods are used to provide answers. This is the extraction from texts of the medieval period of lexical items which, because of their etymological meaning, are assumed to be survivals of Germanic law, although they are not found in legal documents. To cite but two examples in passing: Gothic *unsibjaim* (in the dative plural) occurring in Mark 15:28, where the crucifixion is described: *jah mip unsibjaim rahnips was,* "and he was reckoned among criminals." Etymologically *unsibjaim* would mean "with the 'de-clamped' " and has cognates in Old English and Old High German. In the Old High German version of Tatian's *Gospel Harmony*, the phrase *mit harms* is used. Translated it would mean "harmfully" or "with injury," yet the Old English cognate phrase *mid hearne*, occurring in legal texts, is generally translated as "with hue and cry," because of the uncertainty of the legal practice to which *mid hearne* applies. The Gothic word was early identified as a

"Harm" has a satisfactory etymology and has cognates in the Slavic languages, but interestingly is not found in Gothic. Whether this owes to the limited number of Gothic texts and their predominantly religious nature, or is a case of legal practices following linguistic lines, must also remain moot. Like the citations under the heading "law in literature," the place in Germanic law of petrified items of legal vocabulary awaits the determination of what constitutes Germanic law. Isolated, although numerous, examples of the survival of legal vocabulary in nonlegal texts should be placed in the framework of Germanic law and not used to build up its structure.

In the early part of this report I emphasized at some length the importance of understanding the climate of cultural opinion at the time when many of the basic works on Germanic law were being written. At the heart of this opinion was a belief in the innate superiority of the pagan Germanic past, when the Germanic people, prior to their dissolution into tribes, were untouched by non-German influences. Of course, one might raise the question whether or not such a state of affairs actually existed. But this was not a question one would have raised. It was considered axiomatic by social critics and others writing under the aegis of Romanticism, and as an axiom needed neither proof nor verification. Indeed, to attempt to verify it by sound methods of scholarship would have brought the countercharge that these methods were themselves outworn and the product of non-German cultural influences, and that only emotion and intuition would enable one to capture the Geist of the Germanic past. To demonstrate the effect of the Romantic worship of the past, I comment upon what was considered to be the basis for the origin and development of law among the Germanic people by nineteenth-century legal scholarship. This was the "peace theory," and what was considered its legal by-product, namely outlawry. The "peace theory" conceived of peace as a positive state and not merely the absence of war or other hostilities; peace was considered to be a reflection of normal, harmonious, pre-Völkerwanderung, undifferentiated Germanic society. But for the purposes of legal scholarship, it is not the state of peace that is of primary importance, but rather the opposite of peace which was *peacelessness.* According to nineteenth-century handbooks, the essential tenet of the "peace theory" as the foundation of Germanic law was that a man who broke the peace was...
subject to violent counterreaction by members of his community. This assumption is supported by ascribing to the Germanic people a belief that an injury to one man is an injury to all men. This view is rather sophisticated for Common Germanic times and reflects more an idealized conception than actual conditions; incidentally, it is incompatible with the next stage of the "peace theory," which attempted to equate peacelessness with outlawry.

This equation was facilely made in the past century and is so entrenched that the one major effort to disprove it in the twentieth century, by Gobel in *Felony and Misdemeanor*, produced a spate of unfavorable reviews and, it would seem, no reappraisal. But the equation of peacelessness with outlawry can be questioned on grounds which take into account the assumed social organization of the period. Even if we accept the social organization assumed by commentators of both classical antiquity and the Romantic period, this very type of social organization itself would prevent the equation of peacelessness with outlawry. The basis of Germanic organization was the *sib*, in extended form the clan (that is for the period when the "peace theory" was assumed to be operative). We find that the earliest form of punishment for an act of wrongdoing against a person or persons was not a declaration of peacelessness but a revenge in blood. Clearly, the equation peacelessness = outlawry cannot be posited for a time when vengeance and the blood feud were the sole forms of punishment for commission of a major wrong. In addition, vengeance and feud were by nature personal or familial; outlawry was by its nature territorial. I think that one is unlikely to have a punishment territorial in nature before the establishment of clearly demarcated territories, a development that no one will posit for pre-*Völkerwanderung* Germanic times. To equate peacelessness with outlawry is an attempt to solve one unknown by means of another. We also have no evidence to show how the peace of the *sib* or clan evolved into the peace of the later, greater unit, the tribe thus yielding the so-called "folk peace." Those who claim that the post-*Völkerwanderung* tribe was governed by the "folk peace" must explain how the peace of the *sib* evolved into the "folk peace." If it did, the surest way to demonstrate it is by comparative legal reconstruction, not by etymological citation, which is the common practice.

There are later peaces that are historically verifiable. These are the "peace" or "truce" of God at the end of the tenth century, and the "king's peace" of the eleventh century. Was the concept of "folk peace," postulated for Germanic tribes, a result of these later, historically attested forms of peace and of nineteenth-century belief in the continuity of the Germanic past, plus wish-fulfillment about cherished notions of the past? Since we cannot equate peacelessness with outlawry, nor the peaceless man with the outlaw, how may we account for the existence in law of both outlawry and the outlaw? The evidence of the laws themselves provides a partial answer, as do later literary citations. It appears that outlawry was not a part of the customary law of the undifferentiated Germanic past. Outlawry as a punishment for specific offenses occurs in medieval Scandinavian laws and some laws of Anglo-Saxon England. On the other hand, the *Leges Barbarorum*, the laws of the continental West Germanic tribes of the early Middle Ages, do not treat outlawry explicitly. Since peacelessness = outlawry is assumed for the undifferentiated Germanic past, its absence in the earliest laws of continental West Germanic tribes is a major weakness of that theory. Interestingly, the term "outlaw" itself is restricted to the Scandinavian languages and to Old English and its descendants, and did not appear in Anglo-Saxon law until 922 in the *Laws of Edward and Guthrum*, which appeared after the Danish invasions; and Guthrum was a Dane.

Outlaws, as heroes, are not infrequent in Icelandic saga literature, but far less frequent numerically in medieval English literature. The flourishing of outlaw heroes in saga literature, the dearth of outlaw heroes in English literature for a comparable period, and the absence of outlawry in the *Leges Barbarorum* seem to indicate that outlawry was a secondary phenomenon in law; that it was not to be equated with peacelessness and was not an aspect of Germanic customary law, but constituted a later example of statutory law originating in Scandinavia, which was brought to England during the Danish invasions. I have included outlawry as a topic in order to demonstrate the unsystematic methodology used to reconstruct a part of the Germanic legal past, and to put it into proper perspective. One question remains unanswered, however, and that is, why was outlawry (after being equated with peacelessness) seized upon by early commentators as being the basis for all Germanic customary law that was to follow?

I suggest that one of the reasons (perhaps the main reason) was the cultural climate of the early Romantic period and its reflection in creative literature, literature that would precede in time the works of scholarship dealing with Germanic legal antiquity. To illustrate

---

this point I have selected a Novelle by Ludwig Tieck, entitled Der Runenberg. The title itself is of course more than suggestive of Germanic antiquity (especially of the culturally isolated North). The story concerns a young hunter named Christian, who leaves his village to go into the deepest part of the mountains, "... um sich aus dem Kreise der wiederkehrenden Gewöhnlichkeit zu entfernen." This is of course mirrored in later social criticism that rejected urbanization. The choice of the name "Christian" is symbolic, as is his profession, that of hunter. The nineteenth-century Christian reverted to his pagan past as a hunter. Christian in the forest imagines that the waters are speaking to him, but he cannot understand them. Loudly, he sings a song about the joys of the hunt, of going through the forest with hunting-horn resounding, and recalls "die schöne Jägerzeit." "Seine Heimat sind die Klippe,/Alle Bäume grüßen ihn" begins another verse. The poem concludes with a statement of the joys of the chase, the forest, and of the blissful hunter in his new "Heimat." His old "Heimat" was, of course, a village. Tieck's choice of vocabulary, his inclusion of an episode with a screaming mandrake root, the use of the name "Christian" for a man who rejects the oppressive nature of his ordered existence as a gardener's son to go off into the unspoiled wilderness, are conscious attempts to resolve the conflict between present and past. I have given but a few examples of what upon reading strikes one as being almost hyper-Romantic, until one realizes that the romantic elements in Der Runenberg are not the exception but the rule. From this literary interlude I again raise the question why outlawry was selected as the basis for Germanic law, despite the fact that close analysis militates against this choice.

Observe the legendary outlaw, who leaves home, hearth, and family, because he has committed an offense against the established order of his society, to flee into the mountains and forests to evade capture. There he becomes a changed man, both in the eyes of the law and by his own actions, and gains new strength by being in communion with unspoiled nature. Contrast this prototypical outlaw of medieval literature with Christian of Der Runenberg, who calls his existence "das Ebene" and is more at home in "das Gebirge," and who flees from his family and village not because of the external pressure which forced the flight of the outlaw, but is driven by some internal compulsion to escape the restrictions of early nineteenth-century society in order to return to the world of the past represented by untouched natural forces rather than the manmade ones, which are always ordered (his father was a gardener). Christian's actions are not rational, as we know the term, they cannot be explained but only felt. This Romantic approach serves literature quite well, but, extended into the realm of scientific analysis and investigation, it postulated that the desire to escape the present was a manifestation of a Germanic longing for the unspoiled wilderness. It generalized from the internal pressures of an unstable individual, which produced an emotional rejection of his present existence, to a theory that these pressures and subsequent rejection are analogous to the sociological pressures leading to outlawry; it thus derived later laws from outlawry and biased forever the question of the origin and genesis of Germanic law.

It would be simplistic to state that one Novelle by a German Romanticist could produce this effect on later scholarship. Der Runenberg was used merely as an example to show the literary climate of the times, a climate that stressed nature above man-made things; the unspoiled wilderness above the cosmopolitan city (or even village); rejection of society rather than attempts to modify it; and a feeling that somehow Germanic civilization had been corrupted by external non-German pressures. To this would be added the almost universal belief in the outlaw as a romantic figure, who had been made to suffer unjustly for something that was beyond his control, but which, nevertheless, was also a constant of his society. Outlawry, as the basis for Germanic law, may now tentatively be rejected and systematic investigation begun.

But where? Classically we should begin with the earliest written laws of the Germanic tribes and/or kingdoms which are extant. And it is at this point that our first stumbling block appears. Calvert Watkins has previously demonstrated the inherent archaism and conservatism of legal language, and its value in both linguistic and cultural research. That this is true for many of the Indo-European languages is not in doubt. But for the Germanic languages the earliest laws are so "archaic" that they are not written in a Germanic language at all, but in Latin, and it would seem not very good Latin at that. To be sure, there are German words in most of the earliest laws, in instances where there is no equivalent in Roman law, as in the case of minor public officials, or for certain offenses. These latter are often given in both the Latin and the vernacular form. There are also a certain number of Latinized vernacular words. Writing, except for Runic characters and the Gothic alphabet, reached the Germanic peoples rather late. The dependence of Germanists upon
works of classical antiquity for the earliest recorded information about their subject is testimony to this. This, coupled with the cultural advancement of Greece and Rome, meant that our earliest information took the form of citations of items of material culture absent in the classical world, personal and divine names, and, most importantly for our purposes, social behavior and quasi-legal prescription when they differed from those of Greece or Rome. To this void of information may be added the earliest laws themselves. We must determine to what extent Germanic law has been retained, despite being written in a foreign language, and to what extent these recorded laws of Germanic tribes are influenced by Roman law in addition to the Latin language. That is, to what extent did the medium determine the message?

We are a little more fortunate in Anglo-Saxon law, most of which is recorded in Old English and/or Latin, but this material is of later date and reflects a society far more changed, and in far greater cultural isolation than those tribes that remained on the continent. After the tenth century it is also subject to Scandinavian influence. In addition we must assume that the adoption of Christianity by the Germanic peoples also wrought changes in the laws. This is easiest to see in laws pertaining to members of the clergy, punishments for breaking into a church, working on religious holidays, and so on. But we cannot assume that Christian influence is reflected in the laws only when some aspect of Christianity is referred to. Drawing a parallel from early Germanic vernacular literature, it is quite possible to have Christian influence in such areas as choice of theme, of vocabulary, of treatment of events, and generally of Weltanschauung, although direct references to Christianity do not appear. Students of early Germanic vernacular literature are aware of the many long controversies about whether or not certain aspects of a given work of literature are of pagan origin, show Christian influence, were rewritten to conform to the new religion, and the like.

Still, references in a law to some aspect of Christianity are late developments. But this of course does not solve the problem, for references to the clergy or to Christianity itself may have been either added to the existing pre-Christian part of the law or merely transferred to those portions dealing with pagan religious practices. One thing may be said with certainty, however: by the time we have laws of a Germanic people written in Latin, the society affected by these laws had undergone great changes, not only in relation to undifferentiated Germanic times, but also to early tribal organization, and of a Germanic people written in Latin, the society affected by these references to the clergy or to Christianity itself may have been either added to the existing pre-Christian part of the law or merely transferred to those portions dealing with pagan religious practices. This does not mean that, to determine the entire Germanic component, all one has to do is translate the laws and compare them to laws in a vernacular language. I have done this as a mechanical exercise and found many of the results unrewarding. Alliteration as a stylistic device is the characteristic of early Germanic poetry, and handbooks on Germanic law list numerous examples of alliterating pairs of nominal and verbal forms that occur in the laws. Alliteration was most likely begun as a mnemonic device of a preliterate people, and its original purpose was functional or pragmatic rather than stylistic or ornamental. When the society became literate, alliteration became formulaic rather than functional. With the passage of time the formulaic nature of alliteration predominated and obscured the original meaning of those terms that alliterated. So much so, that although there is an abundance of alliterating forms in the laws, we often cannot determine what is meant. Thus the mere collection of alliteration proves nothing more than the retention (Grimm calls them eingewurzelt in the laws) in legal documents of a traditional Germanic literary device whose origins lay in a desire to bring speedy recall to memory. If it is doubted that survivals of alliteration are formulaic rather than functional, or ornamental rather than descriptive, consider what alliteration is doing in legal prose at all. It is a testimony to the conservatism of legal codices and to the likely connection between poetry and oral legal tradition, but may not bear testimony to contemporary customs, behavior, or proscriptions.

In this connection I would like to propose that the traditional distinction between customary law and statutory law be abandoned as providing no useful parameters for purposes of research. Customary law, common law, or folk law (it goes by all these designations) we take to be the unwritten expression of popular custom and belief (that is, "consensus law") in contrast with statutory law, which is "learned law" found in statutes and imposed. In perpetuating this distinction in Germanic law we are perpetuating an essential con-
tradition, for the earliest written laws of a Germanic people are still designated as "Volksrechte," that is, the setting down in print of the popular beliefs and customs of the people to whom they applied. To continue to use the term "Volksrechte" implies that at a later period other laws would be imposed upon people who got along very well with laws arrived at by consensus, if not by consent. That other, later laws were set down cannot be denied, but the process of evolution from clan to tribe to nation brings with it the concomitant change in law to cope with a new social situation. The expansion, revision, or imposition of new laws does not magically create statutory law. I feel that this distinction between customary law and statutory law should be given up, except in instances where a conflict of laws can be attested or surmised. The distinction just mentioned is illusory; as a society becomes more complex, there is an ever greater specialization of function. In the legal sphere this means that ever fewer members of that society have a direct say in the formulation of laws affecting them. Furthermore, there is enough secondary literature (albeit disputed) to prove that specialization of function in the form of the law-speaker (in Old Icelandic literature) existed prior to the period of written statutory law.

Up to this point I have stated in what ways I feel that studies of Germanic law have been based upon erroneous premises and have proceeded intuitively rather than systematically, and above all have treated fragments of the legal past, rather than the whole. I recommend abandoning such an approach in favor of using the methodology of comparative and historical linguistics (the "genetic" approach) to reconstruct a proto-law in the same manner (but obviously with the same limitations and difficulties) that a protolanguage is reconstructed. I am aware of the fact that the "genetic" approach to legal evolution and reconstruction is open to some question, but this owes in large measure to a lack of appreciation of the nature of the information desired. What we are after is not a miscellaneous grab-bag of proto-words, nor the Geist, but a series of statements about belief, prohibitions, and social behavior, to mention but a few. The only way to see if reconstruction of a proto-law will work is to begin to set it up. To get the best possible picture one must use all the data at hand. This is a difficulty, because of the lack of adequate, up-to-date editions of the relevant laws. This is a time-consuming, but not insurmountable difficulty, except in terms of accessibility in university and other libraries. A second difficulty is the question of language. Unlike the laws of many of the individual Indo-European languages, Germanic law is found written in many languages such as Latin, Old English, Old Icelandic, Norwegian, Swedish, Danish, Old Frisian, Old Low Franconian, Old High German, Middle Low German, Middle High German, and Norman French. To attempt to reconstruct this proto-law, one must have a knowledge of these languages. But this in itself is not enough, else it might have been tried before.

I recommend a new approach. First, collect all laws of the Germanic peoples, with a tentative cut-off date at the time of the Sachsenspiegel around 1230. The laws should then be carefully translated into one uniform language and broken down in a form suitable for computerized analysis, for the purposes of determining similarities and differences. Of course the search for similarities and differences could be done without mechanical assistance, but it would be a tremendous advantage to subsequent interpretation. The data could be further augmented by the addition of material from the area of "law in literature," if this appears warranted. The question of time-depth will have to be resolved, but it can be handled in the same way that an Indo-Europeanist handles the time-depth question in comparing Hittite with Old Prussian and Lithuanian. Computerized analysis might provide an answer to the question of whether legal evolution follows ethnographic and linguistic lines. This was the question that got me started in legal antiquities and the question that led me to begin work in reconstructing something I call a proto-law. The result will determine the validity of this idea. Reconstruction should not cease because of the bias induced by Romanicism, but should proceed in the same manner as does paleontology, anthropology, linguistics, and philology. If this approach does not work, then so be it. It will at least have had the merit of being tried.

6 On January 25, 1968, the Lex Thuringiaca was the first of the laws subjected to computerized analysis.
Any scientific study and interpretation of ancient religion is closely dependent on the available source material. In the study of Germanic religion, the value and reliability of the sources appear to be a particularly important problem, since our information is scanty and desultory. What is at our disposal consists, indeed, mainly of circumstantial evidence and external testimony; we do not have any specific original ritual text, or any genuine Germanic writing witnessing the relationship between man and god in ancient times, and all we claim to know is what we can infer from the scattered remnants of Germanic religious life according to the prevailing views of our time, combined with our personal prejudices. This rather discouraging situation had led Vilhelm Grønbech half a century ago to concentrate his attention on the perception of the genuinely Germanic spiritual, intellectual, and cultural aspects of Old Germanic individual and social life, thus paving the way for a better insight into Germanic Lebensgefühl and basic religious concepts. His identification of some ethical concepts such as honor with a kind of magical vital force introduced the concept of a rather strict creed of predestination into the Old Germanic world, which led to far-fetched conclusions about the so-called germanischer Schicksalglaube.

In recent years, the idea that man shapes his gods according to his own being has received repeated confirmation in the study of exotic cultures; various efforts to apply this new knowledge to Germanic religion have led to careful reexamination of the scanty reliable evi-
The basic idea of the Vienna school is that religious patterns develop in conformity with levels of culture. An illustration of this view is given by Alois Closs in his contribution "Die Religion des Semmonenstammes" to the volume Die Indogermanen- und Germanenfrage, in which he analyzes the ritual implied in the human sacrifice described by Tacitus in chapter 99 of his Germania, and supplies rich comparative material to elucidate its motivation. Similarly, in his study "Das Versekungsgesopf," published in the volume Kultur und Sprache, numerous parallels to the Germanic sacrifice by immersion occurring, for example, at the end of the Nerthus ritual (Tacitus, Germania, chap. 49), are listed in correlation with their Indo-European and general cultural background. A more comprehensive survey of his views is given by Closs in his contribution "Die Religion der Germanen in ethnologischer Sicht" to the second volume of Christus und die Religionen der Erde, where he explains the main phenomena and trends of development in Germanic religion in connection with his views on Germanic ethnogenesis on the basis of Wilhelm Schmidt's somewhat subjective theories on original monotheism and on the prehistory of Indo-European tribes. His conclusion is typical of the Vienna school approach:

Die mannigfachen Kräfte zur späteren intensiven Ausbildung von Stammesreligionen schon in der urgermanischen Anfangszeit lassen sich vielmehr in Erwägung der prähistorischen Verhältnisse am Ende der Steinnzeit am besten als Ergebnis einer Völkermischung verstehen, wobei das Dunkel geklärt ist, wodurch aus verschiedenen Bestandteilen, alternativischen wie dualistischen, dieselbe wohl mit nähern Beziehungen zur urgermanischen Religion, ein neues Volk wurde. Ein besonderer religiöser Antrieb

4 Ibid., p. 396.

Reformulated here, rather subjectively, in ethnological jargon are actually not very original views: (a) the theory of H. Günther of the mixture of two populations—the "megalithic" pre-Indo-European agriculturists and the Indo-European invaders—as the origin of the Germanic people; (b) the intimation of a parallelism between Germanic and Italic religious traditions.

Mircea Eliade's stress on patterns of rituals for archetypal deities is reflected in the study on the Germanic mother goddess which I published more than a decade ago. In this article I tried essentially to reject the common interpretation of the Nerthus ritual as symbolic of a hierogamy between the skygod and the earth goddess, since there was no overt trace of a masculine element playing the part of the former. I indicated that, at an older stage, the archetypal Terra mater did not imply the coexistence of the phallic elements that appear in a later development; agriculture was still a typically feminine activity in the days of Tacitus, and only with its masculinization do the agrarian gods Ing and Freyr appear and does Nerthus change into the male god Njörd. Therefore, I preferred to interpret the Nerthus ritual as the celebration of a cosmic event—the advent of spring along the lines described by M. Eliade:

For a moment, the life of the whole human group is concentrated into a tree or some effigy of vegetation, some symbol intended to represent and consecrate the thing that is happening to the universe: spring. . . . The presence of nature is indicated by a single object (or symbol). It is no pantheist adoration of nature or sense of being at one with it, but a feeling induced by the presence of the symbol (branch, tree or whatever it may be), and stimulated by the performing of the rite (processions, con-
Tacitus, besides Mercurius and Mars as correspondents to Odin and of representative of the third function in the interpretatio Romana military purposes; (3) fecundity, with its correlates: prosperity, health, double aspect—juridical and magical; (2) physical force, mainly for the functional tripartition of social life: (1) sovereignty, with its of Cybele or any other mother goddess in the Western world.

Accordingly, "le rituel de Nerthus apparaît... comme un réactualisation symbolique du renouveau, destinée à promouvoir la fertilité agricole par une procession solennelle et à régénérer la force vitale de la Terre Mère, symboliquement par l'immersion de son emblème et concrètement par la noyade des officiants."

Thus, by applying Eliade's approach, I have ultimately reinterpreted a Germanic ritual as the enactment of a scenario sui generis, based on patterns whose variations abound in the most diverse cultures. This, however, excludes any close relationship with the cult of Cybele or any other mother goddess in the Western world.

Quite different is the situation with Dumézil's approach based on the functional tripartition of social life: (1) sovereignty, with its double aspect—juridical and magical; (2) physical force, mainly for military purposes; (3) fecundity, with its correlates: prosperity, health, long life, peace, and so on. Here Nerthus appears clearly as the representative of the third function in the interpretatio Romana of Tacitus, beside Mercurius and Mars as correspondents to Odin and

---

9 Whereas the identification of Mercurius with *WoSanaz owes to a rather secondary parallelism between the functions of Mercure as conductor of the souls and the associations of *WoSanaz with the dead warriors (Old Norse *dverger), the link between Mars and Tyr rests on the Germanic concept of war as a judgment by arms (ON *vinglending), which puts it into the domain of the judicial functions of Tyr, whose association with the judicial and legislative assembly (ON *ping) is also evidenced by the votive inscriptions to Mars Thinesau. While the identification of *WoSanaz with Mercureius seems rather constant, as shown by inscriptions like Mercurius Rex (Nijmegen) and the sacrifice of prisoners of war to him by hanging them with a noose on trees, the sacrifice of horses to Mars, e.g., after the victory of the Hermunduri over the Chatti (a.d. 58), points rather to a specifically second-function god in the case of the Germanic correspondence to Mars. The text of chapter 9 of Tacitus' Germania, "Dennas maxime Mercurium colunt, cui certis diebus humanum quoque hostis libat fac habet. Hereleam et Marcan consensu animalibus placuit; pars Sueborum et Idfi sacrificat," is particularly significant in this regard, since it closely associates Mars with Hercules, while mentioning the third-function cult of "Talis" among the Suebi the very same day.

views must admit that the structure of Germanic society agreed by and large with his postulated social pattern:

At the head of every tribe was a king or a group of heads of smaller tribal units, but in the latter case, a suitable commander was chosen among them in time of war. Various religious elements appeared in the direction of the state: the king was "sacred," the priests kept order and peace in the "thing" assemblies and punished all crimes. . . . Political power belonged in principle to the "thing"; all important decisions were taken in those assemblies, in which all free men appeared in arms, but among these free men a smaller group of influential families controlled in fact the direction of public affairs, tending to make this situation permanent by isolating themselves from the lower classes and claiming they were born noblemen. Below the free men were the half-free taxpayers, and on the lowest level, the slaves . . . .

It is obvious that Dumézil's approach involves a number of postulates. It implies (1) that the same event can be present as a myth in one group and as history in another, for example, when Dumézil compares the struggle and reconciliation between the Aesir and the Vanir with the Sabine War in ancient Rome as the reflex of an Indo-European mythologem about the shift to peaceful development in a warlike Indo-European people through a symbiosis with prosperous opponents; (2) that the tripartite system survives changes in society; only the functional attributes of the gods, not their names and specific personalities, are of vital importance. Accordingly, for Dumézil, Germanic religion is the religion of the Indo-Europeans in its transformation by the Germanic tribes. This assumption is utterly rejected by Karl Helm who claims: "Die germanische Religion ist zum kleinsten Teil indogermanische Religion; ihre Grundlage ist die Religion des in den späten germanischen Ländern beheimateten und hier vielleicht seit Urzeiten, d.h. schon vor der Bildung des Indo-germanenums siedelnden völkischen Substrates, wie sie sich im Laufe der Jahrhunderte unter den verschiedensten Einflüssen herausgebildet hat." He accordingly emphasizes "Vanic" religion as the pre-Germanic religion of the neolithic farmers and considers, for example, the spread of the cult of Odin as a late development. But if the Vanir and Aesir reflect the two constituents of the Germanic religion in warlike Indo-European society and, by comparison of the various attested systems, tries to back up his deductions on the survival of the original tripartition in the most disparate traditions of the Indo-European peoples. As Werner Betz indicates: "Beide Wege sind notwendig. Der Germanist wird versuchen, die Gefahren beider zu vermeiden: geschichtloses Strukturieren oder historisierendes Auflosen in ausseineredfallende Details—und dafür sich bemühen, die Vorteile beider fruchtbar zu machen: Herausarbeiten der grossen Zusammenhänge und Überprüfung des Beschlossenen am geschichtlichen Bezeugen."

Actually, when we want to evaluate the Indo-European component in Germanic religion we have to determine its varying impact on the available material and the precise type of correspondence it reflects. Too often links have been assumed in the past on the basis of sheer etymological speculations: if one prefers to connect Sanskrit *asura, 'lord,' with Hittite *hassus, 'king,' and Germanic *aos, *As, instead of preserving the traditional interpretation of *asurah as a derivation of *asu-, (reflected by *auh, 'vital strength'), meaning 'gesteigerte Lebenskraft, orenda,' as Günther puts it, he will do so only with reference to the specific functions of the Germanic Asir and the original Indo-Iranian Auras as 'sovereign gods,' especially Odin

---

13 Ibid., p. 396.

---

European invaders— the structure of society in those days as assumed on archaeological grounds perfectly fits the Indo-European pattern; moreover, the story of their struggle as compared with similar situations after the foundation of Rome reflects a general pattern of conflict and compromise which conforms to Indo-European tradition.

What actually opposes Helm and Dumézil is their basic attitude to the problem of Germanic religion: Helm wants to evaluate the scanty facts from a strictly historical point of view and to reach his conclusions about the individual gods by inductive reasoning. Dumézil has recognized a definite structure as basic to and specific of Indo-European society and, by comparison of the various attested systems, tries to back up his deductions on the survival of the original tripartition in the most disparate traditions of the Indo-European peoples. As Werner Betz indicates: "Beide Wege sind notwendig. Der Germanist wird versuchen, die Gefahren beider zu vermeiden: geschichtloses Strukturieren oder historisierendes Auflosen in ausseineredfallende Details—und dafür sich bemühen, die Vorteile beider fruchtbar zu machen: Herausarbeiten der grossen Zusammenhänge und Überprüfung des Beschlossenen am geschichtlichen Bezeugen."

Actually, when we want to evaluate the Indo-European component in Germanic religion we have to determine its varying impact on the available material and the precise type of correspondence it reflects. Too often links have been assumed in the past on the basis of sheer etymological speculations: if one prefers to connect Sanskrit *asura, 'lord,' with Hittite *hassus, 'king,' and Germanic *aos, *As, instead of preserving the traditional interpretation of *asurah as a derivation of *asu-, (reflected by *auh, 'vital strength'), meaning 'gesteigerte Lebenskraft, orenda,' as Günther puts it, he will do so only with reference to the specific functions of the Germanic Asir and the original Indo-Iranian Auras as 'sovereign gods,' especially Odin
and Varuṇa as "masters of the bonds," since the etymology, IE *Housus, is further connected with words like Greek ἰός, 'bride,' Middle Irish ḋísh,' (pl.) 'veins,' Old Norse dé < *ansjö, 'threadhole in a shoe,' and so on.

More significant, however, are correspondences involving (a) typical gods of definite functions, (b) rituals, and (c) myths. Dumézil has been compiling impressive files of correspondences of the first type, pointing out, for example, the striking parallel between the functional mutilations of Odin and Týr and those of the Roman heroes of the Etruscan wars, Horatius Cocles and Mucius Scaevola. Particularly instructive is his analysis of the saga of Hadingus²⁶ whose two lives reflect, on the one hand, an epic rehash of the myths of the Scandinavian Njörðr and, on the other, his new career as an Oligarch hero. Another pre-Germanic myth retrieved by careful comparison of Eddic sources and early Latin history is the already mentioned episode of the war of the Aesir and Vanir,²⁷ with which the Irish tale of the two battles of Mag Tured has also been compared.

There are, indeed, obvious correspondences in the process by which gods and men with conflicting interests and ambitions as the king, the warrior, and the agriculturist-producer manage to come to an understanding after an initial strife. When one examines the development of the script in detail, however, one is struck by the superficiality of some correspondences. Take, for instance, the myth of Njörðr's marriage. It is undoubtedly true, as Dumézil points out, that "tout ce qui est essentiel dans le récit du mariage de Njörðr et de Skadī—

²⁶ C. my study "L'étymologie du terme germanique ansus, 'dieu souverain,' " EC 8:32-41 (1955), esp. pp. 31 ff. The objection of C. Scott Littleton, that the "bounding" aspect of this etymology was obsolete, because the "blind god" thesis had already been largely rejected by Dumézil himself, rests on a tendentious interpretation (The New Comparative Mythology [Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1966], pp. 85-86, 135) of the views of Dumézil in the second edition of Mircea-Veanu, where the binding function of the "fearful sovereign" is explicitly emphasized (pp. 113-116, 202-203). This control of Varuna over the "bonds" is again restated in Dumézil, L'idéologie tripolare des indo-européens (Brussels, 1959), p. 295 and pp. 295ff.


²⁸ La Saga de Hadingus (Saxo Grammaticus 1, s.v.8): Du mythe au roman (Paris, 1953).

spells disaster for the present world, since it opens a long dark age that ends in an ultimate battle between the forces of Evil and the gods, after which a new, regenerated world will arise. The parallelism with the Mahabharata episode consists mainly in the following facts: (1) an apparently dangerous game compels Yudhishthira to exile on account of his partner's cheating; (2) after years of exile during which the evildoer Durvishana prevails, Yudhishthira and his brothers return to claim their rights; the murderous battle of Kuraksetra marks the victory of Good over Evil, after which Vidura and Dhrtarashtra, who did not take part in the fight, assume new functions in the reconciled society of heroes. Apart from the fact that, in both instances, a fateful game involving a blind partner is the decisive event in the drama, the two stories are quite different: Hodr in Snorri's tale is a mere instrument of the schemer Loki, whereas the blind Dhrtarashtra is more directly implicated, since he consented to the cheating through weakness and was aware of the consequences for Yudhishthira. Besides, the link of the death of Baldr with Ragnarok is extremely tenuous; before drawing such far-reaching conclusions it would be advisable to reexamine the whole Germanic tradition. It is indeed obvious that Loki, who is the keystone of Dumz'il's eschatological interpretation of the episode, does not at all play the part that Snorri assigns to him. In the Eddic lay of "Baldr's Dreams," the seeress answers Odin's question about the name of Baldr's murderer as follows:

Hód will the hero hitherward send.
He will Baldr slay, the blameless god,
and end the life of Odin's son.  

a statement that the "Prophecy of the Seeress" (Fólustá, stts. 31-32) confirms:

I saw for Baldr, the blessed god,
Ygg's dearest son, what doom is hidden:
green and glossy there grew aloe,
the trees among, the mistletoe.

The slender-seeming sapling became
a fell weapon when flung by Hodr
but Baldr's brother was born full soon:
but one night old slew him Odin's son.  

This avenger is Vali, the son of the giantess Rind and Odin, who had forced her by magic spells to bear him this son. In the lay of "Baldr's Dreams" as well as in the "Prophecy of the Seeress," this Vali refuses to wash his hands and to comb his hair so long as Hödr has not paid with his life for the evil deed. There is no question of punishing Loki, and in the "Prophecy of the Seeress" the stanza about the atonement for Baldr's death ends with a reference to Frigg's lament over the "fateful deed." Since Baldr's death appears to be the prelude to world destruction, the immediately following question applies to the fettering of Loki. The latter's breaking loose is another prelude to Ragnarök, as is pointed out in the last stanza of "Baldr's Dreams": "Loki is loose from his bonds and the day will come of the souls of the gods."  

The motif of Loki's fettering is accordingly only secondarily linked with Baldr's myth, and that this is also true of the whole intervention of Loki appears from the tale of Saxo Grammaticus, whose euhemeristic account reads as follows:

Hotherus—i.e., Hödr—comes from Sweden; he is the son of Hothrodus. Nanna, the daughter of the Norse king Gevarus, falls in love with him, but Balderus, the son of Othinus, after seeing her at her bath, is madly in love with her, and decides to get rid of Hotherus. The latter is warned by three nymphs, who also tell him that Balderus is half divine. When Hotherus sees for Nanna's hand, Gevarus duty refuses to agree

28 Hollander, op. cit., p. 119. There is no explicit mention of Loki's fettering in the Eddic sources as being specifically his punishment for participating in the murder of Baldr. There is no doubt, however, that Loki was somehow involved in it, since he brags about his being responsible for the absence of Baldr at the gathering of the gods in Aegir's hall (Lokasæna, st. 62):

Be mindful, Frigg, what further I tell of wicked works of mine
my rede wrought it that rides nevermore
bitherward Baldr to hall.

The phrase ec fóri red has, indeed, to be translated 'it is my fault' (ich bin darum schuld) according to H. Gering, Kommentar zu den Liedern der Edda [Halle, 1901], I, 191. E. Mogk thought that this applied to Loki's preventing Baldr from returning from Hell by refusing to bewail him under the shape of Thokk, but this is improbable (cf. F. R. Schneider, Germaniten und Helenisten [Heidelberg, 1907], pp. 109-110; J. de Vola, The Problem of Loki, FFC 110 [Helios, 1935], pp. 163-171). This passage alludes rather to Loki's having been the rahnari of Baldr, i.e., 'the contriver' of his murder, but he may very well have done this merely by supplying Hodr with the only weapon that could harm Baldr, the mistletoe; this would be in keeping with his function as 'trickster' and parallel with his forging the only weapon that can slay the rooster ViSofnir on Mjovan.

29 Holmberg, op. cit., pp. 136-139) tries to establish with the "hardened holly" as a weapon in West European medieval tradition.
to this marriage, because he is afraid of Balderus who is invulnerable. He advises Hotherus to try to obtain a sword from the forest-demon Mimingus, with which he would be able to strike Balderus mortally. Hotherus succeeds in securing the sword and a miraculous ring to boot, which causes the riches of its owner to increase constantly. After Hotherus has vanished a certain Gelderus, while Nanna has rejected Balderus under the pretense that a marriage between a demigod and a mortal is unadvisable, both suitors wage a relentless fight, in which the gods intervene. Balderus has to flee and Hotherus marries Nanna. Soon, however, Balderus attacks his land and Hotherus has to run away with his father-in-law. The struggle continues with varying success for both parties until Hotherus succeeds in secretly getting hold of the miraculous food from which Balderus derives his strength. When Hotherus meets with him shortly after, he runs his sword through him. In the meantime, heavy fighting goes on between their two armies, and in an alarming dream Balderus learns that he will soon stay with Prosperpina. Three days later, his fate is sealed; his remains are buried under a barrow. Then follows the tale of Odin’s revenge.

It would be hopeless to try to harmonize this account with Snorri’s. Saxo’s source must have been a Danish tale, in which Hōdr played the foremost part, whereas Snorri was using Icelandic traditions in which Baldr was the prominent character. Only a few details correspond in both versions, namely Baldr’s premonitory dream and the mention of a miraculous ring, but even these parallel features appear in a basically different context: in the Eddaic tradition, Baldr’s dream is the point of departure for the whole chain of events, whereas in Saxo it is nothing but an anticipation of his imminent death after receiving a fatal wound. As for Draupnir, the “Lay of Skirnir” states that the ring “with Baldr, was burned” and that “eight rings as dear as his are to come to it every ninth night”; yet in Saxo it is nothing but an armilla mira quadam arcanaque virtute possessoris opes augere solita (an arm ring that, through a wonderful and mysterious power, used to increase the riches of its owner’). Its owner is no longer Odin but the forest demon who supplies Hōdr with the weapon with which to kill Baldr.

But let us not preoccupy ourselves with such details: they merely show the widespread Entmythisierung, the total recasting of the mythological data into the plot of a romantic tale, as commonly occurs in the first part of Saxo’s Gesta Danorum. Apparently the Danish historian has no personal grasp of pagan religious thinking and shows a lack of involvement which Snorri does not share. Nevertheless, his story is not completely worthless as a source of information about the original form of the Baldr myth. On the contrary, whereas Snorri modifies the myth with ethical intentions, in order to make Loki the demonic opponent of the gods and assign to him the main role in opposition to the holy victim and the blind instrument Hōdr, Saxo shows these latter two figures to better advantage and also indicates the reason for their enmity, namely their vying with each other for the hand of Nanna (who, by the way, totally disappears in the background in Snorri’s tale). Moreover, in Saxo’s tale Baldr and Hōdr justify their respective names by their heroic behavior: Hōdr is the Old Norse reflex of Germanic *hatho, ‘combat,’ which also appears as first component of the name of Hildebrand’s father, Hadubrand. The word is cognate with Celtic *latu, ‘combat,’ which also appears in the names of Germanic chieftains like Catumerus, head of the Chattii, according to Tacitus, or Catualda, head of the Marcomanni at the end of the first century. It also occurs in the name of the Danish hero Starkadr, which reflects a compound *stark-hōdr, ‘strong warrior,’ whose meaning particularly fits with the character of Starkadr as an “Odinic warrior.”

23 Cf. de Vries, “Die Starkadsage,” GRM 50 (N.F. 2): 281-297 (1955). Dumezil, however, contrasts Starkatherus with Sigurdr, Helgi and Hauklod in his Aspects de la fonction guerriere chez les Indo-européens (Paris, 1956), pp. 80-93, and points out that his ugliness, grim courage, and brutal strength characterize him as a second-function figure (“Une être dont on n’a pas beaucoup d’exemples dans la litterature scandinave: un héros de poder,” p. 86). Without denying his association with Odin, especially in the episode with Ymir, Dumezil considers ‘Intervention d’Oshanus dans sa vie . . . celle qu’on l’attend d’un dieu souverain; Il fixe laborieusement et seul le dieu des individus et leur distribue les dons de nature” (ibid.). He therefore objects (ibid., pp. 107-114) to the arguments of de Vries, who rightly points out, “Wie man sich das Verhalten der Odin- und Thormotive in der Starkadsage zu denken hat, bleibt ungewiss” (op. cit., p. 299). Dumezil’s interpretation is based on Saxo’s story, which he considers as closer to the original version than that of the Gautreksaga; but as de Vries points out, “Nur die dümmische Überlieferung zeigt Andenken zu einem Starkadbild, das den Gogentwist ‘Ther wenger berett’ (ibid.). For an extensive discussion of the problem, cf. Turville-Petre, op. cit., pp. 205-211.
As for the name Baldr, two etymologies are usually advanced: one is connected with the no longer accepted interpretation of Baldr as a sun-god and derives his name from the IE root *bhel-, ‘shining, white.’ In the Gylfaginning, he is described as having a face so beautiful and bright that rays seemed to beam from him. This argument does not weigh very much, however, in view of the fact that such an earthbound divine figure as the vegetation god Freyr is also called ‘shining’ and that his servant—actually a hypostasis of his—is called Skínrí, ‘the bright one.’ Therefore this etymology is usually abandoned in favor of the comparison with the Old English noun bealdor which is supposed to mean ‘lord, prince.’ The name would then belong to the same semantic area as Freyr, which also originally means ‘lord.’ Upon closer examination of the Old English sources, however, it is obvious that the ascription of the meaning ‘lord, prince’ to bealdor is unjustified, so that a third etymology may be considered. There is, indeed, another IE root *bhel-, which refers mainly to bursting with vital strength. Derived from it is the German adjective *bald-, ‘brave, hardy’ (English bold), and connecting the name Baldr with it becomes even more plausible when one remembers that the name of his wife Nanna can reflect an older form *næn̄dp, which is related to the Old High German words nand, ‘audacity,’ and nandan, ‘dare,’ with which the Old Irish word for ‘combat,’ nēit, is also akin. Thus, the names of the three main characters of the Baldr myth belong to the same conceptual sphere of “combat.” Since the kennings always connect the name Baldr with the concept of “warrior,” we could be tempted to consider Saxo’s tale as a reflex of the oldest form of the myth, the more so since Snorri does not say a word about this “courageous” aspect of Baldr’s personality.

The mythologem of fratricide for the possession of a woman is a common motif in the sphere of the cult of the divine twins, where male twins are usually associated with a female personage. In the oldest form of the myth this woman appears as their common wife; accordingly, Sūrī is the wife of both Æsins, the originally horse-shaped sons of the Sky-god in the Vedic sources. The social situation implicit in this common possession of one wife by two brothers is known as “phratrogyamy” and seems to have been known among the Indo-Europeans. There is a tale in Pausanias according to which, on an evening, the Spartan Dioscuri requested the owner of the house in which they had spent their earthly life to put them up for the night. The man accepted, but refused to let them use their former room, as his own daughter slept there. The following morning the latter has disappeared with all her garments, and in her room the owner of the house found a bust of the Dioscuri with a laserwort twig in her stead. Yet it is not out of the question to consider Baldr and Höðr hypostases of the Indo-European divine twins who vie for the possession of the same woman—but, in that case, Snorri’s account would have to be totally disregarded. This approach has been attempted by those who hold that Snorri had combined three originally separate elements into one continuous tale, the components being Baldr’s death, the incineration, and Hermód’s descent to the world of the dead. The first and the third would have been taken over by Snorri from existing lays, whereas the second would be based on a description of the fresco that depicted Baldr’s funeral ceremonies in the hall of the Ice-landic prince Ólafó the Young. The motif of the incineration would accordingly have been inserted between the two originally independent alliterative poems, after the model of the Húsdrápa of the Skáld Úlfr Uggason. Yet at the end of Snorri’s account the dispatching of mes...
singers and their meeting with the giantess Thókk are completely independent of the descent to Hell of Hermodr, but nevertheless are based on an older lay on account of the literal quotation of a stanza by Snorri; one therefore wonders whether the efforts of the philologists to distinguish two different lays in the tale are justified — the more so since the prose text itself reminds us of the rhythm of the stanza of Thókk in the passage about the meeting of the Thing of the gods.

Before fragmenting Snorri’s account, it would have been wiser to examine carefully whether there was any organic coherence among the three components of the mythologem. Partiality for explanations relating to fertility rites seems to have covered up the truth in this matter. On the basis of Frigg’s intervention and of the universal dismay at his death, efforts have been made to transplanted Baldr from the world of the Aesir (i.e., the warlike, ruling gods) into that of the Vanir (i.e., the protectors of agriculture and vegetation growth). He was, accordingly, brought into closer association with Freyr, the principal vegetation god: as already pointed out, it was thought that both names meant ‘lord’; besides, Baldr was occasionally referred to as ‘most favourable’ and as ‘reconciling men,’ so that he could also be considered a god of peace and welfare. Like Freyr, he was an excellent horse rider: both excel in wisdom and bright appearance, and, like Freyr, Baldr even has a ship.41

But how is one to explain Baldr’s death in this context? To do so, parallels from the world of the sagas have been adduced. In the stories about the hero Starkadr, a remarkable event took place during a simulated sacrifice to Odin: the lot had fallen upon King Vikar to serve as mock victim, and he was strung up, as it were, on a holy tree; people were supposed to poke him in the side with a reed, but, in the hands of Starkadr, the harmless cane became a spear by fateful

Old Pflau and Ulfur Uggason note the motif of sending a man as a victim. With reference to Snorri’s text, however, Schröder states more accurately in Germanenm und Hellenismus, p. 98: “zwischen beide [Lieder] ist eine ausführliche Schilddung von Balders Lebensfeier eingeschoben. Diese hat Snorri der Husdirpa des Skalden überliefert, der in diesem Gedichte bildliche Darstellungen der Baldersage bringt, die die Halle des vornehmen Isthylinders, Old Pflau schnüffelten.”42


41 On the correspondences between Baldr and Freyr, cf. especially Schröder, Germanenm und Hellenismus, pp. 122-123.

witchcraft and pierced Vikar’s heart, so that he died then and there. The similarity between the reed and the misletoe that caused Baldr’s death is obvious, and the correspondence between the two episodes becomes even more striking when one thinks that the murderous blows are struck by characters who have actually the same name, since Starkadr means “strong Hödr.” It is, accordingly, plausible to recognize originally a simulated sacrifice in the Baldr myth. But of what kind?

According to Snorri’s account, the gods indulge in a kind of “game” on the “peace ground” at the Thing meeting. Since Baldr is supposed to be invulnerable, their sport is a symbolic “killing,” comparable with the numerous usages on which folklore gives us ample information: simulated fights to celebrate the spring festival, in which the symbol of winter is fought against and vanquished; carrying around a kind of doll or manikin, which is beaten with rods, pierced with sticks, and finally cast into the water or burned on a bonfire. There are dozens of such descriptions of fertility rites on Germanic territory in the collections of W. Mannhardt, J. G. Frazer, and W. Liungman, which accounts for the fact that the Baldr myth was connected with them.

But there is more: specialists have always been struck by the resemblance of Baldr’s story to the life of Siegfried. The remarkable correspondences are, indeed, especially obvious if the Scandinavian traditions of Sigurd are taken into consideration. Like Achilles, Siegfried is vulnerable in only one tiny spot, and a woman learns of it by deceit from another woman. Here the murderer, Hagen, is one-eyed, whereas Hödr is supposed to be blind. In both instances a woman is so inconsolably desperate that she ends up burning on the funeral pyre with her murdered husband: here Brünhilde gives Siegfried this proof of love; there Nanna dies of grief. Like Baldr and Freyr, Siegfried is “shiningly beautiful” and is considered a first-rate horse rider. Among the jewels that Siegfried has acquired with the hoard of the Niebelungen, there is a ring — Andvarinaut — which reminds us in a way of Draupnir.

This comparison between the Baldr myth and the Siegfried saga seems to be especially important with regard to the various assumed connections of the latter with fertility rites.43 One thinks, for ex-

41 Cf. especially Günther, Die Schau der Seherin, pp. 59-61.
ample, of the episode of the awakening of the Valkyrie in the Edda: when Sigurdr has crossed the flames to reach the sleeping Valkyrie and has awakened her by taking off her coat of mail, she says:

- Hail to you, god! Hail, goddess!
- Hail, earth, that gives to all!
- Goodly spells and speech bespeak we from you, and healing hands, in this life!\(^{44}\)

This invocation reminds us in some respects of the old hymn to the earth goddess which survives in the Old English charm:

- Hail to thee, earth, mother of men,
- may you be fruitful under God's protection,
- filled with food for the benefit of men.\(^{45}\)

This would typify Siegfried as a young spring god—he would be a solar hero who performs hierarchy with the earth goddess for the sake of blessing Nature with prosperous crops. Such an association is, however, doomed to end fatally with the summer solstice, and, therefore, the statement of the Middle High German Nibelungenlied: \textit{se einer sunneiuenden der groze mord geschah, 'the great murder took place at a solstice,'} does not come unexpectedly.

Would this also be the case with Baldr's death? Such has been the assumption of some scholars, because the \textit{fimbulvetr} ('the great and awful winter') to which the Edic \textit{Lay of Vafthrudin} alludes might be its cosmic consequence.\(^{46}\) Yet if this assumption were justified, one would expect that in accord with the usual scenario of fertility rites, after the death of the god and the lamentation he would rise from the dead. For Baldr there is no resurrection.

To this argument the defenders of the view just discussed would

\(^{44}\) Sigrdrfrvendi, st. 3 (Holland, op. cit., p. 296).
\(^{46}\) As Schröder points out (PR\textsc{I}\textsc{T} \textsc{I} \textsc{I}, 84/333 (1963)), "Im Mittelpunkt des kosmischen Geschehens steht die Gestalt Balders, mit dessen Sterben aller Segen auf Erden schwindet und der Niedergang unverhältnismässig eintretet." The apparently endless winter need not be an Oriental motif, as has often been assumed (cf. against A. Oetik, \textit{Ragnarök: Die Sagen vom Weltuntergang} [Berlin, 1922], pp. 135-137; de Vries, \textit{Allgemeine Religionsgeschichte} [ed.] II, 399, 403; and Turville-Petre, op. cit., p. 889). If Baldr is considered a "Vegetations- und Jahresgott . . . der in der Bilde der Jugend und der Fülle der Kräfte dem frisieren feindlichen Gott, dem Dämon des Winters" erliegt, it will be expected that he remain "während der langen Wintersonnacht im unterirdischen Bereich, um erst im neuen Jahr zu neuem Leben zu erwachen." In the context of \textit{Fylgjup}, "hat der Dichter . . . das Ablauf eines einzelnen Erdjahrs zum Weltjahr geistigt und in dieses Baldr mittenhineingesetzt, den Fruchtarbeitsgott zum kosmischen Gott erhoben" (Schröder, op. cit.).
The giantess who dwells in a cave is rather the goddess of death herself, and her very words give us a better idea of the real meaning of the Baldr myth: through his death, Baldr has entered the land of no return. There is no question of resurrection. The core of the theme of Hermadr’s descent to Hell is accordingly the same as that of the Babylonian epic of Gilgamesh or of the Greek myth of Orpheus: nobody can escape death, and whoever thinks he has found a way out of it soon realizes his delusion. In Baldr’s story Hermadr returns with joy: Who would not bewail Baldr’s death? He is, accordingly, sure to be “wept out of Hell.” But Hermadr has not understood the hidden meaning of Hel’s remark: “It will have to be proved that Baldr is as much beloved by all as it is claimed.” What she actually meant was: “The whole world may unanimously wish to revive the shining god, but Death herself will remain inexorable”; therefore, she says: “What Hel has, she may keep!” in the shape of Thókk. It accordingly seems to me that the Baldr myth deals with the problem of death, without the motif of the victorious resurrection of life from death.

What, then, is the significance of Baldr’s death in the framework of Edic cosmic history?

The “Prophecy of the Seeress” informs us about it: for the world of the gods, this death comes as a thunderclap out of a bright clear sky, and suddenly destroys the cosmic order painstakingly established after the war with the Vanir. The seeress describes Baldr explicitly as the “gory god” (blóggum tívar), even before the murder is perpetrated, almost marking the.death destined to suffer that fateful death. It can therefore be assumed that Baldr’s death symbolizes the entry of death into the world. Besides, if we accept Bugge’s interpretation of Old Norse tívar as “sacrifice” (as corresponding to Old English tífer, ‘sacrifice,’ and Old High German zebar, ‘sacrificial animal’), it could, moreover, be considered as the first sacrifice on the model of which later rituals developed.

The connection of the Baldr myth with a sacrificial rite has already been pointed out with reference to the death of King Vikar in the Starkadr saga. There, the dart that pierced the heart of the victim is already been pointed out with reference to the death of King Vikar in the Starkadr saga. There, the dart that pierced the heart of the victim was a reed. Why?

This plant, which grows up from muddy puddles and pools, is the murder in the Edic poetic source is, indeed, the twenty-eighth stanza of the Lokasenna (cf. especially Schröder, “Das Symponion der Lokasenna.” ANP 67:2-49 [1929]).

Turville-Petre, op. cit., p. 108 (Höfländer’s translation ‘beastly god,’ quoted on p. 64, does not reflect the GN text accurately; blógg means ‘bloodystained’).


54 This is evidenced by the words of Odin to Starkadr in the Gaukrónsayg: Hóallir ni senda mjó Vikar konung, ‘now then you shall dispatch to me King Vikar’ (cf. de Vries, “Die Starkadeage,” pp. 287-288).

According to the Véðlafr hin skamna (the “Short Seeress’ Prophecy” inserted in the Hyndluljóð)—Véll has avenged his brother Baldr by slaying his murderer—specifically designated as handboni, i.e., ‘actual slayer’ (cf. Old Saxon handbono [Hefland 1939], Old English handbona [Bosworth 360]). In the new world, where all disputes are settled, Hödr and Baldr can live together in Valholl (designated in Véðlaf, st. 62, as Hrípfr siggeir, ‘Hröpir’s (i.e. Odin’s) homes of victory’), and, according to a plausible emendation of Raunus Rask, ref [instead of nef] salilísi, ‘the shrine of the gods of the slain’). This is the reason why de Vries translated the second half of stanza 62 as: “Hódr and Baldr, both reconciled, live in Valholl” (edda [Amsterdam, 1966], p. 51; cf. also Berulcz, op. cit., p. 137).

55 This fact suggests another interpretation of his part in the drama: In the Germanic pantheon, some gods occur with significant bodily defects, for example, the one-handed Tyr, the one-eyed Odin; it would be astonishing, to say the least, that a second Ase often considered a symbol of the divine life that arises triumphantly from the primordial waters of chaos. This same motif is found in Old Indic cosmogonic symbolism, where the divinity reveals itself, together with the cosmos, by popping up out of a lotus floating on the waters. Is mistletoe also such a symbolization of the divine principle of life? The numerous studies devoted to folk customs connected with this plant clearly indicate that it is actually considered a “plant of life”; but in the Baldr myth it appears as the plant of life that belongs to death, or better, of a life that is not granted to man—a kind of plant like the one that Gilgamesh wanted to acquire for man, but which ultimately had to remain in the netherworld.

Is Baldr, then, a man, to whom “divine” life has to be refused?

In this respect the parallelism with the Starkadr saga is particularly instructive: here the hero, acting as a warrior dedicated to Odin, becomes the instrument of a fate determined by the gods and kills King Vikar during the ritual of a simulated sacrifice to Odin. The similarity of name between Starkadr and Baldr’s killer has repeatedly been pointed out; the way both kill their victims is also the same. Yet Hödr is blind; he seems to be merely an instrument of Lok! Snorri, as we know, is constantly stressing the part of Loki in the light of his ethical interpretation of the myth. Eddie tradition, however, holds that Hödr is truly responsible for Baldr’s death. (Why would he, otherwise, have to “reconcile” himself with Baldr after Ragnarok?) This fact suggests another interpretation of his part in this drama: In the Germanic pantheon, some gods occur with significant bodily defects, for example, the one-handed Tyr, the one-eyed Odin; it would be astonishing, to say the least, that a second Ase
would show the same defect as Odin—only to a worse degree, though, since he is totally blind. And even this difference is of little importance, since Odin himself is described as \textit{Teiðblindi}, that is, ‘blind with both eyes.’ Is Hödr then a hypostasis of Odin himself?

If this possibility be admitted, it becomes clear why Odin does not intervene during the whole process, while, on the other hand, Hödr’s appearance is restricted to the Baldr myth. But why would Odin, under the shape of Hödr, want to kill his son Baldr? Analyzing the motif of the struggle between father and son in the Hildebrandslied, de Vries has indicated that it could very well be a mythological schema belonging to an initiation rite. The myth, in which an unruly divine hero even dares to stand up against his father, but must finally be worsted on account of the latter’s divine power, may be a symbolization of actual facts of life as well as a warning to presumptuous young warriors who would no longer feel due respect for paternal authority.

With good reason, the best specialist of Germanic mythology surmised that the same mythological content underlay the Baldr myth, a hypothesis he worked out in his article “\textit{Der Mythos von Balders Tod},” the argument of which I reproduce here with slight modifications. According to de Vries, the kernel of the myth is the killing of a son begotten on a mortal by his divine father Odin. By implication Baldr is not a god: he does not die as a vegetation god only to rise from the dead and thus give proof of his irresistible vital strength. Baldr dies and remains dead. Although he is called “the twelfth among the Ases,” he does not actually belong to their circle. Confirmation may be found in the Skaldic poem describing the arrival in Valhöll of Eiríkr blöðs of a group of followers killed in combat: when they approach, Bragi thinks Baldr returns to the Hall with his retinue, but Odin immediately dismisses this suggestion as ‘nonsense.’ Besides, the names Baldr, ‘valiant,’ and Hödr, ‘warrior,’ are by no means typically divine names, nor is Hermóðr which means ‘courageous in combat.’ Thus the indications are that the main characters in the plot of the Baldr myth are not actually gods.

This conclusion is furthermore confirmed by the funeral rites. Obviously, Snorri has interwoven them with a few mythological incidents like the episode with the giantess Hyrrokkin, which he has presumably somewhat toned down, since it can be surmised from a Skaldic poem dedicated to Thor, which explicitly mentions her as dead, that in the original version her skull was crushed by Thor in anger. The unsmooth behavior of Thor is also evident in his treatment of the dwarf Litr. His kicking of the latter into the fire of the funeral pyre has a symbolic meaning as well; Old Norse \textit{litr}, indeed, means ‘nice complexion’ and applies to the bloom of youth and health given by Lodur to the first human couple, Askr and Embla. The typical attribute of youth characterizing Baldr is utterly destroyed by the flames—another hint that he will not rise from the dead.

As regards the ceremony itself, it is the typical funeral of heroes: he...
is burned in a ship, with his wife and presumably also his retinue, since Modgudr, meeting Hermóðr on the bridge to Hel, tells him that “five throngs of dead men” rode over Gígli, the river of Hell, the day before; his horse is also put on the funeral pyre—all in conformity with Snorri’s statement in the Ynglingasaga that Odin instituted the usage of cremation and determined that the dead should be burned with their earthly possessions in order to have them along in Valhöll.48

This, however, prompts a question: Why does Baldr not go to Valhöll after the “Odinic” sacrificial and funeral rites? Such a fate is excluded for two reasons: first of all, going to Valhöll would imply an unconditional resurrection in the society of the Aesir; second, as a symbol of man’s fate, Baldr must go to the dark realms of Hel.

One more detail: Why is Draupnir returned to Hermóðr? As Dumezil pointed out,49 this ring was the symbol of the regulation of time; it was accordingly out of place in the netherworld. But why, then, had Odin nevertheless placed it on the pyre? Two explanations are possible: from a cosmic angle, Baldr’s death had disrupted the cosmic order, including the regulation of time; therefore it was foreboding the end of time in Eddie eschatology; from a strictly human point of view, the ring had to return to the world of the living, because, although death marks the end of all temporal activity for man, others will assume his temporal tasks.

Taking all these elements into consideration, it is possible to summarize the components of the mythologem of Baldr in Snorri’s account; they consist of four motifs:

1. the first occurrence of death, which is henceforth the inescapable fate of man;
2. the establishment by Odin of human sacrifice, namely by means of a spear;
3. the introduction of cremation;
4. the failure of an effort to prevail over death for lack of fulfillment of one condition.50

Since de Vries considers the Baldr myth as the text of an initiation ritual, the problem is now to discover how these motifs are to be related to such religious practices.

The mythologem of death is the nucleus of such rituals: to be truly a man, one must have become fully conscious of the inevitability of death and accept it with calm resignation, with the understanding that the continually renewed existence of mankind is ensured only by the insertion of death in the cycle of life. This has been understood by the Old Norse: everywhere, death is considered as something unnatural; man cannot realize that it belonged to his original destiny, and he therefore ascribes it to the cunning intervention of a demonic being or to his own failure. A tiny plant was forgotten by Frigg when she received everyone’s oath; this twig will become the instrument of man’s fate. Snorri made Loki responsible, but against Dumezil and de Vries, I believe that he did so merely on the basis of his ethical concepts, in order to assign death definitely to the demonic element, as in the biblical cosmic drama. The heathen Germanic tribesmen must have had a different outlook. He was not coddled as a child; “a parvulis labori et duritiae student,” says Caesar;51 only after proving their competence with pain and courage were they allowed to carry arms and to take their place in the social community, adds Tacitus.52 This acceptance in the group, or rather, this passage from youth to the adult world of warriors was conditioned by particularly severe tests, as many tales show, for example, the Yfungsaga Saga. Here, the mother of Sinfjóllí, the future warrior dedicated to Odin, tests the courage of her children by sewing their shirts to their skins. All her sons cry with pain, but Sinfjóllí bites his lips and does not breathe a word. Then she violently pulls the shirt from his body so that the skin of his arms is left hanging on the sleeves, but he remains silent. As she asks him if he does not feel anything, he simply answers: “For a Völsunga, this can merely be called insignificant pain.” Then his father Sigmundr puts him through another test: he must knead a bag of flour in which a venomous snake is hidden, but he does not even notice it. Later, father and son put on wolfskins, and Sinfjóllí now has to attack at least seven enemies at once. He, however, kills eleven of them. Seeing this, his father jumps at his throat and “kills” him, to revive him immediately afterward with a magic herb that a raven brought him.53 After this strenuous “initiation” Sinfjóllí is deemed capable of fulfilling his task, that is, avenging his grandfather’s death. The parallelism with Baldr’s myth is obvious: Sinfjóllí’s mother

48 From childhood up they stress toil and hardship” (De Bello Gallico 6:61).
50 Yfungsaga Saga, chap. 8. The appearance of Odin’s bird is but one of the numerous “Odinic” features of this “Ins Heroische gesteigerte Form alter Initiationsbräuche” (de Vries, ANF 70:55 [1955], with further reference to Höller, Kultische Geheimbünde der Germanen [Frankfurt, 1933], pp. 150 ff.).
imposes difficult tests upon him in order to acquaint him with pain and fortify him against it. Is this not also the symbolic meaning of the oaths that Frigg receives? Owing to these preparatory steps taken by her, Baldr is apparently ready for any trial imposed upon him at the Thing. Then comes the ordeal of the initiation: this is a strictly manly affair; no women are allowed, a fact that excludes the possibility of a manifestation of a vegetation cult, which would not fit with the activity of the Aesir at the Thing meeting either. Frigg only hears what has happened from Loki who visits her, disguised as a woman. Otherwise, why would she have to ask: "Do you know what the Aesir did at the Thing meeting?" This clearly indicates that, like Sinfjötli's mother, she had to forfeit her son totally to the male community, quite in keeping with Tacitus' statement that before this transition rite the youths were members of the household, but that after it they belonged to the community.66

In both cases the final phase of the ritual is death, but Sinfjötli is immediately called back to life to fulfill his manly task. This is impossible in Baldr's case on account of the basic meaning of the mythologem, but Baldr is nevertheless reborn in another warrior, his own avenger, Vili, the son whom Odin begets for this very purpose and who, merely one night old, brings Baldr's slayer to the stake.

Several elements indicate that Vili represents the initiate who has become a "new man." First of all, his name does not reflect Germanc *wanilaR, "little warrior." He is the youth who triumphantly sustained the hardships of the ordeal of initiation of an "Odinic" warrior and has just been accepted into the community.

Another feature in the Baldr myth which clearly points to initiation practices is Odin's murmuring something into the ear of Baldr before he mounted the pyre (VafpruSnismal, st. 54-55): this act corresponds to the communication of a secret message, the magic password, that will give the initiate entrance and recognition in his new world. No wonder Vafthrudnir is defeated in the contest of wit by Odin's question about this message: only initiates know its content and, as a rule, pretend that only then they have paid back the price of their birth...71

If, then, the Baldr myth is the mythologem of an initiation rite, how was it accomplished? Presumably the initiate stood in the middle of a circle of men; all kinds of weapons were thrown at him. Then "Odin" appeared under the shape of Hödr—the "warrior" par excellence; he cast the mistletoe. As struck by death, the initiate fell on the ground. This was probably enacted very realistically, so that the youth was really considered dead—hence the display of grief! The prior being was another man—reborn but not resurrected.72

The Baldr myth appears, accordingly, as a mythologic drama with a rich symbolism, in which the problem of man facing his destiny is solved in the framework of a typically Germanic social structure.

If this reexamination of the Baldr myth warns us to be careful about too hasty and far-reaching comparisons outside the Germanic social framework, other myths, on the contrary, give evidence of the elaboration of inherited Indo-European mythologems, for example, the cosmogonic episode about the creation of man in the "Prophecy of the Seeress," where the participating gods grant man attributes in keeping with their functional position in the Germanic pantheon.73 Especially interesting in this context is the role of Lödur who endows man with "hair and beautiful complexion," his gifts relating to the physical aspect of man being perfectly in keeping with his probable Vanic origin; his name is, indeed, presumably closely connected with that of the Italic god Liber, who presides over growth and generation.

72 As de Vries accurately points out (ANF 38:56 [1955]): "Die Initiations ist ja ein Durchgang durch den Tod; der zu der Geburt eines neuen, geschlechtsreifen, erwachsenen Mannes führt... Der junge Vili stellt also gewisserraassen den Durchgang durch den Tod. der zu der Geburt eines neuen, geschlechtsreifen, erwachsenen Mannes führt..."
73 As de Vries accurately points out (ANF 38:56 [1955]): "Die Initiations ist ja ein Durchgang durch den Tod; der zu der Geburt eines neuen, geschlechtsreifen, erwachsenen Mannes führt... Der junge Vili stellt also gewisserraassen den Durchgang durch den Tod. der zu der Geburt eines neuen, geschlechtsreifen, erwachsenen Mannes führt..."
and protects the community. The analysis of such Eddic passages shows that careful reexamination of myth may still open valuable new avenues of research into the survival of Indo-European divine archetypes in Germanic.

74 Cf. the functional relationship between Lodurr and the Italic Liber, assumed in conclusion, ibid.

INTRODUCTION

By all odds the most important single episode in Greek mythology is the one that begins with the emergence of Ouranos out of Chaos and ends with the final triumph of Zeus over Kronos and his fellow Titans; for on this account of how Zeus came to succeed to the "Kingship in Heaven" depend, directly or indirectly, almost all other Greek myths, sagas, and folktales, to say nothing of their associated rituals and ceremonies. It formed, in the Malinowskian sense, the "charter" that legitimized the position of the Olympians relative to all other classes of natural and supernatural beings, and in so doing provided a firm foundation for the religious beliefs and practices of the ancient Greek-speaking community.

Yet, despite its fundamental importance to the whole structure of Greek myth and religion, the parenthood of these traditions relative to the "Kingship in Heaven" remains obscure. Through archaeological and linguistic research it has become increasingly apparent that...

1 According to B. Malinowski (Magic, Science and Religion [New York, 1955], p. 101), myth is "... a vital ingredient of human civilization; it is not an idle tale, but a hard-worked active force; it is not an intellectual explanation or an artistic imagery, but a pragmatic charter of primitive faith and moral wisdom."  

2 The first to recognize the basic similarity between the Hittite-Hurrian and Greek versions of the "Kingship in Heaven" theme seems to have been E. O. Forrer; cf. his "Eine Geschichte des Gotterkonigtums aus dem Hatti-Reiche," in Mélanges Franz Cumont, AIPHÇ 4 (Brussels, 1909), pp. 697-719. A second pioneer work in this area is H. G. Götze'sb's Kumarbi, Mythen vom churritischen Kronos, aus den kretischen Fragmente zusammengestellt, übersetzt und erklärt (Istanbula, 1906). The Phoenician version was first put into its proper perspective by...
the “Kingship in Heaven” theme, as it has come to be called, was in fact quite widely distributed and that it generally served a legitimizing function similar to that served by it among the Greeks. Its presence can be documented in the Hittite and Hurrian “Kumbari” myths, in the Phoenician “Theogony” of Philo of Byblos, in the Iranian Shāh-nāmeh or “Book of Kings,” as recorded by Ferdauzi, and, as I attempt to demonstrate, in two Babylonian accounts of the Creation—the well-known Enuma埃lish and the newly translated “Theogony of Dumnu”—and in the Norse traditions surrounding the ancestry and ascendance of Odin, as recorded in the Edda’s of Snorri. In each instance a single pattern of events is present: an existing generation of gods was preceded by two (and in some cases three) earlier generations of supernatural beings, each succeeding generation being presided over by a “king in heaven” who has usurped (or at least assumed) the power of his predecessor. Moreover, there is generally a fourth figure, a monster of some sort, who, acting on behalf of the deposed “king” (in the Iranian and Babylonian versions, as we shall see, the monster became identified with the deposed “king” himself), presents a challenge to the final heavenly ruler and must be overcome before the latter can assert full and perpetual authority.

In considering the source of this “Kingship in Heaven” theme, one question necessarily looms large to the student of comparative Indo-European mythology: despite its apparent absence in the Indic, Balto-Slavic, Italic, and Celtic traditions (discussed later) and its occurrence in a variety of non-Indo-European speaking traditions, is there any possibility that the theme is ultimately derived from one that was present in the Indo-European Urmythology? Perhaps the most ardent advocate of the Indo-European origin theory is the eminent Swedish Iranianist Stig Wikander, who maintains that “histoire des Oumânides,” as he terms it, reached the non-Indo-European peoples of Mesopotamia and Syria only after they had come into contact with the Hittites and Indo-Iranians who penetrated this region after 3000 B.C. This opinion is not shared, however, by most Orientalists. E. A. Speiser, for example, although he suggests that the extant form of the Enuma埃lish seems to reflect an immediate Hittite or Hurrian origin, is nevertheless convinced that its roots lie deep in the early Babylonian and Sumerian traditions. A basically similar view has been advanced by the Hittitologist H. G. Güterbock, who asserts that the Hittite version of the theme, from which the Phoenician and eventually the Greek versions appear to derive, is itself based upon Hurrian models, which in turn are probably derived from early Mesopotamian prototypes.

No one, however, has as yet attempted to resolve this question on the basis of a systematic, comparative survey of all the mythological materials relative to the “Kingship in Heaven.” The purposes of this paper are thus (1) to put into evidence the salient points of similarity and difference between the several versions of the theme in question, among which I include two that heretofore have not generally been recognized as such, the Norse and Babylonian versions, and (2) to consider the question of Indo-European origin in light of the patterns revealed by this survey. I begin with the Greek version which, although it contains neither the oldest nor necessarily the “purest” expression of the theme, is by far the most elaborately documented, and most familiar of the versions to be considered and thus can serve as a convenient point of departure.

THE GREEK VERSION

Inasmuch as the Homeric epics do not fully express the “Kingship in Heaven” theme and thus, for our purposes, cannot serve as pri-
mary sources, the earliest and most important Greek source of data concerning the theme under discussion is to be found in the Hesiodic poems, especially the *Theogony*. Composed during the later part of the eighth century B.C., the *Theogony* is concerned primarily with the events surrounding and preceding the ascension of Zeus as "king" in heaven. It served as the major source of information about cosmogonic and theogonic matters for most Greek (and Roman) poets, essayists, and dramatists. A second source is to be found in the *Bibliotheca* of Apollodorus, which was composed sometime during the first or second centuries B.C. While drawing heavily upon Hesiod, Apollodorus also includes certain data that are at variance with those contained in the *Theogony*, and therefore, as it may reflect an ongoing popular tradition that was either overlooked by or inaccessible to Hesiod, the *Bibliotheca* must be considered a primary source not only for the Greek version of the "Kingship in Heaven" but for Greek mythological data in general. Our third source is the *Dionysiaca* of Nonnos which, despite its fifth century A.D. date, includes some original materials relevant to the theme not found elsewhere among classical works on myth. Nonnos, as we shall see, is especially concerned with the combat between Zeus and Typhon, and his description of this struggle may reflect a popular tradition unknown to either Hesiod or Apollodorus.

According to both the *Theogony* and the *Bibliotheca* the first "king" in heaven is Ouranos ("Heaven" or "Sky"). In the *Theogony*, Heaven is born of Gaia ("Earth"), who is apparently autochthonous, although she is preceded by the personified state or condition termed Chaos: "Verily at first Chaos came to be, but next wide-hoended Earth . . ." (1.1.1). There is no hint of the incestuous situation described in the *Theogony* afterwards she lay with Heaven . . ." (135). Thus Hesiod includes some original materials relevant to the theme under consideration. Next, she takes Heaven as a husband: "But then gives birth to various beings (e.g.. Hills; Pontos ["the Deep"]; Zeus and Typhon, and his description of this struggle may reflect a popular tradition unknown to either Hesiod or Apollodorus.

In the *Bibliotheca* these events are similarly reported (1.1.2-4).

---

14 The numbers enclosed by parentheses refer to lines in the original texts of the *Theogony*, *Bibliotheca*, and *Dionysiaca*; the translations utilized are those, respectively, of H. G. Evelyn-White, J. G. Frazer, and W. H. D. Rouse.
Here, Apollodorus introduces the terms “Titan” (male) and “Titanide” (female) to refer to these offspring, terms Hesiod uses in a later point (see below).

Ouranos was jealous of his offspring, especially the Cyclopes and the giant Hundred-handed, and “used to hide them all away in a secret place of Earth... [Tartaros]. ... so soon as each was born, and would not suffer them to come up into the light...” (Theogony 155). Apollodorus (1.1.2–4) gives us a similar picture, locating Tartaros as a “gloomy place in Hades as far from earth as earth is distant from the sky.” Here he follows Hesiod, who, in a later context (Theogony 725) describes Tartaros as so far below the earth that “a brazen anvil falling from earth nine nights and days would reach Tartaros upon the tenth.”

Gaia, incensed over the treatment of her children by Ouranos, exhorts them to “...punish the vile outrage of your father; for he first thought of doing shameful things” (Theogony 165). None but Kronos, however, has the courage to take action (Theogony 169), and he tells her: “...I will undertake to do this deed, for I reverence not our father of evil name. ...” The deed consists of an emasculation of Ouranos, performed with an “element of grey flint” made into a “jagged sickle” (Theogony 170), which Apollodorus (1.1.4) terms an “adamantine sickle.” Kronos ambushes his father, cuts off the latter’s “members,” and casts them into the sea. The blood so spilled impregnates Earth, who gives birth to the Giants (Theogony 168) and to the Furies (Bibliotheca 1.1.4). The seaborne “members” ultimately reach Cyprus and give birth to Aphrodite.17

With the emasculation of Ouranos his power has gone, and Kronos becomes “king in heaven.” It is worth noting here for later comparative purposes that Ouranos is not killed by Kronos, merely rendered powerless. Kronos is a rebel, but not a parricide.

As regards the nature of this rebellion there seems to be a divergence between the two main sources. Hesiod, as we have seen, gives the impression that it was all accomplished—through guile—by Kronos himself, whereas Apollodorus implies that Kronos was merely the leader of a general attack against the father, one in which all

17 Cf. M. P. Nilsson, “The Sickle of Kronos,” ARSA 46:122–124 (1999). Like Kronos, Saturnus is also associated with a sickle, Greek ἱππη, This seems to be a proto-Indo-European term found also in Balto-Slavic (Lehtinen siripa, Russian serp) and borrowed into Finno-Ugric (Finnish sirpe, Russian sirpi, ‘sickle”). Perhaps the “adamantine” blade used by Kronos against Ouranos was originally a tool associated with an Indo-European harvest god ancestral to both Kronos and Saturnus (cf. n. 16, above).

18 Cf. Rose, op. cit., p. 22.

save one of those siblings not previously consigned to Tartaros took part (Bibliotheca 1.1.4): “And they, all but Ocean, attacked him... and having dethroned their father, they brought up their brethren who had been hurled down to Tartaros, and committed the sovereignty to Kronos.” In any case, after his ascension to power Kronos reconsigns all(?) these siblings to Tartaros (Bibliotheca 1.1.5): “But he again bound and shut them up in Tartaros...” Kronos, now firmly seated on the heavenly throne, marries his sister Rhea (Theogony 455; Bibliotheca 1.1.5). The children produced by this union suffer an unhappy fate, for Kronos, hearing from Heaven and Earth a prophecy that he is destined to be overthrown by his own son (Theogony 410, Bibliotheca 1.1.5), swallows his offspring as fast as they are born. Here, too, we have an episode that may be used for later comparative purposes: the swallowing of one’s offspring.

The swallowed children include first (Bibliotheca 1.1.5) Hestia, “then Demeter and Hera, and after them Pluto (Hades) and Poseidon.” Finally, pregnant with Zeus, Rhea decides to foil Kronos. As to the birth of Zeus our sources differ slightly. Both Apollodorus and Hesiod claim that the event took place in Crete; just where in Crete has long been a matter of some debate.18 A great deal of attention is given to the events surrounding the birth and upbringing of this youngest of Kronos’ sons, an attention directed neither to the births of Zeus’s siblings nor to those of the preceding generations of gods (or Titans), and several of these events must be mentioned as they have analogues in the versions to be discussed shortly. After hiding her son in Crete, Rhea gives Kronos (Theogony 485) “a great stone wrapped in swaddling clothes. Then he took it in his hands and thrust it down into his belly...” Thus is Kronos deceived by his wife, an event that seems to parallel the duplicity of Gaia in the castration of Ouranos. Apollodorus gives us some information concerning the childhood of Zeus which may also have some comparative value (Bibliotheca 1.1.7): “She [Rhea] gave him to the Kouretes and to the nymphs Adrasteia and Ida,”20
daughters of Melisseus, to nurse. So these nymphs fed the child on the milk of Amalthea." This last is apparently either a goat or a cow. We shall have occasion to observe two other cases of this sort, that is, suckling by a goat or a cow, in the Iranian and in the Norse traditions.

Thus, Zeus matures to manhood, being one of the few Greek gods (or Titans) to have a defined childhood. Both Apollodorus (1.2.1) and Hesiod (Theogony 490) indicate that this childhood lasted for a fair number of years.

Upon reaching adulthood, Zeus returns to heaven and sets about the overthrow of his father. According to the Bibliotheca (1.2.1) he "took Metis, daughter of Ocean, to help him, and she gave Kronos a drug to swallow, which forced him to disgorge first the stone and then the children whom he had swallowed. . . ." In the Theogony (495) Zeus is aided by Earth, who, apparently realizing that her son is evil, beguiles Kronos with "deep suggestions" and causes him to vomit up her grandchildren. This time, however, the older generation does not give up without a fight, and there ensues the famous "War of the Titans and Gods," (the latter term now used by both Hesiod and Apollodorus to distinguish the third generation [i.e., that of Zeus, Poseidon, Hera, etc.] from the two that preceded it). The war lasts ten years (Bibliotheca 1.2.1). On the one side are ranged Kronos and his siblings (save those still bound in Tartaros), and on the other Zeus, his mother, and his siblings. Zeus enlists the aid of the Hundred-handed and the Cyclopes, whom he delivers from their subterranean prison. The latter forge thunderbolts for use against their Titan brethren, and for this they later escape the punishment of Kronos and the rest of the Titans (Bibliotheca 1.2.2). It is in this connection that we first see Zeus associated with the sky and with meteorological phenomena, for Zeus' chief weapon is the thunderbolt.

Having defeated the Titans, Zeus now becomes the third and perpetual "king in heaven." As Apollodorus puts it (1.2.2), Zeus "overcame the Titans, shut them up in Tartaros, and appointed the

21 Frorer (ibid., p. 9) claims that "According to Callimachus, Amalthea was a goat. Aratus also reported, if he did not believe, the story that the supreme god desired to be fed from an animal, for all the gods were then suckled by a goat (Strabo, viii.5, p. 587). . . ."

22 Cf. that of Hermes (Homerian Hymn 4.17-19): "At dawn he [Hermes] was born, by noon he was playing on the lyre, and that evening he stole the cattle of Apollo Fardarter. . . ."

23 Although the extent to which Rhea is involved in the conspiracy to dislodge her offspring from Kronos' stomach is unclear, all accounts agree that she sides with Zeus in the ensuing struggle against her husband; cf. W. H. Roscher, "Rhea," in L. Preller, Griechische Mythologie, I (Berlin, 1894), 686 f.

24 That Kronos and his fellow Titans escaped eternal punishment in Tartaros is reflected in a number of variant traditions, some of them quite early. In his Works and Days (152), Hesiod himself claims that Zeus gave Kronos and his fellow "a living and an abode apart from men, and made them dwell at the ends of the earth . . . untouched by sorrow in the islands of the blessed along the shore of deep swirling Ocean, happy heroes for whom the grain-bearing earth bears honey and sweet fruit. . . ." Hesiod also claims (ibid.) that "Kronos rules over them; for the father of men and gods [i.e., Zeus] released him from his bonds." The idea that Kronos' ultimate fate is to rule over a group of western Elysian islands (i.e., the "islands of the blessed") is reflected in Pindar (Olym. Odys. 2) and later in Plutarch (De defectu oraculorum 49), the latter claiming that Kronos, guarded by bright-eyed, peaceful, sleeping on a sacred island near Britain. Vergil (Aeneid 8.919, 355-358) asserts that the defeated Titan fled by sea to Latium, where he founded a city, Saturnia, on the future site of Rome, and that the name of the district stems from Kronos' (i.e., Saturnus') hiding (ibere) in it (cf. Rose, op. cit., p. 43). The association of Kronos with the West, especially Italy, in the minds of later Greek and Roman writers can be seen in the assertion by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1.36.1) that the Golden Age, which preceded the ascension of Zeus as "king in heaven," was in Italy under Kronos. It should also be noted that the element of escape or banishment, resulting in a sea voyage has an interesting counterpart in the Norse version to be considered presently; cf. the fate of the giant Bergelmir.

25 Hesiod renders the monster's name as "Typhoeus." After Apollodorus and Nonnos render it as "Typhon."
our Greek sources agree upon one important aspect of Typhon’s (or Typhoeus’) physical appearance: snakes grow from his body. As Hesiod puts it (Theogony 828), “From his shoulders grew a hundred heads of a snake.” This aspect of Typhon’s appearance will be especially important when we turn to the Iranian version (cf. below, Firdausi’s description of the monster Zohak). Also worthy of note here is Nonnos’ description of Typhon advancing to battle (Dionysiaca 1.266–268), “There stood Typhon in the fish-giving sea, his feet firm on the weedy bottom, his belly in the air (and his head!) crushed in the clouds,” which corresponds almost exactly to a similar description in the Hittite version (see below, the description of the monster Ullikummi before Mount Hazri).

That Zeus defeats this monstrous challenger is agreed upon by all concerned. But between Hesiod and both Apollodorus and Nonnos there are some important divergences when it comes to the manner and location of this defeat. In the Theogony the defeat of Typhoeus is accomplished rapidly and apparently with little effort on Zeus’s part; the latter merely “leaped from Olympus and struck him (i.e., Typhoeus), and burned all the marvelous heads of the monster about him.” This accomplished, “Typhoeus was hurled down, a maimed wreck . . . ;” finally, “in the bitterness of his anger Zeus cast him into wide Tartaros” (Theogony 850–869). Apollodorus, however, claims that Zeus uses an “adamantine sickle” to inflict a mortal wound upon Typhon, who flees to “Mount Kasion” (op. cit., 1.482–512). Hermes and Aigipan steal the sinews from their bearskin and carries him to the famous Corycian cave, again in Cilicia. Hiding place and, unobserved by the monster, fit them again to Zeus and use it (?) to sever the sinews of the latter’s hands and feet. Then Typhon lifts Zeus to his shoulders (his power having briefly over¬

26 The modern Kel Dag or “Bald Mountain,” located just south of the mouth of the Orontes River in what is now Turkey.
27 Nonnos also mentions the sinew-cutting episode (Dionysiaca 1.492–512). Here Kadmos comes to Zeus’s aid instead of Hermes. In a note to his translation of the Dionysiaca (op. cit., pp. 40–41) Rouse points out that “the story is obscurely told, and probably Nonnos did not understand it; it is obviously old. By some device or by a well-lined blow, Typhon had evidently cut the sinews out of Zeus’s arms, thus disabling him; Cadmus now gets them back by pretending that he wants them for harp strings.” In this version there is no mention of a sickle, adamantine or other.
29 By Forrer, op. cit.
of Ulikummi," there has been a renewed interest in the argument—originally based on the presence of a Phoenician version of the theme under consideration—that the Greek "Kingship in Heaven" tradition just delineated is actually composed of myths having their origin somewhere in the ancient Near East. Indeed, I use the term "Hittite-Hurrian" here because of the indisputable evidence that the Hurrians, who were well established in northern Syria and Mesopotamia by the middle of the second millennium B.C., and whose language appears to have been neither Indo-European nor Semitic, also possessed versions of the myths discussed below.

The texts containing the Hittite and/or Hurrian myths in question date approximately from the thirteenth century B.C. and were translated from a series of cuneiform tablets found at Hattusha, the ancient Hittite capital, the site of which is located near the modern Turkish village of Bogazköy. These tablets are not well preserved and countless interpolations have had to be made in order to arrive at anything like a coherent narrative.30 That which Götze terms the "Theogony"—the Hittite title is unfortunately missing—deals specifically with the "Kingship in Heaven." In it we see four generations of gods. The first is called Alalu, who reigns in heaven nine "years."31 His future successor, Anu, is described as he who "bows down to his [Alalu's] feet and puts the cups for drinking into his hand" (1.10-11).32 Although Anu (whose name derives from the Akkadianized form of the Sumerian god An, or "Sky") is not specifically identified as Alalu's son, the fact that a god Alalu is listed in a Babylonian god list as a father of Anu33 leaves no doubt as to the filial relationship here. In the ninth "year" of Alalu's reign Anu rebels against him and either drives or hurl[s] him "down to the dark earth" (1.12), the latter expression apparently referring to a subterranean region.34

31 The texts are written in the Indo-European Neelid language, which was the official court language of the Hittite kingdom (cf. Gitterbock, MAW, p. 157), but employ Akkadian cuneiform characters.
33 More likely "age[s]" or "era[s]" rather than calendar years; cf. Gitterbock, "The Hittite Version of the Hurrian Kumarbi Myths," p. 154 n. 11.
34 The numbers enclosed by parentheses refer respectively to columns and lines in the original text; cf. Gitterbock, Kumarbi, pp. 6-10, 13-28.
35 Gitterbock, MAW, p. 160.
36 Ibid.

Thus, Anu becomes the second "king in heaven." But he, too, must cope with a rebellious offspring. the "mighty Kumarbi."35 At first, Kumarbi is described as serving Anu in a manner identical to that in which the latter had served Alalu; however, like his father before him, Anu is only permitted to reign for nine "years," and in the ninth "year" Kumarbi rebels. This time the elder god flees, but Kumarbi "took Anu by the feet and pulled him down from heaven" (1.23-24). Then follows a most interesting passage in light of our Greek "model": "He [Kumarbi] bit his loins38 [so that] his manhood was..."39

38 The name Kumarbi is apparently Hurrian; cf. Götterbock, MAW, p. 160, who points out that Kumarbi is frequently, although not consistently, equated with the great Sumero-Akkadian god Zalu.
39 The approximate meaning "his loins" or "his thighs" seems to fit the reading parstatidial which various Hittite scholars, including Gitterbock (personal communication, and MAW, p. 157), now prefer to the earlier enondental interpretatio genitalis "his knees" (cf. E. A. Hahn, JAOS 85:298-309 [1965]). In either case there is a euphemistic approximation for "male parts." On the widespread sexual connotations of the knee Professor Jaan Puhvel has contributed the following philological note:

Hittite genu means both "knee" and (secondarily) "male genitals" (sometimes combined in anatomical lists with arrud [= Old High German arud] "anus"; cf. J. Friedrich, "Einige hethitische Namen von Körperteilen," IF 41:357-357 [1964]). This usage, however, is not a euphemism but has much more basic implications. Without having to delve into folkloristic and psychoanalytical records we find that "knee" is often an expression for sexual potency (cf. e.g. J. L. Goertler, Ein Kenntnis des Gottes in der griechischen Mythologie [Winterthur, 1953], p. 139). As random examples we may refer to the passage in the Old Norse Flóamansnúga where a man dreams of leeks (a well-known fertility symbol) growing from his knees (cf. W. P. Lehmann, Germanic Review 36:101-105 [1953], and quote in translation these lines of Hesiod's Works and Days about the "dog days" 546-547; imitated in a drinking song of Alcaeus [Oxford Book of Greek Verse, p. 170]): "But when the artichoke blooms and the chirping grasshopper sits in a tree and pours down his shrill song continually from under his wings in the season of wearisome heat, then goats are plumpest and wine sweetest; women are most wanton, but men are feeblest, because Sirius parches head and knees." In various Semitic languages (e.g., Akkadian, Ethioptic b r k (Akkadian birka) means both "knee" and "penis," and then more widely "strength," "family," or "tribe"; cf. M. Cohen, "Genou, famille, force dans le domaine chami-mésopotamique," Mémorial Henri Basset [Paris, 1945], 1, 303-310, and more generally W. Deonna, "Le genou, siège de force et de vie," RA 134:44-455 [1953]). "Knee" in the sense of "offspring," "family" is commonly found in Indo-European and Finno-Ugrian languages: much as Akkadian tarbit birkiya means "manneling of my birka," we have the synonymous Old Irish gcn-ducile, "knee-nurseling" (cf. J. Long, "Le mot désignant le genou au sens de génération chez les Celtes, les Germains, les Slaves, les Assyriens," RG 40:143-158 [1953]) and the Sogdian z'm k' b' kne'oo-si (see E. Krenic, JBL 77:73-102 [1958]). Similarly Old English cynn, Old Saxon kohn, and Finnish pööbi, "knee," also mean "offspring, generation." Some have claimed a connection between IE *genus, 'knee, and the root *gen- on the basis of ancient evidence for childbirth labor in a kneeling position (e.g., R. Back, "Medizinisch-Sprachliches," IF 40:168-169 [1922]; J. Klek, IF 44:79-80 [1957]; and S. Simony, "Knie und Geburt," Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung 20:153-154 [1923]). Yet in spite of the Hittite genu, "lap," "female..."
absorbed in Kumarbi's interior..." (i.25); compare Kronos' emasculation of Ouranos. Indeed, the striking correspondences42 here between Anu and Ouranos and between Kumarbi and Kronos have been noted frequently (see above).

Subsequent to his deposition and emasculation, Anu informs Kumarbi that by "absorbing" his "manhood" he has been impregnated with five "heavy" divinities: the Weather-god (i.e., the Hurrian Teshub),43 the river goddess Aranuah (i.e., Tigris),44 Tashmishu,45 who is destined to be the vizier of the gods, and two others whose names are not mentioned by Anu.46 Having thus addressed his successor, Anu "went up to heaven" and, after a visit to Nippur, perhaps to consult its chief deity Enil about his pregnancy, Kumarbi becomes the third to occupy the heavenly throne.

From here on the text is too fragmentary for a consecutive narrative, metonymically 'love,' the root of Latin genus, gignō, Greek γνωτί, means primarily 'beget,' while other words are used for 'bear' (Latin parid, Greek παρίζω, was similarly connected with BSL on knees,' is rendered by 'geboren werden' Ehstnisch-deutsches Worterbüch (2d ed.; St. Petersburg, 1893), p. 864, and of a newborn child on the father's knee was the true means of legal affiliation or adoption, thus 'birth' in a juridical sense (cf., e.g., Old Norse knjótsinningr, 'adopted son,' and Homeric and Roman practices, and see Beauvoir, esp. ci., and M. Cahen, 'Genou', 'adoption', et 'parenté' en germanique,' BSI, 1:575-69 [1925].

In archaic Estonian the phrase lape põõdele peale tõsima, 'lift a child on the knees,' is glossed with "ein Kind gehorig zur Welt bringen" by F. Wiedemann, op. cit., 27:56-67 [1926]. "Kumarbi that by "absorbing" his "manhood" he has been impregnated..." (Kumarbi?) says "give me the child...I shall eat" (i.42); later there occurs the expression "Kumarbi begins to eat" (i.52), and prominent mention of the words "mouth" and "teeth" in connection with the Weather-god.

It seems that Teshub and his siblings are able to dethrone Kumarbi, for when we first meet the Weather-god he is already "king in heaven." Just how the rebellion is accomplished is not quite clear. Is it possible that Earth, like her Greek counterpart, conspired with her offspring (if indeed they were such) to bring about Kumarbi's downfall? Considering Earth's probable connection with the birth of Teshub or Teshub (cf. the attention devoted by our Greek sources to the birth of Zeus) to whom, as we shall see, Teshub corresponds in most respects), Then follows a passage that is especially interesting in view of the equivalence between Kumarbi and Kronos. In it someone (Kumarbi?) says "give me the child...I shall eat" (i.42): later there occurs the expression "Kumarbi begins to eat" (i.52), and prominent mention of the words "mouth" and "teeth" in connection with the Weather-god.

The second Hittite myth relevant to the theme in question is entitled the "Song of Ullikummi" and contains many important parallels to the previously discussed Typhon story.47 Kumarbi, having been dethroned, has intercourse with a rock; from this unnatural union is produced the Stone-monster48 (also termed the Diurde after...
the substance of which the monster is composed), or Ullikummi. Conceived by his father in order to avenge the latter's overthrow, Ullikummi is destined to be a rebel against Teshub. That Typhon was born with a similar purpose in life can be seen from a passage in the *Dionysiaca* (1:255-258) where Kronides (an epithet of Zeus), after wounding the monster sorely, chides him saying: "A fine ally has old Kronos found in you, Typhoeus! ... A jolly champion of Titans!"

The young Ullikummi is placed on a shoulder of the Atlas-like Upeilluri and allowed to grow: "In one day one yard he grew, but in transformed into the mother-goddess figure Cybele. The blood produced by the castration causes a marvelous pomegranate or almond tree to spring up, and the fruit of this tree impregnates Nana, daughter of the river god Sangarios. Nana gives birth to Atis, who later castrates himself out of love for Cybele.

Aglistas' birth and only resemblance to Ullikummi may possibly indicate a relationship between the two traditions. Save for the castration motif, however, which might conceivably be implied in Ullikummi's loss of power after being cut from Upeilluri's shoulder, the rest of the story does not have any clear Hittite parallels.

Ullikummi is not the only rebel to oppose Teshub's power; there is also a text (Güterbock, *Kumerbi*, pp. 10-13, Text 1; *MAW*, pp. 161-166) which describes the rebellion of a god known to us only by the highly ambiguous word sign KAL. (cf. Güterbock, *MAW*, p. 161, who claims that neither the reading Sumerian LAMA, Akkadian LAMASU, nor the Hittite reading LAMA fits the context). This text presents some interesting, although not conclusive, parallels to the Greek myths concerning Prometheus and his defiance of Zeus. Unfortunately the KAL text (if indeed it is a separate text) is extremely fragmentary; the tablets are broken in such a way that we possess neither the beginning nor the final colophon that would indicate the name of the text and its exact relationship to the other two texts. Nevertheless, the events described almost certainly follow the ascension of Teshub; whether they precede or follow the Ullikummi affair is, however, much less certain.

Unlike Prometheus, KAL actually seems to have assumed the kingship for a time, for when we first meet him he is described as taking "the reins and [the white] robe of the Storm-God's [i.e., Teshub's] horse" (i.8-12). Like Prometheus, however, and unlike Typhon and/or Ullikummi, KAL eventually submits. Addressing the Weather-god as "my lord," he is subjected to some form of bodily punishment involving mutilation; cf. the fate of Prometheus bound to a rock (or mountain) and continually mutilated by an eagle (*Theogony* 519). There are other aspects of KAL's rebellion which also seem broadly similar to that of Prometheus. In the text, one of the chief objections raised against KAL is that he encourages mortals to be lax in their sacrificial duties; Ea, who apparently had appointed KAL to the kingship, later becomes dissatisfied with his progeny's conduct and claims that "just as he [KAL] himself is rebellious, so has he made the countries rebellious, and no one any longer gives bread or drink offerings to the gods" (i.11-12). Prometheus, too, is accused of encouraging humans to withhold sacrificed food from the gods (cf. *Theogony* 555). While there seems to be no connection here between KAL and either the creation of mankind or man's knowledge of fire, the Hittite rebel can be seen to occupy a role broadly similar to that of Prometheus: a champion of mortals in their dealings with the gods.

Furthermore, KAL's downfall, like that of Prometheus, is apparently the result of a plot hatched by the gods and implemented by the chief god's lieutenant (i.e., Teshub's vizier Ninurta (*MAW*, p. 164); cf. the role played in Prometheus' punishment by Hephaleitos (*Theogony* 520).
both ancient and modern, have interpreted the castration of Ouranos as a symbolic separation of heaven and earth. It is interesting that the Hittites preserve a tradition of a primateval cutting tool once used to separate heaven and earth, and which must later be used to defeat Ullikummi, although no specific tool is mentioned in the account of Anu’s castration. Perhaps in the latter case the teeth of Kumarbi have been substituted for the stone “teeth” of a neolithic sickle (i.e., the “ancient cutting tool”).

When word reaches the gods that Ullikummi has been rendered powerless, they join together under the leadership of Teshub and attack the monster. From here on the text is unreadable; however, we may assume with Göterbock that Teshub and his fellows are ultimately victorious. For it appears that here, as in the Greek tradition, the new “king in heaven” must meet this final challenger so as to validate his position as perpetual ruler, and there is no doubt that Teshub, like Zeus, is able to accomplish this validation. It should be noted, though, that the conflict here is much more general than in the Greek tradition. Perhaps in the conflict between Teshub and Ullikummi we have a merger of the Titanomachia and the Typhon fight.

THE PHOENICIAN VERSION

In the Phoenician History of Herennios Philo of Byblos, known only through the works of Eusebius (Præparatio Evangelica) and Porphyrius (De Abstinentia), is contained a version of the “Kingship in Heaven” which closely parallels the two just discussed, a version that has often been regarded as an intermediary between those of the Hittites and the Greeks. Philo’s date is uncertain, although the best evidence leads me to believe that he wrote during the latter half of the reign of the Emperor Claudius. Claiming to have obtained his information from the works of a certain Sanchunjathon, a Phoenician scholar who, he asserts, “lived before the Trojan War,” Philo attempts to reconstruct the “history” of his city and to trace the origins of its gods. He begins by outlining a four-generational sequence of “kings in heaven,” all of whom are intimately associated with the city of Byblos and its environs.

According to Philo, the first “king in heaven” is named Eliun (or Elun (or Atlas), who is also referred to as Kronos), Baitylos, Dagon, and Atlas (I.16). A quarrel ensues between Ouranos and his wife, and El (or Kronos) and his siblings side with their mother. Ouranos then tries to destroy his rebellious offspring, but El, on the advice of Hermes, whom he has taken as a counselor, forges a sickle (or spear?) and with it drives out his father. El then becomes “king in heaven” (or at least in Byblos), but turns out to be a bad ruler, casting out his brother Atlas and murdering a son and a daughter. Meanwhile, Ouranos has fled unharmed. He sends Rhea, Astarte, and Dione, his young daughters, to plead his case before El. These three El takes to wife, and by each he produces a number of children. The most important of these is Baal (or Baaltis), who succeeds him.

Thirty-two years later, El lures his father back to Byblos, into an ambush, and castrates him (cf. Theog. 175). Thus, the castration theme is present, although it does not accompany the deposition of the “Heaven figure” as it does in the Greek and Hittite-Hurrian versions. Furthermore, what appears to me to be a crucial element is lacking here: the idea that castration is a necessary step in reducing the power of the Heaven figure. In Philo it seems but an afterthought. Castration figures again in Philo’s account, although this time it is self-inflicted. For some obscure reason El mutilates himself thirty-two years after so altering his father.

Finally, the fourth generation (in the person of Baal) takes over the heavenly kingship. This transfer of power is apparently made without much conflict, an occurrence unique in the distribution of the theme. Typhon is mentioned by Philo along with the children of El, but there is no mention of a fight. Moreover, the role of the “Zeus figure” (Baal) is minor when compared with that played by him in the Greek and Hittite-Hurrian versions, and in the Iranian, Norse, and Babylonian versions as well.

---

60 The numbers enclosed by parentheses refer to lines in the original text of the Phoenician History; the translation is by Clemen.

61 There is a close parallel to this in the Iranian tradition wherein the “Kronos figure” (Akk. Apsû) marries two of Ahamid’s sisters after deposing him. See W. Staudach, Die Trennung von Himmel und Erde (Tübingen, 1943), p. 4 i f.


63 Clemen, op. cit., p. 4.

64 Cf. the relationship between El and Hadad, the god of thunder and lightning, as delineated in the Ras Shamra texts. The association of Baal and Hadad has long been recognized in the Canaanite tradition; cf. W. F. Albright, Archeology and the Religion of Israel (Baltimore, 1949), pp. 73, 74; S. H. Hooke, Middle Eastern Mythology (Hermansworth, 1959), pp. 86, 87.

65 Clemen, op. cit., p. 28.
In view of its late date and the high probability that its author was thoroughly familiar with Hesiod, many scholars have been sceptical of this Phoenician "Theogony," labeling it a poor attempt at syncretism. The discovery of some Hurrian texts at Ras Shamra, however, wherein the double name El-Kumarbi occurs, has thrown a new light on the matter. As El is clearly identified by Philo with Kronos, it is reasonable to infer that there was some sort of a Kronos-El-Kumarbi syncretism present in northern Syria, at least, as early as 1500 B.C. If this is correct, then it is also quite reasonable to infer with Götterbock that the Phoenician tradition here forms a link between the Hittite-Hurrian version and the later Greek version, and that what formerly appeared as rank syncretism on Philo's part can now be seen as an elucidating rather than reflecting the Hesiodic version of the theme.  

But there still remain other possibilities. That the Phoenicians undoubtedly received elements of the Kumarbi myth from the Hittites as the latter expanded their empire after 1500 B.C. is not questioned here; indeed, the Ras Shamra evidence renders it almost certain. What is questioned, however, is the assumption that the Phoenicians were necessarily the link in a chain of diffusion from northern Syria to Greece. There is always the possibility that the theme reached Hesiod and/or his immediate sources directly from the Hittite-Hurrian region. This alternative is enhanced somewhat by L. R. Palmer's assertion that the Levant, first cousins to the Hittites, invaded the Peloponnesus and Crete at the beginning of the second millennium B.C., and that the first speakers of Greek arrived several centuries later. If Palmer is correct in this assertion, and there is good reason to believe that he is, then it is remotely possible that the "Kingship in Heaven" theme was taken over by the Greeks along with other aspects of Luvian culture. Another possibility, that the theme was borrowed directly from Babylonia during Mycenaean times, is discussed presently.

THE IRANIAN VERSION

It was Stig Wikander who, in 1951, first demonstrated the presence of the "Kingship in Heaven"—if indeed the term "heaven" is applicable in this instance—in the Iranian tradition. Bypassing the more ancient and mythological Avestan literature, Wikander pointed out that a threefold set of royal usurpers similar to those present in the Greek, Hittite-Hurrian, and Phoenician traditions occupies a prominent position in Firdausi's Shahnameh, which was composed about A.D. 976. Despite its relatively recent date and the high probability that its author was familiar with Greek myth, the Shahnameh has long been recognized as a repository of popular traditions not elsewhere represented in Iranian literature. This would certainly appear to be true as far as the theme in question is concerned.

In any event, the three Iranian kings cited by Wikander as comparable with Ouranos, Kronos, Zeus, et al., are Jamshid, Zohak, and Feridun, who occupy, respectively, positions four, five, and six in Firdausi's king list. Jamshid is preceded by three relatively indistinct figures, Kaiumers (equals Gayomart in the Avesta), Hushang, and Tahumers. These three do not seem to be related to their successors in any important sense—Jamshid is made the son of Tahumers, but little else is said about the relationship between them. Thus it is Jamshid who occupies the Ouranos-like position, despite his lack of an autochthonous or truly divine origin.

Jamshid, whose name corresponds to that of Yima Xla'at68 in the Avesta, is said to have ruled for some seven hundred years, and the early portion of this reign is described as a sort of Golden Age, when men were at peace with one another and the land was bountiful. But this state of affairs did not last. "Then it came about that the heart of Jamshid was uplifted with pride, and he forgot whence came his vassal and the source of his blessings."69 Wikander, in discussing the position of Jamshid, notes that he "règne d'abord sur une humanité heureuse, mais il commet ensuite le premier péché, ce qui amène la perte de la Gloire Royale et sa chute."70 Wikander also remarks that some texts show Jamshid as having been deceived by "une figure féminine qui aurait inspiré ses transgressions et causé sa chute."72 Thus, we have some indication that here, too, there is a Gaia-like figure somewhere in the background.

Jamshid is eventually overthrown by Zohak (equals Azi Dahaka in the Avesta), who in terms of our model occupies an ambiguous position. He is at once Typhon and Kronos. Both in his physical ap-
resembles Typhon. Yet he enters the epic occupying the position of a Kronos figure. Like Typhon, his physical appearance is characterized by the presence of snakes growing from his shoulders; yet he is the one who overthrows Jamshid and who commits the inevitable act of mutilation, although in this instance it is not castration but rather a sawing in half.

There are two interesting parallels here to the Phoenician version. Like El, Zohak waits a hundred years before mutilating his deposed enemy: "in the hundredth year [after his overthrow] the impious shah appeared and in his relationship with the third member of the trio, rather a sawing in half.

However, Zohak is the one who overthrows Jamshid and who commits the inevitable act of mutilation, although in this instance it is not castration but rather a sawing in half.

A second parallel can be seen in the fact that Zohak, like El, marries two sisters who stand in close kinship to him—only in this instance they are sisters of the deposed first-generation ruler (Jamshid).

Wikander emphasizes the similarity between the saw that cut Jamshid in half and the sickle that castrated Ouranos, "Aslak ou un autre ennemi le mutiler avec une 'scie' . . . cette 'scie' est évidemment identique à la 'serpe aux dents aigues' d'Hésiode." He also characterizes Zohak as the "neveu" of Jamshid, although nowhere in our reading of the epic is there any clear-cut statement as to the relationship, if any, between the two figures. Zohak is described simply as the son of an Arabian king who is invited to come to Iran and replace Jamshid.

Zohak, in his turn, is overthrown by the grandson of Jamshid, Feridun (equals Thraetaona in the Avesta), who, like Zeus, has a marvelous childhood. Again we see the theme of the mother hiding away the child from the wrath of the father (in this case Zohak). Zohak, it seems, while having no offspring of his own, has an insatiable desire to consume human beings. Furthermore, the serpent-king dreams that Feridun will someday overcome him (cf. Kronos' foreknowledge of Zeus's coming, and his subsequent swallowing of his offspring), and on the basis of this dream "bade the world be scoured away the child from the wrath of the father (in this case Zohak)."

Zimmern, op. cit., p. 8.

While it is certain that the Avestan names Yima Xsaeta, Azi Dahaka, and Thraetaona correspond, respectively, to Jamshid, Zohak, and Feridun, the only clear thematic parallels between the two sets of figures are that both Yima and Jamshid can be seen to be in one respect or another primordial (although both do have forebears), that both were "Golden Age" rulers who "sinned," that Ali Dahaka and his later namesake share draconic characteristics, and that both are rendered harmless, respectively, by Thraetaona and Feridun. Even in the latter instance there is an important difference. Thraetaona is characterized as the "smiter" of Azi Dahaka, while Feridun, as we have seen, imprisons Zohak. Thus it can be safely asserted that the theme qua theme, despite some similarities, is not present in the Avesta.

Nor is it to be found in the Indic tradition. To be sure, there are some very general parallels, both thematic and philological, between the Avestan figures mentioned above and some of the dramatis personae of the Indic literature. For example, Avestan Yima parallels Vedic Yama; Azi Dahaka is equivalent to the three-headed monster for Feridun. Feridun's mother first places him in the care of a wondrous cow, Purmaieh, who suckles the infant. Then, fearing that Zohak will find this hiding place, she removes him to the care of a shepherd "on the Mount Alberz" (i.e., the Elbruz), who raises him to manhood. Here we can compare the hiding away of Zeus on Mount Ida (or Aigaion). Finally, Feridun grows to manhood and sets out to overcome his monstrous enemy. Instead of a cutting instrument, Feridun uses a club, the head of which is shaped like a cow—in memory of Purmaieh. The combat between Feridun and Zohak is strongly reminiscent of the conflict between Zeus and Typhon. Again, it is a single-combat situation, not the type of group action which dethroned Kronos.

Feridun overpowers Zohak but does not actually kill him (a fusion, perhaps, of the Typhon and Kronos motifs); rather, he chains the monster to a rock on Mount Demawend(?), and Zohak eventually dies of exposure. After this deed is accomplished, Feridun reigns as king, if not actually "in heaven," then certainly as a divine king in Iran.

While it is certain that the Avestan names Yima Xsaeta, Azi Dahaka, and Thraetaona correspond, respectively, to Jamshid, Zohak, and Feridun, the only clear thematic parallels between the two sets of figures are that both Yima and Jamshid can be seen to be in one respect or another primordial (although both do have forebears), that both were "Golden Age" rulers who "sinned," that Ali Dahaka and his later namesake share draconic characteristics, and that both are rendered harmless, respectively, by Thraetaona and Feridun. Even in the latter instance there is an important difference. Thraetaona is characterized as the "smiter" of Azi Dahaka, while Feridun, as we have seen, imprisons Zohak. Thus it can be safely asserted that the theme qua theme, despite some similarities, is not present in the Avesta.

Nor is it to be found in the Indic tradition. To be sure, there are some very general parallels, both thematic and philological, between the Avestan figures mentioned above and some of the dramatis personae of the Indic literature. For example, Avestan Yima parallels Vedic Yama; Azi Dahaka is equivalent to the three-headed monster for Feridun.

Zimmern, op. cit., p. 8.


Warner and Warner, op. cit., p. 174; the Warners suggest (p. 174) that Feridun is actually a conflation of two Avestan figures, Thraetaona and Thrita (cf. Yasna 63-109).
Vytra; Thraetaona bears a resemblance to Treta Âptyna, the slayer of Vytra (also to Indra in this context); and the cow-headed weapon Vrtra. But other than these isolated correspondences, together with one other possibility to be mentioned shortly in connection with the Norse version, there is no evidence for the presence of the theme in question in the Veda's, Mahabharata, and so on. This negative evidence, so to speak, is a most important matter when it comes to the question of possible Indo-European origins, and I return to it later on.

THE NORSE VERSION

All too often there is a tendency among students of comparative mythology to equate "Norse" with "Germanic," to assume that the materials contained in the Edda's, Heimskringla, Gesta Danorum, and the like, are a true reflection of common Germanic religious beliefs and practices. To make such an equation is, of course, an error; for it is abundantly clear that there were differences in religious outlook among the several branches of the Germanic-speaking peoples. One need only compare Tacitus with Saxo Grammaticus to see examples of these differences. While there are some common figures (e.g., *Tiwaz, probable prototype of Norse Týr, Anglo-Saxon Tiw, and perhaps the figure reflected in Tacitus' *Tuisto), any attempt to draw general conclusions about the nature of Germanic religion from any one region or era must be made cautiously.

Yet, when it comes to cosmogonic and theogonic matters we are necessarily limited to a single region and a single era: Scandinavia (primarily Iceland) in the eleventh and twelfth centuries A.D. Moreover, our chief sources,钓 the Eddas or Poetic Edda, attributed to Snemund Sigfusson, and especially the Younger, or Prose Edda of Snorri Sturluson, were composed at a time when the old religion was fast giving way to Christianity (Snorri approaches his subject from an explicitly Christian standpoint), and the extent to which non-Norse materials were interwoven with the native tradition is still not wholly clear.

That Snemund and Snorri were aware—albeit dimly—of the mythic traditions of the eastern Mediterranean is entirely possible. It is also possible that whatever parallels may exist between their accounts of the creation and those previously discussed in this paper are wholly or partially the result of independent invention. In any case, all the foregoing must be kept firmly in mind as we proceed to a brief examination of the Norse theogony to see if it contains materials relevant to the "Kingship in Heaven."

In the beginning was Ginnungagap (equivalent to the Greek Chaos), which can be loosely translated as "yawning void." Out of this yawning void were created initially two regions: Muspellheim on the south (i.e., a "Land of Fire") and Niflheim on the north (i.e., a "Land of Mist"). Ice crystals combined with sparks, and out of this combination there was created the first being, called Ymir. Ymir, defined as a giant of enormous proportions, lies down and sleeps. While he sleeps two things happen: first, a second autochthonous creature appears, a cow named Audhumla. While Ymir sleeps the cow nourishes him, at the same time she licks the salty ice and slowly uncovers first the hair, then the body of the "yawning void." Out of this emergence of Ymir came to be. Thrudhelmir. He, in turn, gives birth to the crafty Bergelmir. Thus, we have one three-generation line of descent from Ymir. As the Lay of Vafthrudnir (29) has it: "Ages before the earth was made, Bergelmir came to be. Thrudhelmir was that thrur's(?) father. But Aurgelmir, [i.e., Órnelmir, or Ymir] oldest of all."

A second three-generation line descends from Buri, who, after emerging from the ice, produces a son: Bör. Bör marries a giantess named Bestla (one of Ymir's offspring). They, in turn, produce three sons: Odin, Vili, and Vé (cf. Zeus, Poseidon, Hadès). Odin and his siblings (who, unlike their Greek equivalents, become shadowy figures very quickly) are the first of the Aesir (or "Gods" as opposed to "Giants"). Their first act is to overthrow Ymir, and with him Thrud-
gelmir. Bergelmir they banish (or he escapes) to subterranean Jötnheim (cf. Tarturol). Ymir they cut up (the tool involved is not mentioned), forming the world: “of Ymir’s flesh the earth was shaped, of his blood the briny sea, of his hair, the trees, the hills of his bones, out of his skull the sky” (Lay of Grimnir 40).

There is a parallel to this in Rig-Pedia 10.90, wherein Indra and others create the world from the flesh and bones of the giant Puruṣa. Another parallel can be seen in the Babylonian Eānim-Elish, in the use to which Marduk puts the body of the slain Tiamat. The similarities here, however, may best be explained in terms of a common folkloristic motif which has nothing specifically to do with the theme under discussion. Yet the fact that Odin and his siblings cut the primeval figure is significant. It is this feature, rather than the subsequent use of his remains, that is relevant for our purposes.

In any event, it is only after the Jötnir have been defeated that Odin and his brothers create mankind. This, of course, is parallelled in the Greek version (i.e., the human race is only created after the final defeat of the Titans; cf. Bibliotheca 1.4.1).

It is our contention that the events just described contain all the essential ingredients of the “Kingship in Heaven” theme: First, there is a three-generational line of descent (although bifurcated); second, there is the mutilation of the first-generation “king” (i.e., Odin’s cutting up Ymir); third, there is the banishment of a descendant of this first-generation being by one who has usurped power from him (Bergelmir is the logical inheritor of Ymir); fourth, the final and perpetual holder of power (Odin) is, together with his siblings and offspring, defined as an altogether different sort of supernatural being (i.e., “Gods” or Aesir, as opposed to “Giants” or Jötnir; cf. the Greek distinction between “God” and “Titan”). And finally, there is a battle between these Aesir and the Giants, a battle that seems to be...

88 In the Gýfagahning Snorri describes Bergelmir’s flight as occurring in the context of a universal flood created from the blood that gushed from Ymir after his demise. As this is the only clear reference to a flood in Norse myth, it seems reasonable to infer that Snorri, as a Christian, felt the need of it. This is underscored by the etymology of the word baur, used by him to refer to the “boat” in which Bergelmir and his wife survive the deluge. Although Snorri clearly uses the word in the context of “boat,” earlier usages of the term (cf. Lay of Vafthrudning 35) would seem to indicate that it meant “coffin” or “bier.” See E. O. G. Turriville-Fitte, “Prof. Dumezil and the Literature of Iceland,” Hommages à Georges Dumézil (Brussels, 1969), pp. 213-215. I have also H. Peterson, “Am. Jour Thng wzr,” II:27:167-289 (1900), who asserts that the basic meaning here is “hollowed tree trunk” and proposes a derivation from Indo-European *sba-rod- (cf. Skt. samba, cut, clip).

89 I.e., askr, “ash,” and emblo, “elm,” respectively, the first man and woman.

---

THE “KINGSHIP IN HEAVEN” THEME

The “Kingship in Heaven” theme as expressed in the Greek and Hittite-Hurrian tradition, is absent, must be admitted. Contained within a broad three-generational framework, however, most of the significant components of this structure are present. To put it another way, a common broad configuration is present in the Greek or Hittite-Hurrian mythologies. Yet the elements within this configuration are not for the most part structurally defined by them. Indeed, we have seen other cases, generally held to be part of the theme in question, which also deviate from this typological structure, yet which maintain the same broad configuration. We may cite here the Iranian version, wherein Zohak, who most closely resembles Typhon, appears in the role of a Kronus figure. We may also cite the Phoenician case, wherein Baal does not have to fight his way to power, as is characteristic of the other versions—including the Norse.

It seems fair to assert that the Norse, like the Greeks, Hittites, Hurrians, Phoenicians, Iranians, and Babylonians, knew the “Kingship in Heaven” theme. Whether its presence here can best be explained in terms of diffusion or independent invention is still a moot point, although I believe that the former theory has been more probable in view of the extremely late periods from which the primary sources date. There is, of course, the alternate possibility that the presence of the theme can be explained in terms of a common Indo-European heritage. Once again, let me defer consideration of this possibility—seemingly quite remote—until I look at the Babylonian versions.

THE BABYLONIAN VERSIONS

Like the Norse version, the two Babylonian versions deviate in a number of important respects from that which for convenience sake I have labeled the typological version (cf. that of the Greeks). Yet these two related accounts of how the gods came to be may well prove to be far closer to the source of the theme in question than any previously considered. Although no extant text of the Enûma-Elish is earlier than 1000 B.C., internal evidence alone indicates that its composition probably dates at least from the Old Babylonian period.
that is, the early part of the second millennium B.C., and that its content may be considerably older. The *Enûma-Elish* begins with an account of the primeval state of things: "When on high the heaven had not been named, Firmament below had not been called by name, Naught but primeval Apsu, their begetter, *[(And) Mummu-Tiamat,*
she who bore them all, *[(Their) waters commingling as a single body . . . ] (i.1-4). We see here the by now familiar pair of autochthons, in this instance defined as fresh and salt water. From this union several generations of divinities are born, including the figures (for our purposes obscure) Lahmu and Laha, Anshar and Kishar, and Anu. Finally, there appears the figure who, together with another shortly to be discussed, occupies the Kronos position, the "all-wise" Ea (or Nudimmud; cf. Sumerian Enki). Although the exact parentage and birth order of Ea are obscure, by all indications he is the youngest of the lot. Although the exact parentage and birth order of Ea are obscure, by all indications he is the youngest of the lot (who can, for our purposes, be reckoned as a single generation; that is, they band together and act as a generational unit). If this interpretation is correct, then there is an interesting parallel here to the ultimogeniture pattern so clearly evident in the Greek version. Under the apparent leadership of Ea, the gods of what we may term the second generation (see above) "disturbed Tiamat as they surged back and forth" (i.22). Apsu, too, is annoyed by "their hilarity in the Abode of Heaven" (i.24) and decides to do away with them. His decision is strengthened by the advice of the vizier Mummu, but is opposed by Tiamat, who counsels forgiveness. Nevertheless, the gods discover Apsu's intentions. After putting Apsu to sleep with an incantation (cf. the "deep suggestions" with which Zeus beguiles Kronos), Ea slays him, yet before doing so he tears off the former's tiara or halo (symbolic, perhaps, of sovereignty and the masculine vigor that accompanies it) and puts it on himself (i.66-69). Admittedly, I may be guilty of overinterpretation here, but it does occur to me that the act of tearing off Apsu's tiara is comparable with an act of castration. By so doing, Ea clearly renders his forbear powerless to resist, just as Kronos, Kumari, *et al.* render their progenitors powerless by dismembering or "biting" them. In any event, thus passes the first generation.

After having become "king in heaven" Ea takes up residence upon the dead Apsu and is joined by his wife Damkina. In time Damkina gives birth to the great Babylonian divinity Marduk, who is patronly the Zeus figure in this version. Many lines follow describing Marduk's brilliance and prowess, for example, "He was the loftiest of the gods, surpassing was his stature, His members were enormous, he was exceeding tall" (i.97-100). Meanwhile, Tiamat schemes in order to seek revenge for the slaying of her husband. She causes a heretofore unmentioned god, Ea's half-brother, Kingsu, to be elevated to command of the Assembly of the Gods, apparently, though the text makes no mention of it, displacing Ea. She then sets about creating a host of monsters (cf. i.18). From this point on Ea fades into obscurity, and the threat presented by Tiamat and Kingu is met by Marduk. A great fight ensues. Marduk eventually slays Tiamat in single combat and destroys her host. He then captures the rebel Kingu, and consigns him to Uggae, the god of the dead (iv.119-120). Afterward, Marduk and Ea create heaven and earth from Tiamat's inflated body by splitting it in two (cf. the fate of Ymir). Marduk now reigns perpetually as "king in heaven." He has validated his claim to sovereignty by emerging victorious in the epic duel with Tiamat. Taken as a whole, the *Enûma-Elish* presents some remarkable parallels to the other versions of the "Kingship in Heaven," although

---

86 E. A. Speiser, "Akkadian Myths and Epics," *ANET,* p. 60. It should be noted, however, that P. Walcot (Heidelberg and the Near East [Cardiff, 1966], p. 36), suggests that the rise of Marduk to supremacy among the gods of Mesopotamia was quite late and that the *Enûma-Elish* as we know it was most likely composed around 1100 B.C. He thus concludes that "in terms of chronology, *Enûma-Elish* now seems to stand between the Hittite tablets and the Theogony . . . " Nevertheless, this would not preclude earlier Babylonian and/or Sumerian prototypes wherein some other god played the part of Marduk. 87 J. E. Reade, "Mother" Tiamat; see Speiser, *op. cit.,* p. 61. 88 The translation of the *Enûma-Elish* utilized here is that of Speiser, *ANET,* pp. 61-73. 89 Cf. i.22, wherein Apsu plots "against the gods, his sons;" i.66, wherein Apsu's intentions are made known "unto the gods, their first-born." 90 Not to be confused with the epithet of Tiamat; cf. i.4 and n. 97, above. 91 See Walcot, *op. cit.,* p. 24. 92 M. L. West, in the "Prolegomena" to *Hesiod: Theogony* (Oxford, 1966), p. 23, asserts that Ea's elder sibling (or grandfather) Anshar assumes the kingship. Nowhere in the text is this clearly evident. The only passage that may possibly reflect such a royal status is iii.i ff., wherein Anshar sends a message to Lahmu and Laha via "Gaga, his vizier" (italics mine). Otherwise, Anshar appears as but one of the siblings (or forebears) of Ea who plays a prominent albeit essentially supporting role in the deposition of Apsu and the subsequent conflict with Tiamat. 93 There is some confusion here. Kramer suggests (*MAW,* p. 121) that Ea actually takes up residence upon Apsu's corpse. The text itself would seem to indicate that Ea names his place of residence (i.e., the location of his "cult hut"; cf. i.27) after his deceased parent. 94 Cf. Kramer, *MAW,* p. 121. 95 "He took from him [i.e., Kingu] the Tablets of Fate, not rightfully his, sealed [them] with a seal and fastened [them] on his breast" (iv.122-123).
there are, of course, several important structural differences. For one thing, there is a bifurcation of the Kronos figure. Taken together, the careers of Ea and Kingu approximate closely that of the typical second generation "king": initially, in the person of Ea, we see him usurping the kingship through a ruse and (perhaps) performing an act of emasculation; later on, in the person of Kingu, we see him defeated by the Zeus figure and consigned to what would appear to be a Tartaros-like place. In the case of Tiamat we have not bifurcation but fusion. She is at once Gaia and Typhon (cf. Zohak, who is both Kronos and Typhon). It is in the latter role, however, that she appears most clearly, and the fight between her and Marduk is strikingly similar to that between Zeus and Typhon, Teshub and Ullikummi, and so on. The relationship between Tiamat and Kingu is, of course, the opposite of that between Kronos and Typhon or Kumarbi and Ullikummi: in the Babylonian account the "king" is a creature of the monster. Yet on balance it seems clear that the theogony contained in the Enuma-Elish is akin to those we have previously surveyed. And given its date, it is probably their prototype.

Until recently, the Enuma-Elish was the only known Babylonian creation myth that came anywhere near to approximating the idea of the divine kingship. In 1965, however, W. G. Lambert published (with A. R. Millard) and subsequently translated a cuneiform text (BM 74329) which may be termed for convenience sake the "Theogony of Dunnu." 102 In it we can see essentially the same course of events as described in the Enuma-Elish, although the locale and figures involved are for the most part quite distinct. The date of this new text is late. Lambert and Walcot assign it to the Late Babylonian period (i.e., between 635 and 330 B.C.), although it is suggested that it belongs to the earlier phase of this period and that, as in the case of the Enuma-Elish, it may contain materials originally composed perhaps as early as the beginning of the second millennium B.C. 103

Here the action centers on the ancient city of Dunnu, an otherwise obscure place as far as the overall Babylonian tradition is concerned. 104 The text itself is far shorter and more literary than the one just discussed. In this instance the two autochthons are the figures Hain (unknown outside this text) 105 and Earth. Although the first three lines are incomplete, it appears that they give birth first to Sea (cf. Tiamat) by means of a plow, and then in an apparently more normal fashion to the male figure Amakandu (once again we encounter the ultimogeniture pattern). Amakandu is seduced by his mother: "[Earth] cast her eyes on Amakandu, her son. 'Come, let me make love to you' she said to him" (lines 8-9). After marrying his mother, Amakandu slays Hain and lays him to rest in the city of Dunnu, "which he loved" (line 12). He then assumes his father's overlordship of the city (line 13). Subsequently, Amakandu marries Sea (his sister: cf. Kronos and Rhea), who gives birth to a son called Lahar. Lahar in turn slays his father, marries his mother (i.e., Sea), and assumes the kingship. He, too, produces offspring: a daughter, River, and a son, whose first name is unreadable. The latter eventually kills both Lahar and Sea (his mother), marries River (her sister), and assumes power. At this point the text is somewhat obliterated, but the pattern seems to be carried out for at least two more generations. Sons slay their fathers and mothers, marry their sisters, and usurp the sovereignty. The female figures here whose names are readable include Ga'un and Ningishzidda. There is no clear terminus a quo to the text, which is contained on the obverse and reverse of a single tablet, although the last readable line (49) indicates that the seat of power has been transferred to the city of Shupa't [or Kupa't].

In this "Theogony of Dunnu" can be seen in abbreviated and somewhat redundant form the essential outlines of the theme. The fact that there are five generations rather than three is not a crucial deterrent to putting the text into comparison with the other versions. It will be recalled that both the Hittite-Hurrian version and that of the Phoenicians, to say nothing of the version contained in the Shâyînâmah, all describe one or more generations as existing prior to those upon whom attention is centered. In the present case the replication follows rather than precedes the principal sequence of events. To be sure, there is a major structural problem here in that in all other versions surveyed, including the Enuma-Elish, there is a denouement. One figure, be he Zeus, Teshub, Ra'a, Feridun, Odin, or Marduk, puts a seal on the succession. In the "Theogony of Dunnu," however, Lahar is in turn overthrown, and the series of usurpations is seemingly without end. Nor do we see here any indication of emas-

---

102 W. G. Lambert and P. Walcot, "A New Babylonian Theogony and Hesiod," Kadmos 11:5-72 (1965). It should be pointed out that Walcot is responsible for the appended "classical commentary" (pp. 68-72); the translation and accompanying commentary are by Lambert.
103 I should emphasize that this is my term, not that of Lambert and Walcot.
104 Ibid., pp. 67-68.
105 Lambert and Walcot suggest that the two signs lu-in may have been miscopied from the one large sign used to write the name of the corn goddess Nisaba (ibid., pp. 66-67).
cation, although Lambert and Walcot, in comparing the text with Hesiod, suggest, perhaps leaning a bit too heavily upon Freud, that mother lust is equivalent to castration. On this point I suggest that the very brevity and laconic nature of the text perhaps precluded the elaboration of such details as how the sovereignty was transferred (e.g., via emasculation or the “tearing off” of a tiara).

One interesting point of comparison between the Dunnu text and Hesiod’s Theogony relates to the order in which Sea and River appear. According to Hesiod, the two figures associated with the sea, Pontos and Okeanos, emerge in succeeding generations. Pontos is essentially an autochthon, having emerged from Gaia without benefit of sexual intercourse, while Okeanos is born of Oursanos and Gaia. There is no doubt that Pontos is the sea proper, but Okeanos is more specifically defined as the “father of rivers,” the river that circles the earth (cf. Theogony 655–656). This order is paralleled in the “Theogony of Dunnu”; Sea is an autochthon, whereas River belongs to the third generation. Lambert and Walcot also point out that there is a parallel to Hesiod in the marital relationships that obtain. The Titans regularly contract sibling marriages (cf. Kronos and Rhea), “but it is only Ouranos and Pontos who practice incest to the extent of mating with their own mother. . . .” Again, in the “Theogony of Dunnu” both Sea and Earth are involved in such marriages, and matings between siblings abound.

These, then, are the Babylonian versions. So far no Sumerian counterpart has come to light, although several important Sumerian divinities are present in the texts just discussed, for example, Enki (Ea) and Anu. I do not mean to suggest that the Greek and other non-Babylonian versions of the “Kingship in Heaven” theme are necessarily based specifically upon the Enuma-Elish or the “Theogony of Dunnu.” Rather, in one way or another all the previously discussed theogonies may be based upon the immediate sources of these two Babylonian texts, sources that themselves would appear to have been Babylonian and perhaps even Sumerian. This suggestion is strengthened in that we now have two distinct versions of the theme, each dating from the early second millennium B.C., from two distinct centers of Babylonian culture, that is, Babylon proper and Dunnu.

The fact that one of these was a minor center adds even more strength.

CONCLUSIONS

Most of the principal points of comparison among the several versions which have been noted are summed up in the table on the facing page. The question that remains is whether or not the “Kingship in Heaven” theme is Indo-European.

Wickara's assumption that the theme is part of the Indo-European mythological inheritance is based principally upon the concordances among the Greek, Hittite, and Iranian versions. These concordances are in fact present, and there is no doubt that the three versions are part of a single tradition. But the fact that these three Indo-European-speaking communities share a common theogonic theme does not itself mean that such a theme is part of their common mythological inheritance. By the same token, it can be said that a fair number of Indo-European speaking communities today share a common belief in how the world was created: by a God whose principal attributes are omnipotence and an intense jealousy of all other pretenders to divine status. There is, of course, no doubt whatsoever that this idea was borrowed from the Judaic tradition. We have a clear record of when and where the borrowing occurred. But suppose that we did not have such a record; suppose that a Martian scholar eons hence were to be confronted with this common tradition—present, albeit, among many non-Indo-European speakers as well. Would he not be tempted to view the relationships from a genetic standpoint? Would he not be tempted to reconstruct a common Indo-European cosmogony involving “the hand of God moving across the waters,” and so on?

I suggest that those who argue for an Indo-European origin as far as the divine kingship is concerned have most likely fallen into the same trap as our hypothetical Martian. The problem here is that, unlike the spread of the Judaic cosmogony, the spread of the idea of divine kingship cannot be documented. There is no clear record of events to mark its spread from ancient Babylonia to Anatolia, Phoenicia, Iran, Greece, and ultimately, perhaps, to Scandinavia. There is nothing here comparable with the conversion of Clovis or the ministry of St. Patrick. Yet spread it did, from one religious system to another, the initial impetus being perhaps the prestige of the Babylonian tradition. By the time the theme reached Scandinavia (if indeed it did not evolve there independently), the Babylonian roots had long since become obscure, and the prestige would have been
### COMPARISON OF FIGURES IN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERSION</th>
<th>FIRST GENERATION FIGURE</th>
<th>SECOND GENERATION FIGURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Ouranos*: autochthon;</td>
<td>Kronos: castrates Ouranos with sickle and exiles him; swallows offspring; marries sister (Rhea); sires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>marries Earth (Gaia);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sires</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurrian-Hittite</td>
<td>Anu: son of Alalu;</td>
<td>Kumarbi: castrates Anu by biting and exposes him; swallows offspring (?); from Anu's seed and Kumarbi's spittle is born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>destroys father; sires</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenician</td>
<td>Ouranos*: offspring of Eliun; marries Earth (Ge, Gaia); sires</td>
<td>El (Kronos): drives out Ouranos with sickle; later castrates him; kills a son and a daughter; marries his three sisters; sires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iranian</td>
<td>Jamshid: preceded by three earlier kings; is overthrown by Zohak (monster-like “nephew” [?]); latest son Jamshid in half; marries Jamshid’s two sisters; is deposed by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norse (two lines)</td>
<td>Buri: autochthon; sires</td>
<td>Bör: sires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babylsonian</td>
<td>Anu*: autochthon; marries Tiamat; sires</td>
<td>Ea: deposes Anu; is apparently supplanted by Ea’s half-brother, Kingsu. Ea sires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Theogony of Durun”</td>
<td>Anahanda: slays Hain, marries mother (Earth), then sister (Sea); sires</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These figures provoke filial rebellion by exiling or attempting to destroy their eventual successors. Not: The italicized names are those of the principal figures involved in the “Kingship in Heaven.”

### “KINGSHIP IN HEAVEN” THEME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THIRD GENERATION FIGURE</th>
<th>MONSTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zeus: deposes Kronos; must validate his position by slaying</td>
<td>Typhon: creature or offspring of Kronos; is killed in single combat around Mt. Katos and Cilicia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teshub: deposes Kumarbi; must validate his position by rendering powerless with “ancient wood” and slaying (?)</td>
<td>Ulukkannu: offspring of Kumarbi; defeated near Mt. Hazli (Kasios).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baal: deposes El; later El castrates self. Baal reigns perpetually</td>
<td>Although Typhon is mentioned, there is no clear monster figure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feridun (Jamshid’s exiled grandson): reigns triumphantly after defeating</td>
<td>Zohak: parallels Typhon; after being clubbed in single combat and left enchained, dies on Mt. Demawend (P). Represents fusion of second generation and monster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odin: who reigns perpetually after killing and cutting up Ymir and banishing Bergelmir to jötunheim. Bergelmir.</td>
<td>Ymir, from whose corpse the universe is formed, represents fusion of first-generation figure and monster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marduk: deposes Kingu and banishes him to Uggae; reigns perpetually after slaying</td>
<td>Tiamat, from whose corpse the universe is formed, represents fusion of first-generation figure and monster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahar: slays Amahanda; marries Sea; deposed eventually by offspring.</td>
<td>No clear monster figure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that of the Greco-Roman tradition, to which it had diffused perhaps two millennia earlier.

Two of the chief reasons for ruling out an Indo-European origin are the absence, previously noted, of the theme in the Indic tradition and its very late appearance in that of ancient Iran. Also important in this connection is its absence in the ancient Celtic tradition. Admittedly much of our knowledge of Celtic religion is confined to those elements of it that persisted in Ireland; yet even here, given the care taken by the medieval Irish monks to preserve their heritage, one would assume that if the theme had been present before the arrival of Christianity it would have carried over. But only by the most Procrustean of methods can one make a case for its presence in the traditions relating to the Tótha Dé Danann and their predecessors. It is simply not present.

Thus, that neither the Veda's, the Avesta, nor the Lebor Gabháel know the theme is highly significant. With the exception of the Norse, all known versions center upon Mesopotamia. Even Egypt does not seem to have known a clear version of the "Kingship in Heaven." Its diffusion to Greece, usually thought to have been accomplished via Phoenicia, may indeed have been much earlier than heretofore suspected. Lambert and Walcot suggest that the mythical conception of a divine kingship may have been diffused directly from Mesopotamia to Greece during the Late Helladic period and cite recent archaeological evidence (e.g., the presence of Babylonian cylinder seals at Thebes) indicative of widespread Mycenaean-Mesopotamian contacts. Its diffusion to the Hurrians would probably have been accomplished via the Hurrians, who had come into close contact with the mainstream of Mesopotamian civilization by the middle of the second millennium B.C. Its late diffusion eastward to Iran may reflect more immediately the Hesiodic and/or Phoenician versions rather than the Babylonian versions themselves (cf. the very specific parallels between Zolukh and Typhon). But whatever the course taken, its absence in at least three widely separated and important Indo-European traditions, coupled with the early dates of the Babylonian versions, would seem to give powerful support to my contention that it is of Babylonian and perhaps even ultimately of Sumerian origin.

No discussion of Indo-European origins would be complete without reference to Professor Dumézil's theory of a common tripartite social and supernatural system, a system that is clearly evident in most of the ancient Indo-European speaking domains. Dumézil himself has refrained from any attempt to apply the tripartite model to the idea of the "Kingship in Heaven," despite the fact that at first glance, at least, the three-generational sequences would seem to offer a fertile field in this regard. Even Wikaneder, in many ways Dumézil's most brilliant disciple, and, as we have seen, the chief proponent of the Indo-European origin theory, has refrained from attempting such an application. The closest Dumézil has come to the problem is the suggestion that the proto-Indo-European mythology possibly included a tradition that Heaven was the last and only surviving offspring of a great water deity (probably female), who drowned all but one of her children as soon as they were born. His suggestion is based upon a comparison between the Norse god Heimdallr and the Vedic divinity Dyaub. Both are connected with water. Heimdall is said to have had nine mothers, who were conceived as "sea waves"; Dyaub and his seven brothers (the Vasus) are linked with the river goddess Gaṅgā (Ganges), who drowns seven of the eight siblings, leaving only Dyaub to reach maturity (cf. Mahābhārata 1.843-956).

Certainly the personifications of sea and heaven play parts in both

---

110 The historical relationships proposed here are generally congruent with those proposed by Steiner (op. cit., p. 104), who sees the Indra-Elīs as the immediate source of two unattested versions of the theme which he labels "X" and "Y." The "Z" version, Steiner suggests, ultimately reached Greece and manifested itself in Hesiod's Theogony. The Hurrian-Hittite version reflects both the "X" and the "Y" versions, although the former would seem to be the most immediate source. He also suggests that the "X" version perhaps gave rise to a third unattested version, "Z," which, together with the Hesiodic version, is reflected in Philo's "history." If Steiner is correct, it might be suggested that his hypothetical "Z" version could have diffused to Iran as well as to Phoenicia (cf. the specific correspondences between Philo and Finnaz as noted in the table elsewhere); the Hesiodic version would be the immediate source of that contained in Snorri's Edda.

111 The most succinct statement of Dumézil's theory can be found in his L'idéologie tripartite des Indo-européens (Brussels, 1953). For a brief analysis of this theory see my article "The Comparative Indo-European Mythology of Georges Dumézil," JFI 1:149-166 (1956); for a more extended discussion of Dumézil's ideas see my The New Comparative Mythology: An Anthropological Assessment of the Theories of Georges Dumézil (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1966).

112 The "Kingship in Heaven" Theme, 1:147-166 (1964); for a more extended discussion of Dumézil's ideas see my The New Comparative Mythology: An Anthropological Assessment of the Theories of Georges Dumézil (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1966).

113 Cf. ibid., pp. 65, 85.

the Greek and the Babylonian versions of the divine kingship (cf. Pontos, Tiamat), but in neither case do we have any clear identification of the drowning of all but one of their offspring. Moreover, Heimdallr plays no part whatsoever in the Norse version, nor do any of the other traditions surrounding the rather otiose Dyauh come anywhere near to approximating the sort of divine succession so crucial to the presence of the theme in question. In short, it would seem to me that, even though Dumézil may well be correct in his suggestions as to the Indo-European roots of the traditions surrounding the births of Dyauh and Heimdallr, it would not be germane to the problem at hand. The presence of such a common Indo-European tradition would in no way alter my convictions as to the origin of the theme.

One of the most interesting suggestions yet made from a Dumézilian standpoint is that previously mentioned by F. Vian relative to the Greek Typhon myth. As Vian sees it, Zeus's battle with the monster derives from an isolated story paralleling what Dumézil and others have suggested is the typical Indo-European myth of a fight between a second-function or warrior figure and a tricephalic monster (cf. Indra versus the son of Tvāṣṭar, and the like). This story later fused with a widespread non-Indo-European dragon-slaying account (which had also diffused to the Hittites; cf. the Ululkummi and Illuyanka narratives) that had been introduced into Greece by the Phoenicians in the early eighth century B.C. Thus, according to Vian, by the time of Hesiod the story as it is generally known in Greek mythology had fairly well crystallized. It is interesting that in later versions of the Typhon episode (i.e., those of Apollodorus and Nonnos) the details undergo progressive elaboration and become more and more similar to those of the Hurrian-Hittite version. As noted, the Hittite description of Ullikummi before Mount Hazzi is almost identical with Nonnos' description of Typhon.

If Vian is correct, then some intriguing possibilities present themselves. Perhaps the Hittites, too, grafted the dragon-slaying myth onto an inherited Indo-European three-headed monster tale and, like their Greek cousins a thousand years later, eventually fused this with the Babylonian account of the divine kingship. Thus there would be three distinct strata in both the Greek and Hittite versions: (1) the Indo-European account of the slaying of the tricephalus,

— C. Scott Littleton

118 Horace et les Caricares.
In one of his investigations of Germanic heroic and mythological traditions, Georges Dumézil speculates that the Norse heroic traditions treating the careers of Hadding and Hunding (and sometimes Frotho), represent euhemerizations of the careers of the Norse gods, Njörd and Freyr. According to Dumézil, the two phases in the career of Hadding represent the two phases in the career of Njörd, the first phase being the “Vanic” period, during which Njörd was firmly associated with the third function, and the second phase being the period during which the god became the protégé of Odin and, in so doing, became a divinity of the first function. Dumézil finds evidence that supports his hypothesis in an episode in Book I of Saxo Grammaticus. In this episode, the hero Hunding meets an accidental death when he falls into a vat of beer. Upon learning the news of Hunding’s fate, Hadding hangs himself. Dumézil sees in this episode the survival of a sacrificial myth in which the death by drowning in a vat involves a ritual of the third function, whereas death by hanging represents a ritual of the first function.

The hypothesis of Dumézil is thus based on the assumption that, in Germanic religion, there were once separate sacrifices performed for the divinities of the first and third functions. This assumption, however, has not been tested. Therefore, I have investigated the available sources in order to establish whether there is a correlation between the classes of Germanic divinities and the sacrifices made to them.

ritual was practiced by the Romans. There is also evidence of such a sacrifice in ancient Greece. See M. P. Nilsson, in Westfalen, 1935), p. 72. See also O. Hofler, Kultische Geheimbünde der Germanen (Frankfurt, 1934), pp. 1-82.

4.27) that horses, dogs, and men were hanged in the sacred grove at Uppsala. Similarly, Adam of Bremen wrote in the eleventh century (Gesta

5.16). Prokopios, for example (De bello Gotico 2.15, 23), describes the victims of this practice in Germanic tradition. The most convincing single piece of evidence that links ritualistic drowning with Germanic divinities of the third function is found in chapter 40 of Tacitus’ Germania. Tacitus reports that the sacred wagon of Nerthus was sprinkled with water, after which slaves were drowned as an offering to the goddess.

It has long been established that Nerthus, a female counterpart of the Norse Njördr, is a divinity of fertility and abundance. Moreover, the practice of sprinkling water on the wagon of the goddess is obviously an example of ritualistic imitative magic of the kind found all over Europe in fertility and rain-producing rituals. Such practices have been observed in rural areas of Germany in this century. It is apparent that the ritual described by Tacitus was performed with the intent of promoting fertility, and the fact that the mode of human sacrifice to the fertility divinity took the form of drowning lends con-

and, if so, whether there are corresponding practices found among other Indo-European peoples.

It has long been established that, in Germanic religion, the practice of sacrificial hangings was associated with the cult of Odin, who, according to Dumézil, represents the Varunaic half of the Indo-European first function. The very epithets Hangi, HangagoS, Hangatýr, and Galgavalýr, all of which are borne by Odin, indicate such a relationship. There is, moreover, a myth in which Odin himself is envisioned as hanging in a tree for nine days (Híawand 198), saying that he was “given to Odin, I myself, to myself, in the tree of which no one knows what roots it grows”. Snorri, furthermore, writes (Ynglingsaga 7) that Odin “sometimes roused the dead out of the earth or sat under the hanged, and therefore he was called the lord of ghosts or the king of the hanged.” There is, in addition, evidence from German folklore which indicates that Wotan, the South Germanic counterpart of Odin, was similarly associated with hanging. Various folk legends tell of the one-eyed personification of the wind who leads the raging army of the souls of the hanged across the heavens. One fourteenth-century source even refers to this host of lost souls as “Wotanes her.”

An account of an actual sacrificial ritual, during which a human victim is offered to Odin by hanging, has been preserved in the Fisher saga as well as in the Danish history of Saxo Grammaticus (6.5). In both sources there is an account of the hanging of King Vikar, whom the hero Starkadr offers to Odin. That such sacrificial hangings belong to an early stratum of Germanic religion is confirmed by the earliest reports of sacrificial practices among Germanic peoples. Prokopios, for example (De bello Gotico 2.15, 23), describes the victory celebration of the Thulites and reports that prisoners of war were hanged in trees. Orosius writes of a similar ritual after the Cimbrian victory over the Romans (Historia adversus paganos 5.16). Similarly, Adam of Bremen wrote in the eleventh century (Gesta

4:27) that horses, dogs, and men were hanged in the sacred grove at Uppsala.

The second sacrificial ritual mentioned by Dumézil involves the drowning of a human victim in a vat or tub. Dumézil’s contention that this kind of sacrifice represents an Indo-European third-function ritual is given support by the occurrence of this motif in various heroic and popular traditions of Indo-European speaking peoples. Elsewhere within Germanic tradition one reads that Fjölnir, son of Yggvirfeyr (Heimskringla 1.24-25) drowns after falling into a vat of beer. In Greece, the motif is found in the story of the Thessalian Piasos and in that of Glaukos, son of Minos and Pasiphae, who drowned after accidentally falling into a vat of honey (Apollodorus, Bibliotheca 3.4.1). Similarly, in Ireland there are several heroes who are reported to have drowned in a vat of beer during a festival. The motif can also be found in Scandinavian and German variants of the folk legend “The Death of Pan,” in which a dwarf is reported to have fallen into a brewing vat.

The occurrence of this motif in widely separated areas, each of which is occupied by an Indo-European speaking people, points to the possibility that it was based on an Indo-European mythological theme, which was associated from the earliest times with a sacrificial ritual, and which had been adopted into various heroic and popular traditions. Further evidence of such a ritualistic drowning among Indo-European peoples will be adduced in the course of this investigation. For the present, however, I wish to focus upon the evidence of this practice in Germanic tradition.

It has long been established that Nerthus, a female counterpart of the Norse Njörd, is a divinity of fertility and abundance. Moreover, the practice of sprinkling water on the wagon of the goddess is obviously an example of ritualistic imitative magic of the kind found all over Europe in fertility and rain-producing rituals. Such practices have been observed in rural areas of Germany in this century. It is apparent that the ritual described by Tacitus was performed with the intent of promoting fertility, and the fact that the mode of human sacrifice to the fertility divinity took the form of drowning lends con-
siderable support to Dumézil's hypothesis that drowning involves a ritual of the third function.

Various observations recorded by other early historians reveal that sacrificial drowning was an important ritual in Germanic religion from early times. Orosius (Historia 5.16) writes that after the Cimabrian victory over the Romans, horses were drowned in a river. Adam of Bremen (schoi. 134) describes a human sacrifice by drowning in a spring at the sacred grove of Uppsala. In the ninth-century Fita Polfraa (chap. 8) it is reported that two youths were sacrificed to the sea by being abandoned on a sandbar, to be swept away by the rising tide. This identical method of sacrifice is evidently reflected in the episode in Snorri's Skaldskaparnall, in which the dwarfs, Fialarr and Galarr, are taken by the giant, Suttungr, to a sandbar at sea, where they are likewise abandoned to the rising tide. This means of doing away with victims is also reported to have been used in penal execution. In the Heimskringla (Olaf saga Tryggvaasonar, 70) Eyvindr kelda and his followers are bound and likewise abandoned on a sandbar as punishment for a crime. These cases are of particular importance for this investigation. The three reports deal respectively with an actual sacrifice, a literary-mythological motif, and a criminal execution. In all three cases the identical method is used for doing away with the victim. This combination of evidence indicates that ancient religious practices can survive long after their religious function has been forgotten. The report in Snorri's Eda indicates that the mythological theme, based on a sacrificial ritual, can survive as a literary motif. Similarly, the report in the Heimskringla indicates that the method of killing used in penal executions can evolve from earlier sacrificial practices. Whether the penal execution represents an offering to the offended god or demon, as Karl von Amira and Galarr, are taken by the giant, Suttungr, to a sandbar at sea, where they are likewise abandoned to the rising tide.9 This means of doing away with victims is also reported to have been used in penal execution. In the Heimskringla (Olaf saga Tryggvaasonar, 70) Eyvindr kelda and his followers are bound and likewise abandoned on a sandbar as punishment for a crime. These cases are of particular importance for this investigation. The three reports deal respectively with an actual sacrifice, a literary-mythological motif, and a criminal execution. In all three cases the identical method is used for doing away with the victim. This combination of evidence indicates that ancient religious practices can survive long after their religious function has been forgotten. The report in Snorri's Eda indicates that the mythological theme, based on a sacrificial ritual, can survive as a literary motif. Similarly, the report in the Heimskringla indicates that the method of killing used in penal executions can evolve from earlier sacrificial practices. Whether the penal execution represents an offering to the offended god or demon, as Karl von Amira and his followers are bound and likewise abandoned on a sandbar as punishment for a crime.

Once again, the most convincing evidence is to be found in Tacitus' Germania. In chapter 12, Tacitus discusses penal executions and he states specifically that the crime determines the punishment: distinctio poenarum delicto. He then informs us that prodigia et transfugae ('traitors and deserters') were hanged from trees, whereas ignavi et imbelles ('cowards and nonwarriors') and corpore infames were drowned in mires and bogs. The term ignavi et imbelles is a traditional combination in classical Latin. Cicero, among others, made frequent use of this word pair. The expression means, in fact, more than just 'cowards and nonwarriors'; but evidently was used to refer to the effeminate, the unmanly, and the timid. Thus when Tacitus adds to this expression the term corpore infames it is evident that he is referring to a particularly flagrant kind of homosexuality or other unnatural sexual vice considered to be deprived enough to warrant capital punishment.10

Thus the pattern that has been established for human sacrifice evidently holds true for human execution as well. Crimes of treason, that is, crimes against the sovereign state (first function), are punished in the same manner in which victims are sacrificed to the sovereign divinity: by hanging. And sexual crimes (third function) are punished in the same manner in which sacrifices are made to the divinities of fertility: by drowning.11

Execution by drowning has a long history in Europe, and it would be almost impossible for a single investigator to assemble all the evidence for this practice.12 There is, furthermore, the question of whether the results would warrant—at least for this study—such an undertaking. In spite of the evidence adduced above, which reveals a relationship between the sacrificial offering and penal execution, one cannot automatically assume that every instance of drowning as punishment—especially those of a later date—is sacrificial in origin.

There are, however, a few cases of execution by drowning which deserve special attention. In a remarkable investigation, in which a

---

8 According to the Additio Saponasius XI of the Lex Frisonum, those who violated the temple of an unnamed divinity had their ears slashed, were castrated, and then drowned.


11 That sacrifices and executions were performed by drowning in bogs has been confirmed by the many archaeological finds of human corpses in the mires of Denmark and North Germany. See, for example, G. Bibby, The Testimony of the Snape (New York, 1970), pp. 406-406. A passage in the Kjalnesinga saga, moreover, tells that people who were to be sacrificed (blotbu) were cast into a bog which was called Blotkelda. According to the Faseyrjad, when the Norwegian queen Gunnhildr arrived at the court of King Haraldr, the latter sent his slaves and "guests" to greet her. They seized the queen amid great tumult and jeering and drowned her in a deep morass.

great amount of data was assembled, Heinz Goldschmidt was able to show that in the Low Countries of Europe—with isolated examples in London and Magdeburg—a common form of execution during the late Middle Ages was by drowning in a vat. The drowning generally took place at night and was performed in secret. Goldschmidt attempts to show that this practice had its origin in heathen sacrificial practices and was only later adopted as a form of execution. Although such a contention is difficult to prove, the similarity of this practice with the motif of accidental drowning in a vat, which was discussed above, is too striking to be dismissed as mere coincidence.

One case cited by Goldschmidt warrants special attention. On February 18, 1478, George Duke of Clarence was secretly executed in the Tower of London by order of his brother, King Edward IV. Although the manner in which the execution was conducted was kept a secret, it was generally assumed that the Duke was drowned in a butt of malmsye wine. One such report is found in Robert Fayan’s New Chronicles of England and France, published in 1516: “This yere, that is to meane ye XVIII daye of February the duke of Clarence... brother te the kynge, thanne beyng prysoner in ye Tower, was secretly put to deth and drowned in a barell of malmsye within the sayd Tower.”

Since the murder was performed in secret, one will probably never know with certainty whether the drowning in the vat of wine was the actual means by which the victim was killed. But since Goldschmidt has been able to show that this practice represented a traditional means of execution in the Low Countries during the late Middle Ages, such a situation must be considered a possibility. Until such time as new evidence can be adduced, however, this question will have to remain open.

Yet, one point is clear. Since the populace of London associated the murder of the Duke with the motif of drowning in a vat of wine, it is evident that this motif was, at that time, a part of the popular traditions. It has already been shown that this motif occurs in the heroic traditions of Greece, Ireland, and Denmark. We are thus once again confronted with a familiar pattern, namely, a literary motif and a penal execution, both of which show the identical method of killing the victim. But one important element is lacking to make the pattern complete. Although evidence has already been adduced which shows that sacrificial drowning was an important ritual in early Germanic religion, there are no written records indicating that a vat or a tub was used in which to drown the victims. There is, however, archaeological evidence that confirms the existence of such a sacrifice. On the kettle of Gundestrup there is depicted a scene in which a large man in a robe—evidently a priest—is pushing a human victim head-first into a large tub. It is evident that this scene depicts a sacrificial ritual during which a human victim was drowned in a tub.

This evidence fills the gap in the pattern. The identical method of killing occurs as (1) an actual sacrificial practice, (2) a literary motif, and (3) a penal execution. This evidence, viewed in its totality, confirms the contention of Dumzil that the motif of Hunding’s death by drowning in a vat of beer, as recorded in Saxo’s history, represents the euhemerization of a mythological theme, which originally was associated with a third-function sacrifice. Furthermore, since this motif occurs in Greece, Denmark, England, and Ireland, it is probable that the sacrificial myth in question dates back to the period of Indo-European unity. This myth was borne by the various migrating peoples to their respective new homelands where, in each instance, it later became euhemerized and was adopted into the respective heroic and popular narrative traditions.

Before concluding the discussion of Germanic third-function sacrifices, I should like to adduce some relatively late evidence that shows that such sacrifices survived in Europe with remarkable tenacity. In several areas of Europe there are documents in which are recorded incidents of humans having been buried alive for the purpose of warding off the black plague. One such document is a letter, dated August 7, 1604, from King Christian of Denmark to the sheriff of Lundenaes in which the king directs that a woman, who buried her child alive, be executed. The crime had taken place in the year 1603, the same year the plague was raging in Denmark.

Several folk legends recorded in Scandinavia preserve evidence of the same practice. Children were reported to have been buried alive

14 Ed. H. Ellis (London, 1811), p. 666. M. Murray (The Divine King in England [London, 1952], p. 117) argues that the slaying of Clarence was actually the ritualistic sacrifice of the King's representative as part of a rite in which, originally, the king himself was the divine victim. This is an attractive hypothesis which, if tenable, could contribute much to this investigation. Unfortunately, the entire structure of Murray's theories rests on a foundation of conjecture.
15 S. Muller, Nordische Altertumskunde (Strasbourg, 1897-1898), II, 164-165.
16 See H. Knudsen, "En hest levende begravet," Samlinger til Jydsk Historie og Topografi, 2. Raekke (1922), IV, 999-998. As late as the eighteenth century, there is a report of live burial having been performed to ward off disease. According to a court record from Sønderho in Slesland, a woman was forcibly nailed in a coffin during the epidemic that raged there in 1714. See Sørum, op. cit., p. 905.
in the hope of warding off the dreaded plague. Remnants of this practice have, moreover, survived to relatively modern times, for there is evidence from several European areas that, as late as the latter half of the nineteenth century, farm animals were buried alive to avert hoof-and-mouth disease among cattle.

From Ireland, there are similar reports that human sacrifice was practiced as a means of warding off disease. One such report is found in the Rennes Dindsenchas:

During the Trena of Tailte, at sunrise I twice invoked Mac Erc
The three plagues to remove
From Erin, though it be a woman's command.
Their hostages were brought out;
The drowning of the bonds of the violated treaties
Immolating the son of Aedh Slane
To Mac Erc—it was not a cause for shame.

From these lines one learns that human victims, in this case a group of hostages, and a captive prince, were sacrificed by drowning for the purpose of warding off the plagues. At this point it should be mentioned that, according to the tripartite theory of Dumézil, one of the important functions of the divinities of the third estate is to insure general well-being and to combat disease. Thus the above passage is additional evidence supporting the contention that sacrifice by drowning was associated with the divinities of the third function.

In the cases adduced from Germanic-speaking areas, as seen above, the method used to sacrifice the victims was not by drowning but by burial alive. It can, I believe, be assumed that, in relatively arid regions, in which there were no swamps or bogs, the practice of live burial could easily have supplant ed that of drowning in a mere. Or, stated in other terms, burial alive as a sacrificial practice can be viewed as being in complementary distribution with sacrifice by drowning.

Additional evidence supporting the contention that burial alive can be associated with Dumézil's third function can be found in medieval legal documents. During the Middle Ages, one means of performing capital punishment in cities in Germany was by live burial. The records show that there was a relationship between this type of punishment and the nature of the crime committed. According to Jacob Grimm, this type of execution was preferred for cases of theft, bestiality, sex crimes, and for the murder of illegitimate children. These crimes constitute specific violations of property, wealth, and sex, all of which belong to the domain of the third function. This evidence reveals a rather astonishing continuity in the correlation between the type of crime committed and the manner of punishment from the time of Tacitus to relatively modern times.

Since the evidence adduced thus far seems to confirm a correlation between the sacrifice and the ideological structure in the case of the first and third functions among Germanic peoples, one might expect a similar correlation in the case of the second function. There is, however, only a small corpus of evidence regarding special sacrifices to a Germanic god of war. Jordanes (Getica 5.41) stresses that the Goths worshiped Mars, who may represent Thor, the Germanic war god, with the spilling of much human blood (humani sanguinis effusione placandum). The report has a parallel in a much later document, namely in the Norman History of Dudo of St. Quintin, who informs us that the Vikings, prior to embarking on a warring raid, sacrificed human life and smeared their bodies with the blood of their victims. Presumably if warriors performed such a blood sacrifice as described by Jordanes and Dudo, the sacrificial instrument would have been a weapon of war.

A pattern thus begins to emerge from the evidence thus far assembled. Among Germanic peoples, there were essentially three methods of offering a human victim to the divinities: noose, water, and weapon. These three means of execution, moreover, correspond to the three social classes, and to the three classes of divinities. Admittedly, the evidence for the second function sacrifice is meager.

17 Variants of the legend have been collected in Dalldand (M. Holberg, Svenska folktägder [Stockholm, 1884], p. 112), in Halland (J. Kåkén, Halländska folkminnen, lokalädgar och överrivar från Fageröd [Stockholm, 1927], p. 207), and in Blekinge (L. Wikström, Folkdiktning, visor, sägner, sågor, glasor, ordspel, ringdansar, lekar och barnvisor [Copenhagen and Göteborg, 1880-1891], I, 159).
18 For further examples, see Ströms, op. cit., p. 904.
19 See Heurgren, Husdjurens i norsk folkeliv (Ovebro, 1929), p. 245. See also Kmoed, op. cit., p. 799.

21 De Moribus saxarum gentium (Vandenhove, 1850), 1. 275-277.
22 De Moribus Saxarum Gentium (Vandenhove, 1850), 1. 275-277.
The relative lack of evidence of this type of sacrifice among Germanic peoples can, I believe, be attributed to the fact that much of the sacrificial activity associated with warfare was frequently devoted to the cult of Odin, the “God of the Dead,” and not to Thor, the war deity.

There are, however, other reasons for the relative lack of evidence of this kind of sacrifice. In contrast with the Mediterranean peoples, warfare for the Germans involved not warriors alone, but the entire community. Tacitus, for example (Germania 8), stresses the fact that women were present during battle, baring their breasts as a gesture to remind the men of that to which their wives would be exposed if the battle were lost. Tacitus also mentions (Germania 7) that women were on hand during battle to tend the wounds of their men. It is evident that, in Germanic society, all three social classes would have a profound interest in the outcome of battle and even share in the victory celebration. A passage in Saxo confirms this contention. In writing about the division of spoils after victory, Saxo (5.152) states that each of the social classes acquired its share of the booty. The chiefs were given the gold and silver, the warriors were given weapons, and the common people were given the ships. It can thus be seen that the society was divided into three classes, and this division corresponds precisely to the tripartite structure as posited by Dumézil.

One can imagine that it became a tradition among Germanic peoples to celebrate a victory with an elaborate festival during which not only a division was made of the booty, but offerings were made to the appropriate divinities of each of the three social classes. Evidence of such a celebration has been recorded by Orosius who writes that after the Cimbrian victory over the Romans (Historia adversus paganos 5.16), the victorious barbarians hanged prisoners in trees, cast silver and gold into the water, and drowned horses in the river. These three kinds of offerings correspond strikingly to the three social classes and to their respective kinds of sacrifices. The hangings clearly represent an offering to Odin, the drowning of the horses is apparently a third-function sacrifice, and the offerings of gold and silver conceivably could represent a second-function ritual.

Additional evidence of a tripartite sacrifice after battle can be observed in an illustration from the seventeenth century by J. van Ossenbeeck entitled “Kriegsgreuel.” In this illustration a victory celebration is depicted during which prisoners of war are sacrificed. One prisoner is shown hanging in a tree. Another is being decapitated by sword. And off to one side a large vat is shown, in which another prisoner has apparently been drowned. This painting seems to confirm the pattern of noose, weapon, and water as means of carrying out human sacrifice.

One might, of course, raise the valid objection that a painting of the seventeenth century is scarcely the place where one would expect to find evidence of ancient Germanic sacrificial practices. Nevertheless, the trifunctional victory celebration, with the traditional sacrifices, is depicted in surprising detail. I suggest three possible explanations: (1) The artist had access to sources that described earlier victory celebrations; (2) the victory celebrations, with the three kinds of sacrifices, survived in form long after their original religious significance had been forgotten and, as such, were still practiced in the Thirty Years’ War; (3) the artist created a scene of horror from his imagination alone, and made no attempt to depict a traditional celebration.

It is probably impossible to determine which, if any, of the three explanations represents the correct one, at least until such time as new evidence can be adduced. For the present, I am inclined to look upon the second explanation as the one that best explains the scene depicted by the artist.

In short, the evidence thus far points toward the following tentative conclusions: Germanic peoples not only performed separate sacrifices to their respective classes of divinities, but also performed a trifunctional rite after victory in battle. During these celebrations offerings were made simultaneously to the three classes of deities. Admittedly, this conclusion has been reached on the basis of a relative lack of evidence.
tively small corpus of material, and additional data would be needed before one could accept the findings as fact. Such supporting evidence can be found in other Indo-European religious traditions. Of all Indo-European religions, the Celtic can provide the best comparative data. Among the most important sources for Celtic religion is the first-century Latin poem Pharsalia by Lucan and the commentaries written by the scholiasts between the fourth and ninth centuries. Just as Adam of Bremen mentions three distinct divinities for Germanic peoples, so does Lucan mention a triad of deities for the Celts, namely, Esus, Taranis, and Teutates. Similar to Germanic religion, there were separate kinds of human sacrifice performed in honor of each of the gods.

Just as in Germanic religion hanging was associated with the cult of Odin, the Commenta to Lucan mention that the victims offered to Esus were hanged and left suspended until their limbs wasted away. It would be convenient to conclude that the figure of Esus represents a first function, that is, an Odinic-Varunaic, divinity. But this conclusion involves some difficulty. First, the Commenta to Lucan provide precious little information regarding the functions of the divinities. Second, in Celtic religion Lug is apparently the true counterpart of Odin-Varuna, and thus hanging ought to be linked with Lug rather than with Esus. Yet Esus is generally hard to pin down—the Commenta equate him both with Mercury and with Mars—and since Lug is not mentioned by Lucan, it can be assumed that Esus has moved into the Odinic-Varunaic slot.

The Commenta to Lucan report that the human victims offered to Taranis were sacrificed in quite a different manner. The victims were placed in a large basket-like structure which was then ignited, cremating those inside. This kind of sacrifice has also been recorded by Strabo, who writes that a large structure was made of wood and straw into which all kinds of animals and humans were cast. The structure was then ignited, creating a bloody holocaust.

The third divinity mentioned by Lucan, Teutates, was honored by still another means of human sacrifice. According to the Commenta, a man was thrust headfirst into a vat, and was held in that position until he drowned. In this passage, Teutates is equated with Mercury, a fact that might lead one to believe that we are again confronted with a first-function divinity. Since Esus, however, who is also equated with Mercury, most likely represents the Celtic first-function sovereign divinity, and since Teutates is associated with the rite of drowning victims in a vat, which has been shown to be a third-function sacrifice, it is highly probable that Teutates represents the Celtic third function. This contention is supported by the etymology of the name: *teutild, 'people,' indicating that he was a divinity of all the people, and, as such, his role would be parallel to the roles of other third-function deities of Indo-European tradition.

The material that has been adduced for Celtic religion reveals a striking agreement with the situation found in Germanic religion. In each case, there is a triad of divinities representing the three social classes, and each of the gods is honored by a separate kind of human sacrifice. Moreover, the pattern for Celtic tradition is remarkably similar to that found in Germanic tradition. In the latter, the three means of doing away with the victim were by noose, weapon, and water, whereas in Celtic religion, the three methods are noose, fire, and water. And as in the Germanic sources, the noose was associated with the first-function sacrifice, and water with the third-function sacrifice. Only in the case of the second function does one find an apparent inconsistency. In Germanic religion the weapon was used, whereas in Celtic religion fire was preferred. The two methods of sacrificing a victim are apparently in complementary distribution. That is, killing by weapon and by fire represent variants of a single class of sacrificial practice. There are, moreover, further parallels with Germanic religious practices. For example, it has been shown that Germanic peoples celebrated their victories with simultaneous sacrifices to the three classes of divinities. Similarly, in Celtic tradition, there is evidence of such "trifunctional" rituals. This evidence is found chiefly in the ancient heroic literature of Ireland and specifically in the complex of motifs known as the "Threefold Death."

The earliest record of the theme is found in Adhamhain's seventh-century account of the life of St. Columba. The Irish saint propheti-
cally informs Aedh the Black that he will die three different deaths. He will be wounded in the neck with a spear, fall from a tree into the water, and he will drown. One can speculate that the fall from the tree represents a variant of hanging. Indeed, evidence adduced below shows that such is precisely the case. The conclusion to this episode seems to be somewhat garbled: Aedh is wounded, falls from a boat, and drowns.

This episode corresponds in striking detail to two Latin poems written by Bishop Hildebert of Le Mans in the early twelfth century.26 In each of the poems a boy asks the gods how he will die. Venus replies that he will die in a noose, Mars says by a weapon, and Neptune says by water. The youth climbs a tree above a river, falls in such a way that his sword pierces his breast, and his head is submerged. Once again, the three methods of death correspond to the tripartite sacrificial practices: noose, weapon, and water. The fact that the noose is the predicted form of death, and the actual death occurs by a fall from a tree, confirms the above assumption that the prediction of death by a fall from a tree actually represents death by hanging.

A variant of this tale occurs in the poems ascribed to Saint Molog, as they appear in the Anecdota of Michael O'Clery, and which are associated with the Irish legend of Suibhne Geilt.32 Although the Anecdota date from the seventeenth century, the material is obviously very much older. There are brief references to the poems as early as the ninth and tenth centuries.33 Grag, who has killed Suibhne, is told by St. Molog that he will die by a weapon, by burning, and by drowning. Grag is relieved to hear this prophecy, for he knows that, since man can die but once, the prophecy must be wrong. Nevertheless, fate is inevitable, for when Grag is climbing an oak tree, he is wounded by his spear, falls from the tree into a fire, and then into the water in which he drowns. Once again, we find the identical pattern: noose (represented by a fall from the oak tree), weapon, and water. There is, however, a new element, namely, fire. It has already been shown that, in Celtic religion, fire apparently replaced the weapon as a means of killing in the second-function sacrifice. Curiously, in this source, both a weapon and fire are mentioned.

The same episode occurs in the Irish life of St. Molog,34 with an important addition. In this account, the punishment of the villain is evidently associated with the crime that was committed. For Grag is not only guilty of killing Suibhne, but also of having stolen cattle. The theft of cattle apparently represents a violation of the third estate, whereas the killing of Suibhne could represent a second-function violation. A third crime is not mentioned, and one can only speculate that the threefold death was once associated with a crime against each of the three functions.

A variant of the episode is also to be found in the account of the exploits of King Diarmaid, who lived in the sixth century. The account is recorded in the eleventh-century Silva Gadelica.35 It is predicted that King Diarmaid will meet death by three different means, by a weapon, by burning, and by drowning. During a festival, the king is wounded with a spear, the house is burned over him, he creeps into a vat of beer to avoid the flames, and drowns. The fact that the death of the king is reported to have taken place during the celebration of a festival is of special importance. I suggest that this account represents the euhemerization of a sacrificial myth which was associated with a periodic festival during which a human victim, most likely a king, was sacrificed simultaneously to the three classes of divinities.

The same story is told of Aidheh Muirchertach mac Erca in a fourteenth-century manuscript36 in incomplete fashion, for only two of the deaths are reported. During a festival, Mac Erca's house is burned, and to avoid the flames, the hero climbs into a vat of beer and half drowns. That this version is incomplete is confirmed by allusions to the hero's death in other manuscripts, one dating from the twelfth century, the other from the thirteenth.37 In both cases, it is mentioned that Mac Erca died by three different means, by a weapon, by burning, and by drowning. Once again, one is confronted with what appears to be the survival of a sacrificial myth, in which it is told how a victim is sacrificed simultaneously to the three classes of divinities.

This theme of the threefold death later became a part of popular oral tradition and was told as a kind of a "fate tale" in which the hero's fate was determined from birth. As the story becomes further removed from its religious background, the manner in which the hero suffers death undergoes changes. This development is not surprising. When the ritualistic significance is forgotten, the only im-

---

27 MS Brussels 5100-5104, quoted from Jackson, op. cit., p. 539.
portant aspect is that the hero dies three deaths, and the manner in which he dies becomes of ever-decreasing importance.

The theme occurs in legends recorded in the British Isles, and is associated with the careers of Myrddin, Merlin, and Lailoken. In the *Vita Merlini* by Geoffrey of Monmouth, 49 Merlin predicts that a youth will die in a tree, by a fall from a rock, and drown. The youth later suffers all three deaths simultaneously. In the account treating the figure of Lailoken, the three deaths are by stoning, beating, piercing with a stake, and by drowning. 50 In a Welsh fate tale, it is predicted that a youth will die by snakebite, by a fall from a tree, and by drowning. 51 The boy later climbs a tree, is bitten by a snake, falls and breaks his neck—a variant of the hanging motif—and drowns in a river below.

The modern folktale treatment of the threefold death has a wide distribution, having been recorded in variants from Ireland to Iran. A relatively complete comparison of these tales can be found in a recent monograph by R. Brednich, 49 and therefore they need not be treated here in detail. Instead, in referring to these tales, I limit my remarks to the place where the tale was collected, and to the manner in which the hero suffers the threefold death.

Estonia: Hunger, fire, and water. 44
Low German: Hanging on willow branch, drowning. 46
Slovene: Snakebite, fall from tree, drowning. 47
Bulgaria: Snakebite, fall from tree. 48
Greece: Snakebite, fall from cliff, burning. 46
Iran: Fall from tree, snakebite, drowning. 50

The motif of the snakebite, which is especially well represented in East Europe and Asia, evidently represents a secondary intrusion. It occurs only in the tales that have been collected at a relatively recent date, and is totally lacking in the older written sources. Hanging—and its variant, fall from a tree—burning, wounding with a weapon, and drowning are all motifs that occur in the earliest sources and evidently have belonged to the tradition from the earliest times.

A study of the distribution of the modern folktale, and consideration of the oldest written sources, apparently leaves only one tenable conclusion regarding the origin and dissemination of the tale. The tale had its origin in ancient Ireland and then spread by diffusion to the various European and Asian locations. But there is an alternative explanation. One can assume that the theme was a part of the mythology of the Indo-Europeans and was borne by the migrating Indo-European peoples to their respective new homelands, and then, in each new area, the tale became a part of the local narrative tradition. Or, stated in other terms, one can explain the distribution of the tale either by the "diffusion" theory or by the "Indo-European" theory. Although I favor the diffusion theory in explaining most of the variants and their distribution, I believe that, in at least one instance, the Indo-European theory represents a more plausible explanation. Such an instance is represented by a variant of the tale as it was recorded in a Low German dialect by Gottfried Henssen in the town of Unter-scheideck in the year 1275.

In this tale a prophet tells a mother in labor that her child should not be born during that hour, for "wenn dat Kenk en de Stond te Welt kõm, dan kõm et to en doudonglõcklichen Doat: entweder et bõng seek op oder et verdronk." The child, alas, is born during the fatal hour. As it becomes old enough to walk, every effort is made to avert the prophesied death. The child is never allowed to play alone. Later the child, under close supervision, is playing near the water when it becomes entangled in a willow twig (*Wiedenstruck*), falls into the water, and is simultaneously strangled and drowned.

Of particular importance in this tale is the occurrence of the motif of strangulation by a willow twig, a motif that does not occur in any of the other variants of the tale. There is a curious parallel to this motif in a narrative recorded many centuries earlier in the same general North Germanic area. It is to be found in the accounts of the death of the Danish king Vikar. The story exists in two prose versions.

41 Jackson, op. cit., p. 546.
43 Jackson, op. cit., p. 546.
49 Ibid., p. 143.

52 Henssen, op. cit., p. 204.
53 If the child should come into the world during that hour then it would suffer a wretched death: it will either hang itself or drown."
One account is in the Danish history of Saxo Grammaticus (55), the other in the Vikarsaga, which had been intercalated in the Icelandic Gauthrekkssaga. Fragments of the episode also occur in verse form in the Vikarsbálkr. In the version preserved in the Gauthrekkssaga, we learn that King Vikar sails to Hóðaland with his army, but is held up by a headwind at some holms. Sacrificial chips (blótspin) are dropped to ascertain the will of the gods, and it is determined that Odin desires a man for hanging. The victim is to be selected by drawing lots. The lot falls to King Vikar himself, and it is decided to hold a conference the next day. During the night Odin appears and commissions Starkadr to send King Vikar to him, giving him for the purpose a spear that looks not very dangerous. Come hither, then, that I may lay the noose about thy neck. The king replies: "If this arrangement is not more dangerous for me than it appears, I do not expect it to harm me; but if it is otherwise, may destiny take its course." He then stepped onto the stump, Starkadr laid the noose about his neck and stepped down from the stump. Starkadr now touched the king with the reed, and said: "I now give thee to Odin." Thereupon Starkadr released the pine twig. At this point, three curious events occur: The reed turned into a spear and pierced the king, the stump fell from under his feet, and the soft entrails of the calf became a strong willow twig (vidju), and the branch flew up and lifted the king into the branches where he was strangled.

In the account that appears in Saxo's history, there are only a few, but nevertheless important, differences. According to Saxo, Odin wishes the death of Vikar, and to achieve this end he grants to the hero, Starcatherus, superhuman strength and the life-span of three human lives. The hero makes the noose, not out of a calf's entrails, but out of willow twigs (ex viminibus). In both cases, however, the actual strangulation occurs by means of willow twigs, the same manner by which the child in the Low German folktale was strangled.

A close examination of the death of Vikar reveals that the king loses his life by the simultaneous occurrence of three events. The reed becomes a spear and wounds the victim, the stump falls over, the pine twig flies up, and the king is strangled by the entrails that have become a strong willow branch. It is thus probable that one is here confronted with a variant of the theme of the threefold death. This contention is supported by the account in Saxo’s history. Saxo states specifically that Odin is using Starkadr as a tool to acquire the life of Vikar, and he grants to the hero the life-span of three human lives. The payment of the threefold death is thus a threefold life, and with this payment a kind of divine balance of life and death is maintained.

It is, moreover, probable that in this Germanic version of the threefold death, the means of execution was originally by noose, water, and weapon. One can imagine that it became increasingly difficult to make plausible an accident in which the victim is hanged and drowned simultaneously. In Celtic tradition this problem had been solved in an obvious manner; the hanging motif had been weakened to merely that of falling from a tree. Here in Germanic tradition a similar solution was reached; the motif of drowning had been weakened by merely indicating that the victim fell from a stump.

This contention is supported by the occurrence of the drowning motif in the Low German variant of the tale of the threefold death which was already discussed. In the German tale the child suffers a simultaneous twofold death by drowning and by strangulation when it becomes entangled in a willow twig (Wiedenstruch) and falls in the water. The occurrence of the willow twig strongly suggests that this tale is related—not directly to the Celtic tradition, as are many of the variants of the tale—but to the Germanic accounts of the sacrifice of Vikar. In view of this evidence, it can now be assumed that the drowning motif was part of the Germanic treatment of the threefold death, and it is thus probable that this motif was originally associated with the accounts of the sacrifice of King Vikar.

An important element shared by the Irish heroic legends, the popular folktale, and the Germanic treatment of this theme is the establishment in advance of the mode of death, either by dream, by prophets, or—in the case of the Vikarsaga—by the drawing of lots and the appearance of Odin in person. In each of the traditions an attempt is made to avert the threefold death. But fate cannot be cheated, nor can the gods be deprived of their victim. Death is the one incontrollable fact of life. There is no escape, thus the three prophesied manners of death inevitably work simultaneously to deprive the victim of his life.

The evidence adduced thus far indicates that both Germanic and Celtic religion knew the three separate kinds of human sacrifice, corresponding to the three classes of divinities and to the three classes...
of society. Moreover, each tradition knew the legend of the threefold death in which all three modes of human sacrifice functioned simultaneously. One question, however, remains unanswered: What is the nature of the relationship of the theme as it occurs in the Celtic and Germanic traditions? One could assume that the Germanic version of the legend represents an intrusion from Celtic tradition. There is certainly enough evidence of prolonged and intensive contact between the two peoples to justify such an assumption. On the other hand, the relationship of the Germanic treatment of the legend with the Celtic treatment seems to be a distant one indeed. The Germanic legend, with the use of the willow twig, the reed, and with the dedication of the victim to Odin, seems to represent a distinct tradition, deeply imbedded in Germanic religion. Moreover, the motif of death by fire, an important element in many of the Celtic variants, is totally missing from the Germanic treatments of the theme. In view of this evidence, one must look for another explanation of the relationship of the two traditions.

If the relationship cannot be explained by diffusion, then the only tenable explanation that remains is the assumption of a common ancestor to both traditions. Since it has been established that the narrative tradition is based on sacrificial practices, and since it has been shown that these practices reflect the Indo-European tripartite ideology as postulated by Georges Dumezil, I suggest that this common ancestor lies in the religion of the Indo-Europeans.

Outside the Indo-European sphere there is an interesting and peculiar appearance of the trifunctional sacrifice in the Finnish ballad "Matalleena." In the following passage Christ exposes the sins of Magdalen with these words:

Kussas kolme poikalastas?
Yhden tuiskasit tulehen,
kolmannen kairoit karkeessen.
Sen kuin tuiskasit tulehen,
slit'ois Ruoösria ritarit;
slit'ois herri talli maalla;
slit'ois pappi paras tullut.

Where are your three sons?
The first you burned in fire,
The second you drowned in water,
The third you buried in the earth.
The one you burned in fire
Could have been a knight in Sweden;
The one you drowned in water
Could have been a burgher in this country;
The one you buried in the earth
Could have been a good priest.

In this passage the three social classes of priest, knight, and burgher are represented, and correspondingly three distinct means of killing: burial, burning, and drowning respectively. Burial, in this instance, seems to have supplanted hanging.

How did this motif find its way into the popular tradition of a non-Indo-European people? As D. J. Ward indicated above, the folk-tale version of the "threefold death" spread by diffusion and is attested in Estonia, yet not in this type of ballad. The southern European variants of the ballad do not have this motif, but rather closely

1 For the entire Finnish text see Elsa Haavio, Ritvalan Helkajuhla (Helsinki, 1953), pp. 180-181.
follow the narrative as it is preserved in a thirteenth-century Latin manuscript of Jacobus a Voragine. Julius Krohn believed that the ballad spread from southern Europe northward into Germany and Scandinavia. "Magdalen," as Krohn also points out, has not survived in Germany; yet, there is a fragmentary text from Lausitz which he quotes. Below is a free translation of the text:

A beautiful maiden, Aria, goes on Sunday to fetch water. An old man comes who requests a drink from her. "The water is not clean; there is dust and dirt in it." "The water is certainly clean, but you are impure." "Prove it." "Go to church with a wreath on your head." Before her departure it withers. In the churchyard nine headless boys surround her. "Mother, why do you still go with the wreath on your head?" "Please forgive my crime!" "We surely could, but not God." She goes to church to receive holy water, gets down on her knees before the altar and makes the sign of the cross, but at that instant sinks into the earth.

The death of the children and their illegitimacy are merely alluded to respectively by the mention of the nine headless children and the withering of the wreath, which indicates that Aria is no longer a virgin. The significance of this text is that it combines two different ballads, "Magdalen" and "The Cruel Mother," and suggests that the inclusion of the motif from "The Cruel Mother" first occurred in Germanic tradition before spreading to the Scandinavian countries and the British Isles. In Germany there are many variations of "The Cruel Mother" and many titles for the narrative which differ in finer details but which conform in the overall narrative pattern. Among the more popular names by which the ballad is known are: "Holländisches Recht," "Die Rattenmutter," and "Die Kindsmörderin." A passage quoted from Das Knaben Wunderhorn suffices to illustrate the handling of the motif in the German ballad.

Trägt du ein Kränzlein rosenroth, 
Du hast ja schon drei Kinder todt. 
Das erste hast in Wasser getragen. 
Das dritt in hohlen Baum gesteckt 
Das erste hast in Wasser getragen. 
Und mit Eichenen Ruhlden zugedeckt.

Almost unanimously Finnish folklore scholars have concluded that the Finns borrowed "Magdalen" from Sweden; in the Swedish variants, however, the children are thrown into a lake, a river, or the sea, thus representing only the sacrificial ritual of the third estate. In addition to this aspect, the Swedish ballads do not mention the place of the sons in the social structure. Because these two items are lacking in Swedish ballads, it is possible that the Finns borrowed directly from the Germans. Conceivably this borrowing could have occurred sometime between the twelfth and sixteenth centuries, since the Hansictec League brought Germans into direct contact with the Finns. In Gotland, at Visby, the League founded a center of commerce. Many vessels sailed from Visby to Turku in quest of fish and furs, the merchants often spending their winters in Finland waiting for the spring market.

Lines similar to those in the Finnish "Magdalen" also occur in the Finnish lyrical song, "Leino Leski" ("The Pitiable Widow"). In this song a widow has been told to leave her castle because of an ensuing battle. The widow, however, defies the advice proudly announcing that she is not to be pitied and that she is not without means since she has three sons to protect her:

One is a bishop in Turku, 
The second a knight in Sweden, 
The third a burgher in this country. 

It happened that death heard this, 
Standing below the wall 
Already the bishop from Turku was killed, 
The knight from Sweden was killed, 
And the burgher from this country.

Both the ballad and the song are isolated examples of the triadic social class structure in Finnish tradition. The ballad has been preserved in western Finland only in Rivala in the province of Häme where it was traditionally sung in the Helka (Whitsun) festival until the nineteenth century. "Leino Leski" was sung mainly in Ingria and the Karelian Isthmus but has never been collected in western Finland. There is, for the time being, no reason for asserting that the Indo-European social structure was wholly or even partially paralleled by the early Finns. Further investigations may uncover more examples
in support of such an assumption. For the present, however, one may only suggest that, after the ballad was transmitted to Finland, the Finns conserved the motif combining the Indo-European triadic social structure with the tradition of the trifunctional human sacrifice. Social patterns introduced by Swedish rule may well have afforded secondary reinforcement of its practical relevance.

The search for Indo-European elements in ancient Slavic and Baltic paganism presents the investigator with a formidable challenge. On the one hand, the data are meager and of comparatively recent date, while on the other hand, what data we do possess are contained for the most part in Christian documents, and are thus distorted by the hostile attitudes of the authors toward the very paganism that they were trying to suppress. Furthermore, since no myths have survived qua myth, we are destined to be limited to euhemerization of older Indo-European beliefs. Aside from individual items of an Indo-European character which poke through the surface of the sea of Christianization like partly submerged mountain peaks, there are few legends that, as systems, present a consistent tripartite Weltanschauung. Thus, the investigator

\[ \text{quaesitique diu terris, ubi sistere possit,} \]
\[ \text{in mare lasalis volucris vaga decedit alis.} \]

Recently Georges Dumézil recorded his own findings and incorporated those of A. Yoshida and others who have been working with euhemerized myth in the Slavic area. They have usually dealt with the byliny, some of which are quite late ("la plus ancienne peut-être du XIVe siècle"). These workers have primarily bypassed the older

1 Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 1.307–308.
southern and eastern Europe). For the north Slavic version of this tale see Gojko Ruziric and Roman Jakobson, “The Serbian Zmaj Ognjeni Vuk analyzed from an Indo-European tripartite point of view by Dumezil and Grunau’s "Protoslav Epos," *Alphô* 10:343-355 (Brussels, 1950).

The Russian Primary Chronicle. The Russian Primary Chronicle: Sources (eleventh and twelfth centuries), such as The Russian Primary Chronicle. Recently V. N. Toporov investigated the gods as they are enumerated in this chronicle, in the Igor’ Tale, and various other works. He has concerned himself directly with the ancient Slavic pantheon, and not with euhemerization. Toporov has postulated the following order:  

First function: Stribogu = Varuna-Mitra  
Second function: Perunu = Indra  
Third function: Volos = Nasatya

Although Perun and Volos are well placed in their respective functions, Stribog is relegated to the first function primarily on the strength of a doubtful etymology: Sti-ro-bogu < *patri-bhagos. Then Stribog would be parallel to *pârtha, Zêo, Êgê, Jupiter, IE *pôsRR dîtus. The main objection here is that regardless of whether or not the etymology is correct, little is really known of Stribog, except his name. There are no myths or legends that explain his function in the system.

The Slavic pantheon is further complicated by the addition of Iranian elements: the god Xfshx, and possibly Simargl, which may be a copyist’s error for “Sian, a household spirit, and Rig, a spirit of the harvest.” It is even plausible that the Slavic pantheon is an artificial organization of gods drawn from native Slavic sources and scholarly borrowing from Persia. Vladimir may have had a strong reaction to the encroachment of Christianity, and therefore tried to establish a standardized state religion. At any rate, so little is known about the ancient Slavic gods that the researcher must rely heavily upon euhemerization.

There is, however, one piece of tertia forma which does directly concern the gods themselves, and this is a surprisingly clear example of tripartite ordering. In Grunau’s *Preussische Chronik* of the sixteenth century, there is a description of a tapestry (bannír) that portrays three heads, two on the top and one on the bottom, looking up at the

and Marc Steffel, "The Vsevol Epos," in *Russian Epic Studies*, Memoirs of the American Folklore Society 41 (1947), where they discuss the intrusion of the folk-tale of Volya Vsevolde (into The Russian Primary Chronicle. This legend appears as the biography of Prince Vsevol of Polock (1044–1100). The hero has been analyzed from an Indo-European tripartite point of view by Dunstzil and Yudjala (see Dunstzil, op. cit., pp. 624-628). For the south Slavic version of this tale see Gojko Ruziric and Roman Jakobson, “The Serbian Zmaj Ognjeni Vuk and the Russian Vsevol Epos,” *Aphô* 10:343-355 (Brussels, 1950).


others. Perkunas, depicted with an angry mien, and Potrimpo, portrayed as a young, beardless man with ears of corn around his head and a happy expression. Perkuna is a well-known counterpart of Thor and Perun. Potrimpo can be none other than the third-function god on a par with Freyr. His name is far less transparent. Since he is the god of water, rivers, and streams, attempts have been made to divide his name into po, “under,” and *trimpa, “water” (the closest word actually attested in Old Prussian is *trumpa, “river”). A search into Nestor’s *Russian Primary Chronicle* for euhemerized Indo-European myth is rewarding. Nestor sets forth the legendary history of the Kievan state: its earliest beginnings, the reigns and personalities of its first rulers. The question of the historicity of the early kings of Kiev is far from settled. The earliest king, Rurik, is the most hazy, and this haze lifts as the chronicle approaches the time of St. Vladimir. Much of the early history contains a great deal of popular legend, and the chronology of succession is riddled with numerous impossibilities. For example, it is unlikely that Igor’ could be Rurik’s son because Igor’ is said to have married Olga in 909, although his own son, Svjatoslav, was not born until 942. More important, the second attack of Oleg on Constantinople is another report that is completely unsubstantiated by Byzantine documents. The chronicle hopelessly confuses the dates of Olga’s journey to Byzantium as well as the date of her baptism. At any rate, even if all those rulers are historical, real figures, very little is known of them, and it is obvious that much oral tradition has been draped around

these early personages. The exact characterizations of their personalities with exemplifying stories, and their order of succession, are manipulated in such a way as to suggest a euhemerization of some underlying myth. It may also represent an unconscious ordering of fact and tradition "en accord avec le système triparti." Finally, considering the long discourses on folk beliefs, portents, apocrypha, and hagiographic miracle lore—all presented as indisputable fact—it should not be surprising to discover such discrepancies.

The legend of the establishment of the Kievan state begins essentially with an entry under the years 860-862 in the Nestor Chronicle. It was at this time that the disunited Slavic tribes, suffering from internecine conflicts, requested the overlordship of the Varangians in a last-ditch effort to achieve stability: "Our land is rich, but there is no order in it; come and rule and have dominion over us."

The important part of the entry for these years is the designation of Rurik as a ruler of Novgorod and the succession of Oleg upon the other's death. It is not entirely farfetched to assume that Rurik and Oleg were corulers of Novgorod, as seems to have been a widespread custom among the Scandinavians of that time (cf. Chadwick, p. 59). If this were the case, then plausibly Rurik and Oleg could be candidates for the same position occupied by Romulus and Remus when they were the early cosovereigns of Rome.

There are other similarities in the two histories. First, Romulus violently wrests control from Remus such violence is not surprising considering the former's Varunaic nature. Although Rurik dies peacefully, Oleg, the Varuna figure, does assume sole rulership. Second, Romulus becomes a syncretized personality since the Rames (< Remus), a tribe devoted to religious and administrative authority, is said to have been founded by the victorious twin. Parallel to this is the syncretism of many Mitraic traits in the personality of Oleg.

By way of contrast, nowhere does the chronicler suggest any change in the basic nature of these two rulers; they were always sovereigns. Whereas, both in Roman tradition and in the Hadingus story, there is a metamorphosis from third- to first-function characteristics of these rulers. So little is known about Rurik, however, that assumptions about his personality are extremely difficult.

7 Cross and Sherbowitz-Wetzor, op. cit., p. 59. Incidentally, this "calling of the princes" has been rejected by most modern scholars on the basis of archaeology and Greek and Oriental records. Apparently the Scandinavians had entrenched themselves in northern Russia before the ninth century, and then proceeded south as traders and warriors. For full argument, see pp. 255-256 and 249-253 n. 20.


Nevertheless, what can be reasonably assumed is that Oleg and Rurik were cosovereigns of Novgorod, and that the Varuna figure became the sole ruler upon the death of his partner.

There are a number of aspects to the legends concerning Oleg that suggest a Varunaic character. First, there is his singular method of winning battles. Under the years 880-882, Nestor reports that Oleg traveled to Kiev, which at that time was held by Askold and Dir; two Norsemen who were not of Rurik's clan but had captured the city. Oleg was of Rurik's clan and was the regent for Igor, Rurik's son. Because of his kinship to Rurik, Oleg considered himself to be the rightful ruler. Nestor goes on to relate (Cross and Sherbowitz-Wetzor, op. cit., p. 61):

He [Oleg] then came to the hills of Kiev, and saw how Askold and Dir reigned there. He hid his warriors in the boats, left some others behind, and went forward himself bearing the child Igor...he sent messengers to Askold and Dir, representing himself as a stranger on his way to Greece on an errand for Oleg and for Igor, the prince's son, and requesting that they should come forth to greet him as members of their race. Askold and Dir straightway came forth. Then all the soldiery jumped out of the boats, and Oleg said to Askold and Dir, "You are neither princes nor even of princely birth." "Igor" was then brought forward, and Oleg announced he was the son of Rurik. They killed Askold and Dir.

In this story there is no long siege, no attempt at integrity, and little bloodshed. But there is a trick and a lie. Also, Oleg emphasizes his own princeliness, his sovereignty, his "race." Oleg calls himself "a stranger," and there is that irony of his lie because he says he is on a mission for "Oleg and Igor." All these elements point clearly to similar features of Varuna and Odin. Just as Odin manipulates warriors, but never enters the actual killing himself, here Oleg merely asserts his authority over Kiev, brushing aside its rulers who seem to stand dumbfounded and paralyzed before his authority. Oleg merely articulates his authority, and without further complications or resistance the city is his. The trick, the lie (especially with ironic overtones) are reminiscent of Odin's treachery. As does Oleg, Odin frequently appears in the guise of a stranger, and "stranger" is one of his epithets. Finally, the very name Oleg is derived from the Old Norse Helgi, "holy," borne by the Odin-related hero Helgi Hundingsbani.

There are other similar accounts of his nonparticipant manner of fighting and his emphasis on extension of authority rather than warfare. In 885 (ibid., p. 61), "Oleg commanded his warriors to make wheels which they attached to the ships, and when the wind was favorable, they spread the sails and bore down upon the city from
the open country. When the Greeks beheld this, they were afraid, and sending messengers to Oleg, they implored him not to destroy the city and offered to submit to such tribute as he should desire.” Again the actual victory is won more by fear and by ingenuity than by brute force (as the device of the wheeled ships points out). Unlike other rulers of Kiev described later in the chronicle, there is no mention of Oleg as an actual warrior. Instead, he seems to be more of a director than a participant. Another factor brought out by this story is the blind fury of Oleg and his men which was unleashed on the Greek captives. This trait again recalls Odin (whose name means “fury” and is glossed by Saxo as “furor”). In this same passage, the victorious Oleg, upon his return to Kiev, is called “the Sage” by the people, “for they were but pagans and therefore ignorant.” The word used for “sage” is vēdij, from the same root as vēde, Indo-European *woyd-, “to know,” but in a supernatural sense. This same adjective is used to describe the magician Boian in the Igor’ Tale. The best translation is “seer,” “wizard.”

The final episode that further demonstrates Oleg’s magical nature is the story of his death. He consulted magicians in order to find out how he would die. They foretold that death would come from his horse. He prudently ordered his horse to be taken care of, but never to be brought into his presence. Word came to him years later that his horse had died. He then scoffed at the magician’s prophecy and went to inspect the dead horse’s bones. “He laughed and remarked, ‘so I was supposed to receive my death from this skull? [a peculiar thing to say, since the skull was never mentioned in the original prophecy], and he stamped upon the skull with his foot. But a serpent crawled forth from it and bit him on the foot, so that he sickened, and died” (Cross and Sherbowitz-Wetzor, op. cit., p. 69).

His death involves a healthy respect for magic and befits a magical sovereign quite well, just as Romulus suffered a magical death or (better) disappearance (Livy, op. cit., p. 35).

As mentioned above, Oleg shows Mitraic characteristics, which may represent his syncretism with Rurik (if the latter ever had such traits), in much the same way as Romulus and the Rhames represent a syncretism of the magical and legal aspects of the first function. After his alleged attack and victory over Byzantium, Oleg concluded a peace treaty that is quite striking in its content when contrasted with the treaties drawn up by his successors. While their treaties tend to be mere nonaggression pacts (completely temporary, until more
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His treaty with the Greeks is a simple document which ends (ibid., p. 78): "May they [the transgressors of the treaty] not be protected by their own shields, but may they be slain by their own swords, laid low by their own arrows or by any of their own weapons, and may they be in bondage forever." These threats and curses stand out against the more sophisticated Greek stipulations which echo many points of Oleg's treaty.

After concluding this agreement, Igor' lived in peace until "autumn came, [when] he thought of the Derevlians, and wished to collect from them a still larger tribute" (ibid., p. 78).

In 945 he sought that extra tribute and "collected it by violence. . ." He returned home loaded with booty, but halfway he had second thoughts; "being desirous of still greater booty, he returned on his tracks with a few of his followers."

Prince Mal of the Derevlians heard of his return for more tribute. They described Igor' as a "wolf come among sheep" who "will take away the whole flock one by one, unless he is killed." They slew Igor' since he had but a small retinue with him.

At this point, Nestor inserts the legend of Olga, Igor's wife, and her threefold revenge for his murder. This is discussed below, but now it is important only to note that an additional tale whose motif is revenge follows the biography of a prince devoted to savage warfare, torture, ravaging for its own sake, revenge, and the exacting of tribute. On account of these characteristics of the Igor' legend, it is best to see him as a Bhima-Vayu personality.

The tone of the reports changes radically with the years 956-964, when Svjatoslav became prince of Kiev. Although his career is extremely warlike, Svjatoslav is described as having a "valiant army," and, "stepping as light as a leopard, he undertook many campaigns." Typical of Nestor's new vocabulary is (year 965): "He sallied forth from them a still larger tribute" (ibid., p. 76): "Upon a horse-blanket under him, and set his saddle upon his head: and all his retinue did likewise." He does not employ the sneak attack, but sends messengers, announcing his intention to fight. His bravery is well attested (971, after a Bulgarian victory): "But Svjatoslav cried to solildary, 'Here is where we fall! Let us fight bravely, brothers and companions!'" (ibid., p. 87). And once when outnumbered by Greeks...
ministration, and other practicalities, although Rome is said to have prospered during his reign. In Slavic tradition there is no other candidate, since the next king is the historically attested Vladimir who is legendarlyy very complex. Perhaps the legends of Jaropolk were overshadowed by those of Vladimir. In the chronicle, Jaropolk seems to be a stepping-stone for Vladimir’s rise to power. At any rate, the case for Jaropolk as a third-function figure is inconclusive.10

In conclusion, the legends of the Nestor Chronicle surrounding the first four kings in the founding of the Kievan state were viewed as a continuation of Indo-European tripartite myth (such as is found in the legends of the early Roman kings), or a tripartite ordering of ancient Slavic lore. The shadowy Rurik had a coruler, Oleg, who displays mostly Varunaic features combined with Mitrasic, legalistic

10 The Jar ‘ in Jaropolk’s name would seem to indicate ‘freemarvilous’ but with sexual overtones: German ‘Brunst’ (cf. Varuna, ‘strong, fiery, lively’, most often used with reference to wine, but sometimes also to drugs; Old Russian ‘prince, warrior’ (Yngvarr < Yngvi is quoted by J. de Vries as a poetical word for ‘warrior’ and ‘law, right’), meaning ‘those who follow the law of Freyr, the people of the cult of Ing.’ On the other hand, Ing. may be a cognate of Greek ‘peace’, ‘spear’; since both occur in such compound names as Ingimars (< ‘Ingimari’ and ‘Ingimiro’), ‘great with the spear, fighting with the spear’ (cf. Gaulish Seg-marus, Old Church Slavic Vladimir, and so on). Although Igor’s personality and warrior function are clear, unfortunately the same cannot be said of the origin and meaning of his name. 

Svjatoslav’s ‘ svjatoslav’, Old Church Slavic svjetbl, ‘‘bright’’ (cf. Avestan spvnta-, Lithuanian svelnite), Svetoslaw would perhaps be best translated as ‘strong, supernaturally powerful.’ (For a detailed summary of the arguments and for a complete list of Baltic, Slavic, and Iranian cognates, see H. W. Bailey, “Iranian Studies III,” BSOS 7:275-298 [1934]). Since this word is used most often for divine beings who are good and beneficial to mankind, the Slavic meaning ‘bright, holy’ is a natural development from an earlier epithet meaning ‘strong, supernaturally powerful.’ Perhaps this conception of ‘strong’ (of good beings) has found its way to the Arjuna figure here, because he represents the “diverise,” “socially acceptable,” “warrior as opposed to Igor”, the sheer embodiment of uncontrolled destruction.

I would be inclined to think that the fact of the different linguistic sources of these names (Old Norse and Slavic) does not invalidate the proposal of the tripartite ordering, yet only within a mythological system. Just as the third-function figures may be called the Alvins in one area and the Adravrevns in another, so even within a mixed language area the semantic slots may be filled with words from different linguistic traditions.

---

features. Igor’ appears as a Bhima-Vayu figure, and Svjatoslav as an obvious Arjuna-Indra figure. Jaropolk has some third-function characteristics, but the evidence is insufficient for any definite conclusion.

There is yet another episode in the Nestor Chronicle in which further Indo-European elements can be seen. This is the story of Olga’s triple revenge on the Derevlians for the murder of her husband, Igor’. As was seen above, Igor’ was slain by the Derevlians. His widow was then approached by the Derevlian Prince Mal who asked for her hand in marriage, since he wished “to obtain possession of Svjatoslav, and work [his] will upon him.” Mal sent his “best men, twenty in number” as envoys (ibid., p. 78). Olga welcomed them, stated her willingness to marry Prince Mal, but added that she wished to honor the envoys the next day before her people. She bade them to refuse to go by horse or on foot, but to insist on being drawn through the city in their boat. That night she had a deep trench dug near the castle. After the envoys had been drawn to the castle and were “puffed up with pride,” their boat was thrown into the ditch and they were buried alive. This completed the first phase of her revenge.

Next she sent a message to the Derevlians, saying that “if they really required her presence, they should send their distinguished men, so that she might go to their prince with due honor, for otherwise her people in Kiev would not let her go.” The Derevlians accordingly “gathered together the best men who governed the land of Dereva, and went to her.” Upon their arrival, Olga had a bath prepared for them, they were locked in the bathhouse, which was then set afire, “so that the Derevlians were all burned to death.”

For her final act of revenge, she told the Derevlians that she was on her way and to “prepare great quantities of meat in the city . . . that I may hold a funeral feast for him [Igor’]. . . When the Derevlians were drunk, she bade her followers fall upon them. . . So they cut down 5,000 of them . . .” Although Olga went on to further revenge by besieging their city the following year (946), this is another story, which is to be kept separate from the legend of her three-leveled scheme to go among the Derevlians under the pretense of a marriage proposal.

This legend shows that Olga brought revenge upon all three social classes: warriors, rulers, common people, in that order. “Best men” seems to refer to warriors in the first phase of her revenge because, first, they were not used to being treated as rulers, since they were “puffed up with pride” when shown honor. Second, they are specified as twenty handpicked men, not the distinguished men “who governed the land of Dereva.” Her last victims are the people at large, the
This tripartite social scheme is rather straightforward, but the methods of killing the representative members of each social group present problems from an Indo-European point of view. Live burial is usually taken as appropriate to the third function, while death by fire and by the sword belong to the second function. The live burial is exceptional in that it involves the ship. Since there is a strong Scandinavian influence on the ruling house of Kiev, perhaps here there is a reference to "ship burials in stone barrows on the edge of the sea described in Norse sagas. In such stories it is sometimes said that a man builds for himself a barrow during his lifetime, and that he enters it while he is still alive with his ship's crew. Frequently in these sagas, we read of the Norse heroes breaking into such barrows, and finding a ship fully manned with a crew richly dressed and laden with treasure, seated, like the Derevlians, on the cross benches" (Chadwick, op. cit., p. 29). Thus, more likely, this episode is connected with the Scandinavian theme of ship burial, and not with an appropriate form of execution with respect to Indo-European ideology.

The second execution is by burning, a death that befits the second function, not the first function as here. One can only suggest that since the first function seems to have taken over second-function characteristics in the Slavic world (stress on warrior activity, lack of firmly entrenched priestly class), perhaps it has also taken on the form of second-function execution. Considering the general discontinuity, however, it seems better not to view the executions as consistent with an Indo-European outlook.

The last massacre involves the common people. From the fact that it occurs at a feast and involves their drunkenness, a good third-function method of killing would be expected. The story states explicitly, however, that the means of death was the sword.

In conclusion, Olga's revenge is truly tripartite since she extends her killings to all three social classes. But the same cannot be said of her methods of execution for each class.

Another tripartite death may appear in The Chronicle of Henry of Livonia (Leonid Arbusow and Albert Bauer, Heinrici Chronicon Livoniae [Hannover, 1955]). Bishop Berthold, while consecrating the cemetery at Holm, is the object of a planned murder by the pagans: (p. 9) "alii in ecclesia concremare, alii occidere, alii submergere congruitabant..." There are, however, difficulties. Although the third-function death (by drowning) and the second-function death (by fire and sword) are represented, there is no first-function death. Here, since a priest is the potential victim, one would especially anticipate mention of hanging or falling. Nevertheless, it is suspicious that his Livonian parishioners thought of killing him in three ways—two of which, drowning and burning, seem to entail extra effort, since it would have been an easy matter to "cut him down" (occidere).

Aspects of Equine Functionality

JAAN PUHVEL, University of California, Los Angeles

From early Europe, the Near East, and Western Asia we possess an immense amount of archaeological, antiquarian, ethnographic, mythological, and folkloristic material concerning the horse. In the face of this welter of data, Indo-Europeanists concerned with mythic and religious matter must apply severe methodical selectivity in order to winnow structurally significant information from the mass of raw material. It is hence my purpose in this paper to pursue the role of the horse as an integral component of such Indo-European mythic and religious structures as are congruent with a tripartite concept of social and religious organization, and to eschew the pitfalls of universal or diffusional accuracies.

Not much has been accomplished so far on the specific subject that interests us. Collections of antiquarian lore, ethnographic treatises, and paleological investigations are not primarily concerned with Indo-European protocivilization in its mythic and religious aspects. The only viable starting point in past research is a kind of triptych depicting Indo-European horse sacrifice, the centerpiece of which is the well-documented and much-studied Ancient Indic āśvamedha ritual. One side panel is composed of the Roman October Equus as interpreted by Georges Dunézil, the other by Celtic analogues first adduced by Franz Rolf Schröder. A critical study of these compositions is needed as a basis for further forays. All other stray informations1 are as J. von Negelein, Das Pferd in arischen Altertum (Königsberg, 1909).


2 Of the type of F. Hanfar, Das Pferd in prähistorischer und früher historischer Zeit, ibid., 11 (1955).
tion concerning horse sacrifice among Indo-Europeans must take a
back seat until this is accomplished.

The asvamedha is exceedingly well endowed with descriptive and
exoteric matter. Apart from such Rig-Vedic hymns as 1.162 and 1.163,
Paul-Emile Dumont treated the relevant White Yajur-Vedic (Vājasaneyi
Sāghita, Sātapatha Brāhmaṇa, Kātyāyana Srautasūtra) texts in his book
L’Asvamedha (Paris, 1947), adding material from three
Black Yajur-Vedic Srautasūtras (Apastamba, Baudhāyana, Vādlihā)
and from Mahābhārata, Book 14 (Āśvamedhikaparvan), and later
performed the same service for the Black Yajur-Vedic variants of the
Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa.4 Further editorial work was done by Shrikrishna
Bhāuve.5 Any number of more general works6 afford a summary
description.

The asvamedha is a ritualistic production with a cast of thousands,
incorporating many adjunct rites and representing in a sense the
sum of Ancient Indic sacrificial pageantry. Trying to strip away
excrescences, the central proceedings may be summarized as follows:

The start of the rite was made in the spring, with the king as
patron and the four main priests (adhvaryu, hotar, udgītar, and
brahman) as officiators. During the preliminary celebrations the king
had to spend the night chastely with his favorite wife by the gār-
hapatiya or domestic fire. A prize stallion was selected as the prospec-
tive victim and subjected to a number of ceremonies, including
sprinkling in a pool, at which time a dog was killed and thrown under
it. The stallion was then set free to roam, accompanied by a hundred
gelded or aged horses and four hundred young men of different
castes who were to guide it toward the northeast and keep it from
contact with mares and from further immersion in water. This
roaming took a whole year, and in the meantime a number of pre-
paratory rituals took place at home. Toward the end of the year a
huge fire-altar was erected, and the king underwent a seven- or twelve-
day initiation (dikṣa) involving fasting and other observances. During
this time the entire stage was prepared, including a new hearth for
the gārahपatiya fire and the procurement and installation of the
 soma-supply. The main ritual took three days. On the principal,
second day of sacrifice the king drove in a war chariot drawn by the
sacrificial stallion and three other horses. The victim was anointed

5 Die Yajus des Asvamedha (Stuttgart, 1930).
6 Recently, for example, J. Gonda, Die Religionen Indiens, I (Stuttgart, 1968),
166-175; J. Campbell, The Masks of God: Oriental Mythology (New York, 1961),
pp. 199-207.

by the three foremost wives of the king, and its mane and tail were
fitted with 101 pearls. The sacrifice took place at twenty-one stakes,
the three principal victims being the stallion, a hornless ram, and a
he-goat. Altogether 660 or 600 victims were prescribed (according to
Taittirīya and Vājasaneyi sources, respectively), but the wild beasts
among them were released rather than killed. The stallion was
smothered to death, whereupon the mahāśi or chief queen symbolically
cohabited with it under covers, while the entourage engaged in
obscene banter. Then followed the cutting up of the victim, disposal
of the parts, further blood sacrifices, ablations, and disbursement of
prostitutes and honoraria.

In the Sātapatha Brāhmaṇa and in several Srautasūtras the asva-
medha description is accompanied by what in most respects amounts
to a summary replication of its ritual in the form of human sacrifice.
This purusamedha involved the procuring of a brāhmaṇa or kṣatriya
victim by purchase from his family for a thousand cows and a hun-
dred horses. After initial rites he was set free for a year and humored
in everything except sexual indulgence. The ritual itself took five
days, versus three for the asvamedha. The victim was adorned and
throttled on the second day much like the horse, together with a
hornless ram and a he-goat. The liturgy was taken mostly from the
Puruṣasūkta and the funeral hymns of the tenth mandala of the Rig-
Veda. The queen had intercourse with the dying or dead victim.
Rather than a menagerie of animals, an accompanying human massa-
cre was prescribed, which in some sources reached 165 persons of all
social strata.

What was the relationship of these two rituals? Oldenberg and
others saw in the purusamedha a figmental replication of the asva-
medha, thus disclaiming its historical reality. It is evident that to the
Brāhmanic and Śiṣṭic compilers the purusamedha was a somewhat
unreal appendage to the horse sacrifice, almost a theoretical after-
thought. In epic and classical literature there is no instance of its
performance, except for the preposterous statement in Mahābhārata
1.1773 that Ayuṣayīn performed ten thousand purusamedha's. The
Pāli Canon repeatedly rejects both asvamedha and purusamedha,
but this occurs in a blanket condemnation of all bloody sacrifices.

The historical purusamedha was thus at best obsolete, at worst un-
real. Willibald Kiefel, in his article in the Walther Schubring dedi-
cation volume,7 has made a case for the historicity of the purusa-
medha as a one-time practical means of actually begetting a royal
heir when for some reason the king was unable to do so. Kirfel brings medical evidence for reflex-conditioned tumescence and emission in victims of hanging and decapitation and assumes a similar set of circumstances in the cohabitation of the mahijī and the purusā. Thus the *asvamedha* would appear to be rather a substitute sacrifice for the *purusamedha*, with the symbolic element prevailing. Yet matters are not so simple, nor does Kirfel assume them to be. In the classical *asvamedha*, the king is triumphant in charge, as dedicant to Prajāpati, the Lord of Creation, and the whole performance is guaranteed to make him victorious, sinless, happy, and glorious, as in Yudhiṣṭhira's great ritual in *Mahābhārata* 14. The cohabitation part, with the queen in the star role, is somehow extraneous to the central concept, although occasionally childlessness propels the sacrifice, as with King Daśaratha in *Rāmāyaṇa* 1. Kirfel assumes that the horse ritual of the invading Indo-Aryans fused on Indic soil with an agricultural fertility rite involving human sacrifice. The horse supplanted the human victim in the resulting conflation, yet the traits of the Pre-Aryan horse sacrifice and Pre-Aryan human sacrifice were conflated in such a way that the result was predominantly horse oriented in form but wholly Pre-Aryan in sacrificial and sexual substance. In short, I admit that there were transformations in the Indic horse sacrifice away from an Indo-European prototype, but not that the latter necessarily excluded connections with human sacrifice or sexual practice.

Let us turn now to one of the side panels of the previously mentioned triptych. That the Roman *October Equus* is a reflection of an Indo-European ritual of horse sacrifice has long been assumed, but Dumézil has made the comparison with India more plausible and precise. As pieced together from Polybius, Plutarch, Festus, and Paulus Diaconus, the Roman ritual may be summarized as follows: After a horse race on the Campus Martius on the Ides of October, the right-side horse of the victorious chariot was immolated to Mars with a spear. The people of Suburra and of the Sacra Via fought over the head of the horse; if the former caught it, they fixed it on the wall of the Turris Mamillia; if the latter, on that of the Regia. The tail was carried speedily to the Regia, and drops of blood from the tail were sprinkled on its hearth.

There are important differences from the *asvamedha*, notably the manner of killing and the absence of the erotic element. But there are also broad similarities, for example, the dedication to Mars in Rome and the clear anteriority of Indra to Prajāpati as the one-time recipient of the *asvamedha* (see e.g., Koppers, op. cit., p. 357), and further the patronage of the *kṣatra-vijñā* in India and the role of the Regia in Rome. There are further specific accordances of the curious type that tends to exclude chance, such as the designation of the *equus bigarum victriculum dextorium* in Rome and the *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa* injunction (13.5.2.1) that the *asvamedha* victim must “excel on the right part of the yoke,” or the role of the horse’s tail in both rituals.

A similar singularity has been pointed out by Dumézil in “Quaestio nula Indo-Italic 17,”18 Dio Cassius 45.24.2-4) describes how, as a result of a mutiny of troops in Rome in 46 B.C., Caesar had one ringleader summarily executed, whereupon two others were ritually killed on the Campus Martius by the pontiffs and the Flamen Martialis, and their heads deposited in the Regia. In these proceedings it seems that Caesar, in preparation for assuming royal power, was receiving an obsolescent ritual of human sacrifice which was a replica of the *October Equus*. It places the relationship of *asvamedha* and *purusamedha* in a truer light, to the extent of indicating that in an Indo-European warrior-class horse sacrifice the substitution of a human victim for the horse was possible. Thus the horse sacrifice was not a tuning down of the human sacrifice; rather the human victim represented an upgrading of the rite, a Potenzierung, as Albrecht Weber long ago described the *purusamedha* in his article “Über Menschenopfer bei den Indern der vedischen Zeit.”19

Now for the other side panel. It is best subsumed in the words of the outraged Geraldus Cambrensis in his *Topographia Hibernica* (ca. a.d. 1185), which Schröder first collocated with the *asvamedha*:20

There is in a northern and remote part of Ulster, among the Kenelcunii, a certain tribe which is wont to install a king over itself by an excessively savage and abominable ritual. In the presence of all the people of this

---

10 REL 41:7-86 (1966).
11 ZDMG 18:39 (1864).
12 Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie 16:310-312 (1897).

---

land in one place, a white mare is brought into their midst. Thereupon he who is to be elevated, not to a prince but to a beast, not to a king but to an outlaw, steps forward in beauty and exhibits his bestiality. Right thereafter the mare is killed and boiled piecemeal in water, and in the same water a bath is prepared for him. He gets into the bath and eats of the flesh that is brought to him, with his people standing around and sharing it with him. He also imbues the broth in which he is bathed, not from any vessel, nor with his hand, but only with his mouth. When this is done right according to such unrighteous ritual, his rule and sovereignty are consecrated.

Here is something that was consummated in the full Middle Ages in the Celtic hinterlands on a far fringe of the Indo-European world. Its principal ties to the *aśvamedha* have often been affirmed since 1927, and I would reiterate what I wrote back in 1955,1 that the Gaulish Arvernian royal name Epomedus is synonymous with the royal name *Aśvamedha* in the *Ṛg Veda* (5.47.4-6) and is the same type of exocentric compound (the Indic *bhagavṛti* *Aśvamedha* being anterior to the descriptive *tapasṛsya* name of the ritual). I am interested to find that V. V. Ivanov and V. N. Toporov14 present this colocation as unchallenged and unreferenced fact. The ritual sacrifice of a horse may well have been a pan-Celtic Indo-European inheritance, a royal rite that was part of a consecration ceremony. In this respect it should belong with the Indic *rajjasṛṣya* rather than the *aśvamedha* proper, and there are other differences as well. The colitional element is there, but among the Celts it involves the king and a mare, versus the queen and a stallion in India. In the flush of collocation this discrepancy has been overlooked or de-emphasized, and I read with surprise: “Mit Recht bemerkt Schroder, dass es ohne Citation this discrepancy has been overlooked or de-emphasized, and 14 I think that this difference is far from inconsequential and in fact provides us with a wedge for penetrating from the ritualistic to the mythological level in dealing with Indo-European equine tradition.

There is ample reason to suspect a hierogamous mating as the mythical underpinnings of the horse sacrifice.15 The nature of this mating is clearly discernible in Celtic traditions and involves a representative of the second or warrior function with the transfunctional

---

18 See, for example, J. Grécourt, *Ogam* 6:28 (1954).
what euhemerized triple transmission. Their tales are preserved chiefly in the story of the sickness of the Ulstermen and in the *Rennes Dindshenchas*, and are conveniently summarized in several recent treatises. The first Macha was a prophetess and wife of Nemed mac Agnmain, a druidic figure connected with the word for “shrine.” The second Macha was the daughter of Aed Ruad (“The Red”), herself called Mongraf, “Red-maned.” Her father had contracted with two other kings, Díthorba and Cimbaeth, that each should reign supreme for seven years in the framework of a triumvirate. On Aed’s death Macha claimed for herself his due term of sovereignty, made her claim stick by force of arms, and ruled for seven years. She was finally killed by Rechraid Rigléig, whose name also reeks of the red color symbolism of the warrior class.

The third Macha, wife of Crunniuc mac Agnmain, was forced by King Conchobar of Ulster to a race against horses, while in the last stages of pregnancy. She won, then immediately gave birth to twins, and died uttering a curse on the Ulstermen which led to their annual *so-called childbed sickness.*

This splitting of the one Macha into three distinct personalities is symptomatic of tensions within the trifunctional system. I cannot subscribe to Dumézil’s claim that the second Macha represents the conflict of warriors with the first function; it is rather that the warriors’ relationship with the trifunctional goddess has gone sour, from hinting to hostility, as it is apt to do in Irish lore. But the cruelty of Conchobar to the third Macha, like the indignities suffered by Rhian-non, is directly relatable to the Western Indo-European mythical tensions embodied in the Norse Aesir-Vanir conflict, the Fomorian troubles in Ireland, and the Sabine War. For it is undeniable that the transfunctional goddess exerts a particular hegemony over the third function, sometimes called *super-Matrona, a sovereignty-conferring warrior-harridan and fountain of sexuality alike, whose nearest undebased parallels are the warrior goddesses Morrígú and Badh.* Her relation to the former is evident from the fact that Medb and Morrígú both figure as interchangeably active in various versions of the prelude to the *Táin,* and diverse bird symbolisms tie her closely to the ornithomorphic Badh. Her taurine fixation on the Donn of Cooley does not obliterate her horse symbolism. Thus her lover Fergus was known as Ro-ech, “Big Horse,” and the third of her four husbands (besides Conchobar of Ulster, Timne of Connacht, and Aíill of Leinster) was named Eochaid, a name also borne by the two husbands of Talltiú, the divine nurse of the god Lug who closely resembles Erīn herself. The name Eochaid may be connectible with Old Irish *ech,* “horse,” and with the epithelial string Eochu Ollathir Ruad rofessa “Horse, Allfather, Red Great Sage” that characterizes the god Dagda. I doubt that Medb’s name means simply “intoxication” or the like, and would rather interpret it as a Celtic *Medús,* uncompound feminine parallel to the Arvernan *Epomeduós,* much as Badh corresponds to the Gaulish *Cábhodub.* The linguistic history would be the following: While the Indie name *Āhu-meḍ̄-ḍ̄o,* contains either an IE *mad-dhō* or *mey-dhō* (cf. *mādāti,* “be drunk,” or *mēyas,* “strength”), a Proto-Celtic *Ekwo-medu-,* would contain IE *mēdhu,* “mead,” “ritual beverage,” hence “ritual involving drunkenness,” and the *o-* or *a-* of *Epomeduós* or the abstracted *Medus* is a *samsanta* suffix characterizing the compound as a whole. It is therefore methodically incorrect to compare *Medh* directly with Welsh *medd* as a thematic Celtic adjective *medwo-* derived from *medu.* I therefore submit that in Celtic tradition there exist traces not only of the royal sacrifice of and mating with a mare performed by kings who sometimes bore the name *Ekwomneduos,* but also of a ritual myth of the mating of the transfunctional goddess, sometimes called *(Ekwo)jemduh,* with a probably hipposomorphous second-function representative. The off-spring of such mating was a set of divine twins, typically of third-function character.

---

I am, of course, taking a calculated risk in awarding so much primacy to the Celtic material. The voice of caution would remind me that very little is known about a transfunctional goddess in the Roman, Germanic, and Indic pantheons, that the whole Aegean and Near Eastern area swarmed with goddess types that could influence the Iranian and Celtic material. The absence of the sexual element in Roman horse sacrifice is no surprise, for early Roman ritual is exceedingly nonerotic, in probable overreaction to Etruscan overindulgence. The transfunctional goddess, however, exists in Roman religion as Juno Scispes, Mater, Regina at Lanuvium, as Dumézil has pointed out. In the Germanic pantheon, the complications caused by the sharp Aesir : Vanir dichotomy and the sexual ambivalence of the Vanir have wrought transfunctional havoc. Traces of the goddess no doubt survive in the Tacitean Nerthus and the masculinized Norse Njördr, whose career combines both Vanir and Aesir periods and is euhemerized in Saxo's figure of Hadingus. In India the epic survival of the goddess in Draupadi is proof enough, and her disappearance from the pantheon is part and parcel of the trend that reduces goddesses to vague echoes of their consorts, onomatologically and otherwise. She is doubtless present in Sarasvati, and the latter's receipt of the sexual element in probable overreaction to Etruscan overindulgence. The reason is that it has been cut adrift from the cult myth that once explained its meaning. In compulsive ancient Rome this was no serious matter, for ritual petrifacts were readily perpetuated there in a vacuum. But the _asvamedha_ must have floundered, ever since at some point its prototype ceased to depict the ritual union of king and goddess, owing probably to a downgrading of the goddess. The king's role as the patron of a great horse festival persisted, the detail was elaborated and absorbed Pre-Aryan matter, not of an _asvamedha_ type, but rather the typical Near Eastern ritual union of queen or goddess and beast. The usual bull of those rituals has, however, not supplanted the horse, or there would be no _asvamedha_. The Indo-European pattern of theriomorphic hierogamy was clearly King and Mare, the Near Eastern and Aegean one Queen and Bull (e.g., _Aspects of Equine Functionality_)

---

**Notes:**

side Yam, may be merely a folkloristic foil to her brother.\textsuperscript{30} Yama himself, like the Iranian Yima Xšaeta, the son of Vivahvant, does mean 'Twin' and can be reconstructed beyond Proto-Indo-Iranian, in view of the Tacitean Germanic anthropogenic deity Tuisto, 'Twin' and Mannus. Tuisto is "termes editus." Mannus his son. A primal relationship is thus not excluded, and possibly in the proto-myth Yama-Mamu and Tuisto-Mannus were the twins born of a primal goddess. This goddess may well have been a Germanic equivalent of the Celtic earth mother Taititu, and the horse form was thus one of her manifestations. It is not impossible that a fusion and duplication of a uniform prototype involving a mating of god and polyvalent goddess in horse form, and the production of hippocorphic issue of the third estate, should be postulated. Twins tend to multiply, and thus the grouping that we see in the Saranyū myth finds its cumulative explanation. Whether the Germanic Alcis-twins of Tacitean testament should also be adduced I cannot say. In any event let us remember that the Asvins have alternative parents (Nasatya, the Alvin proper, has Sumakha, and Daśra is the son of Dyaus [Divō nāpāt]). Thus it is not so much the detail of the offspring that matters as the whole hippocorphic situation. It is noteworthy that the goddess is the one who primarily appears in horse form, in conformity with the postulated Indo-European pattern.

Much as one may in the Greek Dioscuric traditions vaguely glimpse a great deal that reminds one of the Indo-European Divine Twins, even so there is a vast amount of roughly relevant horse mythology particularly associated with Poseidon. Yet, since this presentation has as its theme functionality on an Indo-European level, and since the Greek pantheon is not so readily analyzable, detailed structuring would be gratuitous. With regard to the Saranyū myth let us merely be mindful of its curious similarities with the Arcadian tale of Demeter Erinys and her mating as a mare with Poseidon Hippos, producing a daughter Despoia and the horse Areion.\textsuperscript{31} Other variants exist, also involving Poseidon and a Bocotian Erinys bearing the horse Arcadian while Heraclès used against Kyknos, and Poseidon and Medus producing Pegasos whom Bellerophontes rode against the Chimaera.\textsuperscript{32} On the rebound from Adalbert Kühn's etymological identification of Saranyū with Ḫēwē,\textsuperscript{33} one should be very careful about V. Pissanti's fresh attempt to connect Bellerophoön with Ἱεττή.

30 Thus Lommel, op. cit., pp. 253-255.
31 See Pausanias 8.25.1-10; Apollodorus 3.6.8.
33 Zeitchrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung 1:159-170 (1879).

It is also easy to think of Ixion's union with the Hera double Nêphele ('Cloud') in connection with the Savarṣa (Parasća Chīńā, 'Shadow'), and of the birth of Kentaurs who mated with mares to produce the race of Centaurs. All this is singularly inconclusive, as is the slender Greek evidence for horse sacrifice.\textsuperscript{34} The Dioscuri have their own hippocorphic and attendant traditions which are equally difficult to evaluate. In short, Greece disappoints the comparativist.

No other branch of Indo-European affords significant answers that I know of. In the context of this study, little of structural significance can be garnered from the stray attestations of horse sacrifice or other sacrificial equine lore among the Iranians (including Scythians), Thracians (such as Spartacus' killing of his war-horse in extremis),\textsuperscript{35} Illyrians, Balts, Slavs, and Germanic peoples (e.g., the well-known manipulation of a horse phallos in the Old Norse Völ-sárite). Catalogues of such data have often been assembled (e.g., by Negelein, Koppers, and Capozza, \textit{opera cùis}) but remain repositories of ethnological curiosities rather than mythical matter.

Sometimes, however, there are tantalizing questions. For example, why does the Hittite Law Code expressly exempt from punishment bestiality with horses or mules, after sternly penalizing such practice with cattle, sheep, and pigs? The horse is not an attested sacrificial animal in Hittite religion, except perhaps at burials. Such discrimination is strange when confronted with the sweeping injunction of \textit{Leviticus} 20:15: "And if a man lie with a beast, he shall surely be put to death, and ye shall slay the beast." What is the relation of this Hittite attitude to the horse deity Pirwa? It is of uncertain gender and etymology but definitely related in name to Hittite \textit{pirwa(n)}, \textit{pirwa}, 'rock,' whether of Hattic origin (pir, 'stone') or of Indo-European provenance (Sanskrit \textit{pirv(a)n}, \textit{pîrvata}, and so on). Nothing functionally viable can be extracted from these data.

The only one who has attempted some sort of functional summary of the horse in Indo-European religion is Dumézil.\textsuperscript{36} He finds the horse heavily connected with the Varuna half of sovereignty but absent from the Mitra half. Yet "Mars" (i.e., Tiw in Germany did receive horse sacrifices (Koppers, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 286), and "Mars Thincsus" was certainly the Germanic juridical sovereign of the Mitra type. At the warrior level Dumézil finds the horse reigning

\textsuperscript{35} See F. Schachermeyr, Poseidon und die Entstehung des griechischen Gotterglaubens (Munich, 1960), passim.
supreme, with some competition from the bull, whereas the ass seems to replace the horse at the third-estate level.

I have a feeling that Dumézil has stayed too much on symbolistic ground and in this instance abstained from mythological analysis. It would be easy enough to go on collecting materials on such lines, for example, trying to distinguish functionally oracular horse, war-horse, and workhorse (or death mount, at the third-function level), and to speculate on possible color symbolism in white coursers, bay steeds, and black horses, respectively. I have chosen a divergent tack and hope that it will prove to be a horse of a different color: in brief, the basic Indo-European equine myth involves the mating of a kingship-class representative with the hippomorphous transfunctional goddess, and the creation of twin offspring belonging to the level of the third estate.

The Divine Victim: Aspects of Human Sacrifice in Viking Scandinavia and Vedic India

JAMES L. SAUVÉ, University of California, Los Angeles

1. The study of Ancient Indic and Scandinavian mythology requires a special comparativistic approach. This approach involves a typology that seeks to resolve the comparativistic problems stemming from the wide temporal and spatial separation of the historical periods and places under examination. The relative chronology of Vedic India and Viking Scandinavia permits taxonomic juxtaposition, even though the two temporal loci are separated by an absolute time gulf of about two millennia. The terms "relative" and "absolute," as employed above in their sense proper to typology, express the chronological credibility of confronting Vedic India (ca. 1000 B.C.) and Viking Scandinavia (ca. A.D. 1000) almost as though their historical situations were the same. In an absolute chronology the two periods are, strictly speaking, beyond comparison, but relatively they are yet comparable because they represent mutually analogous developmental phases. For the purposes of typologically describing and naming mythohistorical phenomena, it is permissible to regard the two ages as artificially synchronic. This synchronization is justifiable by its heuristic possibilities. Among the latter is the eventuality that features may be disclosed in a relevancy that may otherwise escape attention, and that genetically related or relatable factors can be rendered accessible to scientific scrutiny.
Information on pagan Scandinavian human sacrifice survives mainly in historical accounts by foreigners. Eddic allusions to mythological details, the saga literature, and the *Gesta Danorum* of Saxo Grammaticus. Eyewitness accounts recall the physical reality of the sacrifices and recount aspects of their execution. There exist also the poetic reflections of what are probably real emanations of a religious outlook that embraced human sacrifice. Finally, there is the more or less legendary information contained in Saxo's quasi-history. Because Germanic paganism was not merely superseded but was extirpated by Christianity, we know nothing firsthand of the pagan ritual or cult. The barbaric ritual knowledge was doubtless suppressed immediately by the missionaries and proselytes of the invading religion. Ritual "science" is the effective support of the total religion in all cases known to me, and this ritual arsenal must be disarmed as soon as possible by the overthrowers in the course of a religious conversion.

The ancient religious converts strove to destroy heathen cultic paraphernalia and idols. It is not surprising, therefore, that all authentic pagan Norse ritual knowledge was obviated.

Vedic religion was never suppressed, and throughout the Indic evolutions very ancient and archaic elements were transformed, reoriented, and variously perpetuated. Some elements were perpetuated virtually unmodified in their primitive form, although their orientation within the religious consciousness may have become displaced. These more or less archaic survivals provide valuable testimony of early practices. The authentic ritual literature, which lacks an exact counterpart in the Norse tradition, is our principal source for the comparativistic data used in this study. This early ritual literature contains actual prescriptive information for application in the priestly performance of the *purusamedha* or human sacrifice. We are fortunate that the *purusamedha* is ritually documented, because this important rite can offer abundant clues to possible interpretations of lacunae of human sacrifice in non-Indic traditions. The *purusamedha* was an even more powerful and efficacious rite than the already tremendously powerful (and expensive) *asvamedha* or horse sacrifice. The only loftier sacrifice ever named is the *sarasvamedha*, the all-sacrifice, which was doubtless largely or entirely *livescape* and was probably conceived as a hyperbolic epitome of the *asvamedha* and *purusamedha*. Extensive evidence indicates that the latter two sacrifices were historically real and performable. The epics and mythological sources provide sufficient evidence pointing to the one-time existence of human sacrifice among the Vedic Aryans.

---

The disposition of the Indic data is significantly different from that of the Scandinavian records. In ancient Scandinavia the actual practice of religious human sacrifice is historically attested beyond doubt, but no genuine Norse ritual texts survive. On the other hand, the extant Indic ritual texts detailing the *purusamedha* contain internal evidence showing that the practice of human sacrifice was already obsolete or obsolescent at the time of their composition. The Indic and Scandinavian records contrast meaningfully for the typologist.

The problem of the historical significance of human and animal sacrifice in ancient India has provoked various reactions among scholars. Whether any ground has been gained toward its resolution remains to be evaluated and demands comparativistic attention. In 1897 J. Eggeling wrote:

"With regard to the earliest phase of Vedic religion, there is no direct evidence to show that the horse-sacrifice was already at that time a recognised institution. ... Seeing, however, that animal sacrifices generally are not alluded to in the Rikasanhitas, whilst there is every reason to believe that they were commonly practised from remote antiquity, this absence of earlier positive evidence regarding the horse-sacrifice cannot be taken as proving the later origin of that institution ... there are sufficient indications to show that even human sacrifices were at one time practised among the Aryans of India, as they were among their European kinsmen."

"Today we can affirm that a horse sacrifice was indeed current in Indo-European times, and we can also be quite certain that the silence of the Rig-Veda is by no means authoritative or constraining. Eggeling's statements represent a sober and reasoned standpoint which we can now afford to amplify.

The individual dispositions of the early Indic and Scandinavian records seem incongruent. Nevertheless, symbolic coherences exist in comparable patterns, and it is these symbolic elements that I am investigating.

I have purposely left out of account the comparison of Rig-Veda 10.90, the *Purushasukta*, with the cosmogonic slaughter of the giant Ymir as told in Norse mythology, simply because it is necessary to define what was meant by the immolation of a man, and to discover the efficacy of human sacrifice for the archaic consciousness, before attempting an interpretation of those myths. Still, I am convinced that those myths can be understood only within the framework of..."
studies on Indo-European human sacrifice. Reference to the Purusa
såkta cannot be avoided, but a true comparativistic analysis must
remain in abeyance.

2. In Book 4 of Adam of Bremen’s History of the Archbishops of
Hamburg-Bremen, written in the eleventh century, there is a de-
scription of the pagan temple and some religious proceedings at
Uppala, the last stronghold of heathendom in the North. Section 27
reads as follows in its entirety (with the exception of one medieval
annotation):2

For all their gods there are appointed priests to offer sacrifices for
the people. If plague and famine threaten, a libation is poured to the idol
Thor; if war, to Wotan; if marriages are to be celebrated, to Frikko. It
is customary also to solemnize in Uppala, at nine-year intervals, a general
feast of all the princes of Sweden. From attendance at this festival no
one is exempted (a, omitted scholion). Kings and people all and singly
send their gifts to Uppala and, what is more distressing than any kind of
punishment, those who have already adopted Christianity redeem them-
sevelds through these ceremonies. The sacrifice is of this nature: of every
living thing that is male, they offer nine heads (b, scholion 141 [137]:
Feasts and sacrifices of this kind are solemnized for nine days. On each
day they offer a man along with other living beings in such a number that
in the course of the nine days they will have made offerings of seventy-
two creatures. This sacrifice takes place about the time of the vernal
equinox), with the blood of which it is customary to placate gods of this
court. The bodies they hang in the sacred grove that adjoins the temple.
Now this grove is so sacred in the eyes of the heathen that each and every
tree in it is believed divine because of the death and putrefaction of the
victims. Even dogs and horses hang there with men. A Christian seventy-
two years old told me that he had seen their bodies suspended promis-
cuously. Furthermore, the incantations customarily chanted in the ritual
of a sacrifice of this kind are manifold and unseemly; therefore it is better
to keep silence about them.

Adam’s account is laconic, but in consideration of his last statement
we must be thankful to learn anything at all of the barbaric Norse
practices. The “manifold and unseemly” incantations are precisely
the variety of ritual knowledge we would be most fortunate to possess
for linguistic and religious historical purposes, but which we would
least expect to find preserved in a land overwhelmed by Christianity.
Still, Adam’s book does contain remarkably valuable and useful in-
formation. A scholion to the section preceding the one I quoted above

2 This translation is borrowed from F. J. Tschan, Adam of Bremen: History of

makes the additional remarkable observations:3 “Near this temple
stands a very large tree with wide-spreading branches, always green
winter and summer. What kind it is nobody knows. There is also a
sprig at which pagans are accustomed to make their sacrifices, and
into it to plunge a live man. And if he is not found, the people’s wish
will be granted.” It would thus appear that drowning was also a
sacrificial technique at Uppala. Notably, this scholion reveals the
existence of a huge tree and its evident cultic elminence. This tree is
beyond doubt the terrestrial, cultic counterpart of the world-ash
Yggdrasill that figures prominently in Norse mythological literature.
The cultic tree probably presided over those others in the grisly grove
where Adam’s Christian informant saw human bodies hanging. Per-
haps we may suppose that distinguished victims were suspended from
the great tree.

5. The cult of the god Odin is known to have especially involved human
sacrifice during the Viking age. The literary reflections of Odin’s
mythology display a broad symbolic perspective in which human
sacrifice has found expression. Two literary motifs furnish minimally
the essential comparative materials. The first is the episode of King
Vikar in the Gauatrekssaga,4 and the second is the enigmatic Rónatal
bött contained in the Háonál (158–145). A superficial survey of
these two sources suffices to disclose the salient symbols of human
sacrifice relevant to the Odin cult. An analysis of the symbolism re-
veals the religious contextuality of Odinic human sacrifice. Here we
approach the comparativistic object of the present study—the role
of god as divine victim in ancient Scandinavia and Iceland.

The tale of the death of King Vikar at Odin’s behest is recounted in
the Gauatrekssaga and by Saxo in the Gesta Danorum.5 For the
purposes of this article the differences in the two versions are of no
consequence. The story recalls that King Vikar was to be made the
mock victim of a sacrifice to Odin and was to be hanged by means of
a fake noose. The god, however, insisted on the real victim, and,
evidently with his powerful magic, at the last moment turned the
sham noose into an all too real hangman’s line, while Starkadr, ad-

3 Ibid., p. 207 n. Scholion 138 (134).
18:268 (1864), refers to a probable Indic drowning sacrifice.
5 E. O. G. Turville-Petre, Mythe and Religion of the North (New York, 1964),
p. 44 and elsewhere.
6 Ibid., p. 225.
ministering the coup de grâce, pierced Vikar's body with a spear. The death imagery of the Gautrekssaga portrays Vikar hanged from a tree, stabbed by Odin's spear in Starkadr's hand.

A common form (perhaps the predominant form) of human sacrifice for Odin was by hanging from a tree or gibbet, accompanied frequently by stabbing with a spear (Odin's weapon) for good measure. Many cases of hanging associated with Odin exist in the literature. Saxo relates that the Odin-hero Hadingus ended his life by hanging himself in public.1 Hanged men and men killed with a spear belonged to Odin, who was actually a death god, or god of the dead, although not a god of the netherworld. Truly, Odin's Einherjar was an army of dead men.

Stanzas 138-145 of the Hávamál are uncannily difficult to interpret with certainty in every respect and probably reflect Christian/pagan syncretism in the poetic structure of their imagery; yet their content does not plausibly derive from sources other than the pagan Odinic tradition. The similarity of the hanging Odin with the crucified Christ is obvious and well noted, but, as at least Van Hamel8 and Turville-Petre9 have convincingly shown, every detail is thoroughly consistent with pagan religiosity and the worship of Odin. The Crucifixion can, of course, be studied in its Mediterranean setting as a typological parallel to the divine sacrifices under scrutiny here, but an analysis of the biblical event itself cannot further a comparative study of Indic and Norse mythology in a way that might facilitate the identification of maximally archaic and perhaps genetically related features in the Indo-European mythological traditions. Internal analysis of the Germanic records has already proved sufficiently that Hávamál 138-145 is essentially pagan.

Considered within the framework of the sacrificial religious tradition from which they spring, the relevant verses of the Hávamál constitute part of the answer to the question of the meaning of human sacrifice to the pagan Norse mentality. In a wider scholarly context, the immolation of the god Odin is a problem that must be stated and clarified before late Norse paganism can be fully understood. This essay seeks to prepare a statement of the problem and to indicate the avenue toward its resolution. While risking the evils of an obscure procedure, I allow the statement of the problem and its resolution to appear in an implicit fashion. For this study, Hávamál 138 is the crucial locus for which India will supply the exegetic key. Stanzas

---

139 ff. record how Odin seized the runes and prospered. The god himself narrates 138:

Veit ek at ek hekk
vindga meiði a
naer aal tnu
geiri undaðr
ok gefun Odni
síljfr sjálum méð
á þeim meiði
er ranga veit,
历来 hang af rótum reinn.

Van Hamel offers a very persuasive interpretation of this Eddie passage without considering the problem of the more pervasive meaning of Odin's act to a pagan religious sensibility. Van Hamel does not investigate the poetic mythological manifestation as part of a consciousness which countenanced human sacrifice, nor does he evaluate the god's action with respect to the manner in which human victims were consigned to him. Furthermore, he tried to demonstrate that Odin's deed in the Hávamál amounted to an act of martyrdom rather than sacrifice. I contest the distinction between martyrdom and sacrifice as applied to a source like the Hávamál, but I do admit that many of Van Hamel's criteria and explanations are interesting for their own sake: for example, that martyrdom construes blind powers, whereas sacrifice intends to win over the free will of a god. The application of Van Hamel's criteria to Odin and the Hávamál is deceptive, however, and fails to discover the most important content of the episode in the poem.

Van Hamel has also discussed the semantic realm within which we should consider gefinn as it occurs in the Hávamál. Rather than 'geopfert,' it means 'geweiht' and was used in this sense when children were dedicated to a god as living pledges. This is also the verb used in the story of Vikar where a human victim (King Vikar) is consigned to Odin: Starkadr: nun gef ek hik Ódni, 'now I give you to Odin.' Still, the question remains as to what meaning there is in the notion of a god being consecrated to himself, as Odin is in Hávamál 138. Van Hamel thinks that there is meaning in such a statement as gefin sjálfl sjálfrum méð only if it is conceived as exemplary of what he considers a pretheistic variety of Norse thinking, that is, that these Norsemen who believed in their own strength only (á matt siaon ok megin). Supposedly these men would not be representative in their world view of an

---

7 Ibid., p. 206.
9 Turville-Petre, op. cit., p. 43.

Translation after ibid., p. 42.
This realization induces us to seek the meaning of the Havamál. In his comprehensive exposition of the Odinic method, Van Hamel comes very close to an adequate realization of the content of the Rūnątas pattr.

While Van Hamel correctly understood Odin's overt method, he is, unfortunately, incorrect in believing that a secular, shamanistic explanation of the hanging Odin will suffice, and that Odin's actions exemplify the orientation of men who belong to a pretheistic cultural level. As we shall see, Odin's behavior is eminently theistic in the utmost degree and typologically resembles that of the Indic Prajāpati (lord of progeny), the prototype par excellence of the divine victim, who suffers self-immolation within a reflexively creative and productive ritual syndrome. The assertion that Odin is martyred, not sacrificed, pays no attention to the obvious and hardly inconsequential fact that he suffers precisely the same ritual death as might befall one of his human sacrificial victims. Odin does indeed die a ritual death by means of which he appropriates the power of death, symbolized in the runic magic that raises the dead to momentary eloquence. Van Hamel's criterion for sacrifice, cited above, could never apply to Odin's act or to Prajāpati's self-transformation and self-immolation as expounded by the Indic Uttarāṇāmāṅgasāliturature which is discussed below. Odin is truly sacrificed to himself and not merely martyred. Odin hung for nine nights on the world tree, which recalls the nine-day festival at Uppsala referred to in Adam of Bremen's History. Odin was stabbed with a spear and hanged like his victim, the unfortunate Vikar (for instance), so that it seems obvious that the god and the sacrificial victim were intentionally confounded in the Havamál. This realization induces us to seek the meaning of the Norse hanging sacrifice in connection with a ritual repetition of the self-willed immolation of the god. Especially considering that Odin sought Vikar's death, we should regard King Vikar henceforth as an Odin surrogate and the prototype of the human sacrificial offering who fulfills the role of the supreme god in the capital sacrifice. The parallels between Odin's techniques in the Hávamál and the arts of ancient and aboriginal sorcerers and magicians merely supply another avenue of research and do not compromise the study of the hanging Odin as a self-immolated divine victim.

Van Hamel and others have correctly observed that the tree with unknown roots upon which Odin hangs can be none other than the world tree, the holy ash Yggdrasill. This tree is the sustainer of the worlds and represents an organic axis mundi. Yggdrasill is the Norse representative of the abundantly attested and remotely archaic "tree of life" symbol. This symbol was taken seriously by many of the ancients and was frequently an innermost constituent of ancient and primitive religions. The primitive panchural Eurasian cosmology is unthinkable without the axis mundi, the tree of life, and the cosmic center, all of which freely combine in the ancient conceptions. Indo-European mythology is a panchural Eurasian phenomenon, and those studies that overlook the "tree of life," or dismiss it as marginal or incidental in importance, must fail to evaluate properly, or even approximately, many aspects of some Indo-European religions and mythologies. The importance of the axis mundi in Germany is well known and not easily overlooked; witness the Saxo Friminsât and his historic role in the conversion of the most die-hard continental Germanic pagans. The cosmic column could be conceived variously by the Germanic people as a tree or a simple stave, without evident sense of contradiction. The manifestation of a universal center shaft is prolific in all its forms in India as well. It was natural and probably necessary, in terms of the religion of ancient Scandinavia, that the poet of the Hávamál should portray Odin as immolated on the world tree. Yggdrasill, of course, is the sacred tree of the Aesir and, symmetrically, we have already observed in Adam of Bremen's account how the great temple of Uppsala had a terrestrial replica of Yggdrasill. The practice of offering human victims on trees, as at Uppsala, must have entailed the will to sacrifice at the symbolic universal center in the presence of the cosmic sustainer. The close association of human sacrifice and the axis mundi greatly facilitates a comparativistic study. The symbolism of the world tree or axis mundi usefully serves typology because it is so widespread among variant traditions and so esoterically meaningful within the individual religions.
5.

Indic data relating to conceptions of the cosmic column and its sacrificial and mythological symbolism are abundant. But there are difficulties of taxonomy and interpretation caused by the mode of expression given to the world-tree symbol. In Vedic India we encounter a language of symbolic forms of the highest sophistication, surpassed nowhere in world literature. Knipper (HIT 8:117 [1964]) correctly emphasizes that the Vedic passages that allude to the world tree or axis refer to an esoteric mystery. For that reason, naturalistic interpretations of the imagery of those passages misapprehend the symbol. Recent attempts have succeeded in taxonomically securing the identity of the tree and column symbol and have established the world tree as paramount among Indic symbols.11

The great tree flourishes in various forms throughout Vedic and later Indic literature; especially as the asvātha (Ficus religiosa) or pippala tree. The asvātha tree is a noteworthy feature of the Vedic texts and, as Linnaeus’ nomen indicates, it is religiously significant. Its Old Indic name might mean ‘horse stead’ or ‘horse abode.’ The asvātha was honored in later times as the bodhi tree of Gautama Buddha. Another related though distinct tree often confused with the asvātha is the nyagrodha or banyan tree (mentioned by the Rig-Peđa). The nyagrodha (Sanskrit nyagrodha, vata, bhāndira, or parbaṭi, i.e., Ficus bengalensis or Ficus indica) is the bodhi tree of Kāśyapa. The pippala (asvātha) and the nyagrodha are among the largest Indian trees and are often known as vanaspati (usually translated ‘lord of the forest’), a name that is also applied to the fire-god Agni.12

The tree of life is encountered in Indic literature and religion in various guises and is symbolically identifiable and partly functionally with the universal column, even when the latter is not conceived as an organic tree, or when the tree has been transformed into a colossal stave as in the case of the skambha of Atharva-Peđa 10.7 and 10.8 (and elsewhere).13 The skambha (‘supporter’),14 which is the sustainer of the universe, is portrayed by the author of Atharva-Peđa 10.7, 20–

12 Ibid., passim.
14 Ibid., p. 442. “Es liegt hier wohl eine etymologische Anspielung auf Skambha vor, die wir mit Wurzel schab, shah oder skamba ‘schab’ stellen; skambha scheint ursprünglich etwa soviel wie ‘schabender Baumstamm’ bedeutet zu haben, woraus sich der Begriff ‘Pfeiler, Stütze’ entwickelte.”
I offer here a brief overview of the purusamedha literature in ancient India and a review of some of the most noteworthy aspects of the rite. The ritual of the human sacrifice is briefly described in the thirteenth kāṇḍa of the Sātapatha Brāhmaṇa (White Yajur-Veda), and a list of the special victims is supplied by Vaiśānaveyi Śaṁhitā 90.5–92 (White Yajur-Veda). The sacrifice is not mentioned in the Taittiriya Śaṁhitā (nor evidently in the Maitreyaṇi or Kāṇṭaka Śaṁhitā), but a slightly differing list of victims is given in the Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa. The ritual of the purusamedha is detailed as well in five of the Śrautaśūtras, viz. those of Śāṅkhāyana (to the Rig-Veda), Āpastamba and Hirapuriniketin (both to the Taittiriya Śaṁhitā), Kātyāyana (to the White Yajur-Veda), and Vaidinā (to the Atharva-Veda). Of these, however, only the Śāṅkhāyana and Vaiśāna Śrāvaṇāśūtra’s actually prescribe the real killing of the human pasu. The others have the human victim released at the last moment, or have an animal put to death in his place, under the ritual pretense that the animal is a man.

The purusamedha is a paśca-rātri (‘five-night’) sacrifice which according to Kātyāyana (1.1.1.2) is to be initiated only by a member of the brāhmaṇa or rājanya castes. According to Śāṅkhāyana (who prescribes real killing) it achieves everything that is not yet attained by the potent aśvamedha. In many particulars the purusamedha rite duplicates the ritual of the horse sacrifice. Whereas in the latter a horse, gomrīga, and asa (śrīpāra) form the nucleus of the assemblage of victims consecrated en masse to Prajapati, in the human sacrifice a man occupies the place of the horse. Śāṅkhāyana says that the purusapāśu is supposed to be a brahmīni or kshatriya who has been purchased for the price of a hundred horses and a thousand cows. Like the horse in the aśvamedha, the human victim is permitted to go unfettered for a year preceding his sacrificial death, under the provision that he remain sexually chaste during that year of freedom. Prajapati himself is sometimes called the year, and the Bhādadrānapāropānapārapārapānāyakoppanājad (1.2.4) states that when Prajapati became the sacrificial horse, he was to be prepared for his voluntary immolation. Thus, the opening sections of the Mādhukāṇḍam, at the very beginning of the Bhādadrānapāropānapārapārapānāyakoppanājad, unroll the fantastic and awesome symbolism of the purusamedha and define how the symbols extoll Prajapati’s cosmogenic self-slaughter. The god and the victim are unequivocally identified.

7. A notable feature of the Purāṇic story is the identification of the yāpa with kāla (‘time’). The world tree itself can be found associated with temporal symbolism. The passage also exploits an ambiguity in the meaning of the word guṇa, employing it in a context that recalls the primary meaning of ‘bond’ or ‘cord’ simultaneously with the derived meaning ‘quality.’ The contextual implication is that the three guṇas bind the purusā to the sacrificial post (yāpa) of time (kāla). The passage says that Brahman had prepared for a cosmogenic sacrifice in which kāla would be the yāpa, and the three guṇas would be the bonds for tying the victim, but no pasu was available (161.39: . . . naima tāvābhūnant pasuḥ). Brahman says forlornly (161.40: Vinaśa pāśuṃ nāyam yājñāḥ parśamaṇe, ‘without a victim this sacrifice cannot be instituted.’ There follows a dialogue between Brahman and the bodiless goddess of speech (śaktavat sarvavāt) within (nītāt) Brahman, which results in a purusā sacrifice.19

The purusamedha, like the aśvamedha, bears a singular relationship to Prajapati, the lord of progeny, frequently called “father” by the Sātapatha Brāhmaṇa. The Uttarānīmāṇḍa texts declare that it is Prajapati himself who is sacrificed in the form of a horse, as an entity undergoing immolation and himself immolating. Thus, the opening sections of the Madhukāṇḍam, at the very beginning of the Bhādadrānapāropānapānapārapānāyakoppanājad, unroll the fantastic and awesome symbolism of the purusamedha and define how the symbols extoll Prajapati’s cosmogenic self-slaughter. The god and the victim are unequivocally identified.

8. The Divine Victim

19 I. śāntī, adhyāya 161.40–44: “tato mām avadāt devi saiva nītā śvarūpāḥ // Śkālaudav uktā — purusamārtha sthānena sthātī tam puruṣam param // brahma-vikā — śrīsastra-ācāra-vādā deva eva jñātāne / mama ca mūrtā mānaś brahma mānaś van paśu karuv dīrghagāhi viśeṣ sthānena puruṣapāḥ h i / śva ca mān aśvādī devi brahma mānaḥ svam paśu karv karu // tatra vīśeṣa puruṣam jñānakam mama cāvāyam // kālaśaṣṭāya pārāvate tam gunapakāre nīveṣitaḥ / bharatāntaram abhimṇaḥ puruṣam jñānam agraṇaḥ //”
The limitless labyrinths of the Brāhmaṇa's enfold yet another transition of role and identity beyond the synthesis of god and victim. The role and power of Prajāpati are bequeathed to the patron of the sacrifice whenever he initiates it. So, as L. Renou writes:20 "The human sacrifice is the most efficacious of all: it makes the sacrificer equal to Prajāpati, the great victim." The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa clearly supports this portrayal of the patron's relation to the process of the sacrifice. Eggeling, in the introduction to his translation, has made some definitive paraphrases which, by virtue of their insight and clarity, are worth quoting at length:21

Prajāpati, who here takes the place of the purusā, the world-man, or all-embracing personality, is offered up anew in every sacrifice: and inasmuch as the very dismemberment of the Lord of Creatures, which took place at that archetypal sacrifice, was in itself the creation of the universe, so every sacrifice is also a repetition of that first creative act. ... The theologians of the Brāhmaṇas go, however, an important step further by identifying the performer, or patron, of the sacrifice—the Sacrificer, with Prajāpati—. ... As regards the symbolic connection of the Sacrificer himself with the sacrifice, there can at any rate be no doubt that it was an essential and an intimate one from the very beginning of the sacrificial practice.

In other words, such a connection is essential to Vedic religion, since this religion was fundamentally sacrificial. This comprehension of the role of the sacrificer has the utmost importance for an adequate understanding of archaic Indic religion and of those religions that are comparable with it. The point of view Eggeling represents is abundantly supported in the testimony of the Pārāsmānāsā and Utpāsmānāsā texts themselves. This viewpoint and the perspectives disclosed by its implementation in an analysis of human sacrifice can provide the clue to the real and pervasive meaning of the utterance of the self-immolated Norse magical deity: gefnus Oðni, sjalf sjalfr meðr, 'given to Odin, myself to myself.'

Typologically, the Indic yāpa (i.e., vanaspati, asvattha, and so on) is categorically equivalent to the sacrificial trees at pagan Uppsala, and,22

---

21 Eggeling, Sacred Books of the East, vol. 43, pp. xxv-xlvi. H. Oldenberg ("Der geopferte Gott und das Agniyana," Nachrichten von der Kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Kl. 1917 [1918], pp. 5-9) disagreed with Eggeling's conception of Prajāpati (purusā) as Victirn, but Oldenberg's objection is not well made because he denied Prajāpati's victimhood principally on the grounds that it did not fit into the Fränkisch symposium paradigm of the dying god. His text-critical objection adumbed in a footnote is unconvincing.
23 Bosch, op. cit., passim.
bounded frist das Kind...’ Murray Fowler\textsuperscript{24} has done the service of calling attention to this startling Vedic image, while trying, by comparative means, to reclaim some of the scorched earth left by pioneers like Ludwig, who translated the opening line: ‘hoch, schatenlos, laublos, beweglich ist der himmel.’ This scholar tried to make his bland translation palatable by adding the acrimonious comment: “unrichtig muss arvō sein, da ein vernünftiger mensch doch wohl von einem laublosen ros nicht sprechen kann.” I, for one, find Ludwig’s leafless sky unrichtig and his point of view absurd.

Fowler correctly identifies the image in the first line of Rig-Veda 10.27.14 as a hippodendron and believes like Grassman that its ultimate referent is Agni of the aśvattha. Agni’s heteromorphology associates him with the aśvattha, but for reasons that differ substantially from the one adduced by Fowler, who evidently believed in the sufficiency of the naturalistic explanation that fire (Agni) is felt to be inert and latent in wood (aśvattha tree).

The comparison of the aśvattha with Yggdrasill is natural and elementary. Yggdrasill, too, is a hippodendron. As has been well known since Sophus Bugge, drasill is an Old Icelandic poetic word for horse, while Ygrr (‘the terrible’) is a name of Odin, as evidenced by Grimmismāl 54:

\begin{quote} Odinn ek nā heiti
Ygrr ek aðan hét.
Odin am I now called,
Ygrr was I called before.
\end{quote}

Most scholars have wanted to construe Yggdrasill as meaning ‘Ygg’s [Odin’s] horse,’ with the meaning extended to ‘Odin’s gallow’ and into the Norse semantic realm wherein ‘horse’ equals ‘gallows’ and doubles as a potent death symbol. Two facts oppose the unqualified acceptability of this definition. First, the tree is alternatively called Yggdrasill ashr (‘Yggdrasill’s ash-tree’), as though Yggdrasill itself were another name for the god Odin. Second, everyone\textsuperscript{25} notices that for the meaning ‘Ygg’s horse’ we should expect the form of the word to be *Yggdrasil, which has not been found. There is a theoretically possible solution if, as I suggest, we interpret the compound as endocentric in meaning and signifying ‘Ygg, the horse.’ Seen in this way, however, not only is Yggdrasill (that is, *Yggdrasill ashr) a hippodendron, but Odin himself is unmasked in a hippomorphic Gestalt like

\begin{quote} ...\textsuperscript{24} JAOs 67:273 (1917).
\textsuperscript{25} E. g., Jan de Vries, Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch (Leiden, 1924), pp. 656-657.
\end{quote}
mounting of the sacrificial post erected at the symbolic center of all existence, whereby the yajamāna thirsts to acquire the being and energy of the absolute center, the symbolic cosmic axis. The extent of the sacrificial victory in ontological terms is most spectacularly expressed by Brhadaranyakopaniṣad 1.2.7:28 He desired:

“Would that this [body] of mine were fit for sacrifice! Would that by it I had a self (ātmanvīra)!” Thereupon it became a horse (asva), because it swelled (asvat). “It has become fit for sacrifice (medhyā)” thought he. Therefore the horse sacrifice is called Asva-medha. He, verily, knows the Asva-medha, who knows it thus. He kept him [i.e., the horse] in mind without confining him. After a year he sacrificed him for himself. Other animals he delivered over to the divinities. Therefore men sacrifice the victim which is consecrated to Prajāpati as though offered unto all the gods. Verily, that [sun] which gives forth heat is the Asva-medha. The year is its embodiment (ātman).

This [earthly] fire is the ārka. The worlds are its embodiments. These are two, the ārka sacrificial fire and the Asva-medha sacrifice. Yet again they are one divinity, even Death. He [who knows this] wards off repeated death (punarnmṛtyu), death obtains him not, death becomes his body (ātman), he becomes one of these deities.

The Upanishadic identity of the horse sacrifice with death parallels the Norse perception of the horse as death symbol.

Human sacrifice conforming to the example of the lugubrious Odin envisages the attainment of a goal similar to that of the Brahmanic practice. Odin achieved a mighty victory over death when he dangled from the world tree for nine nights, and secured possession of the powerful runes, effective over the dead, thus attaining a dual ontological supremacy over the realms of the living and the dead. As in the case of Prajāpati, immortality as it applies to Odin can be properly understood only as a litotes formula for the expression of superabundant life that encompasses and assimilates even death and can never be compatible with the Platonic terms of Judeo-Christian theology. Odin's ontological mastery of two realms was, however, a momentary and designed transcendence of an immutable and basic dualism in the Norse religious tradition. At the Ragnarök Odin's magical cosmic grip would loosen and the inimical forces would dislodge him.

Whatever the contrast between the Vedic and Viking traditions, in the goals of human sacrifice they appear to maintain consonance. The ultimate divine act of self-sacrifice was perceived as the eschatological mystery wherein the last possible cosmic potentiality was actualized in the person of the sacrificer. The religious institution of human sacrifice pursued the model of the godly archetype as the supreme sacrificial mystery which mobilized the maximum possible magical propensities of the offering.

---

27 Prajāpati.
The Separate Functions
of the Indo-European Divine Twins

DONALD J. WARD, University of California, Los Angeles

Although the new comparative Indo-European mythology owes its existence almost exclusively to Georges Dumézil, some of the most brilliant studies to emerge from the new discipline have come not from Dumézil but from the Swedish scholar Stig Wikander. In 1947 Wikander made a highly significant contribution when he was able to show conclusively that much of the great Indian epic, the Mahābhārata, represented euhemerized Indo-Iranian mythology.1 With this one article, the entire study of Indo-European mythology and the theories of Georges Dumézil acquired new stature, for Wikander, working within the framework of Dumézil’s system, was able to produce startling and convincing results. In a more recent investigation Wikander was able to uncover the first totally convincing evidence of Indo-European mythology among Germanic-speaking peoples, and the implications of this study are just making themselves felt among historians, mythologists, and philologists.2 But of all of Wikander’s studies, none is more remarkable than the one in which he again turned to the euhemerized mythology of the Mahābhārata and investigated the twin heroes, Nakula and Sahadeva,3 the twin

3 See, for example, J. de Vries, Heldenlied und Heldensage (Bern and Munich, 1961), pp. 147-148.
sons of the Vedic deities, the Asvins. Wikander was able to show that each member of the heroic pair had a quite distinct personality, and that each played a distinct role in the epic. Nakula, the heroic, handsome warrior, is a breaker and trainer of horses. He is also reported to have "eyes of fire" and "the shoulders of a lion." Sahadeva, on the other hand, is of a sweet, peaceful temperament and is associated with domestic duties and with the care of cattle. He is considered to be especially virtuous, modest, patient, intelligent, and just.

Wikander points out that the one twin, in his role as warrior, represents Dumezil's second function, while his brother, interested in domestic duties and animal husbandry, represents the third function. This association of each twin with a separate function was, according to Wikander, already well defined during the period of Indo-European unity. This hypothesis, however, encounters difficulty for in the Rig-Veda the Asvins are characterized and invoked as equals. Wikander has carefully analyzed the Vedic hymns and has discovered a number of subtle differences between the brothers which are all variants of a sharp, fundamental distinction. For example, the identical traits and functions (fertility and warfare) associated with the heroes Nakula and Sahadeva are also characteristic of the Asvins and are furthermore reflected in their epithets. These epithets, although generally applied to both deities, invariably occur in pairs, and in nearly always the same order. This recurring order, which is parallel to the order of epithets used individually for Nakula and Sahadeva, is a strong indication that originally one set of epithets belonged to the one Asvin, and the other set belonged to the second Asvin. Moreover, the post-Vedic texts call the one twin Nasatya and the other Dasra, both forms being in the singular. Wikander supports his conclusions with evidence found in the Iranian

---

\[\text{footnote text}\]

---

The implication of Wikander's study is, of course, that this distinction of the Indo-Iranian twin gods dates back to the period of Indo-European unity and was evident in the original stratum of Indo-European mythology, such a conclusion, however, should not be reached too hastily. The concept of twin deities having totally distinct characteristics and functions is by no means limited to Indo-European mythology but is worldwide in distribution. This universal concept has arisen logically from the widespread notion that a multiple birth is the result of multiple conception. As the result of this belief, one frequently encounters the notion that a pair of twins cannot possibly be sired by a single father. The attitudes recorded in some of the legends collected by the Brothers Grimm attest that this
belief was still current in Europe in relatively modern times. For example, legend number 541: "Es ist unmöglich, daß dieses Weib drei Kinder von einem Mann haben könne ohne Ehebruch." Similarly, legend number 584: "Es ist unmöglich, daß ein Weib zwei Kinder auf einmal von einem Vater habe." 11

Notions of the dual paternity of human twins have played a role in the formation of mythological traditions involving divine twins as they occur throughout the world. A typical example is provided by the mythology of the Apapocuva Indians of south Brazil. The pantheon of this tribe includes a pair of divine twins, one of whom is the son of a high deity, "Our Great Father," while the second twin is considered the son of a lesser divinity, "Our Father Knower of All Things." 12

Since twin deities are frequently considered to have been begotten by different fathers, the twins often are very different in nature. For example, in the Old Testament Esau is the bold, vigorous huntsman, while his brother Jacob is a docile shepherd. Among the Brazilian Apapocuva, the elder of the twin deities is a powerful god who resides in heaven; the younger brother, on the other hand, is of minor importance and resides in the east with his mother. Generally throughout the Americas the elder of twin deities is clever and capable, while the younger is a foolish, lazy blockhead. 13

Among the mythological traditions of Indo-European peoples, various pairs of Greek divine twins were reported to have been begotten by separate fathers. According to Pindar (Nemeon Odes, 10.150), Polydeuces was begotten by Zeus, while Kastor was fathered by Tyndareos. 14 Similarly, the twin Amphion (musician) was fathered by Zeus, whereas Zethos (huntsman) was fathered by the mortal Epopeus. Moreover, Zeus begot Herakles, whereas the mortal Amphitryon begot his twin brother, Iphikles.

A parallel to the Greek tradition is encountered in Veclic religion. The twin Alvins, like the Dioscuri, are both called Divó napáti, "Sons of God." 15 (Rig-Feda 1.117.12), yet they are likewise reported to have had different fathers. One of the twins is the "blessed offspring of the sky," while the other is the son of the mortal Sumakha (Rig-Feda 1.181.4).

In view of this evidence, the distinction in the function and character of the Vedic twins as worked out by Wikander is in no way surprising. If, as in the case of Dioscuric traditions the world over, the twins were considered the products of two different fathers, the distinction in their behavior and in their religious function is only to be expected. Since this phenomenon is universal, one could justifiably question the contention that the divergences between the Alvins represent an exclusively Indo-European trait. 16 In the case of the Indo-Iranian tradition, however, we do not merely have a distinction between the twin deities, we have a highly specialized difference, that is, one twin is associated with warfare, horses, and strength, and the other is associated with domestic duties, cattle, fertility, and is a gentle being. We thus have a uniquely Indo-European manifestation of a universal Dioscuric trait. 17 For, although distinctions between twin deities are encountered everywhere, the specific one found in the Indo-Iranian tradition is by no means worldwide in its distribution.

Wikander's contention that this distinction in the Indo-Iranian deities belongs to the original stratum of Indo-European mythology, as well as the entire tripartite theory of Dumézil, would gain in strength if one could find evidence of such a differentiation among the other Indo-European Dioscuric pairs. I believe that it can indeed be detected, although, as in the case of the Rig-Feda, it is not always immediately discernible. Before discussing the details, however, I should like to adduce evidence that shows that various Indo-European Dioscuric pairs were, in general, associated with the "second and third functions."

That the Vedic twins were associated with both the warrior and fertility function is well known. Regarding the second function they help Vişňá in contest (Rig-Feda 1.112.10), they protect mortals in combat (10.143.4), they grant victory in war (8.35.12). Similarly, the Greek Dioscuri are renowned for their role as warriors. They bat-

11 Ibid., p. 584. The identical notion is found in lines 58-43 of the twelfth-century poem of Marie de France, Le Frene.
14 See also Pausanias 4.51.7, 5.25.21; Apollodoros 3.105.
15 The identical name is preserved in Baltic mythology where the twins are called Dīeva ãpā in Latvian, and Dīevu sunelis in Lithuanian, both of which mean 'Sons of God.' Moreover, the Greek Δῆος ὁμός has the identical meaning. All three forms are not only related in meaning but etymologically as well.
16 Similarly, the evidence of a distinction between other Indo-European Dioscuric pairs, e.g., Kastor was mortal, Polydeuces divine, Kaster was the "breeder of horses," Polydeuces a boxer (Iliad 5.46; Odyssey 11.498), cannot in itself be considered as belonging exclusively to the Indo-European tradition.
tles. Many Vedic hymns invoking the Avis praise their ability to promote fertility. They are praised for placing the germ in all female creatures (1.157.5), and for giving fertility to the bride (10.184.4). They give a child to the wife of the eunuch (1.117.24) and milk to the barren cow (1.112.9). Evidence of the Dioscuri functioning as divinities of fertility is relatively scant. They were frequently honored at important festivals and banquet settings offerings of food were made to them, indicating that they may have been divinities of the harvest. There are, moreover, countless reliefs and coins that depict the twins with a horn of plenty, sheaves of grain, and other agricultural products. Furthermore, the eggshell hats (pilos) of the twins were evidently fertility symbols. Moreover, the Roman Castor was associated with the goddess of fountains, Juturna, indicating that he was worshiped as a fertility deity. Similarly, in the mythology of the Baltic region, the twin Sons of God were envisioned working with agricultural implements, helping to till the soil and sow the seeds, thus indicating that they functioned as divinities of the harvest and of fertility. One Latvian song, for example, reports that the twin gods had plows of gold and seeds of silver. Moreover, they bring the yeast and add it to the beer, and they are associated with the "golden dew" that covers the green meadows.

The evidence above makes it clear that in the various Indo-European traditions, the Divine Twins were associated with both the second and third functions. The evidence that each twin was originally associated with only one of these functions is more difficult to uncover.

In Greek mythology this contrast is stressed when Pindar (Pythian 4) uses the epithet ἐρυθρόκορας, 'in a golden chariot,' to refer to Kastor alone. Moreover, Kastor was honored as the founder of the horse race, while Polydeukes was honored for having invented the hound races. The dog is clearly an animal associated with house and farm, whereas the horse, especially in ancient Greek civilization, is an animal of warfare. An even more remarkable contrast is made in Homeric Hymn 33.3, which calls Kastor ἐρυθρόκορας, 'breaker of horses,' and mentions ἐπιχειρήσεις Πολύδοξος, 'the faultless [virtuous] Polydeuces.' It is in the Roman sources, however, that this fundamental distinction is most clearly expressed. In a recent study, R. Schilling has demonstrated that the Roman knights, whose cavalry charge at Lake Regillus in 496 B.C. saved the Roman infantry from a rout, had already worshiped Castor as a patron of their class. The reason that one brother alone was worshiped, instead of both Dioscuri, is evidently that Kastor alone was the warlike youth, associated with the horse. His docile, virtuous brother would have been poorly suited for the needs of an elite knighthood. Further evidence of this contrast occurs in Dio Cassius (57.14.9), who reports that the younger Drusus was "so prone to anger that he even inflicted blows upon a distinguished knight and received on this account the nickname Castor." This report indicates that the Romans evidently carried the contrast between the Dioscuri to an extreme. Not only was Castor considered warlike and aggressive, but rash and hot-tempered as well. Pollux, who was unquestionably a more passive figure, and who was more involved with domestic functions, gradually faded into the background.

Although there is evidence of Germanic peoples having worshiped the Divine Twins, the source material is generally too scant to enable the scholar to discern a difference between the Germanic divinities. A possible exception is furnished by Hengist and Horsa, who were reported to have led the Anglo-Saxon invasions of the British Isles. The names of the brothers mean 'stallion' and 'horse,'...
respectively, indicating that the same theiomorphic concept associated with other divine pairs of the Indo-European tradition was known also among Germanic peoples.

Of particular interest regarding these sources is that the one brother, Horsa, gradually disappears from the scene, leaving Hengist as the sole leader of the invaders. We are already familiar with the gradual disappearance of one member of a Dioscurean pair, namely in the Roman sources in which the passive, docile Pollux is overshadowed by his more aggressive, warlike brother. One can speculate that a similar distinction was responsible for the demise of Horsa during the heroic age. As an aggressive heroic warrior Hengist was doubtless praised in legend and legend. His more docile brother, as a representative of the third function who may have been a patron of herders and farmers, was excluded from the heroic songs, and thus his name is often missing from those records that tell of the exploits of Anglo-Saxon heroes.

One can further speculate that in Germanic religion there developed a dual aspect of the sacred horse. The one aspect may have represented the horse as an animal of warfare, and the other as an animal of the farm and of fertility. Similar to the Indo-European tradition in which the one twin divinity was associated with the horse and the other with the cow, the one Germanic twin, Hengist, may have been associated with the war-horse, while his brother, Horsa, may have been linked with the farm animal. This hypothesis is, admittedly, based on speculation. Nevertheless, the curious distinction in the names of the pair, viz. Hengist/Horsa, may well point to such a dual aspect of the horse.

Other than the fact that Horsa gradually fades into oblivion, the records of the exploits of the heroes offer no evidence of separate functions. A folk legend recorded in modern Germany however, offers a remarkable example of a pair of brothers with distinct functions. The legend reports that an aged count, when near death, decided to bestow upon his two sons the implements that would determine their future careers. To the one son he gave a sword and the instructions to use his strength to defend the castle. To the other son he gave a plow, and he instructed him to work the fields of the valley "peacefully."

Anthr and Aoi, the leaders of the Langobards were Ibor and Aio, and the leaders of the Asdingi were Raus and Raptus. The evidence points clearly to a euhemerization of Dioscurean divinities in each of these cases. See N. Wagner, "Dioskuren, Jungmannschaften und Doppelkonigtum," ZDPh *» 79:1-17, 225-247 (1956). See also Ward, *The Divine Twins*, pp. 90-93.

Although it may seem fantastic to assume that this modern legend represents the survival of an ancient mythological tradition, the similarity with the Indo-European theme is so striking that this legend cannot be ignored. Not only are the brothers given distinct roles to play, the distinction is precisely of the kind that is typical of other Indo-European pairs. The one brother, who bears the sword, represents the second function, while his brother, who works with the plow, represents the third function. I suggest that a euhemerized myth of the Germanic divine pair survived in oral tradition and came to be recorded in the form of a folk legend.

An even more striking treatment of this theme occurs in Spanish heroic tradition. Samuel Armistead has worked with the legends that treat the illegitimate birth of the Spanish hero, the Cid. Armistead is able to demonstrate that at one time there were two contemporary epic traditions involving the hero's birth. According to the one tradition, the Cid was a twin who was begotten when a knight forced himself upon a peasant woman. The woman later lay with her husband, at which time the twin brother was conceived. The most complete evidence of this theme has been uncovered in a passage of the second redaction (ca. 1504) of the *Compendio historico*, originally written by Diego Rodriguez de Almela circa 1479. The passage in question attempts to discredit the report of the Cid's illegitimate birth.

Note also inasmuch as some say that the Cid was a bastard they are mistaken about it. And the way in which those who have not read his history and chronicle say this is as follows: That is, that Don Diego Lainez, father of the Cid, before marrying Dona Teresa Nunez, mother of the Cid, on Saint James day in Vivar forced a peasant woman, a miller's beautiful wife, at her house, and she conceived a son at that time. And the peasant, her husband, when he came home from the mill, seized her that same day, and she conceived another son at that time. And when they were to be born, the knight's son was born first. And he looked like his father, very lively and full of grace; and the peasant's [son looked] like his [father], very coarse. And when both brothers were five or six years old, the knight's son made hobby-horses out of wood and lances and swords and other things pertaining to arms. And he called the young boys "knights" and ran about from place to place, and all his activities had to do with weapons and knighthood. And the peasant's son made little oxen out of clay and plows of wood. And with these things and other sticks,
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21. This information will eventually be published by Armistead in an article entitled "Two Rival Traditions Concerning the Parentage of the Cid." I am grateful to Professor Armistead for providing me with this information and for the translation of the manuscript materials.

22. "Compendio historico," 2d redaction, Biblioteca Nacional Madrid, MS 1795, formerly I 1-15, fol. 298v, known as MS F.
which he had in his hand, he would plow along the floor, saying 'Gee up here!' and 'Gee up there!' and those who saw them marvelled at it. Don Diego Lainez then took his son, who was called Fernan Diaz. And when he was of age to bear arms he was a good knight and brave.

The relationship with the universal Dioscuric pattern, whereby the one twin is begotten by a divinity and the other by a mortal, can be clearly discerned in this passage, even though the material has been euhemerized. The theme of the dual paternity of the twins remains, and with it the distinction in the character of each of the twins. Moreover, the distinction is of the specialized type that has been encountered in the Indo-European tradition. Namely, the one twin represents the second function, is consequently of heroic, warrior-like character, and is associated with the horse, while the other twin represents the third function, is of a docile, gentle nature, and is more interested in cattle, plows, and farming than in warfare. I suggest that this contrast between the Spanish hero and his twin brother not only represents the same contrast as one encounters in Indo-European mythology, but that this episode in the career of the Cid represents a heroic euhemerization of an Indo-European Dioscuric myth. The question of just how this theme found its way into the Spanish heroic tradition is left open at this time. This aspect of the problem, however, certainly warrants further investigation.

These various bits of information regarding the character and function of the Indo-European twins when viewed singly may not appear too significant, but viewed altogether they add up to an impressive sum of evidence, showing clearly that the distinction in the function of the twins, as posited by Wikander for the Indo-Iranian tradition, is true for other Indo-European traditions as well. Moreover, this distinction bears a clear imprint of the tripartite ideology of the Indo-Europeans.

Reflections on “yaožda,” with a Digression on “xvaetvadasa”

JACQUES DUCHESNE-GUILLEMIN, University of Liège

Georges Dumézil published an article some twenty years ago entitled “A propos de latin ius.” After recalling that the term has only a profane value, namely ‘area of maximal action or pretension,’ but must previously have had a half-juridical, half-religious one, still reflected in iurare and ius iurandum, he asked the question: “What religious value?”

The answer seemed to lie in a comparison between Avestan yaožda, which in the Videvdat means chiefly ‘to purify from the contagion of dead matter,’ and Latin iusta facere (‘to perform certain religious ceremonies called denicales feriae’). On the day of cremation, a bone was severed from the corpse; this os resectum (usually a finger bone) was then buried at the denicales feriae. If, however, the person had perished at sea (in navi necatus), no denicales feriae were to take place, since the family was then said to be pure: decrevit P. Mucius, Cicero writes in De Legibus 2.22, familiam puram, quod os supra terram non extaret. This seems to prove, Dumézil writes, that iusta facere means not only granting the dead what they have a right to receive, but also purifying the family. The same would be expressed in Varro (De lingua latina 3.4) as familiam purgandam. Hence an intimate connection between iusta facere and yaožda can be deduced, with the common meaning ‘to purify from defilement by death.’

In sending me the offprint of this article ten years after it appeared (I did not yet know him when it was published, and it was only in

1 RHR 134:95-112 (1948). [A considerably revised version of this article may be found in Idées romaines (Paris, 1969), pp. 31-63]
1958 that I asked for it), Dumézil wrote one of those pregnant deductive lines of which he has a wonderful mastery, and which typify the constant revision to which a lifetime of work is being submitted by one of the most active, everlastingly young minds of our time: "Après dix ans, bien des choses sont à changer." He did not say which; but now, in his excellent La religion romaine archaïque (Paris, 1966), although the phrase insula facere is mentioned, no reference at all is made to yaozda. Why? This is the question I tackle below.

Is the reason for Dumézil's change of mind to be found in an article published in 1953 by J. de Bie in Le Muséon? The author tries to reconstruct the semantic evolution of yaozda, drawing his evidence exclusively from Avestan texts. He distinguishes three stages, after first sketching the evolution of the Mazdean religion as he sees it. The first is a purely ethical stage, then (in his own words) "dans la fixation progressive du culte mazdeen, toute purification se lie de plus en plus fermement à des rites magiques bien définis," with reference to J. Darmesteter and A. Carney. From this far too simple background three successive semantic values of yaozda seem to emerge:

1) to put in a state of moral purity, exempt from evil. Yasna 44.9 speaks of yaozda'ing the daena, an act performed, according to Videvdad 10.19, through good thoughts, good words, and good deeds. Yast 8 speaks in the same way of yaozda'ing the urvan, the daena, the agnha;

2) the second stage is reflected in numerous passages of the Videvdad in which yaozda means 'purifying from the contagion of dead matter,' representing a shift from ethics to magic;

3) in the third stage even water is supposed to have been defiled by dead matter and must be purified; such is the case also of other inanimate objects, cult implements, and the like.

De Bie summarizes his view as follows: originally the word designated the internal, moral attitude of 'sinless, well disposed toward the Good and Ahura,' both in the passive sense of 'agreeable' and in the active one 'devoted.'

This linear evolution is allegedly that of the Mazdean religion itself. But such an assumption is obviously wrong. We recognize in the Avesta many elements older than the Gathic reform with which they must later have been merged; defilement by contact with dead matter could have been one of them. Linguistically De Bie takes practically no account of the semantic correspondences found in yaozda, 'exemption from dead matter,' and Sanskrit madya, 'welfare, health, happiness.'

We conclude that de Bie's article cannot have impressed Dumézil very much. What then can have made him find fault with his own?

Perhaps de Bie, a beginner in Avestan, who has since gone over to the study of Greek grammar by means of computers, was misled by the chronological order that Bartholomae followed in his dictionary: beginning with Greek passages, followed by the later Avestan ones. It is useful, in this case, to examine first the passages in which the meanings are similar to the Vedic ones. Such a procedure will be more in line with what Dumézil has done.

The first examples demonstrate a Vedic connection, in both Sanskrit and Avestan, between the term under study and life:

Rig-Veda 1.189.2 and elsewhere: tokhya tanyapi srim yoh, 'sci für den leiblichen Samen zu Wohl und Heil.' Such a prayer is addressed to the waters in Rig-Veda 6.50.7 and 5.53.14, as pointed out by Dumézil in "A propos de latin ins." A parallel is present in the Avestan hymn to the goddess of waters, Anahita: yah vispanam arsham xudr da yaozdadadi . . . harsiymag zajdi garwgan yaozdadati . . . harsitipo hauintdo daadati . . . visjanam haarisingam daitim radaw poema an bairiti (Yast 5.2). 'Who yaozda's the semen of all the males, the embryos of the females for birth; gives the females an easy childbirth; provides them with milk at the right moment.' To which may be compared further on in Yast 5.5: bah me dpad yaozdadati ha arsha xudr ha xarisingam garwgan ha xarisingam poema, 'she yaozda's me the waters, the semen of the males, the embryos of the women, the milk of the women.'

The next example in Yasna 48.5 is subject to a new interpretation, as distinct from Humbach's translation: ' . . . torunhyd yistiti yaozdadati anahinti armaniti yaozd multiy(i) api yagam nishide gosti vorsyapam, . . . mit den Werken der guten Erkenntnis, o Gemilissheit, . . . die mit dem Menschen auch seine Nachkommenschaft gesund macht, soll der Kuh gegenüber angewandt werden.' Humbach makes yistiti the implied subject of vorsyapam, but if we take armaniti instead we obtain a rather remarkable agreement with the passage from Yast 5.2 quoted above, since Armaiti is the Greek substitute for Anahita: 'Armaiti, who also yaozda's man and his progeny.'

The second group consists of passages dealing with purification
are employed as near equivalents.

In the third group yaozda is extended to the soul, urvan, dahtā, or asūd, as in Yasna 44.6: yaoz daemq (yaoz)danē, 'die Gesinnung, die ich mir heilwirkend machen will,' and this is accomplished by means of good thoughts, good words, and good deeds.

In the fourth group, fire has to be purified, for instance Zoroastrian atren paiyia yaozda pshotsam (Yasna 9.1).

In the fifth group, the act has to do with ritual cleanliness of implements.

It seems, then, from the main objects undergoing yaozda, namely, the semen, living beings, the soul, and fire, that we would be entitled to deduce an intrinsic affinity between yaoz and life, and perhaps a new etymology: yewes <<yew, 'young,' compare Sanskrit yosd, 'woman,' and Sogdian ynd <<yavanika.

To test this hypothesis, we may examine the means by which the act is performed. We read in the descriptions of the barahān ceremony that purification is made with water, sand, and gōmēz. Why is gōmēz, 'bull's urine,' used? Is it assumed to have life-giving properties because it is near the semen and perhaps mingled with it, thus a plausible antidote to anything connected with death?

According to Vidēvdāt 8.15, however, corpse-bearers may be purified not only with the urine of cattle, but also with the mingled urine of a man and a woman who have performed the xvaetvada. 8

A DIGRESSION ON XVAETVADA

History repeats itself. In 1888 the Parsi Darab Peshotan Sanjana published a book, The Alleged Practices of Next of Kin Marriage in Old Iran (London, 1888). The following year H. Hübschmann showed that although the Avestan evidence for the practice alluded to in the title is not decisive, inasmuch as no definition of xvaetvada is given, the material in Greek and other foreign authors is overwhelming.

Anyhow, this is what may be said en attendant. Three hypotheses are possible as to the origin of this usage: (1) It may be a survival from a state of savagery, in which free intercourse between the sexes prevailed; (2) or it may be an exaggeration of a particular rule of marriage; (3) or it may have been borrowed from some indigenous population of western Asia.

The third hypothesis may be rejected for lack of evidence, despite what Ghirshman writes: "Many figurines of a naked goddess have been found on prehistoric Iranian sites. This goddess probably [I do not see what makes this probable!] had as a consort a god who was at once and the same time both her son and her husband. Undoubtedly [this seems just a manner of speaking!] it is in this primitive religion that we should seek the origin of marriage between brothers and sisters—a custom common in Western Asia, which the Persians and later the Nabateans inherited from the indigenous population—or of the marriage, less often recorded, between mother and son."

The other two hypotheses are less fragile. The first one is based on Celtic facts. Among the ancient Britons, according to Caesar (Historiarum Romanarum 5.14) and Dio Cassius (Historiarum Romanarum 76.12; 62.6), women were the common property of their husbands. In Ireland, if we are to believe Strabo (Geographica 4.4) and Jerome (11.7), intercourse with wives of other men, with mothers and sisters was frequent, and kinship ties were not an obstacle to marriage: Lugaid,
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able on the part of zealous people who tend to represent their religion as it should be, rather than as it is, it seems less pardonable for a European scholar such as Otakar Klima in his rejoinder "Zur Problematik der Ehe-Institution im alten Iran" to have made a rather heavy refutation of the Parsi thesis without reference to his predecessor Hübschmann or to L. H. Gray's "Marriage, Iranian, Next-of-Kin." He seems at least to have known Hübschmann's article, since he refers in a footnote to the very volume of ZDMG in which it appeared. Why then not cite him?

It is certainly a pity that Klima completely ignored Gray or Otto Schrader, whose hints as to the origin of this Mzdæan usage he might otherwise have followed. I allude to Schrader's Reallexikon der indogermanischen Altertumskunde (Strasbourg, 1901), revised by Alfons Nehring more than thirty years ago, a work that needs yet another edition.

Reflections on yaozda

[Note: The text continues with further reflections on yaozda, but is not fully transcribed here.]
king of Ireland, married his mother; a king of Leinster had his two sisters as wives.

The second hypothesis is illustrated among the ancient Balts. It is true that Christoph Hartknoch's statement in Alt- und neues Preussen seems at first sight rather to bear out the first one:

... das die alten Preussen in ihrem Heyrathan ganz und gar auf keine Blut-Fremmchaft oder Schwägerschaft gesehen, sondern haben auch Bluts-Verwandten einander geheirathet und ist damit niemand ausgeschlossen gewesen als eine rechte Mutter. Denn dass sie auch ihre Stiefmütter haben heirathen können ... auch bey den Litauen hat es vor Zeiten in dem Heydenthum frey gestanden die Stieffatzer zu Weibern zu nehmen.10

But the explanation furnished by Jacobus, "ein Päbsterischer Gesandter," proves that the passage alludes not to unruliness but to a perfectly justified rule: "Cum enim pater aliquam uxorem de pecunia ter," proves that the passage alludes not to unruliness but to a perfect rule: "Cum enim pater aliquam uxorem de pecunia comparata."

The early Indo-European woman thus seems to have been regarded as either a toy or a chattel. But neither theory can account for the position accorded to women amongst the ancient Germans. The famous passages in Tacitus (Germania 7–8) that follow seem to support the view that they were human counterparts of sorts of the trivalent goddess of the Indo-Iranians: ad matres, ad consules uinera femunt; nec illae numerare et exigere plagas paenent, ciboque ... 'the men take their wounds to their mothers and wives, and the latter are not afraid of counting and examining the blows, and bringing food ...' (all this representing the third function); inesse quin etiam sanctum aliquid et providum putant, nec aut consilia earum aspernantur aut responsa neglegunt, 'more than this, they believe that there resides in women an element of holiness and prophecy, and so they do not scorn to ask their advice or lightly disregard their replies' (first function).

But if we are confronted with the three Dumezilian functions, why do they appear in the reverse order, perhaps it be because woman belongs first of all to the third function? We further miss what Scott Littleton refers to as the "corner-stone," namely the character—

10 See "Von den Hochzeiten der Alten Preussen," in Alt und neues Preussen (Frankfurt and Leipzig, 1684), chap. xii.

11 Ibid.
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It went through the notion of 'how it should be' to that of 'untouched by violence; healthy.' This last stage is indirectly attested in *iniuria*, defined as follows in *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 4.25-35: "*Iniuriae sunt quae aut pulsatiae corpus, aut considunt aurae, aut aliqua turpitudine vitam cutissiam violant." Hence English injury, *injure* (this meaning does not appear in French except in the phrase *les injures du temps*, a Latinism attested only from the seventeenth century onward). The connection between bodily integrity and "justice" is still illustrated in the phrase used when someone stumbles and falls: "Are you all right?"

We have therefore no difficulty in accepting the usual etymology of Latin *ius* as *yewes*, from *yew*, 'to join, to fit'; hence *yewes*, 'what fits, is fitting' (cf. French *justesse-justice*), or 'what is exact, unmixed, pure.' The connection of this notion with life is then accidental: life is considered as pure from death, unhampered, unsullied by it. If this meaning is frequently attested it is only because life and death are so particularly important in the religion.

The notion is easily further extended to the soul, which will be considered good because not diminished, not weakened by evil; and finally it will extend also to inanimate objects.

The application to life and death certainly dates back at least to Indo-Iranian times. We have noted a precise identity between Vedic *tobhya yeda* and the Avestan passages, both Gathic and later, in which Anahita or her substitute Armaiti favors the purification of the semen. The question is, last but not least, did not this extension date back still further and is it not reflected in Latin? This boils down to interpreting *iusta facere*: we are brought back to our beginning, without perhaps being any the wiser for all our roamings.

To be precise, how can we interpret the passages in Cicero and Varro quoted above? What does *familiam puram* mean in the Ciceronian passage where it denotes the family of a person killed at sea? In the absence of a good Latin dictionary, the answer is difficult (the *Thesaurus* has not yet reached the letter PI). Does the phrase mean, as Dumézil first suggested: 'not subject to the necessity of being purified from a connection with a dead body'; or does it after all mean simply 'not subject to the obligation of performing certain just actions, *ius*?' Similarly, does *ad familiam pasconda* in Varro simply mean 'to relieve the family from a moral obligation'? Is it this second possibility that caused Dumézil to hesitate and then, in *La religion romaine archaïque*, drop all reference to *yad أد* in dealing with *ius*?
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The Three Functions of Indo-European Tradition in the "Eumenides" of Aeschylus

UDO STRUTYNSKI, University of California, Los Angeles

It was some thirty years ago that Georges Dumézil added the dimension of comparative mythology to the field of Indo-European studies, transforming the beneficiaries of a common linguistic heritage into the bearers of a socially oriented mythological tradition, unique and distinct from that of the other peoples of the ancient world. Central to Dumézil's thought is the notion of Indo-European tripartition: the "three functions" of Indo-European ideology comprising the characteristics of sovereignty, physical prowess, and fertility, wealth, and nourishment, which are represented on the level of social classes by a hierarchy of priests, warriors, and herdsmen-cultivators. This tri-functional pattern of thinking pervades all significant aspects of social life, amounts to a definition by the people of themselves, and finds reflection in the structure of their pantheon. Thus there are first-function gods related to the class of priests and characterized by sovereignty; second-function gods, patrons of the warrior class, who display military prowess; and third-function gods in whose charge has been placed the health, sustenance, and wealth of the entire people.1

While the pivotal areas where Indo-European traditions have been found, the Indo-Iranian, Roman, and Germanic, have provided ample comparative evidence in support of Dumézil's thesis, ancient

---

Greek myth reflects but few Indo-European traits. These few have already been noted by Dumézil and his followers. Still, continuing research makes it possible from time to time to add to their number. In a tradition such as that of Greece, however, which has been fragmented and hidden under continuing change, any traces of an Indo-European heritage which might be uncovered are not often easily recognizable. Certainly this is the case with the plays of Aeschylus. Although Aeschylus is for all intents and purposes the earliest of the Greek tragedians, he is first and foremost a man of letters whose thought is his own. Aeschylus’ dependence upon Hesiod is not slavish, writes Friedrich Solmsen, and from this it can hardly be argued that his thinking was influenced by an even more distant Indo-European tradition. Nevertheless, elements of Indo-European thought have already been found in one of his plays. Dumézil has noted that in the Persians, the lines of the dialogue between the ghost of Darius and Atossa parallel the words of Dārāyavahu in the Old Persian inscriptions.


7 Cf. G. Dumézil, III: “Les ‘trois fonctions’ dans le RgVeda et les dieux indiens de Mitani,” RAR 47:165-168 (1961), esp. pp. 210-211, where the criteria for recognizing trirudimentary structures are given: ‘Deux règles de bon sens s'imposent: 1° Pour qu'on soit en droit de reconnaître une intention de classement trirudimentaire, il faut que les trois termes, dans la syntaxe et plus encore dans la pensée, soient homogènes (trois dons ou qualités d'un dieu, trois prières des hommes, etc.) . . . 2° Il faut écarter toute égérie qui, pour une, ou plus forte raison pour deux des fonctions, se fonderait sur l'interprétation sollicitée de terms équívocques ou impoïciles.”


Three Functions of Indo-European Tradition in Aeschylus

Darius asks:

πν εν τω γενοσ των περσων πολιοδοκη και νομον
In what manner [was the power of Persia destroyed]? Did some onslaught of plague or sedition come upon the state?

Atossa responds:

Οδηγήσαι ἀλλ' αμφ' ἄθρασσα τα κατάστασις εκτροβής.
Not at all, but near Athens our whole army has been destroyed.

Each of the three means of destruction mentioned represents an attack on one of the three functions. Plague destroys the physical well-being of a people and refers to the third function; sedition indicates a crisis of sovereignty, thus referring to the first function; and the annihilation of Persia’s military power represents a defeat for the second-function warrior class. Significant is the fact that it is the destruction of all of Persia, of the society as a whole, which is at issue. For this reason, all three functions must be mentioned, despite the fact that the actual fall was a second-function matter.

What must be kept in mind about this example, however, is the fact that while it is unquestionably Indo-European, it does not belong to the tradition of Greece but to that of Iran. As Dumézil points out, “La publicité que le Grand Roi (Darius I) avait donnée à ses succès, à ses expériences, à ses pensées, avait pu par bien des intermédiaires, depuis les Ioniens de l’empire jusqu’aux prisonniers de Salamine, de Platées, d’Éton, atteindre les Athéniens ses vainqueurs et vainqueurs de son fils.”

Unlike the Persians, the Eumenides is a play that concerns itself with traditions that are distinctly and exclusively Greek. But before examining these traditions for whatever traces of Indo-European thought they might contain, it is necessary to isolate them from what might be properly called the literature of the play.

This task has been immeasurably simplified by the work of Jean Defradas, who has examined the legend of Orestes upon which Aeschylus drew, in the light of its development from the earliest versions, through the transformations it experienced at the hands of the priests of Apollo at Delphi, until it gained currency in Athens at the end of the fifth century B.C. At that time the legend recounted how Orestes, son of Agamemnon, on the orders of Delphic Apollo avenged his father who had been murdered on his return from

11 Cf. G. Dumézil, “Les ‘trois fonctions’ dans le RgVeda . . . ,” p. 385. The three functions occur when the issue is “tout ce qui compte dans le monde . . . .”

12 Ibid., p. 394.

Troy by Aegisthus and Clytemnestra. After Orestes has killed his mother he is pursued by her Erinyes, but Apollo, who had ordered punishment of one's father's murderer, is a question of honor. In the crime, wards off the Erinyes, and taking the guilt upon himself, demands the killing of one's mother. Thus, as soon as the act of the later classical conception of the problem, personal honor must be considered a crime. Only a god can order Orestes to fulfill one's duty when avenging the murder of one's father.

There the god of the Pythian oracle, ordered the avenger to fulfill his duty when avenging the murder of his father. The Homeric avenger becomes a murderer who is himself later counted among the seven sages.

This patriarchal law plays a role in the Eumenides when Apollo introduces it as part of the defense argument during the trial of Orestes (658 ff., 756 ff.). Apollo's position is that the father is superior to the mother because his seed is the true source of life. The murder of a father is then a greater crime against the "clan vital" of nature than is the murder of a mother. When Athena joins her voice with Apollo's, the argument carries the day against the Erinyes. Defradas' following comment can be applied to this:

Ce système patriarchal devait apparaître en propre à une idéologie dorienne. La société dorienne, indo-européenne dans son essence, s’est opposée sembler et à la société égéenne, où dominait le militarism. Dans la mesure où un système religieux est l’expression d’un système social, nous constatons que les religions prêthelléniques, où dominent les divinités féminines, divinités de fécondité, ont été remplacées par des religions à pré-dominance masculine: Zeus, maître de l'Olympe, donne Héra; Zeus Olympien devient à Olymp le maître de l'Aïsa, où règnait avant lui une divinité féminine, dont le culte était célébré à l'endroit où s'élevait l'Héraion.

He concludes by saying: "Nous trouvons chez Eschyle un écho de ce mépris des guerriers pour les femmes, une sorte d’appel à la Delphic literature. There is the legend of Alcmene, son of Amphiarous, who is ordered by the Delphic oracle to kill his mother in revenge for her designs upon his father's life. His deed brings the Erinyes of his mother down upon him until his subsequent purification at Delphi. There are also the versions of the Oresteia of Pindar and Saisichorus which attest the Delphic influence. Both these authors share with Aeschylus this trait that Clytemnestra is the principal murderer of Agamemnon. Pindar shares one other trait with the author of the Eumenides: he presents Orestes as forced to punish his mother by virtue of the patriarchal law whose Dorian character is a significant aspect of the Delphic tradition. One need only compare this story of Orestes with that of Periander, tyrant of Corinth, who killed his wayward wife with impunity. Not only was vengeance by her relatives out of the question, but Periander himself was later counted among the seven sages.

A comparison of Homer and Aeschylus reveals that the latter introduced a number of new themes: the curse of the House of Atreus; the problem of Orestes; Agamemnon's own guilt as compared with that of Clytemnestra; and finally the shifting of the role of the principal murderer from Aegisthus to Clytemnestra. Certainly the theme of the son who murders his mother is not unique in

---


13 Defradas, op. cit., p. 165: "Nous n'hésitons donc pas, même s'il n'existait pas des raisons de fait plus convaincantes, à affirmer a priori que l'Oreste n'eut que Delphes, en vertu de son contenu."

14 Ibid., p. 160.


16 Defradas, op. cit., p. 175-181.

17 Cf. Herodotus 3.90-93; Diogenes Laertius 1.95; Clovis, op. cit., pp. 233 ff.; Defradas, op. cit., p. 187: "celui-là, à la suite de kypselos régna en tyran sur la ville de l'Isthme au début du VIe siècle, à l'époque où nous avons signalé les premières manifestations d'une pensée délphique."

solidarité des combattants contre la femme qui a tué un soldat, quand Apollon oppose à la mort de Clytemnestre celle d’Agamemnon.  

The Delphic aspects of the Orestes legend can be summed up as the following: Apollo orders the murder of Clytemnestra; Apollo announces the purification of Orestes at Delphi; and Apollo defends Orestes by an argument that clearly favors the notion of patriarchy over that of matriarchy. It is the presence of Apollo and his close ties to Orestes which form the core of the Delphic legend.

With this core Aeschylus has fused the Attic traditions of the founding of the Areopagus at Athens and the establishment of the cult of the Eumenides, just as in the Prologue to the play he presented an Athenian version of the installation of Apollo at Delphi.

There are, however, two Athenian institutions in the domain of criminal law which also attest contact between Delphi and Athens: the Delphinion and the Exegetes. Both apply to the case of Orestes. In addition to the Areopagus and the Palladion, there was a third tribunal at Athens which was the “most sacred” (άγιότατος), that of the Delphinion, where it was decided whether or not a crime was permissible (νομισμένο) in accord with the religious laws. The tradition of the Delphinion was brought to both Delphi and Athens by Cretan navigators in the eighth century. Therefore one must speak of an assimilation of a Cretan god and Apollo at Delphi, and then of Apollo at Delphi, and Apollo, god of the Delphinion, at Athens.

In assigning to Apollo the role of defense counsel in his play, Aeschylus was giving a Delphic and even more ancient—and thus more venerable—origin to an Athenian legal fact.  

An Athenian legal tradition even more relevant to the case of Orestes is that of the Exegetes. In the *Choephoroi*, Electra, interrogating the Chorus how she should best honor the memory of her father, employs precisely the word that designates the act of the exegete: (118) Τί φέ; διδάκα άναπρεπής ιεργομένον. Later Orestes is asked by the Chorus, as an exegete might be asked, in what manner Agamemnon’s death was to be revenged on his wife and her lover (552 ff.): ἐγγού δέλλοια. In the *Eumenides* Apollo himself appears as an exegete. The Chorus of the Erinyes asks Orestes (555): ὃς μάκτις ἔργον σε μετροκεντεῖς; And Orestes, turning to Apollo, asks the god as one would ask an exegete, to bear witness on his behalf (609 ff.): ἑν πο' μαρτυρήσῃ· ἐγγού δέ μοι, Ἀπολλό, εἰ σέ ἁγίον ἱπτάτην μοι.  

This additional link which the traditions of the Delphinion and the Exegetes provide between Orestes and his purifier Apollo causes Defradas to observe, “Tous les Apollons convergent dans l’Apollon pythien. Apollon devient le prototype de meuntrier légitime qui se soumet à la purification après la mort de Python.”

until a reconciliation between him and the parents of his victim is achieved; cf. Glotz, op. cit., pp. 305 ff. This theme is picked up in the *Eumenides* where Orestes tells of wandering in exile before reaching Athens (443 ff.).

25 Texts concerning the existence of Exegetes in Athens are listed in Defradas, op. cit., p. 205.

26 Ibid., p. 198. Cf. also a decree in 431 to accord a sacrifice to Apollo in *Inscriptions Graecae* 1.78: Λεώνιας θεού εὔχάλα τινὸς αἱρετής θεοτοκός οὐκ εὐμετακένησαν Ἀπόλλωνα, and an analog in *Inscriptions Graecae* 1.779 ff.; and cf. Defradas, op. cit., pp. 195-199. Judging from what Defradas says, one might consider that a gradual assimilation of the two Apollos began earlier than the fourth century and that the *Orestes* of Aeschylus represents a step in this process.

27 Ibid., 204.
Deffradas has already alluded to the Indo-European character of Apollo's argument in favor of patriarchy, which links the god of Delphi to the Spartan warrior class. A. Yoshida has indicated that the traditions found at Delphi are in some instances marked by Indo-European traits. What now remains to be done is to show how Apollo, the dragon-slayer, relates to Indo-European tradition.

Aeschylus lets Apollo allude to his feat of slaying the Python in the lines with which he wards off the Furies from Orestes by threatening them with physical violence (179-183):

Out of this temple I command you, go at once!
Quit my prophetic sanctuary, lest you feel
The gleaming snake that darts winged from my golden bow,
And painfully spew forth the black foam that you suck
From the sour flesh of murderers.

The presence of the bow and the metaphor "snake" for "arrow" refer to the weapons with which Apollo killed the Python. While the Homeric hymn mentions only one arrow that kills a dragoness, in the legend of Simonides the dragon is male and is called Python. Apollo vanquishes him with a hundred arrows. A version that appears to have been the most popular after 900 B.C. has Apollo killing the dragon at Delphi with many arrows and then leaving for Tempe or Crete to be purified of blood pollution. Another Delphic account, this time in euhemerized form, tells how the son of a certain Krios, who ruled in Euboea, plundered Apollo's shrine at Delphi. Apollo promises to send his arrows upon this bandit and then have himself cleansed of blood pollution by the Cretans.

Finally, a Sicyonian legend mentions how Apollo and Artemis came to Aigialeia seeking purification for the killing of Python.

The guilt that the death of the dragon brings upon the slayer is best paralleled in the Indic tradition of the warrior god, Indra, whose slaying of the tricephalic dragon Visvarupa is a sin. The three Functions of Indo-European Tradition in Eumenides nature of this sin, which is recounted in the fifth chapter of the Markandeya Purana, has been explained by Dumézil: "Indra tue d'abord le monstre Trirâpeça, meurtre nécessaire, car le Trirâpeça est un fléau menaçant pour le monde, et cependant meurtre sacrilège, car le Trirâpeça a rang de brahmane et il n'y a pas de crime plus grave que le brahmanicide."

Fontenrose recognizes another parallel between Apollo and Indra, this time in the legend of Indra's killing of the dragon Vytra: "As early as Rig Veda 1.52 Indra fled after Vytra's death. In later sources his flight and death are combined with his need for purification after blood guilt. In this the Indra-Vytra myth offers a remarkable parallel to the Apollo-Python myth in both Delphic and Sicyonian versions."

It might be added that the legend of Indra's killing of the three-headed son of Tvaght has been compared by Dumézil with the Roman legend of the battle between the three Horatii and the three Alban Curiaii, found in the first book of Livy. The third of the Horatii can be related to Trita Apya, Indra's helper in the dragon slaying. Trita Apya incurs guilt by killing a relative and a Brahman; the third of the Horatii, upon returning to Rome, slew his sister because she mourned the death of the Alban to whom she was betrothed. Both Trita Apya and the Roman champion then had to undergo ritual purification.

In the Eumenides, the story of Orestes offers some striking parallels to that of Trita Apya and the third Horatius. In each case the crime is defined as the murder of a relative. In each case the murderer must be cleansed of his guilt. Orestes kills his mother upon the command of Apollo. Trita Apya kills the three-headed dragon as the helper and ally of Indra. Both Apollo and Indra themselves undergo or have undergone ritual purification.

From these parallels, and bearing in mind that the legend that provides the core for the play of Aeschylus is itself Delphic and therefore exposed to the influence of Indo-European thought, it is tempting to assume that the Apollo who appears in the Eumenides, by virtue of his patriarchal bent, his near identification with Orestes, both as criminal and as purifier, and the parallels that his own
Another treatment of Apollo as a second-function figure, this time, however, of Apollo the physician who is related through Asklepios to Rudra, is found in H. Grégoire, R. Goossens, and M. Mathieu, Asklepios, Apollon Smintheus et Rudra, MARB 45-4 (Bruxelles, 1946).

Orestes, it is true, referred to Athena as a warrior when he first approached her shrine at Athens; cf. Eumenides 995 ff.

Turning our attention to Athena, we find a goddess who has done as much as has Apollo in aiding the cause of Orestes, if not more. Yet there is a difference in their characters and in the means they employ to achieve their common end. While Apollo succeeds only in antagonizing the Erinyes, Athena opposes them with moderation and reason. Apollo threatens the Furies with shafts from his bow; he acts as defense counsel for Orestes. Athena promises the Erinyes a new kind of justice and establishes the court of the Areopagus over which she presides as impartial judge.

Yet she is not impartial. When the votes of the jurors are evenly divided between conviction and acquittal, Athena casts hers in favor of Orestes in a speech in which she reveals herself to be a member of the patriarchal party whose argument Apollo had put forward earlier (735 ff.):

No mother gave me birth. Therefore the father's claim
And male supremacy in all things, save to give
Myself in marriage, wins my whole heart's loyalty,
Therefore a woman's death, who killed her husband, is,
I judge, outweighted in grievousness by his.

When the Erinyes protest the verdict and threaten to inflict sorrow and pestilence upon Athens in revenge, Athena soothes them with kind words, telling them that they have suffered neither dishonor nor defeat. When this course seems ineffectual, her tone changes (825 ff.):

I alone among the gods
Know the sealed chamber's keys where Zeus's thunderbolt
Is stored. But force is needless.

Athena then offers the Erinyes an honored place in the society. In so doing, she describes her own social role in the following way (914 ff.):

I will conduct their valiant arms to victory,
And make the name of Athens honored through the world.

These last lines are the only clear indication in the play of what Athena's function is. Yet in their light the other lines that have been quoted fall into place. Athena is at the side of Apollo, the second-function god, and cooperates with him in the defense and purification of Orestes. It was she who gave him sanctuary at Athens from the wrath of the Furies, just as Apollo had done at Delphi. And it was to her that Apollo had sent Orestes, that she might free him from his pursuers once and for all.

Yet Athena takes on dimensions larger than Apollo, not only in her founding of the court of the Areopagus which brings legal jurisdiction to the warrior function, but in her concern for the defense of the city from the fury of the Erinyes. Apollo represents the ruder aspects of the warrior function (cf. Rudra and the Maruts, n. 39 above), while Athena is entirely civilized (cf. Indra). She is anxious to avoid civil strife in Athens (854 ff.). Her acts of conciliation are motivated by this concern, but it is Athena's great power, her knowledge of how to wield the thunderbolt of Zeus, which allows her to be generous with a defeated enemy. Athena is more important than Apollo because she is responsible for the military protection and regulation of the entire Athenian society. Her second-function role in the play thus does not depend entirely on her relationship to Orestes. Rather, it is outlined in unequivocal terms by the poet when he contrasts the function of the goddess with that of the newly established Eumenides. Athena is par excellence the warrior goddess of Athens.

What is found in the play is found also in the tradition. Athena is a second-function figure not only at Athens but, as Yoshida has noticed, also at Delphi, where as Athena Pronaia she is depicted as fighting under the command of Zeus against the giants. Like Indo-European goddesses in general, however, and specifically the Indic Sarasvati and the Iranian Arđvi Sātī Anzāhī, Athena also appears as a transfunctional figure. In the feast of Pamathenia held at Athens she is described as Hygieia, Pallas, and Nike (inscriptiones Graecae 21,169), which Vian has noted as representing the third, first, and second functions, in that order.

41 Orestes is a second-function figure by virtue of his identification with Apollo, Athena as his judge exercises authority over a second-function figure. Yet the founding of the Areopagus is of the first function (Mitra), and the general guardianship of Athens makes Athena seem more like a sovereign Aryaman figure (in Dumézil's opinion).


The term "function," as Dumézil uses it, refers in this broadest sense to a sphere of power and responsibility. Yet it is not a sphere that exists in isolation. Each function is, as Littleton points out, "in a mathematical sense, a function of the others." Apollo's power rests in his being lord of Delphi, and his responsibility is the protection and purification of Orestes. Athena is also the protectress of Orestes, but she is guardian of Athens as well. Apollo's weapon is the traditional bow with which he killed Python. Athena, however, alludes to wielding the thunderbolt of Zeus, which is an indication that the authority she exercises in the play of Aeschylus is not her own, but has been delegated to her by the lord of Olympus. This reference to Zeus is but one of many in the text which reveal that Zeus, although he never appears on stage or speaks a line, is very much at the center of the action.

In the Prologue the priestess of Delphi, recounting the history of the oracle, gives Zeus the prominent position. Not only is he the god who established his son Apollo as present ruler and ἡγεμόνια ἄθλου (Eumenides 19, 616 ff.), the interpreter to mankind of his father's word and will; he is also the supreme Fulfiller who guarantees that what has been prophesied will come to pass. The Delphic oracle, in effect, begins and ends with Zeus.

The subservient roles that Athena and Apollo play with respect to Zeus are recognized by the Erinyes. They address god and goddess as daughter and son of Zeus (415, 109). The Erinyes themselves agree to let Orestes be tried because they trust Athena's wisdom and her father's word and will; he is also the supreme Fulfiler who guarantees that what has been prophesied will come to pass. The Delphic oracle, in effect, begins and ends with Zeus.

It is a success in which Apollo does not directly share. Orestes gains his life and regains his innocence. There is no story end. But Athena gains freedom from civil strife in Athens (854 ff.), the recognition and acceptance of her Areopagus, and a reconciliation with the Erinyes who become the patron goddesses of wealth, fertility, and nourishment. This is the second part of the story, the main part, for which the trial and acquittal of Orestes serve only as a test case. This is the success that Zeus gains through his role as Pavior, that human justice tempers the justice of nature with reason and intelligence. But he gains it in the same way as he pleads, indirectly and from a distance.

Littleton points out that Dumézil has been loath to regard Zeus as a first-function figure. His weapon, the thunderbolt, is found in Indo-European tradition, as Yoshida has remarked, dans les trois fonctions de l'Indo-Européen. You call on Justice: I rely on Zeus. What need To reason further?

A link between Zeus and Orestes is found in the concept of the suppliants. Orestes is told by Apollo to go to Athena as a suppliant (78 ff.). Athena protects Orestes the suppliant because Zeus is the protector of suppliants who purified Ixion (410). Apollo has no fears that his shrine will be polluted as a result of his purification of Orestes because Zeus, who had set the precedent with Ixion, did not suffer any pollution as the result of his act (715 ff.). In an earlier play of Aeschylus, The Suppliant Maidens, Zeus himself is characterized as a suppliant (1). Zeus πρὸς ἀδειφέρον. This adds a new dimension to the conflict. Apollo has already been identified with Orestes and shown to be the mouthpiece of Zeus. Now Orestes is linked to Zeus as a suppliant. The guilt for the murder of Clytemnestra is passed on from Orestes to Apollo and from Apollo to Zeus, and each must answer for it. The purification of Orestes occurs at the hands of Apollo, but also at the hands of Zeus. Not only do Orestes and Apollo plead before the court: Zeus, in the final lines of the play, is described as "Zeus the Pavior" who "crowned persuasion with success" (972-974). In justifying the act of Orestes, Zeus has justified himself.

But he gains it in the same way as he pleads, indirectly and from a distance.

Littleton points out that Dumézil has been loath to regard Zeus as a first-function figure. His weapon, the thunderbolt, is found in Indo-European tradition, as Yoshida has remarked, dans les trois fonctions de l'Indo-Européen. You call on Justice: I rely on Zeus. What need To reason further?
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The alliance between the first and the second functions, as manifested by Zeus, Athena, and Apollo, is a theme common to Indo-European tradition. The two superior functions unite to conquer the third and thus bring the latter into the social system. Dumezil has isolated three instances of this theme. In India the third-function Avisins were not incorporated into the society of the gods until after a violent conflict with the "two forces" (ubhe vitye), which was followed by a reconciliation and a pact. In Germanic tradition there is the war between the Aesir, the dominant group of gods to which Odin, Tyr, and Thor belong, and the lower group of Vanir, comprising Freyr, Njordr, and Freyja. After their defeat, the Vanir are brought into the community. In the Roman tradition of the Sabine war it is not gods but men who fight, but as Dumezil has repeatedly pointed out, early Roman "history" is euhemerized Indo-European myth. The first book of Livy describes how the Romans under their Titus Tatius, would not agree to let the Romans marry them. The incorporation of the Sabines into Roman society is revealed by the list of the three original Titiienses: some Thoughts on Reading Dumezil," To Honor Roman Jakobson: Essays on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday (The Hague, 1967), pp. 50-54-58.

She answers:

Such that no house can thrive without your favour sought.

Then they ask (901 fE.):

What prerogatives are mine?

And she replies:

Such as bring victory untroubled with regret;

Blessing from earth and sea and sky; blessing that breathes

In wind and sunlight through the land; that beast and field

Enrich my people with unwearyed fruitfulness,

And armies of brave sons be born to guard their peace.52

In Celtic tradition there is a fragment from the mythological cycle which recounts the second battle of Moytura (Mag Tured), wherein the Tuatha Dé Danann defeat the Fomorians. One of the vanquished is Bress, once king of both peoples, but deposed because of avarice and forced to serve as guarantor of nourishment and prosperity for seven years without compensation. The account of how he saves his life from his conquerors provides an interesting parallel to the final scene between Athena and the Erinyes. The dialogue takes place between Bress, the first-function god Lug, and the judge Maeltne:

Bress: It is better to give me quarter than to slay me.

Lug: What then, will follow from that?

Bress: If I be spared, the kine of Erin will always be in milk.

Lug: That does not save thee: thou hast no power over their age or their offspring (?) though thou canst milk them.

Bress tries a second time:

Bress: Tell thy brehon that for sparing me the men of Ireland shall reap a harvest in every quarter of the year.


The probable source of the concept “Eumenides” or “well-disposed ones” is the Attic feast of the Semnai. As Solmsen (op. cit., p. 201) writes, “In effecting the transformation, Aeschylus made use of a well-established Athenian cult, that of the Semnai or Eumenides, who were worshipped in a cave on the slopes of the Areopagus and to whom—perhaps even at Aeschylus’ time—those acquitted by the jury of the Areopagus used to offer sacrifice (cf. Pausanias 1.28.4 and 2.11.4),” Denhner points out that they remain subterranean creatures (thus chthonic like the Erinyes) but then goes on to say, “Von dem Oplerfest war . . . das Geschlecht der Eupatriiden wegen seiner genealogischen Beziehungen zum Muttermörder Orest ausgeschlossen . . .”

What occurs at the end of the play is simply a shifting of emphasis from the conflict between Orestes and the Erinyes to Zeus and the Moirai. The tradition of Orestes itself provides a common ground where the Erinyes and the Eumenides meet. But after the acquittal of Orestes and Apollo depart from the scene, and Zeus through the person of Athena confronts the Furies whose justice he has replaced with his own. At this point they are still Erinyes and represent no more than that aspect of the third function which engages in conflict with the two superior functions. It is only by accepting their new role that they become Eumenides; they assume the proper responsibilities of the third function which, working in cooperation with the other two, provides a basis for the life of the entire society. One has the impression from reading Aeschylus that a social charter is being drawn up and that a new society is just now coming into its own (916–926):

I will consent to share Athené’s home,  
To bless this fortress of the immortal powers  
Which mighty Zeus and Ares  
Chose for their habitation,  
The pride and glory of the gods of Greece,  
This prayer I pray for Athens,  
And guardian of their altars.  
Pronounce this prophecy with kind intent:

The Erinyes are clearly Indo-European. Aeschylus does, Hesiod does mention them as having sprung from the blood of Ouranos when he was overthrown and emasculated by Kronos. What Aeschylus has done is to identify them with the Hesiodic Keres who are born of Night and who relentlessly pursue the sinner until he is punished (Theogony 220–222). Among the other children of Night, Hesiod lists the Moirai, which gives Aeschylus the opportunity to call the Erinyes their sisters “by the same mother.” This new structure allows the Erinyes to be reconciled with Zeus after the acquittal of Orestes, since Zeus’ insistence upon this acquittal was the basis for his reconciliation with the Moirai, a fact that the final chorus celebrates (1045–1046):

Zeus οἱ οἰρcron Moipd,  
the basis for his reconciliation with the Moirai, a fact that Zeus' insistence upon this acquittal . . .
Fortune shall grace her land with healthful gifts
From her the rich earth engendered
By the sun's burning brightness.

In these lines are found a recapitulation and a reinforcement of the trifunctional structure found throughout the play: (1) Zeus, (2) Apollo and Athena, (3) Eumenides. Here this society is headed by the first-function god Zeus; and he is followed by Ares, in Greek tradition the unequivocal god of war. To these the Eumenides will add their name and their power. This triad takes its place among other instances of Athenian trifunctionality: the four Ionian tribes: first-function Dias, second-function Athenai's and Posidonias, third-function Hephaestus; in Aristotle’s *Constitution of Athens* the third-function Archon in charge of goods and possessions, the first-function Basileus whose realm is the celebration of mysteries and the direction of all sacrifices, and the second-function Polemarchos whose role was to keep an eye on strangers in and out of Athens. The social charter of Aeschylus is headed and embraced by Athena, representing her country and her people, who under the transfunctional aspect of Panathenaïüs stands as the supreme symbol for the unity of Athens.

---

It is fair to say that, of all relevant ancient Indo-European traditions, that of the Greeks presents by far the greatest number of difficulties to contemporary students of Indo-European myth and epic. For the common, tripartite ideological inheritance, so clearly demonstrated by Georges Dumézil and his colleagues in the myths and epics of the Indie-, Iranian-, Italic-, and Germanic-speaking communities, is all but absent in the Greek tradition—despite the fact that this tradition is certainly the most voluminous and best preserved of the ancient Indo-European traditions. As Dumézil puts it, “La Grèce—par raison sans doute du «miracle grec», et aussi parce que les plus anciennes civilisations de la Mer Égée ont trop fortement marqué les envahisseurs venus du Nord—contribue peu à l’étude comparative: même les traits les plus considérables de l’héritage y ont été profondément modifiés.”

Yet here and there, tucked away in a variety of contexts, a few bits and pieces of the common Indo-European ideology have come to light, proving that the Greeks were not altogether ignorant of the
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ideology to which, as Indo-European speakers, they were heirs. One of the more recent (1964) and significant additions to this meager store of evidence concerning the persistence of the Indo-European ideology in the Greek tradition is A. Yoshida's \(^4\) suggestion that it is expressed in the embellishments on the shield of Achilles, as described by Homer in Book 18 of the \textit{Iliad}. The purpose of this paper \(^2\) is to build upon this foundation and comment upon the extent to which the \textit{Iliad} as a whole may perhaps reflect the common Indo-European ideology. This is, of course, a matter that cannot possibly be dealt with adequately in a paper of this scope. Yet given the high probability that Yoshida is correct in his interpretation of the shield of Achilles (I had come to similar conclusions before encountering Yoshida's article), a few observations relative to the epic's chief figures and events are in order, if only to point the way for further investigation.

First, however, let us hear what Yoshida has to say about the shield.

Pointing out that Homer begins his description of the embellishments with images of the earth, the sky, and the constellations (center of the shield), and ends it with an image of the sea (outermost rim)—images that, he suggests, reflect a conventional cosmogenic scheme—Yoshida goes on to assert that

\begin{quote}
Entre ces deux ensembles, c'est au contraire une série de scènes décrivant la vie des hommes qu'a ciselées l'artiste. Or cette description est faite de trois parties, nettement distinctes, respectivement consacrées aux activités relevant d'une des trois fonctions de l'idéologie indo-européenne.
\end{quote}

Dans la figuration d'une ville en paix (490-508), sont représentés un mariage (490-495), puis un procès (497-502), deux des grandes manifestations du domaine juridique, c'est-à-dire de la première fonction.


La structure de l'illustration du bouclier d'Achille.

\(^4\) La structure de l'illustration du bouclier d'Achille.

\(^2\) See also Yoshida, "La structure de l'illustration du bouclier d'Achille," pp. 7-9.

In the third-function character of the final scene, Yoshida suggests, is strengthened by his mention of Ariadne: "grande déesse minoenne de la végétation." To this I might add that there is also a great deal of evidence for the association of dancing with a host of third-function figures, especially the divine twins, in other Indo-European traditions. \(^7\)

It should be emphasized that this interpretation of the shield of Achilles is phrased in thematic, contextual terms, and does not pretend to be predicated upon any set of philological premises, other than the fact that the author of the tradition was an Indo-European speaker. Nevertheless, as mentioned earlier, it does seem to me that Yoshida is correct in his assumption that the tripartite Indo-European ideological principles are expressed here and that their expression unfolds in the canonical order so frequently found in Indic, Iranian, Roman, and Norse materials. The uniqueness of \textit{this} expression is itself an interesting phenomenon, for if we examine that other famous Greek shield, the shield of Herakles as described by Hesiod, no clear parallels emerge. Although Hesiod's description of the Thetian hero's shield is perhaps modeled after the Homeric passage in question, and despite certain very specific points of similarity, notably the wedding scene on the shield of Herakles, wherein people "were bringing the bride to the groom, and the loud bride-song was arising" (line 274), the general character and order of the scenes depicted are distinct from those on the shield of Achilles.

Why Hesiod failed to organize his description in terms of the Indo-European ideology is a moot question, especially in view of the strong probability that he was a younger contemporary of Homer (or at least of the author of the \textit{Odyssey}). \(^8\) Lattimore suspects that


\(^8\) See also Yoshida, "La structure de l'illustration du bouclier d'Achille," pp. 7-9.

\(^{10}\) For a discussion of this point, see Donald Ward, \textit{The Divine Twins: An Indo-European Myth in Germanic Tradition} (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1968), pp. 50-51.

If this view is correct, then perhaps by the time these later lines were composed the hold of the Indo-European ideology had largely given way, although there is nothing in the first fifty-six lines that would clearly indicate its presence. The problem is further complicated by the fact that in most other contexts Herakles is, as Dumézil has shown, one of the most "Indo-European" of Greek figures.

Although it is certainly correct to assert that the *Iliad* is concerned primarily with the behavior of Achilles, his withdrawal and subsequent return to the fray, and only secondarily with the siege of Troy, it must never be forgotten that it is against this latter backdrop that the events relative to Achilles' "wrath" take place. Indeed, it is against this backdrop of internecine military conflict that all the events described by Homer take place. Therefore, it seems fitting to begin by asking whether there are any other Indo-European mythic (or quasi-mythic) counterparts to such internecine strife. The answer is, of course, yes: to name but a few samples, the conflict between the Pândavas and the Kauravas, as described in the *Mahábhárata*; the conflict between Aesir and Vanir, which forms an important element in the Norse tradition; the conflict between the Romans and the Sabines, as described by Livy, et al. In all such cases one segment of the society comes into conflict with another segment, even though these segments may be formally distinguished, as in the case of the Romans versus the Sabines.

Now among the more interesting of Dumézil's suggestions as to the character of the proto-Indo-European mythology is that it contained a myth concerning a conflict or "war" between representatives of the first two functions and those of the third. The clearest reflexes of this assumed protomyth are to be found in the Norse and Italic conflicts just mentioned. In the Norse case it is certain that the Æsir, the dominant group of gods, to which Odin, Frey, and Thor belong, are representatives of the first two functions, and that the Vanir, the losers in the struggle, to which Freyr, Njörd, and Freyja belong, are third-function figures. In the Italic case, the Romans, under the leadership of the warlike Tullus Hostilius (second function), and after the successive reigns of Romulus and Numa (first function), engage in a conflict with their neighbors, the Sabines, who, as devotees of luxury, "la tranquillité," and "la volupté," are manifestly representatives of the third function. In both cases, the representatives of the third function—Vanir and Sabines—are defeated and eventually integrated into the social and/or supernatural system, rendering it complete. (Elsewhere, I have suggested that this theme of a "war between the functions" might well serve to explain, or sanction, perhaps, the lowly position of the cultivator in Indo-European society; he was the last to be admitted to it.)

Assuming Dumézil is correct in his interpretation of these two mythical (in the Roman case quasi-mythical) conflicts, is it possible to view the conflict between the Achaeans and the Trojans in the same light? The answer depends upon the extent to which it is possible to assert that Homer, or at least the tradition upon which he drew, conceived of the Trojans in third-function terms.

To begin with, there is the famous Judgment of Paris, which, according to Dumézil, contains perhaps the clearest single Greek expression of the tripartite ideology. At the behest of Zeus, Paris agrees to award the golden "apple of discord" to the fairest of the goddesses. The choice is between the regal Hera, the warlike Athena, and the voluptuous Aphrodite. So as to influence him in his choice, each goddess, seen by Dumézil as representative of one of the three functions, offers Paris a gift: Hera offers world sovereignty (first function); Athena promises military prowess (second function); and Aphrodite tenders the gift of earthly pleasure (third function). Paris chooses Aphrodite, and thus, by alienating Hera and Athena (i.e., the first two functions), he sets the stage for what is to come. It is quite clear that, in making this choice, he has aligned himself and his people with a third-function divinity. Indeed, throughout the epic, the only divine being firmly committed to the Trojan cause is Aphrodite; the other two former contestants in that prototypical...
beauty contest never waver in their commitment to the Achaean cause.

Further evidence of the extent to which the Trojans, both individually and collectively, manifest third-function characteristics can be seen in Homer’s descriptions of the city and its inhabitants. The city itself is consistently depicted as a center of wealth and a rich prize waiting to be sacked (cf. 2.133, 9.278, 22.116–118, and elsewhere); indeed, one of the reasons why Achilles withdraws from the fight is his expectation that he will be shortchanged when the spoils are distributed (1.164–171). Evidence of third-function characteristics can also be seen in the emphasis among the Trojans upon family life and the relationships therein. Perhaps the best example of this can be found in Book 6, wherein Andromache, her infant son in her arms, implores Hector to withdraw from the war (390 ff.). With the bitterness of one who prefers peace to war, Hector tells his wife that he must continue to fight; yet before taking leave of his family he finds the time to kiss and fondle his offspring (465–481). Moreover, throughout the conversation between Hector and Andromache there is the implication that the cause is lost and that she and all the rest of the Trojan women will be carried off by the victorious Achaeans. Here, of course, we can compare the fate of the Sabine women. In this connection it may be recalled that Dumézil has suggested that third-function figures, although primarily concerned with the maintenance of tranquillity and physical well-being, are often depicted as armed in a protective capacity. Typically, they do not instigate conflicts, but they are not exempt from them should they arise or should the domestic peace be threatened. The Roman figure Quirinus is often referred to as Mars qui praestat paci, and there are arma Quirini. The Norse Freyr is armed with a sword, and the Indian epic heroes Nakula and Sahadeva (projections of the Aśvins) carry weapons and engage in battle. Although the chief Trojan figures, especially Hector, are depicted as doughty warriors, their prowess is displayed solely in defense of their homes and families; they are never portrayed as aggressors.

Turning to a consideration of the principal Trojan figures themselves, it is possible that Hector and Paris are projections of the twin third-function figures so frequently encountered in the pantheons of the ancient Indo-European-speaking communities (e.g., the Vedic Aśvins, the Greek Dioscuri). In order to support this contention, it is necessary to consider two of the chief figures in that other Indo-European epic, the Mahābhārata. Some years ago (1947) Stig Wikander was able to demonstrate that the principal protagonists of the Indian epic were transpositions of the major Vedic divinities, and as such reflected the three Indo-European ideological functions.18 Yudhishṭhira was seen to be a projection of Mitra and thereby a representative of the first function; Arjuna and Bhima, respectively, were projections of the warrior divinities Indra and Vāyu; while Nakula and Sahadeva were projections of the twin Aśvins. In 1957, Wikander focused his attention upon the latter two figures and sought to differentiate them in terms of their respective roles in the narrative.19 Nakula, for example, is handsome, fearless, and a breaker of horses; Sahadeva is defined as peace-loving, an indifferent warrior, and a keeper of cattle. Furthermore, although together they clearly serve as representatives of the third function, the differences between them would align Nakula more closely with the second function, while his brother is more firmly a representative of the third. In the Rigveda, common epithets reflecting the third function are used to refer to the Aśvins, although these epithets invariably occur in pairs, and almost always in the same order. This order parallels the epithets used individually in the Mahābhārata for Nakula and Sahadeva. Moreover, many post-Vedic texts refer to one of the twins as Nātasya and the other as Dāsra. Wikander concludes that this distinction goes back to Proto-Indo-European times (or at least to the period of Indo-Iranian unity).20

If we examine the epithets and characters of Hector and Paris, some interesting parallels emerge. The most common epithet of Hector is ἱροβάλλων, ‘breaker of horses.’ Paris, however, is never so characterized; indeed, in his youth he was associated with the care of sheep, having been weaned by a band of shepherds.21


20 Ibid. Further evidence can be found in the Avesta, wherein there is only a single demon, Nahaita, whose name corresponds to Nātasya. The more benevolent twin seems to have survived demonization and persistence. Wikander believes, in the person of Atar, son of Ahura Mazda; see also Ward, “The Separate Functions of the Indo-European Divine Twins,” above, pp. 194–195.

21 Cf. Apollodorus 3.148. Paris’ childhood conforms to the general heroic pattern, as delineated by G. Rood, Lord Raglan, and J. Campbell: although born of Priam and Hekabe, he was exposed at birth on Mount Ida as a result of prophecy that he would bring about Troy’s ruin. Like Oedipus, however, he was reared by shepherds, and it was only after reaching manhood that he was able to claim his birthright. The etymology of his name is obscure. H. Frik (Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, II [Heidelberg, 1965], p. 273) suggests that it is perhaps Illyrian in origin.
tor's character is that of a valorous and chivalrous warrior; Paris, despite his chief epithet, Alexandras ("Warrior, Champion), is characterized as an indifferent fighter (e.g., his duel with Menelaus, wherein he survives only with the aid of Aphrodite), and as a man devoted to the maintenance of physical well-being (or at least to his own sensual enjoyment). In short, the distinction between the two Trojan princes is broadly reminiscent of that between Nakula and Sahadeva.

Yet if Hector's principal epithet and character resemble those of Nakula, his name would seem to be derived from the same Indo-European source as Skt. saha- (cf. Avestan hasah, Gothic sigis; from Proto-Indo-European *segh-,'to withstand, to uphold'). One possible explanation of this metathesis, so to speak, is that at some point before Homer crystallized the tradition, the name of the Nakula figure had disappeared, and his epithets and personality came to be assumed by the surviving Sahadeva figure, that is, Hector. At the same time, it would appear that the theme of a functional distinction between the two did manage to persist, and that many aspects of the Sahadeva figure—though by no means all—were transferred to a new figure whose name has no connection with the Indian version, that is, Paris. One aspect that did not shift was the association with cattle-keeping; he is remotely possible that the epithet "Alexandras," together with the curious equine simile that occurs in connection with Paris near the end of Book 6 (506–512), wherein his movements are likened to "some stalled horse who has been corn-fed at the manger . . . " may be dim survivals of an earlier identification with the Nakula figure. By the same token, despite his epithet and military prowess, certain aspects of Hector's character would seem to reflect Sahadeva; he is, as we have seen, a man who prefers peace to war, a man who would much prefer to live in harmony with his neighbors. Like Sahadeva, Hector is also a would-be peacemaker, and this, too, may be a survival of his former identification.

Whatever the reasons for this transposition, it seems to me that the very existence of a philological connection between Hector and Sahadeva, coupled with the thematic parallels that can be demonstrated between the two sets of heroic siblings, are sufficient to make a strong case for the assumption that Hector and Paris are reflexes of the common Indo-European twin figures. The absence of any lineal connection between the Trojan pair and their divine counterparts (Kastor and Polydeukes), a connection that, as I have said, can be demonstrated in the Indian tradition, does not appear to be an insurmountable obstacle here.

Indeed, the Dioscuri can be brought into the picture, for as the daughter of Leda, Helen is their sister. Thus, while Kastor and Polydeukes are not seen as lineal kinsmen of the Trojan princes, the implication of an affinal relationship seems quite clear. Elsewhere among the ancient Indo-European traditions associated with the twins there is usually a close female relative present, oftentimes a sister, less frequently a spouse; compare, for example, Sarasvatī, Freyja, and, as Donald Ward has recently suggested, Kudrun and Sītā. That Helen, sister of the Dioscuri, and wife to Paris, fits this pattern is a distinct possibility.

In sum, the Trojans, individually and collectively, seem to represent the third function. If this is correct, then the next task is to consider some possible Achaeans candidates for the honor of representing the first two functions.

By all odds, the most logical candidate for the second-function honor is the wielder of the shield discussed previously, Achilles—or, more properly, Akhilleus. He is far and away the most warlike figure in the epic. But what is more, his recalcitrant behavior, as described by Homer, generally conforms to what appears to be a common Indo-European pattern when it comes to warrior figures. Like Indra, Starcatherus, and Herakles, he is culpable. In his Aspects de la fonction guerriere, Dumezil suggested that the Indo-European warrior typically commits three characteristic "sins," each of which is a violation of one of the three ideological principles. Indra, for example, is an accomplice in the murder of a Brahman (the three-headed son of Tvāṣṭar, chaplain of the gods), displays cowardice in the slaying of Namuci (with whom he had sworn a treaty), and commits adultery with Ahalyā, wife of Gautama. Starcatherus (Starkadr), as described by Saxo Grammaticus in Books 6–8 of the Gesta Danorum, commits a similar set of "sins": he strangles a king (Wicarus of Norway), displays cowardice in battle, thereby causing a war to be lost, and, for a price, agrees to kill the Danish king Olo while the latter is in the act of bathing and thus unable to defend himself. This action, although it lacks the sexual component, does involve both money and bathing, and the act of bathing is conducive to a sense of physical relaxation and well-being. To kill a bather is to kill one who, for the moment at least, is

---

Heraclès, "le seul héros panhellénique," as Dumézil calls him, the sin against the first function involves the murder of his children in defiance of the command that he perform the twelve labors, a command issued by his sovereign, Eurystheus, and confirmed by the Delphic Oracle. His sin against the second function involves the cowardly slaying of Iphitos, who had come to claim his broodmares. His sin against the third function involves his abduction of Astydamia and, subsequently, of Iole. Like Indra, whose powers wane with each "sin," Heraclès becomes impotent and eventually succumbs as a result of his misdeeds.

Although the parallels are admittedly imperfect, Achilles, too, commits a set of sins against the established order of things. To begin with, he defies the authority of his commander-in-chief, Agamemnon, and withdraws from the war. Moreover, the immediate cause of his defiance is the command that he give up a slave girl (Briseis). Thus, in this one brief but crucial sequence (1.130 f.) can be seen all the elements in the culpability of the Indo-European warrior. Achilles defies authority (first function); he withdraws from the conflict (second function); and he falls victim to his sexual desires (third function). The Achaeans' hero's defiance of authority and refusal to fight, to say nothing of his concern with his own sensual enjoyment, are themes that occur over and over as the epic unfolds. In the case of the latter theme, it is clear that during his withdrawal he lives in a manner far more suited to a third-function figure than to a representative of the second function. He has become concerned with his own physical well-being to the exclusion of any concern with the proper performance of his warrior role. A good example of this can be seen in the famous interchange between Achilles and Odysseus, wherein Odysseus, acting as Agamemnon's emissary, offers vast riches, women, and so on, if only he will return to the war (9.252 f.). It would appear that in this context, at least, Achilles is treated as if he were a third-function figure.

Another aspect of Achilles' career which bespeaks the third function is his transvestism at the court of Lykomedes of Skyros. The story, not contained within the framework of the Iliad proper (cf., for example, Apollodoros 3.1-74), is that Thetis had dressed her son as a girl and had hidden him among Lykomedes' women, her purpose being to spare him from certain death in the then imminent war. Achilles' location does not long remain a secret, however, and, neither a sovereign nor possessed of effective physical prowess, and would seem to relate to the third function (cf. Littitcom, The New Comparative Mythology, p. 142).

Unlike the other culpable heroes previously discussed, Achilles does manage to redeem himself. He returns to the war bearing the trifunctionally illustrated shield, overcomes Hector, and materially advances the Achaean cause—which, as I have suggested, in essence appears to be the cause of the first two functions. Yet Achilles, too, is doomed; his invulnerability does not last indefinitely. Although his death does not occur within the framework of the Iliad proper, it is clear that it is imminent. In Book 18, for example, when Achilles announces his decision to avenge Patroklos' death, Thetis "spoke to him letting the tears fall": "Then I must loose you soon, my child, by what you are saying. / for since it is decreed your death must come soon after Hector's" (18.94-96). Later on we learn from Xanthos, Achilles' chariot horse (whom Hera had given the power of speech), that this "decree" had come from "a great god and powerful Destiny" (19.419), or, in other words, from the divine representatives of the first function.

That Achilles, like Heraclès et al., does eventually pay the supreme price for his defiance of sovereign authority is congruent with what appears to be a major aspect of the common Indo-European ideology: the ambivalent position of the warrior, especially vis-à-vis representatives of the first function. For he is at once vitally necessary and a threat to the maintenance of the social order. Malinowski once suggested that myths are fundamentally created to serve as pragmatic "charters" for behavior. If this dictum be correct, then in the case of the Indo-European warrior the charter would appear to read: be valorous in battle, but never forget that you are ultimately subject to the authority of your sovereign, for if you do, you are doomed. That such a charter is implied in the account of the "wrath" of Achilles seems quite probable.

27 This episode has a number of counterparts elsewhere among the Indo-European traditions relating to second-function figures; cf., for example, the episode in the Mahabhârata, Book 4 (the Paricchaitana), wherein Arjuna, posing as a eunuch, becomes a dancing master in the harem of King Virata. See Dumézil, Mythe et épopee (Paris, 1968), pp. 71-72.
28 This and other English translations of Homer are taken from Richmond Lattimore, The Iliad of Homer (Chicago, 1951).
The ambivalent character of the Indo-European warrior is also expressed in a general tendency to separate mythical and epic warriors into two distinct categories: the chivalrous and the bestial.\(^{30}\) Perhaps the best attested examples of this dichotomy can be seen expressed in a general tendency to separate mythical and epic distinctions between Arjuna and Bhima. Arjuna, more directly a transposition of Indra, exemplifies all that is noble and chivalrous; Bhima, more immediately linked to Vayu, is boorish and ill-tempered, and exhibits a savage bloodlust.

If we examine the several major figures of the *Iliad*, especially the Achaeans warriors, it is possible to see a number of examples of this sort of differentiation, although none of them are as clear-cut as the dichotomy between Arjuna and Bhima. The most obvious candidate for the Bhima position, it seems to me, is the lesser (or Locrian) Aias (Latin Ajax). Rose points out that this Aias is the one hero for whom Homer shows personal dislike.\(^{31}\) And with good reason, for unlike Achilles or his more chivalrous, if slow-witted, namesake (Aias of Salamis), Aias of Locris is insolent, given to sudden outbursts of violence, ill-mannered, and in general not a very pleasant figure. Perhaps his character is best summed up in Idomeneus' words: " 'Aias, surpassing in abuse, yet stupid, in all else you are the worst of the Argives with that stubborn mind of yours' " (23.483-484). Furthermore, Aias of Locris, like Vayu, is consistently described as extremely swift of foot; this is a characteristic that seems to go with warrior figures of the Vayu type, one that perhaps ultimately reflects the idea of the "ill wind" that can cause sudden and violent destruction. Aias of Salamis presents a different picture; although slow-witted, he is nevertheless possessed of many Arjuna-like character traits, among them loyalty, steadfastness, and a generally good humor. Indeed, the distinction between the two Aias does in many respects parallel the Arjuna-Bhima distinction, although admittedly the greater Aias' lack of sagacity does not conform to the Arjuna model. Nevertheless, from this perspective, it is curious that two warriors exhibiting in many respects opposite personality traits would bear the same name. Perhaps we have here a dim reflection of a common Indo-European warrior figure, possessed of a "Jekyll-and-Hyde" personality structure, who in the Indian tradition underwent onomastic as well as characterological bifurcation.

In addition to the greater Aias, there are several other major candidates for the Arjuna position. One, of course, is Achilles himself, despite his culpability—Indra, too, it must be remembered, was culpable. It is Achilles who, after rejoining the army, bears the tri-functional shield in the climactic struggle with Hector. Moreover, even at his most recalcitrant, Achilles is ever concerned with his honor, and with assumed assaults upon his honor by Agamemnon and others. Yet an equally good case can be made for Achilles as a representative of the Vayu figure. In the first place, he is described as the swiftest of all the Achaeans (see above); second, his behavior is wrathful and capricious and in many respects resembles that of Bhima. In short, Achilles’ character reflects both aspects of the Indo-European warrior figure, and it is impossible to assign him definitely to one or another category.

Another figure that should be mentioned in this connection is Diomedes, who, with the possible exception of Hector, is perhaps the most consistently honorable and chivalrous of Homer's heroes. Unlike Achilles, he is never given to fits of temper, never defies his commander-in-chief, and in general can be counted upon for steadfast and valiant service. Unlike the greater Aias, he is noted for his good advice and quickwittedness. His loyalty to Agamemnon, who on one occasion refers to him as "'you who delight my heart'" (10.234), is never in question. Perhaps these traits can best be seen in Book 10, wherein Diomedes volunteers to lead a commando-like expedition against the enemy. In short, in terms of personal character traits, he is by far the closest Homeric approximation of Arjuna.

Yet Diomedes' role in the *Iliad* hardly compares to that of Arjuna in the *Mahābhārata*, or to that of Indra in the *Rig-Veda*, and for this reason alone I would hesitate to rank him as the Homeric Arjuna figure. That a great many inherited Arjuna-like traits went into the construction of his character cannot be doubted. Once again, we may be confronted with a case of bifurcation, in this instance between two facets of the Indo-European noble warrior: prominence in the narrative (Achilles) and consistent chivalrous behavior (Diomedes).

Finally, there is Patroklos, intimate of Achilles, a figure generally described as honorable and chivalrous in his behavior. That he, too, reflects some Arjuna-like traits seems probable; indeed, his close association with Achilles—homosexuality is not uncommon among second-function figures—may reflect the complimentary relationship between the two aspects of the warrior. Yet Patroklos' role in the epic is even less prominent than that of Diomedes, a fact that certainly must be kept in mind when considering candidates for the honor of representing the noble Indo-European warrior.

In sum, there is no single candidate for this position. With the
exception, perhaps, of the lesser Aiies, all of the figures just discussed present some Arjuna-like characteristics. The same thing, though to a lesser degree, can be said for the Bhima figure. That the theme of the bifurcation of the warrior is present seems undeniable; its manifestation, however, is apparently collective and not centered in a single pair of figures equivalent to Arjuna and Bhima or Indra and Vayu.

When it comes to candidates for first-function honors, the most obvious is Agamemnon, King of Argos, and commander-in-chief of the Achaean forces. The Argive king's overall sovereign position is continually underscored by such epithets as “wide-ruling” (1.102), “lord of men” (2.612), and “shepherd of the people” (19.35). Although he engages in battle, his prowess as a warrior is rarely emphasized; rather, emphasis is continually placed upon his overlordship. In all this Agamemnon resembles Yudhisthira, eldest and leader of the Pâoñjâvas, whom Wihaner has identified as a first-function figure. Yet problems arise when we attempt to make a more precise identification, when we attempt to classify the Argive king as Varunaic or Mitraic. For it will be remembered that one of the cornerstones of Dumêzil's thesis is the idea of the joint or dual sovereignty, the idea that the Indo-European conception of sovereignty was divided into two complementary aspects: the cosmic and the juridical, personified in the Veda's, respectively, by Varuna and Mitra. In the Iliad, the evidence is by no means clear as to which aspect of sovereignty Agamemnon represents. Like Varuna, he is the ultimate sovereign; yet like Mitra, he is very much concerned with the affairs of men and serves (or attempts to serve) as an arbiter of disputes. On balance, however, I would suggest that he is more Varunaic than Mitraic. One reason for this suggestion is the curious impotence exhibited by Agamemnon, especially in times of crisis. Although never abdicating his position as commander in chief, he is by no means decisive and must continually rely upon others to rally his spirits and to prop him up. That impotence—admittedly more physical than mental—is a Varunaic characteristic was long ago pointed out by Dumêzîl. More recently, in following up Wihaner's analysis of the first function in the Mabdhârata, Dumêzîl has suggested that Pâoñjâ himself, “pale and impotent,” yet exercising ultimate sovereignty over his offspring, can be equated with Varuna, and that Yudhisthira, as an incarnation of the principle of Dharma, is more clearly linked to Mitra.

If Agamemnon is Varunaic, who then might be suggested as the Mitraic representative of the first function? The most promising set of candidates are those figures who most frequently serve as the Argive king's props and counselors: Diomedes, Odysseus, Kalkhas, and Nestor. Diomedes can be ruled out by virtue of his previously discussed second-function characteristics. Odysseus, though manifestly a shrewd and sagacious counsellor, is too clearly a trickster figure; he presents too many parallels to Loki, Syrdon, et al., to be taken seriously as an incarnation of the juridical principle. When it comes to Kalkhas and Nestor, however, the matter becomes more complex. Both figures serve as counselors; both are renowned for their wisdom rather than for their fighting abilities. Yet the contrast between them would seem to reflect that typically found between representatives of the two halves of the function in question. Kalkhas is characterized principally as a seer, as a prophet whose counsel is rooted in a supernatural ability to divine; it is he, for example, who predicts the war's duration and the role that Herakles' arrows will play in its successful conclusion. This concern with prophetic insight, with things supernatural, would seem more Varunaic than Mitraic. In contrast, Nestor is the arbiter par excellence, the adjudicator (or would-be adjudicator) of disputes among mortals; one of his principal epithets is “fair spoken.” Rarely if ever does he have recourse to the kind of supernatural modus operandi employed by Kalkhas. On balance, he would appear to be much more concerned with the immediate affairs of the community than Kalkhas, and this, of course, is one of the distinguishing characteristics of the Mitra figure. Indeed, Kalkhas' relationship to Agamemnon presents some broad parallels to the relationship, as expressed in the Rig-Veda (cf. Rig-Veda 10.72.3—5), between Varuna and Daksha (or perhaps Amśa; cf. Rig-Veda 10.31.3), wherein the latter is primarily concerned with ritual relationships and (in the case of Amśa) with the distribution of divine fate.

In short, although Kalkhas and Nestor present a great many generalized first-function characteristics, I suggest that Nestor comes closest to meeting the requirements of a representative of the juridical half of this function.23

23 Ibid.
24 Dumêzîl, Aspects de la fonction guerrière, p. 73.
26 Professor Yoshida suggests (personal communication, April, 1969) that Nestor's character may also contain some elements reflecting what Dumêzîl has termed "les dieux premiers": figures who are trifunctional in definition and who serve to
There are, of course, some purely philological and stylistic grounds for assuming a connection between the Iliad and other Indo-European epic narratives, and these should be noted, if only in passing. For example, in Jaan Puhvel’s opinion there are very sound philological reasons for deriving the Homeric hexameter from Indo-European metrical sources. An interesting stylistic correspondence can be seen in the extent to which the typical Homeric enumeration, which characteristically applies an epithet to the last item

---

or person enumerated, parallels Indic epic enumerations: for example, “These were the dwellers in Kynos and Oppocius and Kalliarios, and in Besa, and Skarphe, and lovely Augeiai” (Iliad 2.531–532; italics mine), and “Drona, Karna, Bhūtrísvas, Sakuni, the son of Sabala, and Bāhlika the great car-warrior (Udyogaparvan 5.149.1–5; italics mine). The etymological tie between Erup and Sanskrit saha- has already been noted.

In sum, although it is, as I have previously pointed out, impossible to deal adequately with a subject of this magnitude in a brief paper such as this, I do think that a strong case can be made for the Indo-European character of the Iliad and its principal characters and events. At the very least, the interpretations suggested here, coupled with those of Yoshida relative to the shield, would certainly seem to warrant a great deal more attention to possible Indo-European ideological themes in Greek epic than has hitherto been given.
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